

**POSTPRINT (PEER-REVIEWED, PUBLISHED, JOURNAL-TYPESET COPY)**

This manuscript is a **postprint** uploaded to EarthArXiv. It has been peer-reviewed and published in **EARTH-SCIENCE REVIEWS** on the **31/07/2019**, and has the DOI **10.1016/j.earscirev.2019.102919**. Authors welcome comments, feedback, and discussions anytime.


Feel free to get in contact: [geo.david.fernandez@gmail.com](mailto:geo.david.fernandez@gmail.com)



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](https://www.sciencedirect.com)

Earth-Science Reviews

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/earscirev](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/earscirev)

## A new crustal fault formed the modern Corinth Rift

David Fernández-Blanco\*, Gino de Gelder, Robin Lacassin, Rolando Armijo

*Institut de physique du globe de Paris, CNRS, Université de Paris, F-75005 Paris, France*



### ARTICLE INFO

#### Keywords:

Continental rift  
Normal fault  
Extensional footwall  
Footwall uplift  
Fault mechanics  
Morphotectonics

### ABSTRACT

This review shows how collective analysis of morphotectonic elements on uplifting rift margins can constrain the mechanical behaviour of continents during early rifting. This is shown for the modern Corinth Rift, one of the fastest-extending and most seismically active continental regions worldwide. We reconstruct the growth of the normal fault system that accommodates most of the rift strain and the uplift of the rift margin it bounds, from onset to present and at rift scale. Our approach allows first-order inferences on the mechanics and evolution of the rift, and can be used in other areas of early continental rifting.

We review and re-assess known geologic evidence in the Corinth Rift, and compile morphotectonic elements into a new map. We analyse the rift topo-bathymetry, and the footwall relief, river catchments and tectonic knickpoints in its uplifting margin. We also review studies that constrain the growth of normal faults using morphotectonic elements in their footwall, and propose a novel theoretical framework to reconstruct fault time-evolution during early rifting. We couple known and new data to derive fault displacement profiles in time, and use the theoretical framework to infer the history of growth and linkage of rift border faults, in turn constraining rift growth mechanics and evolution.

Our rift-scale morphotectonic investigation shows that the current rift-bounding faults are kinematically coherent at depth and constitute a fault > 80 km in length. This composite master fault grew along-strike from the rift centre, linking and integrating individual fault segments that developed co-linearly at earlier times. The observed fault elastic flexure, footwall relief wavelength and high uplift and slip rates throughout the rift margin suggest the border fault is steep and highly localized in strain, and transects the entire seismogenic layer growing in a long-term strong elastic lithosphere.

Integration of previous and our new findings suggest the Corinth Rift evolved in two distinct extensional phases. These extensional phases are delimited by the fast, overwriting growth of the new rift-forming fault, that switched rift mechanics in a ~300 kyr timespan, and controls rift evolution thereafter. The new rift-forming fault enlarges the modern rift as an asymmetric half-graben, along and across strike, superimposed onto the preceding ~4 My distributed extension.

### 1. Introduction

The kinematics, spatial distribution and geometry of normal faults control the mechanics and evolution of intracontinental rifts, as defined by the strength of the continental lithosphere. In continents, the thickness and rheological strength of lithospheric layers set the dip and geometry of normal faults (Buck, 1991, 1993; Brun, 1999; Gueydan et al., 2008), and the seismogenic thickness and effective elastic thickness of the crust regulate the maximum fault slip and along-axis segmentation of the resulting asymmetric grabens (Scholz and Contreras, 1998). Concurrently, the kinematics, spatial distribution, and geometry at depth of normal faults, expressed as footwall uplift and

uplift rate, control the maximum elevation and morphology of mountain fronts (Wallace, 1978; Armijo et al., 1986, 1991), as well as the presence, geometry and wavelength of footwall up-warping (King and Ellis, 1990; Resor and Pollard, 2012; De Gelder et al., 2019). Normal border faults also control footwall relief, fluvial catchment drainage area and spacing (Densmore et al., 2004, 2005; Cowie et al., 2006), and the distribution and height of river long-profile convexities (e.g., Boulton and Whittaker, 2009; Kent et al., 2016; Gallen and Wegmann, 2017). It follows that morphotectonic elements in extensional footwalls record the growth of border faults and have the potential to characterise rift mechanics and evolution, and thus to provide insights into continental lithospheric behaviour to a first order.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [geo.david.fernandez@gmail.com](mailto:geo.david.fernandez@gmail.com) (D. Fernández-Blanco).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2019.102919>

Received 1 February 2019; Received in revised form 4 July 2019; Accepted 31 July 2019

Available online 06 August 2019

0012-8252/ © 2019 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Intracontinental rift mechanics can be generally abridged as two end-members (Fig. 1). High-angle faults commonly accommodate extensional strain at early stages of continental rifting (Bell et al., 2017), in an overall-strong lithosphere with the largest rheological strength in the lower crust or upper lithospheric mantle (Fig. 1A) (De Gelder et al., 2019). Contrarily, low-angle faults commonly tend to occur at late stages of rifting due to rotation by continued stretching (e.g., Jackson and McKenzie, 1983; Buck, 1993) in an overall-weak lithosphere with maximum strength in the upper crust (Fig. 1B) (Brun, 1999; Burov and Watts, 2006; Gueydan et al., 2008). Exceptionally, low-angle faults can occur during early rifting by magmatism or presence of favouring inherited structures (Bell et al., 2017 and references therein). Both faulting mechanisms have been proposed to accommodate rifting in tensionally-stressed, continental regions like the Basin and Range (e.g., Allmendinger et al., 1983; Stein and Barrientos, 1985), East African Rift (e.g., Ebinger, 1989; Morley, 1989), Baikal Rift (e.g., Mats, 1993; van der Beek, 1997), Central Apennines (e.g., Ghisetti and Vezzani, 1999; Boncio and Lavecchia, 2000) and the Corinth Rift (e.g., Armijo et al., 1996; Sorel, 2000).

The asymmetric continental rift of Corinth is young and amagmatic, and studies have reported both high- and low-angle faults transecting nearly orthogonally the pre-existing structural grain of the thickened Hellenic orogenic wedge (e.g., Armijo et al., 1996; Flotté and Sorel, 2001). The rift is one of the fastest extending regions accessible on land worldwide and one of the most seismically active (e.g., Dan McKenzie, 1978; Collier and Dart, 1991; Papazachos et al., 1992; Armijo et al., 1996; Avallone et al., 2004; Bernard et al., 2006; Leeder et al., 2008; Jolivet et al., 2010; Charalampakis et al., 2014). Therefore, the Corinth Rift is an outstanding natural laboratory for intracontinental rifting and a key site to gain an enhanced understanding of normal fault mechanics and continental tectonics.

Models of mechanics and evolution in the Corinth Rift are diverse, despite an impressive volume of research that spans from the fifth century BC philosophical arguments on mythological attributions given to karstic features in the mountains south of the Corinth Gulf (Herodotus "History"; e.g., Clendenon, 2009) to present-day results of the IODP Expedition 381 in the gulf itself (McNeill et al., 2019). Models lack a coherent view on growth history, kinematics and mechanics of the latest, currently active, rift border fault system and its significance for the Corinth Rift and for generic rift growth processes.

Reconstructing the growth of these rift-bounding faults is possible by assessing, collectively and at rift scale, well-preserved geomorphic strain markers that record rift margin uplift.

Here we constrain the modern Corinth Rift mechanics and evolution, analysing at rift-scale the growth of active, collinear faults that bound the rift southern margin. First, we review previous geologic knowledge, and reassess, (re)map and integrate geologic and morphotectonic data into a new map. Second, we analyse relief along and across the rift axis to characterize rift morphology and study its relation with rift geology. We then review approaches that use the geomorphology of extensional footwalls to constrain normal fault mechanics, and put forward a theoretical framework to reconstruct normal fault growth history during early rifting of continents. Finally, we correlate time-strain markers and tectonic knickpoints at rift margin scale. With all the above, we derive the kinematic evolution and along-strike sequence of growth of modern border faults in the rift, as well as rates, wavelength and amplitude of fault uplift. Data and interpretation are coherent with the growth of a new, high-angle, rift-scale border fault that controls and progressively develops the modern Corinth Rift atop antecedent extension.

## 2. Geologic background: Corinth Rift & proposed models

Progressive rollback of the downgoing African slab and concomitant southward migration of the Hellenic trench since ~30–45 Ma lead to widespread extension in NW Greece, in the Cyclades and W Turkey (e.g., Le Pichon and Angelier, 1981; Reilinger et al., 2009; Brun and Sokoutis, 2010; Jolivet and Brun, 2010; Jolivet et al., 2013; Brun et al., 2016). In N Greece, however, this extension is overwritten by younger, steep normal faults that are active at present and formed in relation to the westward propagation of the North Anatolian Fault (NAF) into the North Aegean Trough (NAT) (e.g., Armijo et al., 1999; Koukouvelas and Aydin, 2002). The age of stress change from older to younger faulting is unclear but can be broadly bracketed between 430 ka in the southwestmost NAT (Sapropides Basin; Ferentinos et al., 2018) and ~4 Ma at the NAT front (Olympos-Ossa-Pelion Range; Lacassin et al., 2007). The Corinth Rift is located to the NE of the Hellenic subduction trench, to the NW of a south-arched bathymetric trough formed by a detachment of the Aegean Sea, and to the SW of the southmost NW-SE-trending extensional trough of the NAF (Fig. 2). The rift, with an overall strike of




Fig. 1. End-member models for intracontinental rifts and representative strength profiles. In the upper section is the flexural-cantilever rift model (Kusznir et al., 1991), and in the lower section is the core complex-detachment rift model (Buck, 1991). Their representative strength profiles are shown to the right of each model.




Fig. 2. Active tectonic faults and GPS velocities of the W Turkey-Greece region. The map shows the main tectonic units, plate boundaries and active faults in the region, and the location of the Corinth Rift (CR). The bathymetry is modified from Huguen et al. (2004). The GPS vectors, with a fixed Eurasian Plate, are simplified from Le Pichon and Kreemer (2010). The map of active faults comes from Armijo et al. (1999) and Flerit et al. (2004) for the Aegean and North Anatolian areas, and Kreemer and Chamot-Rooke (2004) for the Mediterranean Ridge area. Line thickness and arrow size represent amount of slip to a first-order. NAF and EAF are the North and East Anatolian faults.

N105°E, transects almost orthogonally the thickened continental crust of the Eocene-to-Miocene Hellenides nappes (e.g., Jacobshagen et al., 1978; Bonneau, 1984; Jolivet et al., 2010).

Normal faults with overall north dips control the south coast of the Gulf of Corinth and govern present-day extension in the Corinth Rift (e.g., Doutsos and Piper, 1990). Rift border faults arranged in en-échelon segments ~10–25 km-long have a ~130 km cumulative length and along-rift strikes that vary from NE-SW to ENE-WSW in the easternmost rift to WNW-ESE to E-W in the central and west rift (Fig. 3). These active normal faults cut not only the Hellenic nappes at a high angle, but also a former set of normal faults with WNW-ESE trends that bounded (now exposed) Plio-Pleistocene basins (e.g., Collier et al., 1992; Armijo et al., 1996). These relationships are readable in the rift eastern end, where ESE-striking extensional faults bounding former depocenters are cross-cut by the younger fault system (e.g., Leeder et al., 1991; Gawthorpe et al., 1994). Similar observations are not clear in the central and west rift, where both antecedent and presently active fault systems are sub-parallel to each other.

Whereas active north-dipping rift-bounding faults set a markedly asymmetric half-graben in the rift center (e.g., Armijo et al., 1996; De Gelder et al., 2019), conjugate faults dipping south set more symmetric rift sectors at rift ends (e.g., Sakellariou et al., 1998, 2007; McNeill et al., 2005; Bell et al., 2011) (Fig. 3). The rift basin is broader and has its maximum basement subsidence at its centre where the whole-crust extension is greater (e.g., Bell et al., 2011), and the highest summits bound reversed, endorheic drainages (Fig. 3). Westwards along the rift axis, the wide, asymmetric half-graben changes into a symmetrical and narrow graben, as the gulf width changes from ~30 km to ~3 km and its seafloor depth decreases from ~850 m to ~200 m (Fig. 3). By contrast, modern deltaic systems are significantly more developed in the

west than in the rift centre (e.g., Seger and Alexander, 2009). Similarly, the extent of now-exposed marine Plio-Pleistocene rocks reduces westward (e.g., Ori, 1989), whereas syn-tectonic sedimentary wedges of the rift-bounding fault decrease in thickness (e.g., Nixon et al., 2016). In the same direction, overall fault orientations change from N105°E to N090°E and mean topography reduces by ~400 m. Rift morphology towards the east is more complex, for rift border faults change their orientation to N045°E–N055°E and the orientation of other faults is more variable (Fig. 3). Both east and west rift ends are highly active seismically (Jackson et al., 1982; Ambraseys and Jackson, 1990; Hubert et al., 1996; Bernard et al., 2006; Godano et al., 2014; Duverger et al., 2015).

### 2.1. Corinth Rift mechanical models

We discriminate proposed mechanical and evolutionary models for the Corinth Rift by two key characteristics: mechanics at depth and evolutionary continuity (Fig. 4). Despite the specificities of each model, we define mechanical models by proposed fault geometry at depth, and evolutionary models by proposed continuity between early distributed extension and the youngest, fastest rifting phase of highly localised strain.

#### 2.1.1. High-angle faults: evidence and models

High-angle planar faults predominate in the Corinth Rift (e.g., Jackson et al., 1982; Armijo et al., 1996). At present, extension is largely accommodated by faults that have dips of 40°–60° north and rupture the surface seismically during the Holocene, especially along the gulf southern coast (e.g., Hubert et al., 1996; Rigo et al., 1996; Stewart and Vita-Finzi, 1996). Whereas these active border faults lead to the rift






Fig. 3. 3D view of the Corinth Rift with representation of the main morphotectonic elements of the southern margin.

marked asymmetry (Armijo et al., 1996), mostly-inactive faults located southwards also dip  $\sim 40^{\circ}$ – $60^{\circ}$  north at the surface and delimit narrow tilted blocks with little footwall relief (Rohais et al., 2007b; Bell et al., 2008; Ford et al., 2012). Individual faults imaged by offshore seismic studies are planar and remain steep at least until  $\sim 3$  km depth (e.g., Taylor et al., 2011; Nixon et al., 2016) (Fig. 4).

In the east rift, border faults accommodate elastic flexure of lithosphere (elastic-plastic flexure (*sensu stricto*), given inelastic strain above the brittle-ductile transition and plastic strain below it). Onshore-offshore strain markers accurately record elastic flexure at glacial-interglacial intervals ( $\sim 120$  ky; De Gelder et al., 2019) (Fig. 5A). Elastic flexure derived from these markers delineate an uplift/subsidence ratio of 1:1.2–2.4 along the SE rift margin (De Gelder et al., 2019) that agrees well with ratios of 1:1.2–2.2 estimated along the SW rift margin with geological features (McNeill et al., 2005). Coupled flexural footwall uplift south of the border faults (rates up to  $\sim 1.7 \pm 0.1 \text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  near the Xylokaastro Fault) (Armijo et al., 1996; De Gelder et al., 2019), and flexural hanging-wall subsidence to their north (rates of  $\sim 3.6 \text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  in the gulf center) (Moretti et al., 2004) mark the  $\sim 4.8$  km high-amplitude structural relief that exists in the rift centre-

east in relation with the latest phase of faulting (Armijo et al., 1996; De Gelder et al., 2019) (Fig. 5A). This modern relief is in stark contrast with the antecedent “proto-gulf” low-amplitude relief inferred from stratigraphic data (e.g., Ori, 1989). The wavelength of elastic flexure in the east rift implies a high-angle ( $40^{\circ}$ – $60^{\circ}$ ) planar fault reaching the base of the seismogenic layer (Armijo et al., 1996; Bell et al., 2017; De Gelder et al., 2019).

Mechanical models derived from the data above propose the rift is controlled by elastic flexure along the border fault system since their onset (e.g., Armijo et al., 1996), probably by the Middle Pleistocene (Ford et al., 2016). The model is supported by the geometry of marine terraces, river catchments and topography (Armijo et al., 1996; De Gelder et al., 2019; Fernández-Blanco et al., 2019b) (Fig. 5A), and the distribution of large earthquakes in the east and west rift with focal mechanisms that indicate normal faulting at  $40^{\circ}$ – $60^{\circ}$  angles (e.g., Jackson et al., 1982; King et al., 1985; Lyon-Caen et al., 2004). High-angle faulting is similarly supported by the correlation between observations of basement subsidence and crustal thinning, and rift total extension, calculated by computing fault heaves under the assumption of planar faulting (McNeill et al., 2005; Bell et al., 2011; Ford et al.,

2012). Moreover, finite-element models reproduce the vertical displacements and subsidence-uplift ratios observed in nature in simulations with high-angle planar faults reaching the brittle-ductile transition, but not in those with low-angle faults (Bell et al., 2017). Different seismic imaging methods show a minimum in regional Moho depths < 30 km below the east and central gulf and elongated along axis (Zelt et al., 2005; Sachpazi et al., 2007; Pearce, 2015) that is coherent with the single, high-angle fault model (Fig. 5A).

### 2.1.2. Low-angle faults: evidence and models

At the southern end of the rift margin, field observations led to the proposal of a low-angle fault ( $0^\circ$  to  $30^\circ$ ) dipping north at shallow depths (0–2 km) (e.g., Sorel, 2000; Flotté and Sorel, 2001; Flotté et al., 2005) (Fig. 5B). These studies suggest that high-angle normal faults root into such low-angle detachment, interpreted to deepen northward from the surface to 2–3 km depth at the gulf southern coast, and proposed to be active from Pleistocene to Present. More recent research by Jolivet et al. (2010) considers the outcropping detachment as one of three decollements active before formation of border faults in the gulf southern coast (Fig. 5B). These studies extend the low-angle structure farther north into a microseismicity cloud imaged in the west rift (see below). Between the two sites, a low-angle basement fault compatible with the detachment has been interpreted in reflection seismics (Sachpazi et al., 2003; Taylor et al., 2011), although the structure is not mapped by other studies (Bell et al., 2008, 2009), even if using the same seismic lines (Nixon et al., 2016).

In the west rift, high-angle border faults seem to reach a ~2.5-km-thick microseismicity cloud that increases in depth from ~6 km with a gentle northward dip ( $10^\circ$ – $20^\circ$ ) (Rietbrock et al., 1996; Rigo et al., 1996; Lyon-Caen et al., 2004; Bernard et al., 2006; Gautier et al., 2006) (Fig. 5B). Whereas short-term microseismicity swarms in the upper ~2 km of the cloud may be controlled by pore-pressures in a highly-fractured, fluid-saturated geologic layer, long-term microseismicity in regular multiples located to its base may be explained by aseismic slip (Gautier et al., 2006; Duverger et al., 2015).

Mechanical models derived from the data above propose the rift is controlled by the low-angle north-dipping structure and that high angle faults root and are mechanically linked to it (Fig. 5B). The structure is interpreted as a detachment, either related to the brittle-ductile transition (Hatzfeld et al., 2000) or to shear (e.g., Rigo et al., 1996; Sorel, 2000; Bernard et al., 2006), occurring along either an inherited crustal-scale detachment (Jolivet et al., 2010) or a local incipient detachment (Lambotte et al., 2014). Most of these studies consider that the structure transitions into the ductile middle crust, since seismicity is reduced below the microseismicity cluster (e.g., Duverger et al., 2015).

Contrarily, active structures 1–2 km in length imaged at that depth are suggested to relate to significant strain (Lambotte et al., 2014). The low-angle fault models are supported by extensional focal mechanisms of large earthquakes in the west rift with one nodal plane parallel to the low-angle structure (e.g., Bernard et al., 1997) (Fig. 5B) and the weakening and fluid circulation usually associated with shallow-dipping detachments (e.g., Morrison and Anderson, 1998). A gravity inversion study, showing a shallower Moho north of the gulf (Tiberi et al., 2001), is also compatible with low angle fault models (Fig. 5B).

### 2.2. Evolutionary models for the Corinth Rift

Early distributed extension (e.g., Seger and Alexander, 2009; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b) and basinward fault migration (e.g., Gawthorpe et al., 1994; Goldsworthy and Jackson, 2001) occurred before the marked present-day strain localization that characterizes the modern Corinth Rift (e.g., Armijo et al., 1996; Hubert et al., 1996). Present-day extension rates in the rift are among the largest geodetic rates measured on any continental site (cf., Briole et al., 2000; Tetreault and Buitier, 2018), with GPS velocities increasing westward from ~11 mm  $\times$  yr<sup>-1</sup> in the Xylokaastro area to ~16 mm  $\times$  yr<sup>-1</sup> in Aigion (e.g., Avallone et al., 2004). However, modern extension rates have increased by up to more than one order of magnitude since extension started (e.g., Ford et al., 2012) and geodetic data is at variance with finite strain and long-term average extension rates (e.g., Bell et al., 2011). These discrepancies, together with uncertainties over the age, (un)disruptive nature and overall tectonic relevance of the modern rift-bounding fault(s) leads to different rift evolutionary models (Fig. 4).

#### 2.2.1. Evolutionary models of continuous rift development

The onset of distributed extension is poorly constrained to 3.6–5 Ma with radiometric dating of syn-extension volcanics in the east rift (Collier, 1990; Collier and Dart, 1991; Leeder et al., 2008), and led to protected-setting continental and shallow water deposits (e.g., Gawthorpe et al., 2017a). In the southern flank of the modern rift, these deposits were uplifted in extensional footwalls that are sequentially younger northward, thereby recording basinward migration of normal faults and block tilting (e.g., Gawthorpe et al., 1994; Goldsworthy and Jackson, 2001; Ford et al., 2012).

