From source to sink in central Gondwana: Exhumation of the Precambrian basement rocks of Tanzania and sediment accumulation in the adjacent Congo basin

Charles Happe Kasanzu1, Bastien Linol2,3, Maarten J. de Wit4, Roderick Brown4, Cristina Persano4, and Finlay M. Stuart5

1Geology Department, University of Dar es Salaam, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, 2Department of Geosciences, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 3AEON-ESSRI, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 4School of Geographical and Earth Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK, 5Scottish Universities Environmental Research Centre, East Kilbride, UK

Abstract Apatite fission track (AFT) and (U-Th)/He (AHe) thermochronometry data are reported and used to unravel the exhumation history of crystalline basement rocks from the elevated (>1000 m above sea level) but low-relief Tanzanian Craton. Coeval episodes of sedimentation documented within adjacent Paleozoic to Mesozoic basins of southern Tanzania and the Congo basin of the Democratic Republic of Congo indicate that most of the cooling in the basement rocks in Tanzania was linked to erosion. Basement samples were from an exploration borehole located within the craton and up to 2200 m below surface. Surface samples were also analyzed. AFT dates range between 317 ± 33 Ma and 154 ± 20 Ma. Alpha (Ft)-corrected AHe dates are between 433 ± 24 Ma and 154 ± 20 Ma. Modeling of the data reveals two important periods of cooling within the craton: one during the Carboniferous-Triassic (340–220 Ma) and a later, less well constrained episode, during the late Cretaceous. The later exhumation is well detected proximal to the East African Rift (70 Ma). Thermal histories combined with the estimated geothermal gradient of 9°C/km constrained by the AFT and AHe data from the craton and a mean surface temperature of 20°C indicate removal of up to 9 ± 2 km of overburden since the end of Paleozoic. The correlation of erosion of the craton and sedimentation and subsidence within the Congo basin in the Paleozoic may indicate regional flexural geodynamics of the lithosphere due to lithosphere buckling induced by far-field compressional tectonic processes and thereafter through deep mantle upwelling and epeirogeny tectonic processes.

1. Introduction

Insights into the geodynamic interplay between hinterlands and depocenters can be gained through thermochronological and basin subsidence studies [e.g., Weber et al., 2004; Tinker et al., 2008; Fan and Carrapa, 2014]. In particular, apatite fission track and (U-Th)/He studies on crustal rocks can furnish important information on the chronology and rate of cooling, exhumation history, and approximate magnitudes of exhumation [e.g., Gleadow and Brown, 2000; Ehlers and Farley, 2003; Donellick et al., 2005; Tinker et al., 2008; Kasanzu, 2014; Torres-Acosta et al., 2015]. The application of low-temperature thermochronology of stable lithospheric blocks such as cratons has proved to be particularly important in detecting shallow thermotectonic processes that cannot be detected by other conventional isotopic approaches such as zircon U-Pb dating [e.g., Sao Francisco Craton, Brazil [Harman et al., 1998]; Canadian Shield [Lorencak et al., 2004]; Fennoscandian Shield [Cederbom et al., 2000; Hendriks and Redfield, 2005; Kohn et al., 2009]; Yilgarn Craton, Australia [Weber et al., 2005]; Ukrainian Craton [Danišik et al., 2008]; and Zimbabwe Craton [Belton and Raab, 2010]).