Continuous rift models (Fig. 4) suggest self-organization of normal faults and progressive strain localization since the onset of distributed extension in a 20–30 km-wide area south of the present rift (e.g., Jolivet et al., 2010; Ford et al., 2016; Nixon et al., 2016; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b). In these models, increased rate and strain localization in the border fault system results from sequential rift development (e.g.,





Fig. 4. Types of models proposed for the Corinth Rift in time, when classified by two key characteristics: mechanics at depth and evolutionary continuity.





**Fig. 5.** Cross sections across the (A) centre-east and (B) west sectors of the Corinth Rift. Sections are modified from De Gelder et al. (2019) and Jolivet et al. (2010) respectively, and scaled for direct comparison. The top 3–4 km below the surface is exaggerated 3 times, and show the main elements as highlighted by the original studies. Notice the different set of elements and constraints used to reproduce each section. The bottom of the sections show the interpreted geometry of normal faults at the brittle-ductile transition at 1:1 scale. Fault geometry for (A) is proposed, and for (B) is shown as nodal planes of extensional focal mechanisms of large earthquakes that are parallel to the interpreted low-angle structure (as plotted in Jolivet et al., 2010). Panels at the bottom left of each section are crustal transects at 1:1 scale that extend the sections northward (~25 km). We use geophysical studies with maps of the Moho depth (Tiberi et al., 2001; Zelt et al., 2005; Sachpazi et al., 2007; Pearce, 2015) to derive Moho depth below each section, and plot seismicity along a 10 km-wide swath that is centered in the section. Seismicity data comes from the (A) 1996–2008 University of Athens and the (B) 2000–2017 Corinth Rift Laboratory seismic catalogues.

Nixon et al., 2016). Continuous rift models frame the last faulting event within an undisrupted sequence of fault migration and block tilting in 2–4 continuous rift phases, i.e. the “Great Breaching” event at 0.6 Ma, within R2 phase starting at 2.2–1.8 Ma (Gawthorpe et al., 2017b); Phase 3 onset at  $0.7 \pm 0.2$  Ma (Ford et al., 2016); or Syn-rift 2 at 0.8 Ma (Rohais and Moretti, 2017). In these models, the rift evolves in response to retreat of the Hellenic slab and crustal collapse as an early form of a core complex similar to those in the Cyclades (Jolivet et al.,

2010). For these models, the last faulting event is not necessarily indicative of a relevant kinematic change in response to large-scale tectonic boundary conditions (Jolivet, 2001).

### 2.2.2. Evolutionary models of disruptive, non-continuous rift development

Early distributed strain with low extensional rates ( $0.6\text{--}1 \text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$ ) (Ford et al., 2012) preceded the development of the modern, strain-localised border fault (Armijo et al., 1996). The onset of

activity on the border fault is still disputed. Estimations based on lateral chrono-/bio-stratigraphic correlations of syn-extensional deposits in the uplifted margin give an upper boundary age of 2.2–1.8 Ma for fault initiation (Gawthorpe et al., 2017b). An age of ~1 Ma is derived from linear extrapolation of Late Pleistocene marine terraces (Armijo et al., 1996; De Gelder et al., 2019) and datation of calcite cements (Causse et al., 2004). Depositional ages (Rohais et al., 2007a, 2007b; Ford et al., 2009, 2016) and U-Th dating of tufa (Brasier et al., 2011) in perched conglomeratic deltas onshore, and depocenter coalescence in the offshore (Nixon et al., 2016) give a lower boundary of ~0.7–0.6 Ma. Given the uncertainty involved in assigning chronostratigraphic significance to systems tracts when marked spatial variations in vertical motions exists (Gawthorpe et al., 2017a), we here consider an age between ~1 Ma and ~0.6 Ma for the onset of fault activity. Border fault growth marked a dramatic increase in subsidence and a first-order switch in rift tectonostratigraphy, with a sharp sedimentation contrast both onland and in the offshore, and to a rift-scale angular unconformity (e.g., Ori, 1989; Sachpazi et al., 2003).

Disruptive, non-continuous rift models (Fig. 4) suggest a strongly-localized strain since border fault onset (De Gelder et al., 2019), and discriminate an early proto-Gulf from a modern Corinth Rift (Ori, 1989). Increased rates and strain localization results from disruptive growth of a new high-angle, rift-forming fault driving the elastic flexure along the rift margin (Ori, 1989; Armijo et al., 1996). Disruptive rift models frame the last faulting event as discontinuing comparatively minor antecedent extension, and controlling the rift geometry and most defining features thereafter (e.g., Armijo et al., 1996). In these models, the modern rift evolves in response to propagation of the NAF and lithospheric flexure, accommodating extension at the fault tip, much like those extensional throughs to the NE (Armijo et al., 1996, 1999). This evolution implies a marked kinematic change that disrupts previous extension in response to the process zone of the lithospheric-scale transform fault (Hubert-Ferrari et al., 2003; Flerit et al., 2004).

### 2.3. Implications

Different models imply different behaviour of the continental lithosphere below the rift (Figs. 1 and 5). Continuous low-angle detachment models assume combined shear (Barbier et al., 1986) in the rift, transiting eastwards to simple shear rifting (Wernicke, 1981) in the central Aegean. Continuous high-angle fault models infer pure shear rifting (McKenzie, 1978a) south of the present rift evolving to a flexural cantilever model (Kusznir et al., 1991) in its rift-bounding fault. Disruptive models infer a flexural cantilever rift that overwrites prior extension (whether pure or simple shear) at younger times, implying a temporal modern rift that is sustained by protracted seismicity (King et al., 1988).

## 3. The modern Corinth Rift

We compiled, reassessed and (re)mapped active tectonic, tectonomorphic and geologic information from 30+ suitable papers, compilation papers, and published maps into a new map at the scale of the rift (Fig. 6). We provide in the supplementary material a detailed account on the data used (Suppl. material A), a comparison with the map of offshore faults by Nixon et al. (2016) (Suppl. material B), as well as shapefiles and KML files (topobathymetric DEM, 5-level hierarchy active faults, marine terraces, Gilbert-delta topsets, and river streams and catchments) (Suppl. material G to K).

We differentiate two rift sectors that correlate with the strike of the rift border fault system (Fig. 7). Whereas faults trend NE-SW to ENE-WSW in the “easternmost rift” (Perachora peninsula and offshore north of it), faults trend WNW-ESE to E-W in the “rift southern margin” (W of the Perachora peninsula). We further identify three footwall sectors in the rift southern margin, where we perform our analyses, using position and distance of the coast and main morphological elements from the

active fault system; “east” (east of Kiato), “central” (from Kiato to Akkrata) and “west” (from Akkrata to Psathopyrgos) (Fig. 7). For the latter, we differentiated as needed between “E west” sector, related to the Elikli Fault Array (Elikli FA) and “westernmost” sector, related to faults farther west. Hereon, we distinguish individual faults (F) from fault arrays (FA).

### 3.1. Active normal faults

Geomorphic markers uplifting in the footwall of individual border faults have been extensively studied, often to derive fault uplift and/or slip rates (e.g., Collier et al., 1992; Armijo et al., 1996; Stewart, 1996; Stewart and Vita-Finzi, 1996; Koukouvelas et al., 2001; Stefatos et al., 2002; Houghton et al., 2003; Leeder et al., 2003; McNeill and Collier, 2004; Pantosti et al., 2004; Pavlides et al., 2004; Verriots et al., 2004; Palyvos et al., 2005, 2007, 2008; Turner et al., 2010; Karymbalis et al., 2016b; De Gelder et al., 2019). Details on fault activity, slip and uplift rates derived by these studies are compiled by Bell et al., 2009 (see their Tables 1 and 2), and the overarching findings follow.

Uplift and slip rate are maximum in the rift centre (CRFA, Figs. 7 and 8), minimum in the east rift and intermediate yet high in the west rift (AiFA, EkFA, Figs. 7 and 8). Upward elastic flexure along the rift margin led to uplift rates that range from up to  $1.5\text{--}2\text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  to  $\sim 0.2\text{--}0.3\text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  (e.g., Collier et al., 1992; Armijo et al., 1996; Stewart and Vita-Finzi, 1996; Leeder et al., 2003; McNeill and Collier, 2004; Pavlides et al., 2004; Turner et al., 2010; Karymbalis et al., 2016b; De Gelder et al., 2019). Except in the east rift, these values markedly overpass a regional uplift signal, estimated between 0 and  $0.3\text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  (e.g., Armijo et al., 1996; Turner et al., 2010). Fault slip rates inferred are also consistently high along the entire rift margin, with minima ranging from  $4\text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  (McNeill and Collier, 2004) to  $7\text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  (Armijo et al., 1996).

North of the border fault system, parallel faults dipping south and conjugate faults are kinematically linked to the border fault system and passively accommodate its motion (Fig. 8) (e.g., Stefatos et al., 2002). These smaller active faults are either synthetic or antithetic to the border fault and trend roughly parallel to it along most of the rift, or conjugate faults in the rift eastern and western terminus (Figs. 6 and 8). With the exception of faults in the westernmost rift (e.g., Beckers et al., 2015), these south-dipping faults develop smaller syntectonic sedimentary wedges that the border faults (e.g., Nixon et al., 2016). Among these faults, the system with largest offsets locates north of the bathymetric low and is composed of E-W trending faults with south dips. This fault set produces small reliefs and has no associated pattern of onshore uplift and offshore subsidence (e.g., Stefatos et al., 2002). In fact, the irregular northern coastline of the gulf (Fig. 6) is dominated by subsidence (Bell et al., 2009; Elias et al., 2009).

### 3.2. Uplifted Quaternary marine terraces

Sequences of uplifted marine terraces correlated to sea level highstands up to ~400 ka outcrop near the coast all along the rift-bounding fault footwall, from Alepochori to Psathopyrgos (Figs. 6, 7 and 9A). The best-developed marine terrace sequence outcrops in a ~6–8 km wide strip trending NW-SE, parallel to the gulf southern coast west of Corinth for ~40 km (Fig. 9A). This wave-cut marine terrace flight, carved into Plio-Pleistocene marls, is correlated to sea level highstands up to ~400 ka. It has large lateral variations NW-wards as distance to the master fault decreases from ~20 km to ~3 km; i.e. the marine terrace sequence increases in the number of levels, from a few-low laying levels in Kechrie to ~14 levels in the Onshore Xylokastro F footwall, and in elevation by a factor of 3–4, reaching as high as ~400 m (Armijo et al., 1996; De Gelder et al., 2019) (Figs. 6, 7 and 9A). The MIS 5e terrace at ~177 m is the highest of its age for the whole gulf (Fig. 9A).

In the west rift, marine terraces formed by wave erosion far from the outlets of major rivers, and depositional marine terraces developed at







Fig. 6. Tectonomorphologic and active tectonics map of the Gulf of Corinth. Based on a compilation, reassessment and remapping from 30+ contributions, and own mapping (see Suppl. material A). Inlet shows the different DEMs used for the topobathymetry.






**Fig. 7.** Index map, showing the main elements of the Corinth Rift considered in this review. The lower right inset shows the extent of the DEM for across-axis (red) and along-axis (purple) stacked swath profiles and their projection lines, as well as the location of other figures of the western rift (green), the full rift (orange), and cross sections (in blue). Abbreviation of the main elements, from east to west. *Main active faults:* Psatha (Pth); Kakia-Skala (Ka-Sk); Alepochori (Al) and Skinos (Sk); Strava (St); Pisia (Pi); Perachora (Pe); Loutraki (Lo); Central Rift Fault Array (CRFA) [composed of Xylokastron Onshore (Xy On), Xylokastron Offshore (Xy Off), Lykorporia (Ly) and Derveni (De)]; Eliki Fault Array (EkFA) [with the East Eliki (E Ek) and West Eliki (W Ek)]; and the Aigio Fault Array (AiFA) [inclusive of Aigio (Ai), Fasouleika (Fa), Selianitika (Sel), Lambiri (La) and Psathopyrgos (Psa)]. *Marine terraces location:* Xylokastron (Xy1 & Xy2), Akrata (Ak), Aigio (Ag1 & Ag2), and Psathopyrgos (Ps). *Pleistocene perched Gilbert deltas:* Klimenti (Kl), Evrostini (Ev), Platanos (Pl), Vouraikos East (VoE) and West (VoW), Kolokotronis (Ko) and Meganitis (Mg). *Late Pliocene (perched) Gilbert delta:* Mavro (Mv). *Main drainage systems:* Xerias (Xe), Raizanis (Ra), Zapantis (Za), Asopos (As), Trikalitikos (Tr), Fonissa (Fo), Skoupeiko (Sk), Derveni (De), Krios (Kr), Krathis (Kt), Ladopotamos (La), Vouraikos (Vo), Kerinitis (Ke), Selinous (Se), Meganitis (Me) and Finikas (Ph). *Internally drained basins and their plains:* Soutini (So) and Skotini Plain (SkPl); Safenetos (Sa) and the Stymfalia Plain (StPl); and Olvios (Ol) and the Feneos plain (FePl). *Main summits:* Klimenti (Km) and Mavro (Ma) at the front and Kyllini (Ky) and Aroania (Ar) at the back.

these locations over prograding delta fans (e.g., Hemelsdaël and Ford, 2016) (Figs. 6, 7 and 9A). Up to ten levels of relatively well-developed marine terraces with laterally consistent elevations of up to ~350 m lay along the coastline in the footwall of the West and East Eliki and Aigio faults (McNeill and Collier, 2004) (Figs. 6, 7 and 9A). The Eliki F footwall terraces show a relevant marine terrace sequence in Akrata that dims westwards. They outcrop typically within 5 km of the Eliki FA trace and their elevation varies westward from 135 to 150 m for MIS 5e level and from 240 to 255 m for the MIS 7e terrace (McNeill and Collier, 2004; for their preferred  $\sim 1.1 \text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  uplift rate) (Fig. 9A). Marine terraces lying between the Aigio F footwall and the hanging wall of the western sector of West Eliki F are at 160 m for MIS 5e, and 232 m for MIS 7e. Although a MIS 9 level at 360 m has been dated in the western sector of West Eliki F footwall, it is not confidently correlated laterally (De Martini et al., 2004). At the westernmost rift, seven narrow terrace levels reaching a maximum elevation of ~250 m are carved into the Plio-Pleistocene rocks of the Ps footwall, outcropping within 2 km of Ps trace, at ~90 m elevation (for MIS 5e) and ~160 m (for MIS 7e) (Houghton et al., 2003) (Figs. 6, 7 and 9A).

### 3.3. Modern and perched Plio-Pleistocene Gilbert deltas

Two families of coarse-grained Gilbert-type deltas with similar facies associations and geometries are differently distributed along the Corinth Rift southern flank (e.g., Seger and Alexander, 2009) (Figs. 6, 7 and 9B). Whereas Plio-Pleistocene deltas outcrop with varying angular unconformity atop of uplifted Plio-Pleistocene syn-rift and Hellenic basement rocks (e.g., Ori, 1989; Gawthorpe et al., 2017a), Holocene deltas lie in a narrow rim along the coast (Figs. 6 and 7). In the east rift, a large low lying plain passes seawards to a wide coastal platform in the absence of deltas (Figs. 6, 7 and 9B). In the rift center, prominent Plio-Pleistocene deltas display thick foresets packages (> 700 m) at up to ~1750 m elevation, and down-step in stranded offlapping sequences that become younger towards the under-developed Modern deltas in the gulf shore (e.g., Rohais et al., 2007b; Seger and Alexander, 2009). In the west rift, less-developed Plio-Pleistocene deltas crop out along a relatively continuous strip behind well-developed Modern deltas, which coalesce in a broad coastal delta plain (e.g., Ford et al., 2009, 2016) (Fig. 6). The shift in the locus of growth of large deltaic systems from the rift center in the Plio-Pleistocene to the west in the Holocene may





**Fig. 8.** Map of Corinth Rift active faults with displaced relief. (A) Corinth Rift topobathymetry and the map of active faults. The topobathymetry is derived from a merged DEM, and the active faults map comes from own mapping and reassessment of fault maps from other contributions (see Suppl. material A). (B) Highlight of the three highest levels of our fault hierarchy. (C) Master fault (acronyms as in Fig. 7). In grey for all panels, a representation of a hypothetical composite master fault at seismicogenic layer basal depths (~10 km) with similar high-angle north dips and planar attitudes than at-surface faults bounding the rift at present.

relate with changes in master fault activity and differential footwall uplift or changes in sediment supply.

### 3.4. Plio-Pleistocene (uplifted) basin extent


The extent of the exposed Plio-Pleistocene basin decreases westward along the rift southern flank strike, from an extensive area ~35 km long to a couple of strips of each < 10 km long (Fig. 9C). In the east rift, the Plio-Pleistocene rocks cover a large area of low relief (Figs. 6 and 9C). Towards the central rift, the uplifted syn-rift deposits are reduced to an extent of ~20 km. Similarly, the modern progradational coastal area loses extent until it is very limited or not existent between the towns of Kiato and Derveni (Karymbalis et al., 2016a, 2016b) (Fig. 9). However, in the west rift, the extent of the Plio-Pleistocene rocks presently outcropping onland is reduced in comparison to areas farther east, and they outcrop in elongated WNW-ESE areas alternating with basement rocks (Fig. 9C). Farther west, the extent of the Pliocene marine basin is reduced to a stripe of several kilometers, i.e., smaller than anywhere else in the southern margin of the Corinth Rift (Fig. 9C).

### 3.5. Hanging wall synrift deposits

The rift basin is markedly asymmetric and dominated by the north dipping master fault system (e.g., Brooks and Ferentinos, 1984; Stafatos et al., 2002; Taylor et al., 2011), except at the basin ends, where antithetic faults are relevant (Fig. 8) (e.g., Hubert et al., 1996; Benedetti et al., 2003; McNeill et al., 2005; Bell et al., 2008). In the west, the transition from asymmetric to roughly symmetric is located around the area where East Elike F crosses onland (e.g., Nixon et al., 2016), and albeit asymmetric, larger symmetry is also recognized in the eastern end of the rift basin (Sakellariou et al., 2007).

A rift-scale unconformity with an estimated age of ~620 ka, bounds two units with distinct seismic character that mark a change in setting from lacustrine to mixed marine/lacustrine; a unit with non-coherent reflectors below the unconformity, and a unit with rhythmical alternations of low-/high-amplitude reflectors above it (Sachpazi et al., 2003; Lykousis et al., 2007; Sakellariou et al., 2007; Bell et al., 2008, 2009; Taylor et al., 2011; McNeill et al., 2018). Synrift depocenters traced for both units (Fig. 9 in Nixon et al., 2016) mark a switch from a





**Fig. 9.** Variations along the Corinth Rift axis, in map views highlighting different geologic elements. The main trend of each corresponding feature is shown schematically on top of each map. (A) The presence of known marine terraces, their estimated ages and elevations at six locations - bold highstands are dated levels, and the asterisks indicate elevations extrapolated in space to match the distance to the master fault of the MIS 5e terrace. (B) The presence and location of mapped topsets of Gilbert deltas, their age and rough elevations. (C) the extent of the Plio-Quaternary basin exposed onland. (D) and (E) are isochore maps showing two-ways travel times true vertical thickness for two seismic units, representing  $\sim 1.5\text{--}2\text{ Ma}$  to  $620\text{ ka}$ , and  $620\text{ ka}$  to Present, simplified from Nixon et al. (2016).

complex rift zone with distributed depocenters (Fig. 9D) to a markedly asymmetrical rift (Fig. 9E). This switch towards the present asymmetric rift may have taken place by establishment of the north dipping faults by  $\sim 620\text{ ka}$  and their later linkage by  $\sim 340\text{ ka}$  (Nixon et al., 2016). The upper unit is laterally continuous along the rift, with two exceptions; a second unconformity ( $\sim 340\text{ ka}$ ) exists in the west, and only the upper part of the sequence can be traced in the Alkyonides Gulf (Fig. 8) (e.g., Bell et al., 2008, 2009).

### 3.6. Topo-bathymetry


We analyse the morphology of the Corinth Rift in relation to its current bounding fault system, and its interrelation with geological and morphological elements, using stacked swath profiles of average topography. Stacked swath profiles (Armijo et al., 2015) are a suite of parallel swath profiles plot orthogonally to their strike. We use a 20-m DEM to derive stacked swath profiles that are either parallel or perpendicular to border faults (Fig. 7). See details on the procedure followed to produce the stacked swaths in Suppl. material C.

#### 3.6.1. Across the rift axis

Topographic variations in the rift central sector are the largest for both the maximum and minimum topographic envelopes (red and blue in Fig. 10A). The central rift has the highest mean elevations, the highest summit (Killini, 2376 m) and the former basin outcropping at

the highest location (Mavro, 1756 m). In the south, flat-laying and gently south-dipping endorheic basins (Feneos, Stymfalia y Skotini plains; Figs. 6 and 7) remain overall at similar mean elevations for horizontal distances of  $\sim 40\text{ km}$ . Here, maximum and minimum topography show similar mean elevations ( $\sim 1650\text{ m}$  and  $\sim 650\text{ m}$ , respectively) for similar horizontal distances (Fig. 10A). The northward decreasing relief contains Gilbert delta topsets at  $\sim 1100\text{--}1200\text{ m}$  (Evrostini) and  $\sim 900\text{--}1000\text{ m}$  (Klimenti) (Figs. 6 and 7) and reaches, in an horizontal distance of  $10\text{--}15\text{ km}$ , bathymetric depths in excess of  $\sim 800\text{ m}$ , as close as  $2\text{ km}$  away from the shore (Fig. 10A). This represents a vertical relief change of  $\sim 2.5\text{ km}$  in  $< 15\text{ km}$  in the horizontal, or  $> 3\text{ km}$  in  $< 25\text{ km}$ , measured from the rift highest topography to its lowest bathymetry, i.e. a slope of  $\sim 9.5^\circ$  or  $\sim 7^\circ$ , respectively. Northwards, the flat basin floor lays at approx.  $\sim 850\text{ m}$  for  $\sim 10\text{ km}$  and the gulf is the widest at sea level. The envelope of maximum relief in the northern margin rises from  $\sim 750\text{ m}$  to  $\sim 1000\text{ m}$  in a rounded convex-up shape (Fig. 10A).