The topography of Africa is characterized by large basins and swells, and because the continent is completely surrounded by passive margins (Figure 1), this bimodal topography cannot be explained simply by orogenesis alone [e.g., Burke, 1996; French and Romanowicz, 2015; de Wit, 2007]. The Tanzanian Craton at 2.6–3.6 Ga [Manya et al., 2006; Kabete et al., 2012] comprises part of the East African Plateau (>1100 m above sea level) that stretches from Zambia northward to the Afar junction. It forms a 5000 km long elevated structure or “superswell” [Nyblade and Robinson, 1994; Litgow-Bertelloni and Silver, 1998; Gunnis et al., 2000; Werarante et al., 2003; Moucha and Forte, 2011; Wichura et al., 2015; O’Donnell et al., 2013; Torres-Acosta et al., 2015].
This has been attributed to a mantle “hot spot” and convective upwelling beneath the African plate during the Neogene [Nybland and Brazier, 2002; Torres-Acosta et al., 2015]. The Congo basin lies to the west of the craton. It covers about 10% by size of the African continent and marks a topographic low in sub-Saharan Africa [Linol et al., 2015a]. This topographic anomaly has been suggested to be related to an underlying “cold spot” and convective downwelling [see Linol et al., 2015c, and references therein]. Together, the Congo basin and the Tanzanian Craton are part of the Central African Shield (Figure 2) which is discussed in detail in de Wit and Linol [2015]. Other Precambrian terrains in the shield include the Ntem, Cuango, Kasai, Mboumou, and Uganda Cratons (Figure 1).
Studies of the exhumation and subsidence histories in the region can provide a unique tectonic framework for the understanding of geodynamic linkages between hinterlands (used here to refer to sediment sources) and depocenters (used here to refer to sediment sinks). The apatite fission track (AFT) and (U-Th)/He (AHe) techniques record rock cooling between 110°C and 40°C and have been used extensively to place temporal constraints on ancient basement exhumation histories [e.g., Brown et al., 1994; Tinker et al., 2008; Farley, 2002; Ehlers and Farley, 2003; Donelick et al., 2005]. The temperature range over which the AFT system is most sensitive is 60–110°C, also called the partial annealing zone (PAZ), and for the AHe system it is 40–80°C, which is called the partial retention zone (PRZ) [Gleadow et al., 1986; Farley, 2002]. On the other hand, studies of basin subsidence provide important information about temporal variation of sediment flux into depocenters. Subsidence modeling relies on the back-stripping procedure especially adapted to terrestrial (nonmarine) basins [Linol et al., 2015c]. In this paper we compare the timing of erosion and deposition of the eroded part of the basement crustal rocks into an adjacent basin. We use both thermochronologic and subsidence data in order to quantify the amount and rates of unroofing of Tanzanian basement rocks which we compare to the subsidence of the adjacent Congo basin in the realm of central Gondwana.

We report AFT and AHe data from a ~2.2 km deep exploration borehole located in the Tanzanian Craton and surface samples from across the terrain extending westward to the Ubendian orogen, which is proximal to the western arm of the East African Rift System (EARS; Figure 2). Additionally, we use subsidence data from the Congo basin obtained from four boreholes drilled during the 1950s and 1970s (Figure 1 for locations). We also attempt to compare the magnitude of sediment yield to the volume of sediments deposited in the Congo basin.

2. Geological Setting

2.1. The Tanzanian Craton

The Archean bedrock of Tanzania comprises high-grade Dodoman Complex and the granite-greenstone sequences of the Nyanzian and Kavirondian Supergroups (Figure 2). These terrains exhibit diverse tectonic histories, including variable magmatism, sedimentation, and metamorphism [Manya et al., 2006; Kabete et al., 2012; Kasanzu, 2014]. The Dodoman Complex is composed of relatively high-grade facies orthogneisses, quartzites, and migmatites. Kabete et al. [2012] report a detrital zircon U-Pb date of 3.6 Ga from the
Dodoman terrain and interpreted it to be the basement rocks of the low-grade greenstone sequences of the Nyanzian and Kavirondian. Magmatic activity in the Nyanzian Supergroup is constrained by U-Pb dates ranging from 2.8 ± 0.3 Ga to 2.7 ± 0.9 Ga [Borg and Krogh, 1999; Wirth et al., 2004; Manya et al., 2006]. The Nyanzian and Kavirondian Supergroup rocks in the region are envisaged to be associated with subduction tectonism processes [Manya et al., 2006]. Lithological assemblages include granitoids, basalts, pyroclastics, felsic flows, shales, mudrocks, and iron formations.

The craton is bounded by granulites of the Pan African Mozambique Belt to the east; the Eburnean Ubendian-Usagaran to the southeast, south, and southwest; the Kibaran Karagwe-Ankolean terrain to the northwest; and the Neoproterozoic clastic sedimentary sequences of the Malagarasi Supergroup [see Deblond et al., 2001; Tack et al., 2011]. However, no detrital U-Pb zircon data have ever been reported for these clastic sequences. Phanerozoic basins are present in the southern and eastern parts of the country (Figure 2). These basins are mainly Karoo sequences which reach a thickness of up to 3 km [Wopfner, 2002; Linol et al., 2016]. The term Karoo in the region has been used to refer to late Carboniferous-Jurassic depositional sequences, which represent a regional erosional event that was associated with Gondwana tectonics [Linol et al., 2016]. The rift flanks of the EARS form topographic highs along the western, northern, and northeastern margins of the craton (Figure 1 bottom) and the eastern branch of the rift have divided the cratonic margins since ~25–30 Ma [e.g., Chorowicz, 2005; Wichura et al., 2015].