Topographic variations in the west rift are relevant in short horizontal distances, as marked by the maximum and minimum topography envelopes (Fig. 10B). The west rift contains the second highest summit (Aroania, 2341 m) and a northward decreasing topography with the topsets of Mid-Late Pleistocene Gilbert deltas at  $\sim 700\text{--}1000\text{ m}$  heights and  $< 5\text{ km}$  from the border fault. Rivers with flat upstream reaches and steep lower reaches set the minimum topography and feed large modern Gilbert-type deltas (Fig. 10B). A flat wide bathymetry at



**Fig. 10.** Topo-bathymetry across the Corinth Rift in three “views” perpendicular to the current rift-bounding fault. Each section is ~26 km wide and is composed of 400 swath profiles stacked over a projection line perpendicular to the average strike of the main fault in each rift sector (see below). The width of each individual swath is calculated dynamically and of ~75 m. Relief is exaggerated ~8 times. Distance along each wide swath is measured from the master fault (positive northwards). (A) Topo-bathymetry associated with the Central Rift FA in a view looking towards N295°E. (B) Topo-bathymetry associated with the Eliki FA as seen looking in a N290°E direction. (C) Topo-bathymetry associated with the Aigio FA in a view looking towards N290°E. In all views the upper envelope (red line) and the lower envelope (blue line) represent the maximum and minimum topo-bathymetry, respectively. The master fault is shown with a 55° north dip in red. Other associated features are shown: rivers and endorheic basins (dim red); topsets of Gilbert deltas in light brown (Late Pliocene - Early Pleistocene); and yellow for modern Gilbert Deltas.

–750 m in the east changes westward to a narrower rugged bathymetry at shallower depths (approx. –375 m). This change occurs in both basin margins and not only in relation to the deltas. The maximum topography envelope in the northern margin has a concave-up profile not paralleled by the minimum topography envelope (Fig. 10B).


The westernmost rift has the lowest variations in topography (Fig. 10C). In the southern margin, two topographic maxima bound two differentiated areas. In the area close to the master fault, the steep envelope of maximum relief decays monotonically from the footwall river headwaters, except for a topographic high in its westernmost end (“off-fault topography” in Fig. 10C). The area farther away from the master fault has a minimum topography envelope in relation to longer rivers. The rift is here the narrowest and shallowest, with a width of

~8 km at sea level and a basin floor at depths between –250 m and –350 m (Fig. 10C). The maximum and the minimum topographic envelopes in the northern margin have a sharp triangular shape with its maximum ~15 km north of the coast.

### 3.6.2. Along the rift axis

Maximum drainage topography has variable along-strike average elevations of ~750 m in the east, ~2000 m in the center and ~1600 m in the west (Fig. 11A). The maximum relief within ~21 km of the rift-bounding fault (Fig. 11B) similarly varies along-strike at heights ~70–80% of those in the maximum drainage topography (Fig. 11A). Both profiles significantly increase in elevation between the east and central rift while only the maximum drainage topography decreases





**Fig. 11.** Stacked swath profiles of topography and bathymetry along the southern flank of the Corinth Rift in a view parallel to the master fault. The “view” is looking SSW, with a projection line N105°E, defined to represent the average strike of the master fault. Plotted swath profiles are exaggerated  $\sim 8$  times. Relief in A and B panels is defined by stacking 500 swath profiles, each with an estimated width  $\sim 90$  m, on a 20 m-resolution DEM. (A) Maximum relief within the rift flank drainage is obtained clipping the DEM to the extent of the river networks, including those draining the southern coast of the Gulf of Corinth as well as the endorheic river basins; and (B) Maximum relief within  $\sim 21$  km from the fault is obtained clipping the DEM at  $\sim 21$  km from the main fault and aims to approximate to the relief related to the bounding fault system, i.e. fault-related relief. In these panels, no bathymetric data is used and there is no correction on the basis of master fault position, i.e. relief in the figure is a good approximation to footwall relief only in the area where the fault is at or near sea level (from Akrata eastwards for  $\sim 7$  km, Fig. 6). River basins are marked in red in panel A, and the topsets of Gilbert deltas are marked in blue (Mid-Late Pleistocene) and in light brown (Calabrian) in panel (B). (C) Bathymetry from north of the lowest sea floor axis to the south coast, as seen by 500 stacked swaths profiles in a 50-m resolution bathymetry (see Section 3.1).

west of Aroania summit (at  $\sim 2341$  m) (Figs. 6, 7 and 11). Bathymetric depths show a sharp transition in the east, from depths of  $\sim 150$  m to  $> 800$  m. Similar bathymetric depths are maintained westwards for  $\sim 40$  km, and then decrease gently to  $< 250$  m in  $\sim 40$  km (Fig. 11C).

River drainages and triangular facets stand out in the stacked swaths of southern margin of the Corinth Rift (Fig. 11). River drainages (dimmed red lines; Fig. 11A) show significant differences along the southern rift margin strike. Low laying drainages in the east exist at elevations below  $\sim 300$  m. Flat concave-up drainages in the center lay at elevations between  $\sim 700$  m and  $\sim 800$  m in relation to the endorheic plains. Catchments further west have similar morphologies decaying in elevation to  $\sim 600$  m and tilting lightly to the east (Fig. 11A). Well-developed triangular facets in the center and west rift occur in four hierarchical levels and often have perched Gilbert deltas at the “tips” of their triangular facets (Fig. 11B). The oldest Gilbert delta of the rift, Mavro (Figs. 6 and 7) outcrops at the highest fault-related relief ( $\sim 1756$  m) in relation to the highest set of triangular facets, with triangular tips at  $\sim 1600$ – $1750$  m (purple line; Fig. 11B). Gilbert delta topsets of younger age, Klimentia and Evrostini, outcrop to the sides of Mavro at heights coincident with the second-highest tips of the triangular facets (at  $\sim 1000$ – $1200$  m). Gilbert deltas to the west (Platanos, Vouraikos, Kolokotronis and Meganitis) (Figs. 6 and 7) are on top of triangular facets with tips at  $\sim 850$ – $950$  m (Fig. 11B). A fourth set of triangular facets, with tips at  $\sim 500$  m elevation, is seen only in the center of the margin (Fig. 11B). Aforementioned first-order variations along the rift axis may result from changes in rift maturity, potentially derived from decreasing slip rates and/or younger ages in border fault westwards.


### 3.7. Footwall river long profiles and tectonic knickpoints

We analyse the longitudinal profile geometry of the 16 largest rivers draining the southern margin of the rift, and picked tectonic knickpoints in their trunks (Fig. 12 and Table 1). We reproduce river profile geometry using Topotoolbox 2.0 (Schwanghart and Scherler, 2014), and perform knickpoint analysis with the  $\chi$ -profiler package (Gallen and Wegmann, 2017). We analyse knickpoints in river trunks to assess their tectonic origin, which we corroborate with knickpoints at similar heights in nearby tributary streams. See Suppl. material D for details on river profile analysis.

In the east rift, river longitudinal profiles are flat ( $< 300$  m elevation in upstream distances of  $> 15$  km) and show broad up-convexities (Fig. 12A, right). Here, all trunks show a tectonic knickpoint laying at low elevations (100–200 m) (Fig. 12B and Table 1), and a variable number of knickpoints with heights that lay at three elevations (two at  $\sim 275$  m, two at  $\sim 450$  m and one at  $\sim 700$  m).

In the central rift, the shortest and steepest longitudinal profiles ( $> 1$  km height in  $< 15$  km) flow towards the gulf at the front of wind-gaps bounding large endorheic plains of reversed rivers. Central rift exorheic and endorheic catchments, taken together, show the largest divergence from theoretical graded profiles in steady-state (Fig. 12A, center). Here, each river has either three or four tectonic knickpoints, and there are three families at different heights (Fig. 12B and Table 1). A set of knickpoints are again at low elevations (100–200 m) for all but the largest river network, the Trikalitikos River. Two other sets of tectonic knickpoints lay at  $\sim 1100$ – $1200$  m (Trikalitikos, Fonissa, Dervenios, Krios), and between  $\sim 1500$  m and  $\sim 1700$  m for the two river





**Fig. 12.** Sixteen largest river catchments in the southern margin of the Corinth Rift and tectonic knickpoints of their trunks. (A) Illustrative representations of main characteristics of river longitudinal profiles and plainviews per rift sector defined by this contribution; west (left), center (center) and east (right) rift, exaggerated 4 times in the vertical. (B) Main tectonic knickpoints of the trunks of the sixteen largest river catchments of the southern margin of the Corinth Rift in longitudinal profile view, grouped per rift sector. East: (Xe) Xerias, (Ra) Raizanis, (Za) Zapantis and (As) Asopos; Center: (Tr) Trikalitikos, (Fo) Fonissa, (Sk) Skoupeiko, (De) Dervenios and (Kr) Krios; West: (Kt) Krathis, (La) Ladopotamos, (Vo) Vouraikos, (Ke) Kerinitis, (Se) Selinous, (Me) Meganitis and (Fi) Finikas. (C) Location of tectonic knickpoints in map view. For this analysis we also used slope-area and  $\chi$  plots. The stars mark the lower set of tectonic knickpoints seen in most river trunks at low elevations.

networks that reach that elevation (Trikalitikos, Krios) (Fig. 12B, Table 1). In between these knickpoints, their height is more distributed, and another set can be seen gaining elevation from east (500 m at Trikalitikos R) to west (700 m at Krios R) (Fig. 12B). Fonissa R has another tectonic knickpoint at ~375 m and Skoupeiko R at ~825 m.

In the west rift, rivers alternate long ( $\geq 35$  km) and short ( $< 15$  km)

longitudinal profiles except for the two westernmost footwall river catchments. Whereas short rivers compare with the steep profiles of the central rift, long rivers have morphologies with up-convexities departing from an inferred steady state profile geometry (Fig. 12A, left) and declining in steepness westwards (see Fernández-Blanco et al., 2019a for details). In the west rift, we differentiate two areas. Rivers

**Table 1**

Data associated with the tectonic knickpoints identified in the trunks of the 16 river networks analysed in this study.

River	#	KP #	X coord	Y coord	Abs. Elevat. (m)	Smooth Abs. Elvt. (m)	Elevat. from fault (m)	Drainage area (km <sup>2</sup> )	Distance fault (m)	Distance divide (m)	Chi
Xerias	1	1	666526	4191780	138	140	Underwater	110.2144	8543	23,678	1.924745
Xerias	1	2	669726	4183420	460	460	Underwater	26.7408	19,860	12,361	6.268060
Xerias	1	3	673346	4178620	664	665	Underwater	2.7896	28,123	4098	11.672004
Raizanis	2	1	658866	4191600	113	114	Underwater	115.8364	7680	16,283	1.728496
Zapantis	3	1	653046	4195520	143	144	Underwater	54.6592	12,156	17,621	3.718770
Zapantis	3	2	650286	4190380	267	265	Underwater	19.214	14,495	9658	5.167287
Assopos	4	1	647446	4200840	124	122	Underwater	246.9484	9839	35,027	1.616133
Assopos	4	2	644386	4190120	266	265	Underwater	162.4516	24,165	20,701	4.221977
Assopos	4	3	634766	4186440	464	454	Underwater	15.4148	37,689	7177	8.628353
Trikalitikos	5	1	631426	4205420	480	478	Underwater	66.6064	17,937	16,608	4.265542
Trikalitikos	5	2	627066	4201740	1180	1175	Underwater	25.022	24,769	9776	6.856264
Trikalitikos	5	3	624446	4197280	1644	1641	Underwater	4.428	30,843	3703	10.932628
Fonissa	6	1	636386	4216360	122	113	Underwater	50.3056	17,000	19,260	0.573023
Fonissa	6	2	636286	4214680	381	368	Underwater	46.5236	3554	17,406	1.217854
Fonissa	6	3	633966	4211420	515	514	Underwater	26.3052	8510	12,450	3.253888
Fonissa	6	4	627146	4208960	1101	1084	Underwater	1.7648	18,240	2720	10.176852
Skoupeiko	7	1	628725	4218520	121	121	Underwater	34.6452	5956	12,975	2.221048
Skoupeiko	7	2	628666	4216420	575	576	Underwater	25.2004	7047	10,264	2.857482
Skoupeiko	7	3	627266	4212280	832	810	Underwater	8.0304	12,808	4503	6.169165
Devrenios	8	1	625506	4218500	162	148	Underwater	35.224	4250	12,744	1.637598
Devrenios	8	2	622726	4214860	623	613	Underwater	7.5708	9593	7401	4.289638
Devrenios	8	3	621186	4212840	1066	1054	Underwater	4.0536	12,694	4299	7.122171
Krios	9	1	618606	4218760	195	185	Underwater	93.7536	5021	19,608	1.220103
Krios	9	2	618086	4211840	714	707	Underwater	47.8124	13,471	11,158	3.759270
Krios	9	3	616446	4207780	1120	1116	Underwater	7.2472	19,170	5459	6.981231
Krios	9	4	616286	4205700	1473	1463	Underwater	1.4496	21,600	3029	10.100120
Kratis	10	1	612526	4222760	199	174	184	133.5284	5525	28,997	1.194022
Kratis	10	2	611286	4219320	351	345	336	120.7608	9875	24,648	2.180448
Kratis	10	3	608666	4214720	695	694	680	84.5236	16,452	18,071	3.842688
Kratis	10	4	611666	4206960	970	970	955	24.9636	26,851	7672	7.331195
Ladopotamos	11	1	606706	4219800	708	706	693	19.0396	7607	15,012	3.244866
Ladopotamos	11	2	604166	4214100	1274	1264	1259	8.4976	15,110	7509	8.007839
Ladopotamos	11	3	605066	4212400	1411	1405	1396	5.676	17,350	5269	9.856060
Vouraikos	12	1	602826	4223300	138	149	108	213.2052	4499	38,531	0.773081
Vouraikos	12	2	602306	4220820	447	442	417	206.7072	7480	35,550	1.307397
Vouraikos	12	3	602126	4214800	661	661	631	181.276	14,559	28,471	2.629612
Vouraikos	12	4	585986	4203300	975	968	945	7.2736	39,183	3847	11.039972
Kerinitis	13	1	599366	4225820	161	158	111	69.9096	2785	17,674	0.788818
Kerinitis	13	2	595446	4222140	581	585	531	46.256	9971	10,835	3.080262
Kerinitis	13	3	595786	4219680	693	695	643	14.564	12,564	7895	4.278960
Kerinitis	13	4	594986	4217560	914	911	864	8.9888	15,241	5217	6.099830
Selinous	14	1	592866	4227640	146	145	66	295.148	5892	40,143	0.884287
Selinous	14	2	588486	4218540	439	438	359	242.3104	19,731	26,304	3.107405
Selinous	14	3	582866	4212760	622	621	542	51.9428	29,859	16,176	5.767960
Selinous	14	4	578746	4203780	908	907	828	10.0236	41,463	4572	10.910468
Meganitis	15	1	584247	4226074	853	848	803	8.1643	18,527	5662	7.073409
Meganitis	15	2	583166	4225300	970	955	930	6.116	16,733	4516	7.361968
Phoenix	16	1	580866	4232120	511	508	461	31.8224	11,964	10,382	3.927337
Phoenix	16	2	579506	4227040	1162	1153	1112	5.0552	18,342	4005	8.081930


transecting the Eliki FA have four tectonic knickpoints, except Ladopotamos R, with three (Fig. 12B, Table 1). With the exception of the latter, one set of knickpoints lies again at low elevations between 100 m and 200 m. Tectonic knickpoints of the other three families are at lower elevations for the longer trunks (Krathis, Vouraikos, Selenous) and at higher elevations for the shorter trunks (Ladopotamos, Kerinitis). Footwall rivers in the westernmost rift, associated with the Aigio FA (Meganitis, Finikas), present two knickpoints each and none correspond to the low elevation knickpoints observed elsewhere in the southern rift flank (Fig. 12B, Table 1). Contrarily, the uppermost set of tectonic knickpoints in both rivers is at a similar position than the set of tectonic knickpoints at highest elevations in all trunks eastwards.

#### 4. Theoretical background: Footwall record of normal fault growth

Normal faults growing self-similarly by tip propagation have distinct individual displacement profiles with displacement maximum at the centre of the fault total length and displacement minima at its ends

(e.g., Dawers et al., 1993; Manighetti et al., 2005; Childs et al., 2017). Elliptical to triangular fault displacement profiles are common, although mechanical restrictions like adjacent faults and/or original location of the fault nucleation point result in other shapes (e.g., Manighetti et al., 2001, 2005). The displacement profile of single normal faults is similarly modified during fault growth as local stress fields deviate at its tips by mechanical interactions with adjacent faults (e.g., Willemse, 1997; Gupta and Scholz, 2000). These intrinsic characteristics of the displacement profiles of normal faults help evaluate whether fault segments adjacent at the surface are connected at depth.

Whereas unconnected faults initiating mechanical interaction may have a displacement profile with more than one maxima and reduced aspect ratios, fault segments mechanically linked at depth show a single displacement profile for their summed fault lengths and normal aspect ratios (e.g., Anders and Schlische, 1994; Dawers and Anders, 1995; Gupta and Scholz, 2000; Manighetti et al., 2001, 2005). Faults that grew independently and later linked may show a large-wavelength composite displacement profile, composed of fault displacement profiles with shorter wavelengths (e.g., Cowie and Roberts, 2001;



**Fig. 13.** (A) Schematic representation of elements in extensional footwalls in relation with their active faults in an along-strike view, and footwall rivers and their tectonic knickpoints in an across-strike view. (B) Elements of an extensional footwall and their relation with the proxies of relief used in this study. (C) Self-similar growth of a normal fault, as shown by geomorphic features in its footwall, in four time-steps: (t0) steady-state of a river network - Gilbert delta system; (t1) initiation of normal fault activity and footwall flexural uplift propels formation of a tectonic knickpoint and uplifts former Gilbert deltas; (t2) lateral growth of the normal fault leads to inclusion of rivers in its footwall, the formation of new tectonic knickpoints and uplift of new Gilbert-deltas; (t3) lateral self-growth and perpetuation of t2. Similar constraints by Gilbert-deltas on fault displacement profile (albeit more accurate) can be inferred using marine terraces. Other inferences on fault displacement profiles can be obtained from footwall relief and total topography. Assuming that geomorphic features formed at each time-step are not eroded and can be dated, their location and height provide key constraints on the fault growth and displacement profile in time.

Whittaker and Walker, 2015). Between initial mechanical interaction and full linkage of individual fault strands, increased aspect ratios and transient “under-recovered” displacement profiles briefly occur as lateral tip propagation and fault lengthening is limited while faster-than-normal displacement takes place at the linkage zone in order to reach a new “recovered” single-fault profile (e.g., Cartwright et al., 1995).

#### 4.1. Footwall elements used as proxies for normal fault growth


Range front relief is the result of cumulative fault displacement and can be used to assess the dimensions and the history of growth and linkage of range-bounding normal faults (e.g., Dawers and Anders, 1995; Gupta and Scholz, 2000). If erosion is effective and fault tip propagation and slip rate are coupled, the range front relief maxima occurs at a uniform distance from their border faults (Densmore et al., 2005, 2007). We use an equivalent to range front relief, footwall relief (Fig. 13B), defined as the height of the first major slope break in the extensional footwall, measured vertically from the trace of their active normal faults (e.g., Whittaker and Walker, 2015), as a proxy to upper-limit fault displacement profile (Fig. 13). Suppl. material E provides details about our procedure to calculate footwall relief.

Fluvial geomorphology accounting for normal fault laws allow the evaluation of fault growth, linkage, and inferences of tectonic and fault throw rates (e.g., Boulton and Whittaker, 2009; Whittaker and Boulton, 2012; Whittaker and Walker, 2015; Kent et al., 2016; Gallen and Wegmann, 2017). For example, in detachment-limited rivers, a new local convexity or knickpoint forms in a footwall river after an

increased uplift rate led by a fault slip increase. While migrating upstream as a kinematic wave (Rosenbloom and Anderson, 1994), the knickpoint bounds steeper downstream river reaches adjusted or adjusting to the new uplift conditions from flatter upstream river reaches unaware of the uplift rate change (Fig. 13A) (e.g., Whipple and Tucker, 1999; Snyder et al., 2000). Whereas knickpoint retreat rates (map view) are fundamentally controlled by drainage area and bedrock erodibility (e.g., Wobus et al., 2006; Berlin and Anderson, 2007), knickpoint vertical propagation rates (profile view) are directly proportional to tectonic change amplitude (e.g., Whittaker et al., 2008). Hence, tectonic knickpoints migrate upwards predictably and have heights, measured from the active fault, that scale with the fault vertical displacement and footwall relief (e.g., Kent et al., 2016). A given set of tectonic knickpoints found in river drainages of extensional footwalls may be related to three fault-related events: fault initiation, fault linkage or fault slip rate increase (Whittaker and Walker, 2015; Gallen and Wegmann, 2017).