**2.2. Congo Basin and Sediments Provenance**

The Congo basin comprises 4–6 km of Neoproterozoic to Cenozoic sediment [Linol, 2013]. The upper Neoproterozoic to lower Paleozoic Inkisi redbeds are overlain by Carboniferous to Permian glacial sequences
Table 1. Fission Track Results for Basement Rocks From Tanzania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>D/E (m)</th>
<th>UTM</th>
<th>Litho.</th>
<th>Nc</th>
<th>( \rho_s (N_s) ) ((x 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-2}))</th>
<th>( \rho_i (N_i) ) ((x 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-2}))</th>
<th>U ((\mu g/g) \pm C.v.)</th>
<th>( P (\chi^2) )</th>
<th>Central Date ((\text{Ma}) \pm 1\sigma)</th>
<th>CFTL ((\mu m) \pm 1\sigma)</th>
<th>SD ((\mu m))</th>
<th>Dpar ((\mu m))</th>
<th>SD ((\mu m))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC02</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Aggl.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.46 (308)</td>
<td>0.37 (246)</td>
<td>3.3 (39)</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>307.1 ± 32.6</td>
<td>12.6 ± 0.2 (45)</td>
<td>1.6 2.2 0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC04</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Andesite</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.56 (153)</td>
<td>0.45 (123)</td>
<td>3.9 (38)</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>305.1 ± 43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC06</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Andesite</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.78 (350)</td>
<td>0.64 (290)</td>
<td>5.8 (48)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>296.3 ± 31.8</td>
<td>12.4 ± 0.2 (31)</td>
<td>1.1 2.1 0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC08</td>
<td>-400</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Aggl.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.53 (234)</td>
<td>0.49 (203)</td>
<td>4.3 (35)</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>284.4 ± 32.6</td>
<td>13 ± 0.4 (6)</td>
<td>1.3 2.3 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC12</td>
<td>-600</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Tuff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.67 (210)</td>
<td>0.59 (184)</td>
<td>5 (41)</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>275.4 ± 34.6</td>
<td>12.4 ± 0.5 (7)</td>
<td>1.2 2.2 0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC14</td>
<td>-700</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Mudst.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.49 (245)</td>
<td>0.44 (219)</td>
<td>4.1 (42)</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>268.2 ± 31.6</td>
<td>12.3 ± 0.3 (13)</td>
<td>1.0 2.1 0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC16</td>
<td>-800</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Tuff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.66 (298)</td>
<td>0.60 (270)</td>
<td>5.3 (33)</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>261 ± 34.5</td>
<td>13.7 ± 0.4 (3)</td>
<td>1.1 1.9 0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC18</td>
<td>-900</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Aggl.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.46 (156)</td>
<td>0.42 (143)</td>
<td>3.8 (62)</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>265 ± 36.2</td>
<td>13.6 ± 0.1 (2)</td>
<td>0.2 2.2 0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC22</td>
<td>-1100</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Aggl.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.57 (173)</td>
<td>0.52 (157)</td>
<td>4.4 (60)</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>267.9 ± 35.5</td>
<td>12.8 ± 0.6 (8)</td>
<td>1.3 2.8 0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC26</td>
<td>-1300</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Aggl.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.45 (148)</td>
<td>0.41 (135)</td>
<td>3.8 (40)</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>264 ± 36.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC30</td>
<td>-1500</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Andesite</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.35 (204)</td>
<td>0.33 (189)</td>
<td>3.5 (56)</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>262 ± 32.6</td>
<td>12.1 ± 0.7 (7)</td>
<td>2.2 2.7 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC34</td>
<td>-1700</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Andesite</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.43 (237)</td>
<td>0.40 (221)</td>
<td>4.0 (80)</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>260.6 ± 30.8</td>
<td>11.7 ± 0.4 (8)</td>
<td>0.7 2.1 0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC40</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Andesite</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.35 (70)</td>
<td>0.35 (70)</td>
<td>2.9 (40)</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>244.9 ± 45</td>
<td>10.8 ± 0.3 (23)</td>
<td>1.5 2.4 0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC42</td>
<td>-2100</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Andesite</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.32 (175)</td>
<td>0.37 (201)</td>
<td>3.2 (45)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>215.1 ± 27.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC44</td>
<td>-2200</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>Andesite</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.32 (35)</td>
<td>0.43 (46)</td>
<td>3.6 (32)</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>188.4 ± 44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK07</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>484637/9527823</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.92 (832)</td>
<td>1.76 (760)</td>
<td>15.4 (57)</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>261.3 ± 24.5</td>
<td>13 ± 0.5 (11)</td>
<td>1.3 2.7 0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK08</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>473162/9455056</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.58 (400)</td>
<td>0.44 (303)</td>
<td>3.7 (26)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>317 ± 33.3</td>
<td>12.1 ± 0.1 (32)</td>
<td>2.2 2.2 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK12</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>282431/9440582</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.89 (876)</td>
<td>1.79 (798)</td>
<td>43.8 (26)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>275.7 ± 27.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK14</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>233276/9437344</td>
<td>Gneiss</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.13 (2166)</td>
<td>6.90 (2100)</td>
<td>7.7 (62)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>266.2 ± 29.1</td>
<td>12.4 ± 0.2 (46)</td>
<td>1.3 3 0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK15</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>210136/9436401</td>
<td>Gneiss</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.59 (763)</td>
<td>1.30 (627)</td>
<td>12.5 (51)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>285.1 ± 26.5</td>
<td>12.4 ± 0.2 (83)</td>
<td>1.1 3.5 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\( D = \) depth; \( E = \) elevation; \( UTM = \) Universal Transverse Mercator; \( \text{Litho.} = \) lithology; \( \text{Aggl.} = \) agglomerate; \( \text{Mudst.} = \) mudstone; \( N_c = \) number of crystals dated; \( \rho_s = \) density of spontaneous tracks; \( \rho_i = \) density of induced tracks; \( N_s = \) number of spontaneous tracks; \( N_i = \) number of induced and dosimeter glass tracks; \( \text{C.v.} = \) covariance in \%; \( P (\chi^2) = \) chi-square probability; \( \text{Var.} = \) variation coefficient in \%; \( \text{CFTL} = \) confined fission track length; \( \text{SD} = \) standard deviation.
of the Lukuga Group [Bose and Kar, 1978] (Figure 3), then Triassic Haute-Lueki Group, Upper Jurassic to Upper Cretaceous fluvial-lacustrine and aeolian sequences of red sandstones and mudstones of the Kwango Group, and Cenozoic alluvium deposits of the Kalahari Group. These sequences are separated by basin-wide unconformities (see Figure 3). The Lukuga, Haute-Lueki, and Kwango (only its basal unit) Groups constitute the equivalents of the Karoo sequences.