Correlatable marine terraces and/or Gilbert-type deltas can be used as strain markers and allow reconstructions of coastal landscapes (Fig. 13C). Marine terrace shoreline angles, at the intersection between the terrace and its inland-bounding cliff, best characterize sea level position during terrace formation, typically in sea level highstands (Lajoie, 1986; Anderson et al., 1999; Scott and Pinter, 2003). Similarly, Gilbert-type delta topset-foreset contacts occur approximately at sea level (Gilbert, 1890) as proximal topsets extend the alluvial plain sub-aerially, and distal foresets prograde basinwards underwater. Sets of coeval morphotectonic markers, i.e. marine terraces of the same sea-





**Fig. 14.** Diagrams for fault displacement and tectonic knickpoint height in footwall rivers associated with different modes of initiation, growth and propagation between adjacent normal faults. (A) Main features of the diagrams in the rest of the figure. Top-left: normal faults in an along-strike view, their displacement profiles in time, as expressed in top-right, and a simple representation of six footwall rivers, whose longitudinal river profiles are represented in the lower-left. Lower-right: legend for the main components of the longitudinal river profiles. (B) Initial state,  $t = 0$ , for all cases, representing steady-state equilibrium. (C) Non-directed fault interactions, showing coeval growth and link. (D) Directed fault interactions, with normal faults that initiate with a preferential direction (rightwards), either by growth and linkage (left column) or by propagation (right column). In all cases, only the second generation of knickpoints developed in the linkage zones are near the tips of the faults (and shows a convex outward knickpoint propagation mode). In all cases,  $F$  is for fault,  $D$  for fault displacement profile,  $R$  is for river,  $a$  and  $b$  are tectonic knickpoint sets, and  $h$  is elevation; thus,  $D_{F1F2}$  is a composite displacement profile including both  $F1$  and  $F2$  faults, and  $ha_{F1} > hb_{F1}$ ,  $hb_{F2} > hb_{F1}$ ,  $hb_{F1} > hb_{F2}$  means that the set  $a$  of tectonic knickpoints in fault 1 is at higher elevations than the set  $b$  of tectonic knickpoints in the third river of fault 1, which is at similar elevations than set  $b$  in fault 2.

level highstand or Gilbert deltas deposited at similar age, may form sequentially along uplifting coasts and lead to uplifted sets that down-step coastwards into younger sets (Figs. 13B, C). Land relative upwards motion between the formation of two sets of morphotectonic markers can be retrieved from the height difference between them, taking into account past sea-level positions. If coastal uplift occurs by growth of an extensional footwall, the land upwards motion relative to the sea level is a proxy for fault displacement, and sets of coeval morphotectonic markers can be approximated to fault displacement profiles in time (Fig. 13C). Relative along-strike fault uplift rates can be derived using the age of the coeval morphotectonic sets.

#### 4.2. Approach to reconstruct normal fault growth in time

We propose a conceptual framework to reconstruct growth and propagation history of active normal faults (Fig. 14). The framework uses the first-order morphological expression of topography, relief, river catchments and morphotectonic markers in extensional footwalls (Figs. 13 and 14), and is predicated on the response to fault linkage expected in fault displacement profiles and tectonic knickpoints of extensional footwall river profiles (e.g., Anders and Schlische, 1994; Dawers and Anders, 1995; Gupta and Scholz, 2000; Cowie and Roberts, 2001; Manighetti et al., 2001, 2005; Attal et al., 2008; Whittaker et al., 2008; Whittaker and Boulton, 2012; Whittaker and Walker, 2015; Gallen and Wegmann, 2017). This framework builds on these studies to discriminate, barring complicating factors, the relative time of activity of individual fault segments and linkage mode; simple, directed or propagated (Fig. 14).

Co-linear normal faults that initiated activity concurrently and later interacted by simple (non-directed) linkage (Fig. 14C) present symmetrical fault displacement profiles throughout their evolutionary history, both as individual and composite faults. These normal faults show two sets of genetically-linked tectonic knickpoints. The oldest set of tectonic knickpoints forms at the moment of initiation of each fault and lays at higher elevations, roughly similar in all river networks. The youngest set of knickpoints develops when faults link and lays at lower elevations, with knickpoint heights relatively higher for footwall river profiles in the area of fault linkage (Fig. 14C).

Although co-linear normal faults initiating activity at different times may develop similarly asymmetric end displacement profiles, we envisage characteristic tectonic knickpoint arrays depending on whether faults are initially unconnected and link successively, or new fault segments become active by propagation. In the successive initiation case (Fig. 14D left), fault displacement profiles are symmetrical until the moment of linkage, and have a composite displacement profile that is asymmetrical from linkage until displacement profile “recovery” to single fault shape. The displacement maxima of the older fault is at a higher position than the displacement maxima in the younger fault. Three families of knickpoints occur (Fig. 14D left); (i) an oldest set at the relative highest elevations exists solely in the oldest fault footwall; (ii) a second set appears at mid elevations solely in the youngest fault footwall; (iii) one last set of knickpoints occurs at the relative lowest elevations along the strike of the entire composite fault, with knickpoints that lay higher at its linkage zone and are absent at its tips.

In the propagation case (Fig. 14D right), the displacement profile is always asymmetrical, except in the oldest fault segment at times before propagation. As long as new propagation takes place at a faster pace than displacement profile “recovery” to single composite fault form, the displacement profile remains elongated and relatively flat, with its lowest displacement maxima in the sense of propagation (Fig. 14D right). Knickpoint families are expected to occur at the moment of initiation of each fault segment, occupying relatively lower positions in the sense of propagation and effectively marking the extent of propagation at any given time.

## 5. Analysis of fault growth and relief response

We plot tectonic knickpoints of footwall catchment trunks (Section 3.7) together with footwall relief (see Section 4.1 & Suppl. material E) to explore their relationship and that with the border fault (Section 4.2) (Figs. 15 and 16). We project the height of tectonic knickpoints of river trunks, measured vertically from border faults they cross, orthogonally to faults’ strike at the point of intersection. Tectonic knickpoints belong to the 16 largest river trunks draining the gulf and to the trunks of the two largest reversed drainages (Olvios and Safenetos; Table 1). We tentatively correlate tectonic knickpoints across fault strike on the basis of cross-causality, not cross-coevality, i.e. equal numbers do not imply equal occurrence times but equal (interpreted) mode of tectonic perturbation in the border fault (initiation, linkage, slip rate increase). This correlation aims at reconstructing the main tectonic perturbations of the border fault since its formation and accounts for the considerations detailed below.

Reverse drainages in the central rift were footwall rivers that drained north and eventually disconnected from their original outlet, probably < 1 Ma. Tectonic knickpoints in (now) endorheic river basins record tectonic perturbations in the border fault until the moment of inversion and are thus relevant to understand the growth and evolution of border faults. In fact, these tectonic knickpoints have a longer “recording period” than other drainages. The two knickpoints in both reversed basins are at similar elevations of ~1200 m and ~1400 m, and the windgaps related to the disconnection of these basins are carved in topsets of Gilbert-type deltas of different ages perched at different elevations. The highest windgap is at ~1300 m in the Late Pliocene-Early Pleistocene Mavro Delta, and the lowest windgap is at ~850 m, carved in rocks of the Klimenti Delta, with an approximate age of Middle-Upper Pleistocene (e.g., Ford et al., 2016).


### 5.1. Border fault growth in the west rift

The Eliki FA footwall relief shows a broad (~7 km horizontally) maximum at ~1900 m in the east, and decays towards the west to a minimum value of ~600 m (Fig. 15). Between both ends, the footwall relief has three local maxima (at ~1900 m, ~1500 m and ~1000 m) and four local minima that correlate with the extent of different faults (Figs. 6, 7 and 15), i.e. local maxima roughly coincide with the center of East Eliki (undifferentiated from the East Offshore Eliki), West Eliki and Westernmost Eliki faults, respectively, and local minima set between each fault segment (Fig. 15). The westward decline of footwall relief is constant, with local minima sited below each local maximum, -400 m below eastwards and -800 m below westwards (Fig. 15). Minima at the tips of Westmost Eliki F are exceptional and both lay at similar elevations (~600 m below their local maximum).

The overall trend of Aigio FA footwall relief has a minimum at ~900 m in the east, and a maximum at ~1900 m in the west. The extent of the four single fault strands coincide with footwall relief individual “up-pointing triangles” (minima at tips and a maximum at center) (Figs. 6, 7 and 15). The overall trend is defined by local minima that lay roughly every ~7 km at heights of ~900 m (east of Aigio F), ~1100 m (between Aigio and Fasouleika faults), ~1200 m (between Fasouleika and Selianitika faults) and ~1300 m (between Selianitika and Lambrini faults). The trend set by local maxima is more complex, with the east Aigio F showing a maximum of ~1800 m, only ~100 m lower than the displacement maxima at the center of Lambrini F, in the west (Fig. 15). In between, footwall relief rises west more gently than the overall trend in mean topography (~200 m height difference in ~10 km along strike in an overall trend of ~700 m in ~20 km) (Fig. 15).

The footwall relief patterns of both Eliki FA and Aigio FA can be attributed to independent individual growth of fault segments and subsequent link into a larger fault systems (see details in Section 4.1). The east rising trend in footwall relief in the Eliki FA suggest that it behaves as the western termination of a larger fault and the footwall





**Fig. 15.** (A) Footwall relief associated with the Eliki FA and Aigio FA, and the heights of the tectonic knickpoints of river trunks intersecting them. The strike of each fault array was simplified for their whole length as N275°E for East Eliki F, N285°E for West Eliki F and N300°E for Aigio FA. Both footwall relief and knickpoint heights are measured vertically in relation to their active faults. Footwall relief is shown in different colours for each correlatable fault array. Tectonic knickpoint heights of Krathis (Kt), Ladopotamos (La), Vouraikos (Vo), Kerinitis (Ke), Selinous (Se), Meganitis (Me) and Finikas (Ph) rivers are projected perpendicularly to the strike of Eliki FA and Aigio FA at the point where the river crosses the fault. To avoid duplicity in the overlapping area between West Eliki Array and Aigio FA, tectonic knickpoints are plotted only as “seen” by the Aigio FA. (B) Tectonic knickpoints lateral correlation as per analogous tectonic perturbation in the main fault. (C) Map view, shown with north pointing down. Thick black boxes in the footwall of each fault segment mark the extent of the DEM areas used for the projection of the footwall relief. Tectonic knickpoints, which coloring is in agreement with panel (A), belong to the trunks (in black) of the river networks (in blue) that run through the active faults (in red).


relief plateau in the overlap between Eliki and Aigio fault arrays points to recent linkage between both fault systems (Section 4).

We recognised four groups of tectonic knickpoints in the west rift that show marked differences between Eliki FA and Aigio FA (groups 1–4 in Fig. 15B). In the Eliki FA, the three sets of tectonic knickpoints at highest positions (groups 1, 2 & 3 in Fig. 15) correlate with footwall relief, laying at higher and lower elevations in footwall relief maxima and minima, respectively. This leads to triangular patterns (grey dashed lines in Fig. 15B) in these three sets that roughly mimic footwall relief trends. Such a trend is less clear for tectonic knickpoints at lower and western positions, and potentially absent for the lower set (group 4 in Fig. 15B). Instead, this lower knickpoint set shows an apparent trend towards lower elevations at westward positions (Fig. 15 and Table 1). The highest tectonic knickpoints in river trunks transecting the Aigio FA (group 1 of Meganitis and Finikas in Fig. 15B) are close to the drainage divide, in a position comparatively similar to the highest set of tectonic knickpoints eastward (Table 1). The relatively high elevation of the tectonic knickpoint set at low elevations in Meganitis and Finikas trunks may indicate that they developed in relation to recent fault linkage (see theoretical framework in Section 4.2 and Fig. 14), and we have tentatively correlated them with the set at ~100–200 m farther east (group 4 in Fig. 15B).

Our interpretation implies that both footwall relief and tectonic knickpoints are genetically linked, with perhaps the exception of the

westernmost two river catchments (Fig. 14). Group 1 lays at highest positions and closest to the drainage divide in all drainages. We interpret that it correlates with the initiation of tectonic activity at each individual fault segment. We consider that this group is absent in the Ladopotamos River due to river capture immediately above its drainage divide by the Vouraikos River stream that flows parallel to the coast (Fig. 15C). We interpret Group 2 as the result of hard linkage of individual fault segments into the Eliki FA, with no connection farther west. We suggest that Group 3 formed by linkage of the Eliki FA with fault segments in the central rift, i.e. by the effective connection of the main fault at larger scale (see Section 5.2 below). We consider that the lowest set of tectonic knickpoints that exist in all rivers (Group 4) formed at the moment of westward inclusion of the Aigio FA (Section 4.1; Figs. 7 and 14).

We defend that this sequence is the most plausible geologically. Correlatable sets of tectonic knickpoints will develop in composite faults from their linkage onwards (“b” sets in bottom two rows of Fig. 14), except at its tips or if the tectonic perturbation has not yet reached those rivers. Therefore, tectonic knickpoint sets on different faults can only be correlatable if linkage is already effective. For the west rift, the simplest scenario assumes that tectonic knickpoints laying at lower elevations in the west rivers (Group 4 in Meganitis & Finikas, Fig. 15A, B) formed coevally and hence both correlate with just one set of tectonic knickpoints farther east. If tectonic knickpoints laying at



**Fig. 16.** Projection along master fault strike (N105°E) of footwall relief, and tectonic knickpoints of footwall river trunks with regards to the location of main fault segments. (A) Footwall relief of the master fault, and heights of main tectonic knickpoints of footwall river trunks, measured from the main fault. Tectonic knickpoints of footwall rivers draining the gulf are plotted as triangles (see Table 1). Squares represent tectonic knickpoints seen for the trunks of the reversed rivers of (Sa) Safenetos (green) and (Ol) Olvios (orange). River networks are, from east to west: (Xe) Xerias, (Ra) Raizanias, (Za) Zapantis, (As) Asopos, (Tr) Trikalitikos, (Fo) Fonissa, (Sk) Skoupeiko, (De) Dervenios, (Kr) Krios, (Kt) Krathis, (La) Ladopotamos, (Vo) Vouraikos, (Ke) Kerinitis, (Se) Selinous, (Me) Meganitis and (Ph) Finikas. Tectonic knickpoints are projected perpendicularly to the master fault overall strike (N105°E) in two different manners. If the master fault is onshore, i.e. mapped with confidence, the intersection between river trunk and master fault sets the horizontal position of the projected knickpoint, while its height is measured vertically from the fault trace (as in Fig. 15). If the master fault is offshore and its trace is more uncertain, we derive horizontal position of the projected knickpoint as the average point of the projected lateral extent of its footwall catchment. Its vertical position is the tectonic knickpoint height measured vertically from the master fault trace, and we attach an estimative error equivalent to that used for the footwall relief. Further west than the vertical dashed line, elevations for both footwall relief and tectonic knickpoints are taken with respect to sea level, and raised to remain coherent with the easternmost end of the footwall relief in the central sector, and using the same errors. Errors are shown as an envelope for the footwall relief, and as bars for the heights of the knickpoints. Tectonic knickpoints in the reversed catchments are shown with the same error than rivers in the central area. Error bars for the eastern rivers (left of the dashed line) are maintained equal to those in the central sector. Error bars for the western rivers are smaller than the symbols. (B) Approximate location and extent of the main fault segments in the direction of projection. (C) Interpretation of the sequence of events associated with the tectonic knickpoints.

lower elevations in the west rivers would have formed coevally with older groups, other knickpoint sets developed at younger times should exist at lower elevations. Contrarily, our proposed tectonic disturbances for groups 2 and 3 respect the absence of tectonic knickpoints in the Aigio FA footwall rivers, laying farther west than our inferred fault tip at that time. Since linkage should be either the last or the second to last tectonic perturbation event in the sequence, based on Fig. 15 only, the last two events could have taken place coevally or in a different order.

## 5.2. Border fault growth in the rift margin

Footwall relief has a wavelength that correlates with the rift southern margin, with a maximum in vertical displacement around its center and minima at both ends (Fig. 16; see Section 4). Several sets of up-pointing triangles contained in successively larger triangles exhibit similar footwall relief morphologies at smaller scales, within the rift-scale parabolic trend. Most first-order triangular morphologies can be tracked with confidence to their respective faults, with a maximum around the centre of each fault segment and two minima at its tips (cf. Fig. 16A, B). For example, the ~12 km-wavelength individual up-pointing triangle that sets the maximum footwall relief is formed by three individual triangles, and correlates in lateral extent with the Derveni F, and (partially with) the West Onshore Xylokaastro F traces (Fig. 16A, B). This is indicative that either of these faults or both together have the largest slip and are the oldest fault segment(s) of the composite master fault, and suggest onset of activity in relation to three individual fault segments before linking into the Derveni F and/or the West Onshore Xylokaastro F. Overall, the parabolic geometry of the footwall relief indicates that the border faults behave as a single fault at

depth, and the different hierarchies of up-pointing triangles suggest that the fault grew by along strike fault linkage (Section 4).

Most trunks show four tectonic knickpoints that ought to result from tectonic perturbations that occurred during the growth of the border faults of the Corinth Rift southern margin (see Section 4.1). At least one of those perturbations affected the entire fault system, perhaps with the exception of the Aigio FA in the westernmost rift.

In the center of the rift, footwall rivers below the highest footwall relief (Trikalitikos to Krios rivers, Fig. 16A) have their tectonic knickpoints at the highest elevations and either 3 or 4 sets of tectonic knickpoints. Here, four out of the five knickpoints with the highest elevations in the entire southern rift flank are in the endorheic river basins of Olvios and Safenetos (Table 1). Westwards, as mentioned above, all footwall rivers have 4 tectonic knickpoints (Krathis to Selinous) laying at lower elevations, with the exception of Ladopotamos River (Fig. 16A), whereas only two tectonic knickpoints exist in the two westernmost footwall rivers (Meganitis and Finikas; Fig. 16). Analysis in the east was not performed, as it is prone to comparatively large errors in relation to the increasing distance between river outlets and fault trace. Overall, tectonic knickpoint heights measured vertically from the bounding fault system show triangular patterns that correlate with footwall relief at full rift-margin scale, with the exception of the lowest set in the westernmost two drainages (Figs. 15 and 16 and Table 1). This implies that tectonic knickpoints and the active fault are genetically related (Whittaker and Walker, 2015), and points to faults initiation as individual segments, and their subsequent linkage and growth at rift scale (Section 4.1, Fig. 14).

We recognized five groups of tectonic knickpoints in the central rift (groups 0–4, Fig. 16C). Group 0 implies an extra tectonic perturbation

not seen elsewhere in the rift shoulder, which we suggest relate to the formation of individual fault segments in the rift center. Knickpoints of the lowest set within the endorheic drainages (Group 1) lay at heights that coincide with the footwall topography (Fig. 16A, C). Group 1 is ~100 m below the windgap in Mavro area, where footwall relief is maximum, and ~350 m above the windgap in the Klimenti area, where footwall relief is at lower heights. Therefore, we propose that Group 1 knickpoints belong to the second tectonic perturbation in a two-stage linkage process in the center of the rift.

This inference agrees well with other observations in the central rift rivers (from Trikalitikos to Krios; Figs. 12 and 16A), where two river trunks (Fonissa and Krios) have an extra, fourth knickpoint at the highest location, closer to the drainage divide than any other river in the rift (Table 1). This is, drainage reversal occurred earlier or was more pronounced in the central rift, and captured one or two sets of tectonic knickpoints from the presently beheaded rivers. This is consistent with a fault slip rate increase that was more pronounced or older in the central rift, that we frame as fault linkage between two of the larger fault segments of the Central Rift FA, probably the Derveni-Lykoporia F or the Onshore Xylokastron F. We consider that the upper set of tectonic knickpoints seen in Fonissa and Krios is also related to this increase in fault uplift rate, and hence correlated as Group 1 in Fig. 16C.


We suggest that Group 2, i.e. the upper set of tectonic knickpoints of central rift rivers (Skoupeiko, Dervenios) and the third-highest of Fonissa (Fig. 16A), results from the effective linkage of the Central Rift FA. Under this scenario, this second increase in uplift rate would result in the eventual disconnection of former river systems and led to the uppermost tectonic knickpoints in Trikalitikos, and would occur either prior or perhaps coeval with the third-highest set of knickpoints (Group 3) in the river networks in the west. We propose that connection with the Eliki FA farther east results in the knickpoints of Group 3, which appear almost everywhere along the rift. This proposal is supported by the relatively higher elevation of this set in the Ladopotamos River (Fig. 16A). Group 4 lays at the lowest heights and show a common behaviour along the entire rift border fault that included river basins in the westmost rift sector.

Regardless of the exact time-sequence of events, we understand that the elevated position of the lowest tectonic knickpoint of the Meganitis (Figs. 15 and 16) reflects the fast vertical upstream propagation of the erosional wave (knickpoint area) expected for a linkage area (see for example Gallen and Wegmann, 2017) due to increased throw/uplift rates (e.g., Whittaker and Boulton, 2012). Similarly, the high elevations of the Aigio F footwall relief with regards to the overall west-rising trend of the Aigio FA footwall relief (Fig. 15) suggest the mechanical interaction between the Aigio FA and Eliki FA. Taken together with the footwall relief plateau existing in the overlapping area of the Eliki FA and Aigio FA, our interpretation points to an “under-recovered” fault displacement profile and thus, a young linkage age (see theoretical framework; Fig. 14D). Moreover, the presence of solely two sets of tectonic knickpoints in the westernmost rivers, in comparison to the four sets found in rivers further east (with similar or larger drainage areas and reaching similar or larger maximum heights) supports that the aforementioned linkage took place by propagation (Fig. 14D right).