Detrital zircon dates for each stratigraphic unit are summarized in Figure 3. The redbeds of the Ikinsi Group have two dominant date populations of 1100–950 Ma and 800–600 Ma. These are most likely sourced from the Oubanguides of north central Africa [Linol et al., 2015b]. Eburnian and Kibaran sources are dominant for the Lukuga Group, whereas the overlying Haute-Lueki Group detrital zircon data suggest a largely Pan African protolith (Figure 3). The uppermost Kwango Group, including the Stanleyville Formation, reveal four main date populations; 3.0–2.6 Ga, 2.1–1.8 Ga, 1 Ga, and 0.85–0.5 Ga (Figure 3) [Linol et al., 2015b] that suggest mixed Precambrian sources. Paleocurrents were from the east, implying that the Tanzania Craton was one of the source terrains that supplied detritus to the basin [e.g., Linol, 2013].

3. Analytical Methods: AFT and AHe Thermochronometry

Fifteen subsurface samples collected from the Bulyanhulu borehole (surface elevation is 1184 m) (Figure 2) were dated using the external detector method for AFT; confined fission tracks lengths were measured, and the etch pit diameters (i.e., kinetic parameter, Dpar) values were also measured for each sample. Sampled lithologies from the borehole include granites, andesites, mudstones, tuffs, and agglomerates. Surface cratonic granite samples (CK07, CK08, and CK12) together with two Ubendian gneissic samples (proximal to the rift; CK14 and CK15) were also included in the analyses.