### 5.3. Vertical motions in time


We attempt to reconstruct the fault displacement profiles in time along the border fault strike (Figs. 17 and 18), and the time evolution of fault footwall uplift along the rift (Fig. 19). We determine the relative footwall displacement near the fault occurring in the time-lapse between uplifted sets of coeval morphotectonic markers formed at sea level using the difference in elevation between markers and their age. We project the sets of coeval morphotectonic markers towards the bounding fault strike (N105°E) (Figs. 9A, B and 17; Table 2) and plot them together with footwall relief (Section 4; Fig. 14). Potential errors and uncertainties that exist in the time reconstruction are relatively minor in comparison with the main tectonic signal at full-rift scale. See Suppl. material F for detailed description on data constraints, manipulation, errors and uncertainties in the reconstruction of vertical motions in time (Figs. 17, 18 and 19A).

Sets of contemporaneous marine terrace paleo-shorelines and Gilbert delta topset-foreset contacts have along-strike trends similar to



**Fig. 17.** Projection along master fault strike (N105°E) of major morphotectonic features with known or correlated age with regards to the location of main fault segments. (A) Major morphotectonic elements of the master fault footwall and footwall relief. Filled circles represent the location of paleoshoreline angles of the MIS 5e (green), MIS 7e (blue) and MIS 9e (red) highstands of flights of marine terraces grouped by location. From E to W; Xy1 and Xy2, for Xylokastron area (paleoshoreline angles at low and maximum heights); Ak, for Akrata area; Aigio area, with Ag1 (paleoshoreline angles at the footwall of the Eliki FA) and Ag2 (with MIS 5e and MIS 7e at its hanging wall and MIS 9 at its footwall); and Ps for Psathopyrgos (based on Armijo et al. (1996); De Martini et al. (2004); Houghton et al. (2003); McNeill and Collier (2004)). Circles with yellow fill are the present day shoreline angles simplified as modern sea level (at 0 m), and are used only as a reference for the reconstructions in Figs. 18 and 19. Distinct filled geometric symbols represent the projection of the highest, lowest, eastmost and westmost location of the topsets of each Gilbert delta, as mapped in Fig. 6. Gilbert-delta topsets of Pleistocene age are in purple, while black triangles represent the topsets of the Late Pliocene - Early Pleistocene Mavro Gilbert delta. Gilbert deltas are labeled from E to W as Kl (Klimenti), Mv (Mavro), Ev (Evrostini), Pl (Platanos), VoE and VoW (Vouraikos, east and west), Ko (Kolokotronis) and Mg (Meganitis). In all cases, symbols are larger than associated errors. Footwall relief is defined as in Fig. 15. (B) Approximate location and extent of the main fault segments in the direction of projection.





**Fig. 18.** Flexure geometry and evolution in time of the rift-forming fault of the Corinth Rift along strike, marked by relative elevation and age constraints of footwall morphotectonic elements, and pre-fault paleotopography. (A) Reconstruction in time-frames of main fault relative vertical motions. Symbols represent the relative elevations between two consecutive sets of morphotectonic markers formed at sea level. We applied specific corrections to consecutive markers that represent longer time-steps to plot roughly equivalent time-steps ( $\sim 110$  ka). Yellow circles: Present to 124 ka (124 ka). Green: 240 ka to 124 ka (115 ka). Blue: 326 ka to 240 ka (91 ka). Red:  $\sim 700$  ka to 326 ka/3 ( $\sim 123$  ka). Purple symbols:  $\sim 1$  Ma to  $\sim 700$  ka/3 ( $\sim 100$  ka). Envelopes of estimated maximum and minimum paleotopography prior to the formation of the main fault are shown as a blue line with triple vertical scale. (B) Uplift rates of the marine terraces during aforementioned time frames and equivalent colors to those in panel (A) for own analysed terraces, and proposed ranges of uplift rates from Houghton et al., 2003 (Ho), McNeill and Collier, 2004 (McN) and DeMartini et al. (2004) (DeM).

those of footwall relief (Fig. 17), i.e. each set of correlatable morphotectonic markers has minimum heights in Xy1, maximum between Xy2 and Ak and intermediate heights between Ak and Ps. Correlatable morphotectonic markers thus point to self-similar vertical growth in the master fault since its onset with its nucleation point around the rift center (Section 4; Figs. 13 and 14).

Overall, the reconstruction suggests at least  $\sim 100$  m of onland uplift every  $\sim 110$  ka all along the master fault footwall since its onset, except at the fault ends (Figs. 18A and 19A). We infer similar rates for the central rift between  $\sim 1$  Ma and  $\sim 700$  ka, while other areas along-strike lack footwall uplift during this period (Figs. 18A and 19A). Contrarily, footwall uplift seems to take place along the entire margin from  $\sim 700$  ka to Present (Table 2; Fig. 14, D-right). Between  $\sim 700$  ka and  $\sim 326$  ka, a reconstructed onland uplift of  $\sim 60$  m and  $\sim 90$  m occurred every  $\sim 124$  ka along most of the margin. We consider this inference with care, given the change in location, from Gilbert deltas to marine terraces, with respect to the bounding fault. The inferred vertical motion signal for this time frame lays almost flat, with larger heights at both ends. This unexpected signal for normal faults may be an artefact, as no motion is tracked farther along strike. Between 326 ka and 240 ka, the data has two maxima at  $\sim 150$  m and  $\sim 135$  m (Klimenti and Meganitis), and suggests a larger onland uplift for this period, which increases between 240 ka and 124 ka (Figs. 18A and 19A). Finally, between 124 ka and Present, onland uplift has two maximum, at  $\sim 180$  m and  $\sim 155$  m (Xylokastró 2 and Vouraikos West, respectively), and a minimum in Psathopyrgos at  $\sim 100$  m. The overall profile is asymmetrical with the higher positions at the present rift center and lower elevations to the west.

## 6. Discussion on rift models and implications

### 6.1. Mechanical model of the modern Corinth Rift


The wavelength and amplitude of the master fault elastic flexure and footwall uplift (Figs. 10, 11, 17 and 18) can only be produced by steep planar faults (e.g., McNeill et al., 2005; Bell et al., 2011), reaching at least the brittle-ductile transition (Bell et al., 2017) (Fig. 5A) and developing in a strong lithosphere (King and Ellis, 1990; Buck, 1991, 1993; Resor and Pollard, 2012) (Figs. 1A and 19B). High uplift-

subsidence ratios along the rift margin (McNeill and Collier, 2004) as well as a localised Moho rise (Zelt et al., 2005; Sachpazi et al., 2007; Pearce, 2015) further support this conclusion. Finally, fault down-dip depths derived with displacement-length ratios (Walsh and Watterson, 1988; Cowie and Scholz, 1992a, 1992b; Dawers et al., 1993) that use at-surface length and dip also suggest the border fault transects the seismogenic layer ( $\sim 10$ – $15$  km), thus significantly surpassing depth of proposed detachments ( $\sim 3$ – $9$  km) (e.g., Rigo et al., 1996; Sorel, 2000). Collectively, our evidence fails to support detachment fault geometries and thus, detachment models (e.g., Rietbrock et al., 1996; Rigo et al., 1996; Briole et al., 2000; Flotté and Sorel, 2001; Jolivet et al., 2010) that may apply further to the SE and in SW Turkey (Jolivet and Brun, 2010; Jolivet et al., 2013).

### 6.2. Evolutionary model of the Corinth Rift

Elastic flexure and fault dimensions, along-strike propagation and the fast associated uplift rates since the onset of activity in the border fault suggest its growth halted early distributed extension in the area (Figs. 15–20). This is recoded by correlations, geometrical relationships and spatiotemporal variations of geologic and geomorphologic features with the border fault at the scale of the entire rift (Figs. 8, 9E, 10, and 11). Similarly, the along-strike dimensions and estimated vertical offsets of antecedent faults are small (e.g., Ori, 1989; Ford et al., 2012) when compared to the  $\sim 80$ – $130$  km along-strike length (Figs. 6 and 8), and  $\sim 4.8$  km vertical offset along the active fault system (De Gelder et al., 2019). Whereas paleo-relief estimates with mean elevations of  $\sim 300$  m and maxima of  $\sim 700$  m (Fig. 18) point to  $< 1$  km antecedent topography, the topography of the modern margin surpasses these heights often  $< 10$  km away from the border fault. Further, the distributed extension rates  $< 1$  mm  $\times$  yr $^{-1}$  accommodated by antecedent parallel faults for  $> 3$ – $4$  Myr since extension onset (Ford et al., 2012) are at present more than one order of magnitude larger throughout the rift ( $> 11$  mm  $\times$  yr $^{-1}$ ; Avallone et al., 2004) and highly localised in the rift-forming fault. We take our data and interpretation together with the observation that antecedent faults in the eastmost rift are cross-cut by the younger fault system (Figs. 6 and 8) to infer disruptive growth of a new steep border fault and a two-phase rift growth model.

We reconstruct the opening of the Corinth Rift since its onset,



**Fig. 19.** Time-evolution of the master fault footwall along strike (A), and its implication for the Corinth Rift formation (B). (A) Time-evolution of displacement profiles at  $\sim 110$  ka. Each line represents a displacement profile of the master fault above a sea level, drawn joining the data points shown in Fig. 18, assuming continuity and smooth profiles among them. Each displacement profile represents  $\sim 110$  ka. To maintain these comparable time-steps in the top two panels, we derived unconstrained profiles from the first constrained displacement profile by simple vertical addition 2 and 3 times, respectively. (B) Non-to-scale conceptual representation of Corinth Rift development in relation with a high-angle, propagating fault and its associated elastic flexure (left) and, in relation with a hypothetical detachment fault not supported by our data (right).

integrating our new findings with those from previous studies (Fig. 20). Constraints before onset of the modern master fault come largely from other research, and the reader is referred to these studies for further details where appropriate.

#### 6.2.1. Antecedent distributed extension

Distributed extension tipping out to the west over Hellenic paleotopography initiated  $< 5$  Ma (Fig. 20A) (e.g., Keraudren and Sorel, 1987; Doutsos and Piper, 1990; Rohais et al., 2007b; Ford et al., 2016; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b). Distributed normal faulting may have started between 5 and 3.6 Ma south of the present rift (e.g., Collier, 1990; Collier and Dart, 1991; Leeder et al., 2008). Extension rates decreased westwards from estimates of  $1.5\text{--}2.3\text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  in the center to  $0.6\text{--}1\text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  in the west rift (e.g., Ford et al., 2016), suggesting a

diachronic extension onset that tipped out to the west (Ford et al., 2012; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b). Well-established catchments drained N-to-NE inherited Hellenic paleotopography regionally plunging east, while local hanging-walls controlled along-strike sedimentary flow paths (Ford et al., 2012; Hemelsdaël and Ford, 2016; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b). The aforementioned evidence agrees well with the distributed extension at the NW tip of a south-arched extensional trough developing due to the Hellenic slab rollback.

New N- and S-dipping faults led to less distributed extension (Bell et al., 2009; Taylor et al., 2011; Nixon et al., 2016) after a  $\sim 10\text{--}30$  km northward shift in extension locus at  $\sim 2$  Ma (Fig. 20B) (e.g., Rohais et al., 2007b; Leeder et al., 2008; Bell et al., 2009; Ford et al., 2009, 2012, 2016; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b). This period of fault migration is poorly dated between  $\sim 2.2$  and  $\sim 1.8$  Ma (Malartre et al., 2004; Rohais



**Table 2**

Data associated with the paleoshoreline angles and the Gilbert delta topsets, including assumed age and derived uplift rates. All names for the “Site” column are explained in Fig. 4. Sources of the data are marked as McNe (McNeill and Collier, 2004), DeMa (De Martini et al., 2004), Houg (Houghton et al., 2003) and Own (this contribution).


Object	Site	Source	X coord	Y coord	Level	Age (ka)	Elevat. (m)	Ze (m)	AbsUpliftRate	
Paleoshoreline angle – Marine terraces	<i>Xy1</i>	Own	657252	4199244	MIS 5e	124	55.32	1.03	0.45	
	<i>Xy1</i>	Own	657449	4197907	MIS 7e	240	108.35	0.46	0.45	
	<i>Xy1</i>	Own	657276	4197519	MIS 9e	326	146.86	2.88	0.45	
	<i>Xy2</i>	Own	643328	4213762	MIS 5e	124	177.23	0.47	1.43	
	<i>Xy2</i>	Own	n.a	n.a	MIS 7e	240	347	5	1.45	
	<i>Xy2</i>	Own	n.a	n.a	MIS 9e	326	471	5	1.44	
	<i>Ak</i>	McNe	613223	4225224	MIS 5e	124	135	5	1.09	
	<i>Ak</i>	McNe	613014	4224383	MIS 7e	240	240	5	1.00	
	<i>Ak</i>	McNe	611975	4223875	MIS 9	326	350	5	1.07	
	<i>Ag1</i>	McNe	600178	4228598	MIS 5e	124	150	5	1.21	
	<i>Ag1</i>	McNe	599843	4228011	MIS 7e	240	255	5	1.06	
	<i>Ag1</i>	McNe	599575	4227668	MIS 9	326	370	5	1.13	
	<i>Ag2</i>	DeMa	592506	4233848	MIS 5e	124	160	5	1.29	
	<i>Ag2</i>	DeMa	591685	4232525	MIS 7e	240	232	5	0.97	
	<i>Ag2</i>	DeMa	590492	4231081	MIS 9	326	360	5	1.10	
	<i>Ps</i>	Houg	575679	4241583	MIS 5e	124	95	5	0.77	
	<i>Ps</i>	Houg	575625	4241270	MIS 7e	240	160	5	0.67	
	<i>Ps</i>	Houg	575545	4241047	MIS 9e	326	240	5	0.74	
	Gilbert delta topsets-foreset contacts	<i>Ki</i>	Own	640560	4200259	–	700	1192	35	1.70
		<i>Ki</i>	Own	647564	4205230	–	700	380	35	0.54
		<i>Ki</i>	Own	638068	4207654	–	700	893	35	1.28
		<i>Mv</i>	Own	624537	4212086	–	1000	1751	35	1.75
		<i>Mv</i>	Own	625408	4209556	–	1000	1604	35	1.60
<i>Mv</i>		Own	619703	4211123	–	1000	1285	35	1.29	
<i>Ev</i>		Own	620247	4214600	–	700	1253	35	1.79	
<i>Ev</i>		Own	622593	4216435	–	700	1032	35	1.47	
<i>Ev</i>		Own	619275	4216912	–	700	1058	35	1.51	
<i>Pl</i>		Own	610754	4224444	–	700	394	35	0.56	
<i>Pl</i>		Own	611651	4223930	–	700	416	35	0.59	
<i>Pl</i>		Own	609534	4224008	–	700	659	35	0.94	
<i>Pl</i>		Own	610171	4223192	–	700	716	35	1.02	
<i>VoE</i>		Own	606786	4223762	–	700	739	35	1.06	
<i>VoE</i>		Own	605490	4223472	–	700	839	35	1.20	
<i>VoE</i>		Own	605032	4225862	–	700	557	35	0.80	
<i>VoE</i>		Own	604127	4224097	–	700	605	35	0.86	
<i>VoW</i>		Own	603985	4226231	–	700	403	35	0.58	
<i>VoW</i>		Own	601081	4226465	–	700	632	35	0.90	
<i>VoW</i>		Own	601539	4225371	–	700	839	35	1.20	
<i>Ko</i>		Own	597942	4225616	–	700	803	35	1.15	
<i>Ko</i>		Own	596556	4227337	–	700	1005	35	1.44	
<i>Ko</i>		Own	593328	4225181	–	700	673	35	0.96	
<i>Mg</i>		Own	592568	4229459	–	700	510	35	0.73	
<i>Mg</i>		Own	590827	4227958	–	700	778	35	1.11	
<i>Mg</i>		Own	587353	4228953	–	700	580	35	0.83	

et al., 2007a, 2007b; Leeder et al., 2008) and resulted in a more symmetrical extensional area that narrowed westward (e.g., Ford et al., 2016; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b), suggesting potential diachronic onset of fault activity initiating earlier in the central rift (Gawthorpe et al., 2017a). Fault systems in the central rift (Central Rift FA) initiated at modern margin positions (Bell et al., 2009; Nixon et al., 2016) and accumulated slip since then (Figs. 17–20; Ford et al., 2016). The Central Rift FA accumulated  $\sim 1/4$  of its throw during this time (Nixon et al., 2016). The border fault system propagated west in a graben that narrowed from  $\sim 20$ – $25$  km in the center to  $\sim 10$ – $15$  km in the west (Ford et al., 2016). The fluvial network changed to N-flowing rivers that started reworking footwall uplifted sediments and Gilbert deltas formed in new hanging-walls (e.g., Ford et al., 2016; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b). For example, the Ilias and Evrostini deltas developed foresets of hundreds of meters after its feeding river cannibalised previously-depositing Killini and Mavro deltas (Ford et al., 2016). Evolution during this time frame is compatible with further entrenchment, westward propagation and southward arching of the Aegean detachment-led trough.

### 6.2.2. Change in extension mechanics

A basin-wide unconformity and sedimentation switch (e.g., Ori, 1989; Sachpazi et al., 2003) at  $\sim 800$ – $600$  ka (e.g., Ford et al., 2016;

Nixon et al., 2016; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b) resulted from an abrupt onset of activity along the master fault and associated increase in rates of slip and associated vertical motions at rift scale (Fig. 20; Armijo et al., 1996). Over a short time span of  $\sim 300$  ka, the antecedent complex and distributed rift structure shifted to the modern markedly asymmetrical rift growing in relation with N-dipping faults in the southern flank (Fig. 9D, E; figs. 8c and 11c in Nixon et al., 2016). During this tectonic event, fault activity focused on the Central Rift FA (Figs. 16–20), increased in the eastern Perachora and East Alkyonides faults (Nixon et al., 2016) and initiated in the western Eliki FA (e.g., Ford et al., 2016; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b) as well as in both Eratini faults (e.g., McNeill et al., 2005; Bell et al., 2008, 2009). Concomitantly, all antecedent faults of the southern margin halted activity (Gawthorpe et al., 2017b) while S-dipping faults in the northern margin, like the Galaxidi Fault, significantly decreased activity and eventually ceased (Bell et al., 2008, 2009; Nixon et al., 2016). During this tectonic event, the dynamics of rift growth radically changed from slow-growing distributed faults to fast-growing elongated features that linked along strike to set the modern rift margin (Figs. 17–20). The along-strike propagation of the border fault localized strain and consequently shut down the activity of subsidiary faults in its footwall while kinematically controlling relatively minor faults dipping against it.



**Fig. 20.** Conceptual evolutionary model in schematic 3D views (top) and cross-sections (bottom), with time steps: (A) < 5 to 3 Ma and (B) 3 to > 1 Ma, (C) < 700 ka and (D) Present. Upper panels show the evolution from distributed extension along several normal faults and their associated low-amplitude vertical motions (A & B) to highly-localized extension along a new single fault and high-amplitude vertical motions associated to its disruptive growth (C & D). Bottom panels show a conceptual time-evolution of the footwall elastic flexure of the master fault in the centre of the rift and the associated evolution of Gilbert delta(s) and river profile(s) (near the frontal section in the 3D views of the top panels, and roughly at the location shown in Fig. 7). The drainage reversal is not specifically constrained, and could have taken place anytime after ~700 ka.

### 6.2.3. The advent of the modern Corinth Rift

The change in extension mechanics and an abrupt increase in tectonic rates occurred diachronically as a new rift-forming fault grew by propagation, linking individual faults along-strike (Fig. 20C, D). We suggest that the Derveni, Lykoporia and Offshore Xylokaastro faults linked into the Central Rift FA that became the principal focus of extension (Fig. 16; Section 5.2). Here, fast fault lengthening and concomitant footwall flexure led to the development of new footwall relief (Figs. 16–20), the abandonment and eventual perching of deltas, and disruption and reversal of large drainages (Fig. 20D). In the central rift, the abandonment of the Evrostini delta and the defeat of its feeding river is estimated to have occurred some time after ~700 ka (Rohais et al., 2007b; Ford et al., 2016). Lesser footwall relief existed in the west

rift (Figs. 17–20) where homologous syn-rift deltas remained at hanging-wall positions of the bounding fault (Gawthorpe et al., 2017a). Here, rivers cannibalized their Gilbert deltas and the pre-rift units, and continue to flow north (Ford et al., 2016; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b), probably due to a relatively younger uplift rate change (Fig. 12). In other words, the master fault time-transgressive propagation along strike from the rift centre results in differential rift margin response and asymmetric fault footwall flexure (cf. Fig. 20C, D). This is recorded in the elevation of terraces and delta topsets, as well as the extent of the uplifted basin (Fig. 9A, B, C), the variable topography of the rift (Figs. 10 and 11), and the profiles of gulf-draining rivers (Fig. 12).

Rift across-axis asymmetry since ~400–300 ka (Nixon et al., 2016; Gawthorpe et al., 2017b) is sustained by high uplift rates in rift-forming

faults propagating along-strike (Fig. 18). Subsidence and deposition of linked depocenters in the hanging-wall (Nixon et al., 2016) and the growth of footwall relief (Figs. 16–20) is controlled by north-dipping faults bounding the rift to the south. High uplift/subsidence ratios of 1:1.2–2.4 for the central rift (De Gelder et al., 2019) and 1:1.2–2.2 for the west rift (McNeill et al., 2005) result from highly localised strain and elastic flexure in the master fault (Figs. 8 and 20). Flexural uplift led to uplift rates that surpass  $1 \text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  along most of the rift, with the exception of its tips (Fig. 18B). The advent of rapid rates is coherent with a change in extension rates from  $\sim 1\text{--}2 \text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  to  $\sim 11\text{--}16 \text{ mm} \times \text{yr}^{-1}$  (Avallone et al., 2004; Ford et al., 2016). Overall relative low tectonic rates before  $\sim 700 \text{ ka}$  might be related with the slow growth of depocenters and regional uplift, while remarkably high tectonic rates at present along most of the margin relate with fault flexure and fast growth of an asymmetric rift basin.

Further westward propagation of the master fault along strike initiated the Aigio FA and the Psathopyrgos F. Here, fault activity started as well in the Marathias and Nafpakos faults of the northern margin (Beckers et al., 2015). This resulted in a second unconformity in the area (Bell et al., 2008) and the opening of the Rion Strait at equivalent times (Ford et al., 2016). Flattening of the footwall relief profile in the west and the reduced number of tectonic knickpoints (Figs. 16 and 17) suggest fault activity in the area results from westward propagation of the master fault (Fig. 14). Changes in elevation of major inflections in longitudinal river profiles and the reduced magnitude of related river channel steepening are consistent with this inference (Fernández-Blanco et al., 2019a, 2019b). Further supporting evidence come from the recent hanging-wall uplift in the footwall of the Aigio F (Palyvos et al., 2005) and its age (50–60 ka; Cornet et al., 2004), as well as the high frequency of earthquakes in the Aigio, Fassouleika and Psathopyrgos faults (Bernard et al., 2006; Boiselet et al., 2014; Duverger et al., 2018). Eastwards propagation is likely to have occurred at younger times than those suggested by Leeder et al. (2012). Activity of the easternmost faults is clearly evidenced by Holocene and historic fault ruptures in the Alepohori and Pisia faults (Jackson et al., 1982; Hubert et al., 1996; Mechernich et al., 2018) as well as in antithetic Kapareli Fault (Benedetti et al., 2003), and is probably limited in extent by mechanical restrictions further east, which we speculatively relate with the near-orthogonal orientation of faults belonging to the antecedent detachment-led trough.

#### 6.2.4. The modern Corinth Rift at present

Continued self-similar growth of the master fault sets the modern Corinth Rift asymmetry, localising strain during its along strike propagation (Fig. 20D). Individual fault segments grew from the modern central rift along strike and linked to form larger faults that eventually coalesced into the current master fault. In this sense, Nixon et al., 2016 suggest that full fault linkage occurred at  $\sim 130 \text{ ka}$ . Kinematic linkage of the master fault at depth is consistent with subsidence distributions (Nixon et al., 2016) and footwall relief (Fig. 16) that show rift-scale parabolic shapes flattened to the west. Given that the master fault grew in a self-similar fashion, footwall-uplifted coeval morphotectonic features distributed self-consistently along the margin (Fig. 17), leading to a highly-localised asymmetric rift (Fig. 19B) (De Gelder et al., 2019). The rift asymmetry is marked along a northward transect by up-flexed topography with a border faults footwall width of  $\sim 15 \text{ km}$  (Fig. 10) near its maximum footwall relief  $\sim 2.5 \text{ km}$  (Fig. 16A) followed by pronounced syntectonic sedimentary wedges opening southwards (e.g., Taylor et al., 2011) and a northern coast dominated by subsidence (Bell et al., 2009; Elias et al., 2009). Contrarily to the above, symmetric cross-sectional geometries are maintained at both rift ends. Border fault growth led to the development of new symmetrical rift sectors along the sense of propagation, bounded by oppositely-dipping faults, with active south-dipping faults in the northern rift margin (Benedetti et al., 2003; McNeill et al., 2005). Further propagation and strain localisation along the north-dipping border fault plane eventually overwrote these new rift

sectors as their bounding faults link kinematically with the master fault. This transgressive switch in rift structural style is recorded in the along-strike differential rift geometry (Bell, 2008), and is documented in the west rift, albeit ascribed to westward rift propagation and northward fault migration (Ford et al., 2016).

In the west rift, strain is distributed among a few steep oppositely-dipping faults (Nixon et al., 2016) where the youngest, ongoing propagation of the master fault takes place (Figs. 15, 16, 19 and 20). The west rift has the highest geodetic extension rates recorded for the rift (e.g., Avallone et al., 2004) and a north-dipping microseismicity layer with very high seismicity (Lambotte et al., 2014). Both features contrast with the relatively minor antecedent extensional strain for the area (e.g., Bell et al., 2011). The Aigio and Fassouleika faults show normal focal mechanisms dipping  $\sim 45^\circ$  and  $60^\circ$  north at the interface with the microseismicity layer (Duverger et al., 2015). We speculate that if this layer is a low-dipping detachment of the antecedent extensional system (Rietbrock et al., 1996; Rigo et al., 1996), the new high-angle rift-forming fault documented here is in the process of transecting it at present. This would imply that the westernmost rift holds at depth the interface between the antecedent, distributed extension and the localised, modern Corinth Rift. Being this the case, both the high seismicity and the anomalously high geodetic extension rates in the area would result from the mechanical interaction between both faults and their summed capabilities to accommodate extensional strain. This hypothesis agrees as well with the quick decrease in Moho depth westwards (Zelt et al., 2005; Sachpazi et al., 2007; Pearce, 2015), as the modern rift-forming fault affecting the entire crust at its centre (Fig. 5A; Section 5.2) tapers out towards its tips.

#### 6.3. Tectonic implications

Our comprehensive model is compatible with early distributed extension at the northwestern tip of a detachment-controlled extensional trough of the Aegean, followed by strain-localized, disruptive growth of a new fault system in relation to changes in external tectonic forcing. In other words, the early phase has an evolutionary structural style that can be explained by the self-organisation of a fault network known in continental settings (Cowie, 1998; Cowie et al., 2000, 2006; Gawthorpe et al., 2003, 2017b), and contrarily, the second phase involves drastic and fast changes in normal fault dynamics in relation with the Corinth Rift tectonic setting (Armijo et al., 1996; Flerit et al., 2004; this contribution). The evidence above supports the ‘two-phase linear-elastic’ Aegean model by which transtensional stresses, lead by the south-westward propagating tip of the North Anatolian lithospheric transform, are superimposed onto pre-existing extensional structures that guided the growth of new extensional fault systems (Hubert-Ferrari et al., 2003; Armijo et al., 2004; Flerit et al., 2004).

Our data supports that the modern Corinth Rift is a short-lived flexural cantilever rift (Fig. 17C) sustained by active seismicity during many earthquake cycles (King et al., 1988; Kuszniir et al., 1991). Simulations constrained with coeval, elastically flexed time-strain markers across the border fault in the east rift reproduce such flexure by coseismic strain along a  $40^\circ\text{--}60^\circ$  planar normal fault, and postseismic viscous relaxation at the basal lower crust or upper mantle (De Gelder et al., 2019). These models suggest that continental lithosphere responding to fast, localized tensional strain on  $10^3\text{--}10^4 \text{ yr}$  timescales may be defined by rheologies holding significant strength for similar timescales (De Gelder et al., 2019). Similar U:S ratios at the Eliki FA location (McNeill et al., 2005) hint that a similar rheology may occur in the west rift. Evidence shown here, like the geometry and wavelength of rift margin topography and its coherency in time with correlatable geological and geomorphological evidence (Figs. 9–11, 15, 16 and 17C), supports significant long-term strength (Fig. 1, upper row) at the scale of the entire Corinth Rift, and since border fault onset ( $\sim 10^6 \text{ yr}$ ).

Upper-crust and whole-crust extension estimates (Bell et al., 2011) suggest pure-shear (McKenzie, 1978b) during early extension in the



area. This extension mechanism would imply a lithosphere with elevated rheological strength (e.g., Ziegler, 1988; Buck, 1991; Brun, 1999) also before the new border fault, suggesting a constant behaviour of the continental lithosphere under the Corinth Rift. Alternatively, early extension in relation to low-angle detachment(s) preceding a core-complex (Jolivet et al., 2010) would suggest combined shear (Barbier et al., 1986) or simple shear (Wernicke, 1981) and an overall weak continental lithosphere, as that of the central Aegean (Lister et al., 1984; Brun and Sokoutis, 2010; Jolivet et al., 2013). The discontinuation of viscous deformation by strain localisation and elastic failure of the continental lithosphere would imply strengthening of the lower crust and/or upper mantle in a short time frame. Severe changes in composition or geothermal gradient that could explain such lower crust mechanical strengthening (Déverchère et al., 2001) are unlikely in  $\sim 10^6$  yr timescales at rift scale. We thus favour that, if such change exists, it may relate with a relevant increase in the near-field stresses, probably driven by an increase in earthquake activity in the seismogenic zone (Jamtveit et al., 2018).

## 7. Conclusions

This review reconstructs in detail the growth of an active rift border fault at the scale of an entire intracontinental rift, to provide constraints on rift evolution and mechanics, and understand its first-order lithosphere behaviour. To that end, we reviewed and re-assessed previous research in the Corinth Rift, as well as studies on the use of tectono-morphological approaches to constrain fault mechanics. This allows us to (i) use the rich record of strain markers and morphotectonic elements along the uplifting, southern margin of the Corinth Rift, and (ii) put forward a novel theoretical framework to characterise the lateral and vertical evolution of normal faults from the geomorphology of their footwalls. By these means, we characterise the kinematics and the evolution of the rift-forming fault, and propose a mechanical and evolutionary model for the rift. Similar frameworks and geomorphic compilations can be used to constrain the evolution of other active normal faults, and thus the growth and evolution of early rifting of continents elsewhere.

The active Corinth Rift border faults form a single composite master fault > 80 km in length. Footwall relief is roughly symmetrical, with maxima in fault throw in the Mavro area that is correlated with the Central Rift FA, and decays in both directions along-strike (Fig. 16A). Using footwall relief as a proxy for the fault displacement profile (see Section 4.1, Figs. 7 and 13) implies that discrete en-echelon surficial fault segments (Fig. 8) are hard-linked into a kinematically coherent fault at depth, which extends along strike, at minimum, from the eastern end of Offshore Xylokastro F to the Westernmost Eliki F (Fig. 16A). This signal is also reflected in the decay in topographic elevation and relief (Figs. 8 and 9), the morphology of footwall catchments (Fig. 11A), and the along-strike height of coeval marine terraces and perched Gilbert deltas (Figs. 9A, B, 16 and 17). Such rift-scale displacement profile is coherent with a single, high-angle, composite master fault that has estimated down-dip depths well below the seismogenic layer.

The master fault grew from the rift center by simple linkage of individual faults into larger systems, and by propagation integrating younger, collinear faults along strike. Successive linkage of individual fault strands into larger fault segments is indicated by the overall correlation between individual fault segments and footwall relief up-pointing triangles that collectively compound triangles of larger wavelengths (cf. Fig. 16A, B; Section 4). We infer that the Central Rift FA is the oldest fault segment of the rift master fault, for it has the largest along-strike length at the surface (Fig. 8), maximum relief offset (Fig. 10) and footwall relief (Fig. 16A), and maximum fault displacement (Fig. 5A). We deduce the along-strike propagation of the border fault activity westwards, integrating the Eliki FA, and more recently, the Aigio FA (Figs. 13 and 14). Such westward propagation is primarily

manifested by the asymmetry of its fault displacement profile coupled with the absence of tectonic knickpoints in catchments to the west. More specifically, the single-fault displacement profile is flat, and thus “unrecovered” in its westernmost end, where the along-strike correlation among tectonic knickpoints that is valid for the rest of the rift is not valid (Figs. 14–16).

We propose a sequence of fault growth and evolution that opens the rift through time. Coupling footwall relief and tectonic knickpoints (Fig. 16) with fault displacement profiles in time (Fig. 18A) in the context of our theoretical framework (Fig. 14) allow us to propose the following sequence of events: (i) initiation of individual fault segments in the central sector; (ii) growth and simple linkage of fault segments in the central rift, and initiation of individual fault segments in the west; followed by (iii) connection by simple linkage into the composite Central Rift FA in the rift centre, and that of the Eliki FA in the west rift; (iv) connection of both fault systems; and (v) propagation farther west, with the inclusion of the Aigio Fault Array in recent times.

The diachronic along-strike growth of rift border fault controls the modern rift along- and across-axis asymmetry (Figs. 8–12). The relationship between the envelope of maximum relief in drainage and maximum relief at  $\sim 21$  km from the border fault (Figs. 11 and 18) suggests  $\sim 50$ – $75\%$  of the main margin topography is related to the current border fault, i.e. that  $\sim 1/2$ – $3/4$  of the present topography developed since the modern border fault onset, and thus in  $\sim 1/5$  of the time since the onset of extension in the area ( $\sim 700$  ka out of 4–5 Ma). Most other features in the modern rift are also controlled by the border fault; from rift basin extent and geometry to the size and distribution of synsedimentary wedges, from the morphology of river catchments to the location and extent of coeval marine terraces and perched Gilbert deltas with respect to the border fault system (Figs. 6, 8–12 and 15–18). Given that these features allow us to track the activity of active surficial fault segments back to border fault onset (Figs. 16–19A), this evidence collectively suggests that the border fault grew rapidly and controls the modern rift evolution, and implies that the antecedent distributed extension for the preceding  $\sim 4$  My is subsidiary in the formation of the modern rift.

We propose a comprehensive two-phase rift growth model (Fig. 20). Distributed extension occurred symmetrically and at low rate atop the Hellenic basement since the Early Pliocene. During  $\sim 4$  My, this extended area progressively migrated northwards and further entrenched westward. At  $\sim 800$ – $600$  ka, an abrupt tectonic event (spanning for  $\sim 300$  ky) radically changed extension mechanics, and the resulting rift geometry and tectono-sedimentary dynamics. Since Middle Pleistocene, the synchronous onset of asymmetric rifting occurs at fast rates as the new fault system grows along strike from the present rift centre. This rift-forming fault, which correlates in length with the along-strike extent of the present rift, controls the active tectonics, morphology and geology of the rift to a first-order, indicating that its growth drives the modern Corinth Rift opening in time and its present-day rates and scale.

## Acknowledgements

We thank reviewers Laurent Jolivet and Douwe J.J. van Hinsbergen for their comments and suggestions that improved the original version of the manuscript, and the skilled editorial management. We thank Dimitris Sakellariou for kindly providing the bathymetric data, and Sotiris Valkaniotis and Dimitris Papanastassiou for the seismic catalogues of the Corinth Rift Laboratory and University of Athens, respectively. We thank Conrad Childs for discussions on fault mechanics, and Rebecca Bell and Sean Gallen for proof reading the text. The research leading to these results received funding from the People Programme (Marie Curie Actions) of the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme under the ITN project ALerT (Grant FP7-PEOPLE-2013-ITN number 607996) and by the ISIS program of CNES. This study contributes to the IdEx Université de Paris ANR-18-IDEX-0001. This is IPGP contribution 4061.

## Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2019.102919>.

## References

- Allmendinger, R.W., Sharp, J.W., Von Tish, D., Serpa, L., Brown, L., Kaufman, S., Oliver, J., Smith, R.B., 1983. Cenozoic and Mesozoic structure of the eastern Basin and Range province, Utah, from COCORP seismic-reflection data. *Geology* 11, 532–536. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613\(1983\)11<532:CAMSOT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(1983)11<532:CAMSOT>2.0.CO;2).
- Ambraseys, N.N., Jackson, J.A., 1990. Seismicity and associated strain of central Greece between 1890 and 1988. *Geophys. J. Int.* 101, 663–708.
- Anders, M.H., Schlische, R.W., 1994. Overlapping faults, intrabasin highs, and the growth of normal faults. *J. Geol.* 102, 165–179. <https://doi.org/10.1086/629661>.
- Anderson, R.S., Densmore, A.L., Ellis, M.A., 1999. The generation and degradation of marine terraces. *Basin Res.* 11, 7–19.
- Armijo, R., Tapponnier, P., Mercier, J.L., Han, T.-L., 1986. Quaternary extension in southern Tibet: field observations and tectonic implications. *J. Geophys. Res.* 91, 13803–13872. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JB091iB14p13803>.
- Armijo, R., Lyon-Caen, H., Papanastassiou, D., 1991. A possible normal-fault rupture for the 464 BC Sparta earthquake. *Nature* 351, 137–139. <https://doi.org/10.1038/351137a0>.
- Armijo, R., Meyer, B., King, G.C.P., Rigo, A., Papanastassiou, D., 1996. Quaternary evolution of the Corinth Rift and its implications for the Late Cenozoic evolution of the Aegean. *Geophys. J. Int.* 126, 11–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246x.1996.tb05264.x>.
- Armijo, R., Meyer, B., Hubert, A., Barka, A., 1999. Westward propagation of the North Anatolian fault into the northern Aegean: timing and kinematics. *Geology* 27, 267. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613\(1999\)027<0267:WPOTNA>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(1999)027<0267:WPOTNA>2.3.CO;2).
- Armijo, R., Flerit, F., King, G., Meyer, B., 2004. Linear elastic fracture mechanics explains the past and present evolution of the Aegean. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 217, 85–95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X\(03\)00590-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X(03)00590-9).
- Attal, M., Tucker, G.E., Whittaker, A.C., Cowie, P.A., Roberts, G.P., 2008. Modeling fluvial incision and transient landscape evolution: Influence of dynamic channel adjustment. *J. Geophys. Res.* 113. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JF000893>. F02010.
- Avallone, A., Briole, P., Agatza-Balodimou, A.M., Billiris, H., Charade, O., Mitsakaki, C., Nercessian, A., Papazissi, K., Paradissis, D., Veis, G., 2004. Analysis of eleven years of deformation measured by GPS in the Corinth Rift laboratory area. *Compt. Rendus Geosci.* 336, 301–311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crte.2003.12.007>.
- Armijo, R., Lacassin, R., Coudurier-Curveur, A., Carrizo, D., 2015. Coupled tectonic evolution of Andean orogeny and global climate. *Earth-Sci. Rev.* 143, 1–35.
- Barbier, F., Duvergé, J., Le Pichon, X., 1986. Structure profonde de la marge Nord-Gasconne. implications sur le mécanisme de rifting et de formation de la marge continentale. *Bull. Centres Rech. Explor. Prod. Elf-Aquitaine* 10, 105–121.
- Beckers, A., Hubert-Ferrari, A., Beck, C., Bodeux, S., Tripanas, E., Sakellariou, D., De Batist, M., 2015. Active faulting at the western tip of the Gulf of Corinth, Greece, from high-resolution seismic data. *Mar. Geol.* 360, 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2014.12.003>.
- Bell, R.E., 2008. Tectonic Evolution of the Corinth Rift (phd). University of Southampton.
- Bell, R.E., McNeill, L.C., Bull, J.M., Henstock, T.J., 2008. Evolution of the offshore western Gulf of Corinth. *Geol. Soc. Am. Bull.* 120, 156–178. <https://doi.org/10.1130/B26212.1>.
- Bell, R.E., McNeill, L.C., Bull, J.M., Henstock, T.J., Collier, R.E.L., Leeder, M.R., 2009. Fault architecture, basin structure and evolution of the Gulf of Corinth Rift, central Greece. *Basin Res.* 21, 824–855. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2117.2009.00401.x>.
- Bell, R.E., McNeill, L.C., Henstock, T.J., Bull, J.M., 2011. Comparing extension on multiple time and depth scales in the Corinth Rift, Central Greece: extension across the Corinth Rift. *Geophys. J. Int.* 186, 463–470. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2011.05077.x>.
- Bell, R.E., Duclaux, G., Nixon, C.W., Gawthorpe, R.L., McNeill, L.C., 2017. High-angle, not low-angle, normal faults dominate early rift extension in the Corinth Rift, central Greece. *Geology*. <https://doi.org/10.1130/g39560.1>.
- Benedetti, L., Finkel, R., King, G., Armijo, R., Papanastassiou, D., Ryerson, F.J., Flerit, F., Farber, D., Stavrakakis, G., 2003. Motion on the Kaparelli fault (Greece) prior to the 1981 earthquake sequence determined from <sup>36</sup>Cl cosmogenic dating. *Terra Nova* 15, 118–124. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3121.2003.00474.x>.
- Berlin, M.M., Anderson, R.S., 2007. Modeling of knickpoint retreat on the Roan Plateau, western Colorado. *J. Geophys. Res.* 112. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JF000553>. F03S06.
- Bernard, P., Chouliaras, G., Tzanis, A., Briole, P., Bouin, M., Tellez, J., Stavrakakis, G., Makropoulos, K., 1997. Seismic and electrical anisotropy in the Mornos Delta, Gulf of Corinth, Greece, and its relationship with GPS strain measurements. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* <https://doi.org/10.1029/97gl02102>.
- Bernard, P., Lyon-Caen, H., Briole, P., Deschamps, A., Boudin, F., Makropoulos, K., Papadimitriou, P., Lemeille, F., Pataa, G., Billiris, H., Paradissis, D., Papazissi, K., Castarède, H., Charade, O., Nercessian, A., Avallone, A., Pacchiani, F., Zahradnik, J., Sacks, S., Linde, A., 2006. Seismicity, deformation and seismic hazard in the western rift of Corinth: new insights from the Corinth Rift Laboratory (CRL). *Tectonophysics* 426, 7–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2006.02.012>.
- Boiselet, A., Scotti, O., Lyon-Caen, H., 2014. Estimating the probability of occurrence of earthquakes ( $M > 6$ ) in the Western part of the Corinth rift using fault-based and classical seismotectonic approaches. In: EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts.
- Boncio, P., Lavecchia, G., 2000. A structural model for active extension in Central Italy. *J. Geodyn.* 29, 233–244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-3707\(99\)00050-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-3707(99)00050-2).
- Bonneau, M., 1984. Correlation of the Hellenide nappes in the south-east Aegean and their tectonic reconstruction. *Geol. Soc. Lond., Spec. Publ.* 17, 517–527. <https://doi.org/10.1144/GSL.SP.1984.017.01.38>.
- Boulton, S.J., Whittaker, A.C., 2009. Quantifying the slip rates, spatial distribution and evolution of active normal faults from geomorphic analysis: field examples from an oblique-extensional graben, southern Turkey. *Geomorphology* 104, 299–316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2008.09.007>.
- Brasier, A.T., Andrews, J.E., Kendall, A.C., 2011. Diagenesis or diagenesis? The origin of columnar spar in tufa stromatolites of central Greece and the role of chironomid larvae. *Sedimentology* 58, 1283–1302. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3091.2010.01208.x>.
- Briole, P., Rigo, A., Lyon-Caen, H., Ruegg, J.C., Papazissi, K., Mitsakaki, C., Balodimou, A., Veis, G., Hatzfeld, D., Deschamps, A., 2000. Active deformation of the Corinth rift, Greece—Results from repeated Global Positioning System surveys between 1990 and 1995. *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth* 105, 25605–25625. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000jb900148>.
- Brooks, M., Ferentinos, G., 1984. Tectonics and sedimentation in the Gulf of Corinth and the Zakynthos and Kefallinia channels, Western Greece. *Tectonophysics* 101, 25–54. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-1951\(84\)90040-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-1951(84)90040-4).
- Brun, J.-P., 1999. Narrow rifts versus wide rifts: inferences for the mechanics of rifting from laboratory experiments. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* 357, 695–709. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.1999.0349>.
- Brun, J.-P., Sokoutis, D., 2010. 45 m.y. of Aegean crust and mantle flow driven by trench retreat. *Geology* 38, 815–818. <https://doi.org/10.1130/G30950.1>.
- Brun, J.-P., Faccenna, C., Gueydan, F., Sokoutis, D., Philippon, M., Kydonakis, K., Gorini, C., 2016. The two-stage Aegean extension, from localized to distributed, a result of slab rollback acceleration. *Can. J. Earth Sci.* 53, 1142–1157. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjes-2015-0203>.
- Buck, W.R., 1991. Modes of continental lithospheric extension. *J. Geophys. Res.* 96, 20161–20178.
- Buck, W.R., 1993. Effect of lithospheric thickness on the formation of high- and low-angle normal faults. *Geology* 21, 933–936. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613\(1993\)021<0933:EOLTOT>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(1993)021<0933:EOLTOT>2.3.CO;2).
- Burov, E.B., Watts, A.B., Others, 2006. The long-term strength of continental lithosphere: “jelly sandwich” or “crème brûlée”? *GSA Today* 16, 4.
- Cartwright, J.A., Trudgill, B.D., Mansfield, C.S. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. 357, 695–709. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.1999.0349>.
- Cartwright, J.A., Trudgill, B.D., Mansfield, C.S. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. 357, 695–709. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.1999.0349>.
- Causse, C., Moretti, I., Eschard, R., Micarelli, L., Ghaleb, B., Frank, N., 2004. Kinematics of the Corinth Gulf inferred from calcite dating and syntectonic sedimentary characteristics. *Compt. Rendus Geosci.* 336, 281–290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crte.2003.11.017>.
- Charalampakis, M., Lykousis, V., Sakellariou, D., Papatheodorou, G., Ferentinos, G., 2014. The tectono-sedimentary evolution of the Lechaion Gulf, the south eastern branch of the Corinth graben, Greece. *Mar. Geol.* 351, 58–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2014.03.014>.
- Childs, C., Holdsworth, R.E., Jackson, C.A.L., Manzocchi, T., Walsh, J.J., Yielding, G., 2017. Introduction to the geometry and growth of normal faults. *Geol. Soc. Lond., Spec. Publ.* 439, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1144/SP439.24>.
- Clendenen, C., 2009. Karst hydrology in ancient myths from Arcadia and Argolis, Greece. *Acta Carsologica* 38.
- Collier, R.E.L., 1990. Eustatic and tectonic controls upon Quaternary coastal sedimentation in the Corinth Basin, Greece. *J. Geol. Soc. Lond.* 147, 301–314. <https://doi.org/10.1144/gsjgs.147.2.0301>.
- Collier, R., Dart, C., 1991. Neogene to Quaternary rifting, sedimentation and uplift in the Corinth Basin, Greece. *J. Geol. Soc. Lond.* 148, 1049–1065. <https://doi.org/10.1144/gsjgs.148.6.1049>.
- Collier, R.E.L., Leeder, M.R., Rowe, P.J., Atkinson, T.C., 1992. Rates of tectonic uplift in the Corinth and Megara Basins, central Greece. *Tectonics* 11, 1159–1167. <https://doi.org/10.1029/92TC01565>.
- Cornet, F.H., Doan, M.L., Moretti, I., Borm, G., 2004. Drilling through the active Aigion Fault: the AIG10 well observatory. *Compt. Rendus Geosci.* 336, 395–406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crte.2004.02.002>.
- Cowie, P.A., 1998. A healing–reloading feedback control on the growth rate of seismogenic faults. *J. Struct. Geol.* 20, 1075–1087. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141\(98\)00034-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141(98)00034-0).
- Cowie, P.A., Roberts, G.P., 2001. Constraining slip rates and spacings for active normal faults. *J. Struct. Geol.* 23, 1901–1915. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141\(01\)00036-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141(01)00036-0).
- Cowie, P.A., Scholz, C.H., 1992a. Physical explanation for the displacement-length relationship of faults using a post-yield fracture mechanics model. *J. Struct. Geol.* 14, 1133–1148. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(92\)90065-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(92)90065-5).
- Cowie, P.A., Scholz, C.H., 1992b. Displacement-length scaling relationship for faults: data synthesis and discussion. *J. Struct. Geol.* 14, 1149–1156. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(92\)90066-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(92)90066-6).
- Cowie, P.A., Gupta, S., Dawers, N.H., 2000. Implications of fault array evolution for synrift depositional development: insights from a numerical fault growth model. *Basin Res.* 12, 241–261.
- Cowie, P.A., Attal, M., Tucker, G.E., Whittaker, A.C., Naylor, M., Ganas, A., Roberts, G.P., 2006. Investigating the surface process response to fault interaction and linkage using a numerical modelling approach. *Basin Res.* 18, 231–266. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2117.2006.00298.x>.
- Dawers, N.H., Anders, M.H., 1995. Displacement-length scaling and fault linkage. *J.*