Mineral separation and sample preparation was conducted at the University of Glasgow. Mounts of apatite grains were etched using a 5 M HNO₃ solution at 20°C for 20 s to expose spontaneous tracks from $^{238}$U. Three IRRM glass monitors with U content of 10 ppm each were used for irradiation. These samples were irradiated with thermal neutrons at the nuclear reactor at Oregon State University (USA). Following irradiation, the mica detector samples were etched using 40% HF acid at 20°C for 36 min to reveal induced tracks from $^{235}$U. Counting of tracks was performed using a 1250X magnification Zeiss Axiotron microscope and computer-controlled x-y stage system (FTStage). Date computations were accomplished using a zeta calibration factor of 320 ± 21 for C.H. Kasanzu and the software TrackKey version 4.2 by Dunkl [2002].

Individual apatite grains were screened based on their clarity and morphology and handpicked for (U-Th)/He analysis then packed into Pt tubes prior to analysis. Helium, U, and Th analyses were performed at the Scottish Universities Environmental Research Centre (SUERC). The analytical protocol adopted in this study follows that described by Foeken et al. [2006, 2007]. Length and width measurements for alpha ejection correction (Ft) [Farley, 2002] were taken for each grain. (U-Th)/He dates were calculated using standard
procedures developed by Meesters and Dunai [2002]. Total analytical uncertainty was computed as a square root of squares of weighted uncertainties of U, Th, and He measurements and including the estimated additional variation of ±7% determined on repeat analyses of Durango apatite.

4. Results

4.1. AFT Data

AFT data are presented in Table 1 and are graphically displayed in Figures 4 and 5. Basement samples collected from the Bulyanhulu borehole reveal a tight cluster of Permian-Triassic (296 ± 32 to 215 ± 27 Ma) except for samples TC02, TC04, and TC44 that yielded Carboniferous dates of 307 ± 33 Ma and 305 ± 43 Ma and Jurassic dates of 188 ± 44 Ma, respectively. AFT dates from outcrop samples range between 317 ± 33 and 261 ± 25 Ma (Upper Carboniferous to Upper Permian, respectively). Mean track lengths for all samples vary between 13.7 ± 0.4 and 10.8 ± 0.3 μm, with a standard deviation of 0.8 μm, and Dpar range between 1.9 and 3.5 μm, with a standard deviation of ~0.3 μm. The number of confined track lengths was lower in our samples due to low uranium contents and thus low track density. None of the samples used in this study were from within the PAZ (based on mean surface temperature of 25°C and current gradient of 9°C/km which is obtained from the model results) where enhanced annealing of apatite fission tracks takes place. The deepest samples were sampled from 45–55°C and so may have experienced some track annealing. The dates are also much younger than the stratigraphic ages (Archean-Proterozoic), implying that all samples have experienced significant thermal annealing and subsequent Phanerozoic cooling below the 110°C isotherm. All samples pass the chi-square test except for TC16, CK14, and CK15.

4.2. (U-Th)/He Data

Apatite (U-Th)/He dates were determined on 16 single grains from three borehole samples (TC02, TC06, and TC44) and two outcrop samples (CK07 and CK14). The samples yielded α-ejection corrected single-grain dates ranging between 333 ± 33 Ma and 285 ± 112 Ma (Table 2 and Figure 4; for shallowest sample at 100 m below surface) and between 251 ± 90 Ma and 156 ± 104 Ma (for deepest sample at 2100 m below surface). In contrast, surface samples CK07 and CK14 yielded (U-Th)/He dates ranging between 349 ± 59 and 258 ± 22 Ma and between 399 ± 26 to 443 ± 24 Ma, respectively (see Figure 5), which are somewhat older than the corresponding AFT dates. All helium dates are single-grain dates, and errors are 1 sigma. All samples (except for sample TC42; ~2100 m; ~40°C) do not currently reside in the AHe PRZ. This indicates that AHe dates, which are all significantly younger than the Precambrian emplacement ages for these rocks, reflect elevated paleotemperatures followed by subsequent cooling to below 80°C during or after the Paleozoic.