- Struct. Geol. 17, 607–614. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(94\)00091-d](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(94)00091-d).
- Dawers, N.H., Anders, M.H., Scholz, C.H., 1993. Growth of normal faults: displacement-length scaling. *Geology* 21, 1107–1110. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613\(1993\)021<1107:GONFDL>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(1993)021<1107:GONFDL>2.3.CO;2).
- De Gelder, G., Fernández-Blanco, D., Melnick, D., Duclaux, G., Bell, R.E., Jara-Muñoz, J., Armijo, R., Lacassin, R., 2019. Lithospheric flexure and rheology determined by climate cycle markers in the Corinth Rift. *Sci. Rep.* 9, 4260. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36377-1>.
- De Martini, P.M., Pantosti, D., Palyvos, N., Lemeille, F., McNeill, L., Collier, R., 2004. Slip rates of the Aigion and Eliki Faults from uplifted marine terraces, Corinth Gulf, Greece. *Compt. Rendus Geosci.* 336, 325–334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crte.2003.12.006>.
- Densmore, A.L., Dawers, N.H., Gupta, S., Guidon, R., Goldin, T., 2004. Footwall topographic development during continental extension. *J. Geophys. Res.* 109. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JF000115>. F03001.
- Densmore, A.L., Dawers, N.H., Gupta, S., Guidon, R., 2005. What sets topographic relief in extensional footwalls? *Geology* 33, 453–456. <https://doi.org/10.1130/G21440.1>.
- Densmore, A.L., Gupta, S., Allen, P.A., Dawers, N.H., 2007. Transient landscapes at fault tips. *J. Geophys. Res.* 112. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JF000560>. F03S08.
- Déverchère, J., Petit, C., Gileva, N., Radziminovitch, N., Melnikova, V., San'Kov, V., 2001. Depth distribution of earthquakes in the Baikal rift system and its implications for the rheology of the lithosphere. *Geophys. J. Int.* <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0956-540x.2001.1484.484.x>.
- Doutsos, T., Piper, D.J.W., 1990. Listric faulting, sedimentation, and morphological evolution of the Quaternary eastern Corinth rift, Greece: First stages of continental rifting. *Geol. Soc. Am. Bull.* 102, 812–829. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606\(1990\)102<0812:LFSAME>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606(1990)102<0812:LFSAME>2.3.CO;2).
- Duverger, C., Godano, M., Bernard, P., Lyon-Caen, H., Lambotte, S., 2015. The 2003–2004 seismic swarm in the western Corinth rift: Evidence for a multiscale pore pressure diffusion process along a permeable fault system. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL065298>. 2015GL065298.
- Duverger, C., Lambotte, S., Bernard, P., Lyon-Caen, H., Deschamps, A., Necessian, A., 2018. Dynamics of microseismicity and its relationship with the active structures in the western Corinth Rift (Greece). *Geophys. J. Int.* 215, 196–221. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggy264>.
- Ebinger, C.J., 1989. Geometric and kinematic development of border faults and accommodation zones, Kivu-Rusizi Rift, Africa. *Tectonics* 8, 117–133. <https://doi.org/10.1029/TC008i001p0117>.
- Elias, P., Kontoes, C., Papoutsis, I., Kotsis, I., Marinou, A., Paradissis, D., Sakellariou, D., 2009. Permanent Scatterer InSAR Analysis and Validation in the Gulf of Corinth. *Sensors* 9, 46–55. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s9010046>.
- Ferentinis, G., Georgiou, N., Christodoulou, D., Geraga, M., Papatheodorou, G., 2018. Propagation and termination of a strike slip fault in an extensional domain: The westward growth of the North Anatolian Fault into the Aegean Sea. *Tectonophysics* 745, 183–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2018.08.003>.
- Fernández-Blanco, D., de Gelder, G., Gallen, S., Lacassin, R., Armijo, R., 2019a. Transient rivers characterize evolving crustal-scale flexure in the Corinth Rift. *EarthArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.31223/osf.io/8w7kf>. January 10, 2019.
- Fernández-Blanco, D., de Gelder, G., Lacassin, R., Armijo, R., 2019b. Geometry of flexural uplift by continental rifting in Corinth, Greece. *Earth ArXiv* (preprint).
- Flerit, F., Armijo, R., King, G., Meyer, B., 2004. The mechanical interaction between the propagating North Anatolian Fault and the back-arc extension in the Aegean. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 224, 347–362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2004.05.028>.
- Flotté, N., Sorel, D., 2001. Structural cross sections through the Corinth-Patras detachment fault-system in Northern Peloponnesus (Aegean Arc, Greece). *Bull. Geol. Soc. Greece*. <https://doi.org/10.12681/bgsg.17018>.
- Flotté, N., Sorel, D., Müller, C., Tensi, J., 2005. Along strike changes in the structural evolution over a brittle detachment fault: Example of the Pleistocene Corinth–Patras rift (Greece). *Tectonophysics* 403, 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2005.03.015>.
- Ford, M., Williams, E.A., Malartre, F., Popescu, S.-M., 2009. Stratigraphic architecture, sedimentology and structure of the Vouraikos Gilbert-type fan delta, Gulf of Corinth, Greece. In: *Sedimentary Processes, Environments and Basins: A Tribute to Peter Friend*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, pp. 49–90.
- Ford, M., Rohais, S., Williams, E.A., Bourlange, S., Jouselin, D., Backert, N., Malartre, F., 2012. Tectono-sedimentary evolution of the western Corinth rift (Central Greece). *Basin Res.* 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2117.2012.00550.x>.
- Ford, M., Hemelsdaël, R., Mancini, M., Palyvos, N., 2016. Rift migration and lateral propagation: evolution of normal faults and sediment-routing systems of the western Corinth rift (Greece). *Geol. Soc. Lond., Spec. Publ.* 439. <https://doi.org/10.1144/SP439.15>.
- Gallen, S.F., Wegmann, K.W., 2017. River profile response to normal fault growth and linkage: An example from the Hellenic forearc of south-central Crete, Greece. *Earth Surf. Dyn.* 5, 161. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-5-161-2017>.
- Gautier, S., Latorre, D., Virieux, J., Deschamps, A., Skarpeles, C., Sotiriou, A., Serpetsidaki, A., Tselentis, A., 2006. A New Passive Tomography of the Aigion Area (Gulf of Corinth, Greece) from the 2002 Data Set. *Pure Appl. Geophys.* 163, 431–453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-005-0033-7>.
- Gawthorpe, R.L., Fraser, A.J., Collier, R.E.L., 1994. Sequence stratigraphy in active extensional basins: implications for the interpretation of ancient basin-fills. *Mar. Pet. Geol.* 11, 642–658. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0264-8172\(94\)90021-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0264-8172(94)90021-3).
- Gawthorpe, R.L., Jackson, C.A.-L., Young, M.J., Sharp, I.R., Moustafa, A.R., Leppard, C.W., 2003. Normal fault growth, displacement localisation and the evolution of normal fault populations: the Hammam Farauq fault block, Suez rift, Egypt. *J. Struct. Geol.* 25, 883–895. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141\(02\)00088-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141(02)00088-3).
- Gawthorpe, R.L., Andrews, J.E., Collier, R.E.L., Ford, M., Henstra, G.A., Kranis, H., Leeder, M.R., Muravchik, M., Skourtsos, E., 2017a. Building up or out? Disparate sequence architectures along an active rift margin—Corinth rift, Greece. *Geology* 45, 1111–1114. <https://doi.org/10.1130/G39660.1>.
- Gawthorpe, R.L., Leeder, M., Kranis, H., Skourtsos, E., Andrews, J., Henstra, G., Mack, G., Muravchik, M., Turner, J., Stamataki, M., 2017b. Tectono-sedimentary evolution of the Plio-Pleistocene Corinth rift, Greece. *Basin Res.* 30, 448–479.
- Ghisetti, F., Vezzani, L., 1999. Depth and modes of Pliocene–Pleistocene crustal extension of the Apennines (Italy). *Terra Nova* 11, 67–72.
- Gilbert, G.K., 1890. *Lake Bonneville*. US Government Printing Office.
- Godano, M., Deschamps, A., Lambotte, S., Lyon-Caen, H., Bernard, P., Pacchiani, F., 2014. Focal mechanisms of earthquake multiplets in the western part of the Corinth Rift (Greece): influence of the velocity model and constraints on the geometry of the active faults. *Geophys. J. Int.* 197, 1660–1680. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggu059>.
- Goldsworthy, M., Jackson, J., 2001. Migration of activity within normal fault systems: examples from the Quaternary of mainland Greece. *J. Struct. Geol.* 23, 489–506.
- Gueydan, F., Morency, C., Brun, J.-P., 2008. Continental rifting as a function of lithospheric mantle strength. *Tectonophysics* 460, 83–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2008.08.012>.
- Gupta, A., Scholz, C.H., 2000. A model of normal fault interaction based on observations and theory. *J. Struct. Geol.* 22, 865–879. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141\(00\)00011-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141(00)00011-0).
- Hatzfeld, D., Karakostas, V., Ziazia, M., Kassaras, I., Papadimitriou, E., Makropoulos, K., Voulgaris, N., Papaioannou, C., 2000. Microseismicity and faulting geometry in the Gulf of Corinth (Greece). *Geophys. J. Int.* 141, 438–456. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-246x.2000.00092.x>.
- Hemelsdaël, R., Ford, M., 2016. Relay zone evolution: a history of repeated fault propagation and linkage, central Corinth rift, Greece. *Basin Res.* 28, 34–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bre.12101>.
- Houghton, S.L., Roberts, G.P., Papanikolaou, I.D., McArthur, J.M., Gilmour, M.A., 2003. New 234U–230Th coral dates from the western Gulf of Corinth: Implications for extensional tectonics. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 30, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL018112>.
- Hubert-Ferrari, A., King, G., Armijo, R., Meyer, B., Papanastasiou, D., 1996. Fault re-activation, stress interaction and rupture propagation of the 1981 Corinth earthquake sequence. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 142, 573–585. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X\(96\)00108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X(96)00108-2).
- Hubert-Ferrari, A., King, G., Manighetti, I., Armijo, R., Meyer, B., Tapponnier, P., 2003. Long-term elasticity in the continental lithosphere; modelling the Aden Ridge propagation and the Anatolian extrusion process. *Geophys. J. Int.* 153, 111–132. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-246x.2003.01872.x>.
- Huguén, C., Mascle, J., Chaumillon, E., Kopf, A., Woodside, J., Zitter, T., 2004. Structural setting and tectonic control of mud volcanoes from the Central Mediterranean Ridge (Eastern Mediterranean). *Mar. Geol.* 209, 245–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2004.05.002>.
- Jackson, J., McKenzie, D., 1983. The geometrical evolution of normal fault systems. *J. Struct. Geol.* 5, 471–482. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(83\)90053-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(83)90053-6).
- Jackson, J.A., Gagnepain, J., Houseman, G., King, G.C.P., Papadimitriou, P., Soufleris, C., Virieux, J., 1982. Seismicity, normal faulting, and the geomorphological development of the Gulf of Corinth (Greece): the Corinth earthquakes of February and March 1981. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 57, 377–397. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X\(82\)90158-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X(82)90158-3).
- Jacobshagen, V., Dürr, S., Kockel, F., Kopp, K.O., Kowalczyk, G., Berckhemer, H., Büttner, D., 1978. Structure and geodynamic evolution of the Aegean region. *Alps, Apennines, Hellenides* 38, 455–477.
- Jamtveit, B., Ben-Zion, Y., Renard, F., Austrheim, H., 2018. Earthquake-induced transformation of the lower crust. *Nature* 556, 487–491. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0045-y>.
- Jolivet, L., 2001. A comparison of geodetic and finite strain pattern in the Aegean, geodynamic implications. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 187, 95–104. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X\(01\)00277-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X(01)00277-1).
- Jolivet, L., Brun, J.-P., 2010. Cenozoic geodynamic evolution of the Aegean. *Int. J. Earth Sci.* 99, 109–138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00531-008-0366-4>.
- Jolivet, L., Labrousse, L., Agard, P., Lacombe, O., Bailly, V., Lecomte, E., Mouthereau, F., Mehl, C., 2010. Rifting and shallow-dipping detachments, clues from the Corinth Rift and the Aegean. *Tectonophysics* 483, 287–304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2009.11.001>.
- Jolivet, L., Faccenna, C., Huet, B., Labrousse, L., Le Pourhiet, L., Lacombe, O., Lecomte, E., Burov, E., Denèle, Y., Brun, J.-P., Philippon, M., Paul, A., Salaün, G., Karabulut, H., Piromallo, C., Monié, P., Gueydan, F., Okay, A.I., Oberhänsli, R., Pourteau, A., Augier, R., Gadenne, L., Triuzzi, O., 2013. Aegean tectonics: Strain localisation, slab tearing and trench retreat. *Tectonophysics* 597–598, 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2012.06.011>.
- Karymbalis, E., Ferentinou, M., Giles, P.T., 2016a. Use of morphometric variables and self-organizing maps to identify clusters of alluvial fans and catchments in the north Peloponnesian, Greece. *Geol. Soc. Lond., Spec. Publ.* 440. <https://doi.org/10.1144/SP440.7>.
- Karymbalis, E., Papanastasiou, D., Gaki-Papanastasiou, K., Ferentinou, M., Chalkias, C., 2016b. Late quaternary rates of stream incision in Northeast Peloponnesian, Greece. *Front. Earth Sci.* 10, 455–478. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11707-016-0577-0>.
- Kent, E., Boulton, S.J., Whittaker, A.C., Stewart, I.S., Cihat Alçiçek, M., 2016. Normal fault growth and linkage in the Gediz (Alaçehir) Graben, Western Turkey, revealed by transient river long-profiles and slope-break knickpoints. *Earth Surf. Process. Landf.* <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.4049>.
- Keraudren, B., Sorel, D., 1987. The terraces of Corinth (Greece) – a detailed record of eustatic sea-level variations during the last 500,000 years. *Mar. Geol.* 77, 99–107. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-3227\(87\)90085-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-3227(87)90085-5).