Grains TC02#06, TC42#01, and TC42#02 and most of the CK07 and CK14 aliquots yielded (U-Th)/He dates that are significantly older than corresponding central AFT dates in this study (Figures 4 and 5). Similar observations of older AHe dates relative to their corresponding apatite fission track dates have been reported in a number of other studies of cratonic regions [e.g., Lorencak, 2003; Belton et al., 2004; Green et al., 2006; Flowers and Kelley, 2011]. This can be explained by the low effective helium diffusivity in grains with high radiation damage. Other additional causes of dispersion of grain dates may include helium implantation...
Spiegel et al. [2009], uranium-bearing mineral and/or fluid inclusions, and effects of uranium-bearing coatings on grains or grain boundaries [e.g., Murray et al. [2014]].

In our study, no samples display clear correlations between grain dates and grain sizes (i.e., radii; Figures 6c and 6d). This may in part reflect the small to moderate range of grain size (40–70 μm). In Figure 6a the relationship between AHe dates versus effective uranium (eU) is shown for the Bulyanhulu samples. Only sample TC42 shows signs of a positive correlation between date and eU, and sample TC02 shows a weaker correlation (based on only two grains). The limited number of dated grains for these two samples makes it difficult to evaluate the significance of these correlations. The eU range for sample TC06 is small, and so the eU effect is not expressed strongly by this sample. The eU content for sample CK07 is high (40–100 ppm). The effect of eU is often saturated at these levels, explaining why the correlation between grain dates and eU is not clear (Figures 6 and 6db).

Brown et al. [2013] demonstrated that the competing effects of grain size, eU, and fragmentation act to disrupt the simple correlations expected between grain size, eU, and grain dates and so this sort of behavior is to be expected for samples with complex histories and significant helium loss.

Fission track density distributions are homogeneous, which tends to rule out U and Th zoning as explanation for the date dispersion. However, the relatively low eU values for these grains (except for TC42) make them susceptible to the influence of helium implantation from outside the grain and thus the spread in dates. Overall, though, we believe the AHe date dispersion observed is consistent with the combined effects of grain size variation and the partial prolonged residence within the partial helium retention zone. The fact that the samples have experienced the same thermal histories explains this spread in dates. Overall, though, we believe the AHe dates reflect the small to moderate range of grain size (40–70 μm).

5. Thermal History Modeling

Optimum thermal history models were determined using the inverse approach explained in detail by Gallagher [2012] and Table 2. Apatite (U-Th)/He Data for Basement Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>#Grain</th>
<th>D/E. (m)</th>
<th>UTM</th>
<th>Nc</th>
<th>L (μm)</th>
<th>W (μm)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Th (ppm)</th>
<th>U (ppm)</th>
<th>eU (ppm)</th>
<th>4He (cc as STP)</th>
<th>Unc. Date (Ma)</th>
<th>Ft</th>
<th>Cor. Date (Ma)</th>
<th>Error (Ma)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC02#12</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.77E–12</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC02#6</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.55E–09</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC06#4</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.91E–10</td>
<td>120.2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC06#3</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.11E–10</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>154.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC06#2</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.65E–10</td>
<td>148.8</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>218.7</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC06#10</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.48E–10</td>
<td>121.7</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC42#10</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.30E–11</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC42#2</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.59E–11</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC42#18</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>442425.5/9645439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.29E–10</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK07#3</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>484637/9527823</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.1 + E–10</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK07#6</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>484637/9527823</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.00E–09</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK07#2</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>484637/9527823</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.59E–10</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK07#7</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>484637/9527823</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.96E–09</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK14#2</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>233276/9437344</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.61E–08</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK14#3</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>233276/9437344</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.13E–08</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK14#4</td>
<td>5/120</td>
<td>233276/9437344</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.35E–08</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a All data are calculated following the formula in Meesters and Dunai [2002].

L = length; W = width; T = terminations; eU = effective uranium calculated as [U] + 0.235*[Th] [Flowers et al., 2009]; Unc. = uncorrected; Ft = correction factor; Cor. = corrected. Other abbreviations as in Table 1.
jointly modeling AFT and AHe data using the QTQt software where both AFT and AHe were available. To account for the effects of radiation damage accumulation and annealing on the diffusivity of helium in apatite, we use the radiation damage model of Gautheron et al. [2009]. Due to the lack of robust geological constraints on the thermal histories, the initial model constraints allowed samples to pass between 0°C and 140°C any time between 600 Ma and 400 Ma (before the oldest fission track date of 307 ± 33 Ma). Joint inverse modeling of multiple samples from different depths enables an independent estimate of the paleogeothermal gradient. Modeling results indicate that Paleozoic to recent paleogeothermal gradients for the studied sites were similar to the present day (nominal geothermal gradient of ~9°C/km for craton and 25°C/km for the Ubendian samples). This observation is important in this context, as it indicates that the Paleozoic cooling recorded by the AFT and AHe data must have occurred because of erosion of crustal material and cannot be explained by cooling caused by a transient increase in the geothermal gradient.