- King, G., Ellis, M., 1990. The origin of large local uplift in extensional regions. *Nature* 348, 689–693.
- King, G.C.P., Ouyang, Z.X., Papadimitriou, P., Deschamps, A., Gagnepain, J., Houseman, G., Jackson, J.A., Soufleris, C., Virieux, J., 1985. The evolution of the Gulf of Corinth (Greece): an aftershock study of the 1981 earthquakes. *Geophys. J. Int.* 80, 677–693. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.1985.tb05118.x>.
- King, G., Stein, R., Rundle, J., 1988. The growth of geological structures by repeated earthquakes 1. Conceptual framework. *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth* 93, 13307–13318. <https://doi.org/10.1029/jb093ib11p13307>.
- Koukouvelas, I.K., Aydin, A., 2002. Fault structure and related basins of the North Aegean Sea and its surroundings. *Tectonics* 21, 1046. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001TC901037>.
- Koukouvelas, I.K., Stamatopoulos, L., Katsonopoulou, D., Pavlides, S., 2001. A palaeo-seismological and geochronological investigation of the Eliki fault, Gulf of Corinth, Greece. *J. Struct. Geol.* 23, 531–543. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141\(00\)00124-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141(00)00124-3).
- Kreemer, C., Chamot-Rooke, N., 2004. Contemporary kinematics of the southern Aegean and the Mediterranean Ridge. *Geophys. J. Int.* 157, 1377–1392. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2004.02270.x>.
- Kusznir, N.J., Marsden, G., Egan, S.S., 1991. A flexural-cantilever simple-shear/pure-shear model of continental lithosphere extension: applications to the Jeanne d'Arc Basin, Grand Banks and Viking Graben, North Sea. *Geol. Soc. Lond., Spec. Publ.* 56, 41–60.
- Lacassin, R., Arnaud, N., Leloup, P.H., Armijo, R., Meyer, B., 2007. Syn- and post-orogenic exhumation of metamorphic rocks in North Aegean. *eEarth* 2, 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.5194/ee-2-51-2007>.
- Lajoie, K.R., 1986. Coastal tectonics. In: *Active Tectonics*, pp. 95–124.
- Lambotte, S., Lyon-Caen, H., Bernard, P., Deschamps, A., Patau, G., Nercessian, A., Pacchiani, F., Bourouis, S., Drilleau, M., Adamova, P., 2014. Reassessment of the rifting process in the Western Corinth Rift from relocated seismicity. *Geophys. J. Int.* 197, 1822–1844. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggu096>.
- Le Pichon, X., Angelier, J., 1981. The Aegean sea. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* 300, 357–372.
- Le Pichon, X., Kreemer, C., 2010. The Miocene-to-present kinematic evolution of the Eastern Mediterranean and middle east and its implications for dynamics. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* 38, 323–351. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-earth-040809-152419>.
- Leeder, M.R., Seger, M.J., Stark, C.P., 1991. Sedimentation and tectonic geomorphology adjacent to major active and inactive normal faults, southern Greece. *J. Geol. Soc. Lond.* 148, 331–343. <https://doi.org/10.1144/gsjgs.148.2.0331>.
- Leeder, M.R., McNeill, L.C., Li Collier, R.E., Portman, C., Rowe, P.J., Andrews, J.E., Gawthorpe, R.L., 2003. Corinth rift margin uplift: new evidence from Late Quaternary marine shorelines. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 30, 1611. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL017382>.
- Leeder, M.R., Mack, G.H., Brasier, A.T., Parrish, R.R., McIntosh, W.C., Andrews, J.E., Duermeijer, C.E., 2008. Late-Pliocene timing of Corinth (Greece) rift-margin fault migration. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 274, 132–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2008.07.006>.
- Leeder, M.R., Mark, D.F., Gawthorpe, R.L., Kranis, H., Loveless, S., Pedentchouk, N., Skourtos, E., Turner, J., Andrews, J.E., Stamatakis, M., 2012. A “Great Deepening”: chronology of rift climax, Corinth rift, Greece. *Geology* 40, 999–1002. <https://doi.org/10.1130/G33360.1>.
- Lister, G.S., Banga, G., Feenstra, A., 1984. Metamorphic core complexes of Cordilleran type in the Cyclades, Aegean Sea, Greece. *Geology* 12, 221–225. doi: 2.0.CO;2 > 10.1130/0091-7613(1984)12 < 221:MCCOCT > 2.0.CO;2.
- Lykousis, V., Sakellariou, D., Moretti, I., Kaberi, H., 2007. Late Quaternary basin evolution of the Gulf of Corinth: sequence stratigraphy, sedimentation, fault-slip and subsidence rates. *Tectonophysics* 440, 29–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2006.11.007>.
- Lyon-Caen, H., Papadimitriou, P., Deschamps, A., Bernard, P., Makropoulos, K., Pacchiani, F., Patau, G., 2004. First results of the CRLN seismic network in the western Corinth Rift: evidence for old-fault reactivation. *Compt. Rendus Geosci.* 336, 343–351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crte.2003.12.004>.
- Malartre, F., Ford, M., Williams, E.A., 2004. Preliminary biostratigraphy and 3D geometry of the Vouraikos Gilbert-type fan delta, Gulf of Corinth, Greece. *Compt. Rendus Geosci.* 336, 269–280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crte.2003.11.016>.
- Manighetti, I., King, G.C.P., Gaudemer, Y., Scholz, C.H., Doubre, C., 2001. Slip accumulation and lateral propagation of active normal faults in Afar. *J. Geophys. Res.* 106, 13667–13696. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JB900471>.
- Manighetti, I., Campillo, M., Sammis, C., Mai, P.M., King, G., 2005. Evidence for self-similar, triangular slip distributions on earthquakes: implications for earthquake and fault mechanics. *J. Geophys. Res.* 110, B05302. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JB003174>.
- Mats, V.D., 1993. The structure and development of the Baikal rift depression. *Earth-Sci. Rev.* 34, 81–118. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-8252\(93\)90028-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-8252(93)90028-6).
- McKenzie, D., 1978. Active tectonics of the Alpine–Himalayan belt: the Aegean Sea and surrounding regions. *Geophys. J. Int.* 55, 217–254.
- McKenzie, D., 1978a. Some remarks on the development of sedimentary basins. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 40, 25–32. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X\(78\)90071-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X(78)90071-7).
- McKenzie, D., 1978b. Active tectonics of the Alpine–Himalayan belt: the Aegean Sea and surrounding regions. *Geophys. J.* 55, 217–254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.1978.tb04759.x>.
- McNeill, L.C., Collier, R.E.L., 2004. Uplift and slip rates of the eastern Eliki fault segment, Gulf of Corinth, Greece, inferred from Holocene and Pleistocene terraces. *J. Geol. Soc. Lond.* 161, 81–92. <https://doi.org/10.1144/0016-764903-029>.
- McNeill, L.C., Cotterill, C.J., Henstock, T.J., Bull, J.M., Stefatos, A., Collier, R.E.L., Papatheodorou, G., Ferentinos, G., Hicks, S.E., 2005. Active faulting within the off-shore western Gulf of Corinth, Greece: implications for models of continental rift deformation. *Geology* 33, 241–244. <https://doi.org/10.1130/G21127.1>.
- McNeill, L.C., Shillington, D., Carter, G., Everest, J., Green, S., 381 Scientists, E., 2018. Preliminary Results from IODP Expedition 381: Development of the active Corinth Rift, Greece. *EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts*. adsabs.harvard.edu.
- McNeill, L.C., Shillington, D.J., Carter, G.D.O., Everest, J.D., Gawthorpe, R.L., Miller, C., Phillips, M.P., Li Collier, R.E., Cvetkoska, A., De Gelder, G., Diz, P., Doan, M.-L., Ford, M., Geraga, M., Gillespie, J., Hemelsdaël, R., Herrero-Bervera, E., Ismael, M., Janikian, L., Kouli, K., Le Ber, E., Li, S., Maffione, M., Mahoney, C., Machlus, M.L., Michas, G., Nixon, C.W., Oflaz, S.A., Omale, A.P., Panagiotopoulos, K., Pechlivanidou, S., Sauer, S., Seguin, J., Sergiou, S., Zakharova, N.V., Green, S., 2019. High-resolution record reveals climate-driven environmental and sedimentary changes in an active rift. *Sci. Rep.* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-40022-w>.
- Mechernich, S., Schneiderwind, S., Mason, J., Papanikolaou, I.D., Deligiannakis, G., Pallikarakis, A., Binnie, S.A., Dunai, T.J., Reicherter, K., 2018. The seismic history of the Pisias fault (Eastern Corinth Rift, Greece) from fault plane weathering features and cosmogenic <sup>36</sup>Cl dating. *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth* 123, 4266–4284. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2017JB014600>.
- Moretti, I., Lykousis, V., Sakellariou, D., Reynaud, J.-Y., Benziane, B., Prinzoffer, A., 2004. Sedimentation and subsidence rate in the Gulf of Corinth: what we learn from the Marion Dufresne's long-piston coring. *Compt. Rendus Geosci.* 336, 291–299. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crte.2003.11.011>.
- Morley, C.K., 1989. Extension, detachments, and sedimentation in continental rifts (with particular reference to East Africa). *Tectonics* 8, 1175–1192. <https://doi.org/10.1029/TC008i006p01175>.
- Morrison, J., Anderson, J.L., 1998. Footwall refrigeration along a detachment fault: implications for the thermal evolution of core complexes. *Science* 279, 63–66.
- Nixon, C.W., McNeill, L.C., Bull, J.M., Bell, R.E., Gawthorpe, R.L., Henstock, T.J., Christodoulou, D., Ford, M., Taylor, B., Sakellariou, D., Ferentinos, G., Papatheodorou, G., Leeder, M.R., Collier, R.E.L.L., Goodliffe, A.M., Sachpazi, M., Kranis, H., 2016. Rapid spatiotemporal variations in rift structure during development of the Corinth Rift, central Greece. *Tectonics* 35 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015TC004026>. 2015TC004026.
- Ori, G.G., 1989. Geologic history of the extensional basin of the Gulf of Corinth (?Miocene-Pleistocene), Greece. *Geology* 17, 918–921. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613\(1989\)017 < 0918:GHOTEV > 2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(1989)017 < 0918:GHOTEV > 2.0.CO;2).
- Palyvos, N., Pantosti, D., de Martini, P.M., Lemeille, F., Sorel, D., Pavlopoulos, K., 2005. The Aigion–Neos Erineos coastal normal fault system (western Corinth Gulf Rift, Greece): geomorphological signature, recent earthquake history, and evolution. *J. Geophys. Res.* 110, B09302. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JB003165>.
- Palyvos, N., Pantosti, D., Zabi, C., D'Addezio, G., 2007. Paleoseismological evidence of recent earthquakes on the 1967 Mudurnu Valley earthquake segment of the North Anatolian fault zone. *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.* 97, 1646–1661. <https://doi.org/10.1785/0120060049>.
- Palyvos, N., Lemeille, F., Sorel, D., Pantosti, D., Pavlopoulos, K., 2008. Geomorphic and biological indicators of paleoseismicity and Holocene uplift rate at a coastal normal fault footwall (western Corinth Gulf, Greece). *Geomorphology* 96, 16–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2007.07.010>.
- Pantosti, D., De Martini, P.M., Koukouvelas, I., Stamatopoulos, L., Palyvos, N., Pucci, S., Lemeille, F., Pavlides, S., 2004. Palaeoseismological investigations of the Aigion fault (Gulf of Corinth, Greece). *Compt. Rendus Geosci.* 336, 335–342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crte.2003.12.005>.
- Papazachos, C., Kiratzi, A., Papazachos, B., 1992. Rates of active crustal deformation in the Aegean and the surrounding area. *J. Geodyn.* 16, 147–179. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0264-3707\(92\)90024-M](https://doi.org/10.1016/0264-3707(92)90024-M).
- Pavlides, S.B., Koukouvelas, I.K., Kokkalas, S., Stamatopoulos, L., Keramydas, D., Tsodoulos, I., 2004. Late Holocene evolution of the East Eliki fault, Gulf of Corinth (Central Greece). *Quat. Int.* 115–116, 139–154. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1040-6182\(03\)00103-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1040-6182(03)00103-4).
- Pearce, F.D., 2015. *Seismic Imaging of the Western Hellenic Subduction Zone: The Relationship between Slab Composition, Retreat Rate, and Overriding Lithosphere Genesis*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Reilinger, R., McClusky, S., Paradissis, D., Ergintav, S., Vernant, P., 2009. Geodetic constraints on the tectonic evolution of the Aegean region and strain accumulation along the Hellenic subduction zone. *Tectonophysics* 488, 22–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2009.05.027>.
- Resor, P.G., Pollard, D.D., 2012. Reverse drag revisited: why footwall deformation may be the key to inferring listric fault geometry. *J. Struct. Geol.* 41, 98–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2011.10.012>.
- Rietbrock, A., Tiberi, C., Scherbaum, F., Lyon-Caen, H., 1996. Seismic slip on a low angle normal fault in the Gulf of Corinth: evidence from high-resolution cluster analysis of microearthquakes. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 23, 1817–1820. <https://doi.org/10.1029/96gl01257>.
- Rigo, A., Lyon-Caen, H., Armijo, R., Deschamps, A., Hatzfeld, D., Makropoulos, K., Papadimitriou, P., Kassaras, I., 1996. A microseismic study in the western part of the Gulf of Corinth (Greece): implications for large-scale normal faulting mechanisms. *Geophys. J. Int.* 126, 663–688.
- Rohais, S., Moretti, I., 2017. Structural and stratigraphic architecture of the Corinth rift (Greece): an integrated onshore to offshore basin-scale synthesis. In: Roure, F., Amin, A.A., Khoms, S., Al Garmi, M.A.M. (Eds.), *Lithosphere Dynamics and Sedimentary Basins of the Arabian Plate and Surrounding Areas*, Frontiers in Earth Sciences. Springer International Publishing, pp. 89–120. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-44726-1\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-44726-1_5).
- Rohais, S., Eschard, R., Ford, M., Guillocheau, F., Moretti, I., 2007a. Stratigraphic architecture of the Plio-Pleistocene infill of the Corinth Rift: implications for its

- structural evolution. *Tectonophysics* 440, 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2006.11.006>.
- Rohais, Sébastien, Joannin, Sébastien, Colin, J.P., Suc, J.-P., Guillocheau, F., Eschard, R., 2007b. Age and environmental evolution of the syn-rift fill of the southern coast of the gulf of Corinth (Akrata-Derвени region, Greece). *Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France* 178, 231–243. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gssgfbull.178.3.231>.
- Rosenbloom, N.A., Anderson, R.S., 1994. Hillslope and channel evolution in a marine terraced landscape, Santa Cruz, California. *J. Geophys. Res.* 99, 14013–14029. <https://doi.org/10.1029/94JB00048>.
- Sachpazi, M., Clément, C., Laigle, M., Hirn, A., Roussos, N., 2003. Rift structure, evolution, and earthquakes in the Gulf of Corinth, from reflection seismic images. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 216, 243–257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X\(03\)00503-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X(03)00503-X).
- Sachpazi, M., Galvé, A., Laigle, M., Hirn, A., Sokos, E., Serpetsidaki, A., Marthelot, J.-M., Pi Alperin, J.M., Zelt, B., Taylor, B., 2007. Moho topography under central Greece and its compensation by Pn time-terms for the accurate location of hypocenters: the example of the Gulf of Corinth 1995 Aigion earthquake. *Tectonophysics* 440, 53–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2007.01.009>.
- Sakellariou, D., Lykousis, V., Papanikolaou, D., 1998. Neotectonic structure and evolution of the gulf of Alkyonides, central Greece. *Bull. Geol. Soc. Greece* 32, 241–250.
- Sakellariou, D., Lykousis, V., Alexandri, S., Kaberi, H., Rousakis, G., Nomikou, P., Georgiou, P., Ballas, D., 2007. Faulting, seismic-stratigraphic architecture and Late Quaternary evolution of the Gulf of Alkyonides Basin–East Gulf of Corinth, Central Greece. *Basin Res.* 19, 273–295. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2117.2007.00322.x>.
- Scholz, C.H., Contreras, J.C., 1998. Mechanics of continental rift architecture. *Geology* 26, 967–970 doi: 2.3.CO;2" > 10.1130/0091-7613(1998)026 < 0967:MOCRA > 2.3.CO;2.
- Schwanghart, W., Scherler, D., 2014. TopoToolbox 2 – MATLAB-based software for topographic analysis and modeling in Earth surface sciences. *Earth Surf. Dynam.* 2, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-2-1-2014>.
- Scott, A.T., Pinter, N., 2003. Extraction of coastal terraces and shoreline-angle elevations from digital terrain models, Santa Cruz and Anacapa Islands, California. *Phys. Geogr.* 24, 271–294. <https://doi.org/10.2747/0272-3646.24.4.271>.
- Segeer, M., Alexander, J., 2009. Distribution of Plio-Pleistocene and modern coarse-grained deltas south of the Gulf of Corinth, Greece. In: Frostick, L.E. (Ed.), *Tectonic Controls and Signatures in Sedimentary Successions (Special Publication 20 of the IAS)*. John Wiley & Sons, pp. 37.
- Snyder, N.P., Whipple, K.X., Tucker, G.E., Merritts, D.J., 2000. Landscape response to tectonic forcing: digital elevation model analysis of stream profiles in the Mendocino triple junction region, northern California. *Geol. Soc. Am. Bull.* 112, 1250–1263. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606\(2000\)112 < 1250:LRTTFD > 2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606(2000)112 < 1250:LRTTFD > 2.0.CO;2).
- Sorel, D., 2000. A Pleistocene and still-active detachment fault and the origin of the Corinth-Patras rift. *Greece Geol.* 28, 83–86. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613\(2000\)28 < 83:APASDF > 2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(2000)28 < 83:APASDF > 2.0.CO;2).
- Stefatos, A., Papatheodorou, G., Ferentinis, G., Leeder, M., Collier, R., 2002. Seismic reflection imaging of active offshore faults in the Gulf of Corinth: their seismotectonic significance. *Basin Res.* 14, 487–502.
- Stein, R.S., Barrientos, S.E., 1985. Planar high-angle faulting in the basin and range: geodetic analysis of the 1983 Borah Peak, Idaho, earthquake. *J. Geophys. Res., Publ.* 90, 11355. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JB090iB13p11355>.
- Stewart, I., 1996. Holocene uplift and palaeoseismicity on the Eliki fault, Western Gulf of Corinth, Greece. *Ann. Geophys.* 39.
- Stewart, I., Vita-Finzi, C., 1996. Coastal uplift on active normal faults: the Eliki Fault, Greece. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 23, 1853–1856.
- Taylor, B., Weiss, J.R., Goodliffe, A.M., Sachpazi, M., Laigle, M., Hirn, A., 2011. The structures, stratigraphy and evolution of the Gulf of Corinth rift, Greece: structures, stratigraphy and evolution of GoC. *Geophys. J. Int.* 185, 1189–1219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2011.05014.x>.
- Tetreault, J.L., Buitter, S.J.H., 2018. The influence of extension rate and crustal rheology on the evolution of passive margins from rifting to break-up. *Tectonophysics* 746, 155–172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2017.08.029>.
- Tiberi, C., Diament, M., Lyon-Caen, H., King, T., 2001. Moho topography beneath the Corinth Rift area (Greece) from inversion of gravity data. *Geophys. J. Int.* 145, 797–808. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-246x.2001.01441.x>.
- Turner, J.A., Leeder, M.R., Andrews, J.E., Rowe, P.J., Van Calsteren, P., Thomas, L., 2010. Testing rival tectonic uplift models for the Lechaion Gulf in the Gulf of Corinth rift. *J. Geol. Soc. Lond.* 167, 1237–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1144/0016-76492010-035>.
- van der Beek, P., 1997. Flank uplift and topography at the central Baikal Rift (SE Siberia): a test of kinematic models for continental extension. *Tectonics* 16, 122–136. <https://doi.org/10.1029/96TC02686>.
- Verrios, S., Zygouri, V., Kokkalas, S., 2004. Morphotectonic analysis in the Eliki Fault Zone (Gulf of Corinth, Greece). *Bull. Geol. Soc. Greece* 36, 1706–1715. <https://doi.org/10.12681/bgsg.16578>.
- Wallace, R.E., 1978. Geometry and rates of change of fault-generated range fronts, north-central Nevada. *J. Res. US Geol. Surv.* 6, 637–650.
- Walsh, J.J., Watterson, J., 1988. Analysis of the relationship between displacements and dimensions of faults. *J. Struct. Geol.* 10, 239–247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(88\)90057-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(88)90057-0).
- Wernicke, B., 1981. Low-angle normal faults in the Basin and Range Province: nappe tectonics in an extending orogen. *Nature* 291, 645–648.
- Whipple, K.X., Tucker, G.E., 1999. Dynamics of the stream-power river incision model: implications for height limits of mountain ranges, landscape response timescales, and research needs. *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth* 104, 17661–17674.
- Whittaker, A.C., Boulton, S.J., 2012. Tectonic and climatic controls on knickpoint retreat rates and landscape response times. *J. Geophys. Res.* 117 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JF002157>. F02024.
- Whittaker, A.C., Walker, A.S., 2015. Geomorphic constraints on fault throw rates and linkage times: examples from the Northern Gulf of Evia, Greece. *J. Geophys. Res. Earth Surf.* 120, 2014JF003318. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JF003318>.
- Whittaker, A.C., Attal, M., Cowie, P.A., Tucker, G.E., Roberts, G., 2008. Decoding temporal and spatial patterns of fault uplift using transient river long profiles. *Geomorphology* 100, 506–526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2008.01.018>.
- Willemsse, E.J.M., 1997. Segmented normal faults: correspondence between three-dimensional mechanical models and field data. *J. Geophys. Res.* 102, 675–692. <https://doi.org/10.1029/96JB01651>.
- Wobus, C., Whipple, K.X., Kirby, E., Snyder, N., Johnson, J., Spyropoulou, K., Crosby, B., Sheehan, D., 2006. Tectonics from topography: procedures, promise, and pitfalls. *Geol. Soc. Am. Spec. Pap.* 398, 55–74. [https://doi.org/10.1130/2006.2398\(04\)](https://doi.org/10.1130/2006.2398(04)).
- Zelt, B.C., Taylor, B., Sachpazi, M., Hirn, A., 2005. Crustal velocity and Moho structure beneath the Gulf of Corinth, Greece. *Geophys. J. Int.* 162, 257–268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2005.02640.x>.
- Ziegler, P.A., 1988. Evolution of the Arctic-North Atlantic and the Western Tethys: a visual presentation of a series of Paleogeographic-Paleotectonic maps. *AAPG Mem.* 43, 164–196.