5.1. Bulyanhulu Borehole Model

The optimum expected model for the Bulyanhulu borehole data is shown in Figure 7a, and a comparison between the observed and predicted data is provided in Figure 7b. The model indicates protracted cooling over 140 Ma of the cratonic samples through the PAZ and PRZ starting in the Carboniferous (340 ± 30 Ma) followed by residence at or near-surface temperatures of ~20–30°C since ~280 Ma.

5.2. Outcrop Sample Models

The optimum expected model for surface cratonic samples CK07, CK08, and CK12 is shown in Figure 8a, and a comparison between observed and predicted data is shown in Figure 8b. The data for these samples were jointly modeled as a coherent sequence because all three samples are from cratonic basement and are not separated by any major structures. The thermal history for these samples also indicates strong Carboniferous cooling starting at 340 ± 30 Ma as seen for the Bulyanhulu data. The model suggests that these samples cooled from maximum paleotemperatures of 90 ± 30°C to 40 ± 12°C by ~280 Ma. This early maximum temperature is slightly lower than the near-surface samples from Bulyanhulu, but the uncertainty on the maximum temperature is large, and so these samples may have cooled from maximum paleotemperatures similar to the Bulyanhulu (i.e., 110–120°C). This cooling was followed by a protracted period of stability through to the early mid-Cretaceous when cooling resumed, but at much lower rates, and the samples finally reached present surface temperatures of 20–30°C.
Samples CK14 and CK15 were modeled using the same approach; the optimum expected thermal history model is shown in Figure 9a, and a comparison between observed and predicted data is shown in Figure 9b. The two samples were both collected within the Ubendian orogen and adjacent to the western rift and are treated as a coherent vertical profile. Like previous models from the craton interior, significant Carboniferous (340–290 Ma) cooling (70 ± 25°C) is indicated (Figure 9a). However, in contrast to the craton samples, the model suggests that these samples experienced significant additional cooling of 30 ± 15°C starting in the mid-late Cretaceous (80–60 Ma).

Although this later episode is not well resolved by our current data from the craton, it is consistent with conclusions from several other thermochronology studies in East Africa [Foster and Gleadow, 1992, 1996; Noble et al., 1997; Mbede et al., 1993; Spiegel et al., 2007]. The period of Carboniferous cooling is consistently recorded by all samples. Subsequent to this early cooling episode, the cratonic samples from Bulyanhulu and the outcrop samples CK07, CK08, and CK012 experienced relative stability and/or only minor additional cooling (30°C) through to the present. In contrast, the modeling results suggest that the two samples, CK14 and CK15, experienced a later cooling initiated between 80 and 60 Ma. Although the magnitude and timing of this later phase is not well constrained by our data, it is significant that previous thermochronological studies focused on the EARS and rift margins in Tanzania [Noble et al., 1997; van der Beek et al., 1998] and farther north in Kenya [Foster and Gleadow, 1992, 1996; Spiegel et al., 2007; Torres-Acosta et al., 2015] all document significant mid-late Cretaceous cooling of exposed basement rocks.

6. Subsidence Data Model for the Congo Basin

Subsidence of the Congo basin is analyzed by back-stripping the stratigraphic records of the four existing deep boreholes (approximately between 2 km and 4 km in depth) drilled near the center of the basin (see Figure 3 for borehole sequence thicknesses) [Linol, 2013]. The back-stripping procedure removes the effect of sediment loading from the basement subsidence, thus allowing quantification of the tectonic subsidence [e.g., Allen and Allen, 2005]. This is performed by correcting for sediment compaction at the respective depths and times of deposition of each stratigraphic unit, using empirical porosity/deep parameters linked to the proportion of clay and silt compared to sand of each stratigraphic unit, determined during logging of the boreholes.
The subsidence curves show the existence two main episodes of rapid subsidence. The first and most pronounced episode of subsidence (mean rate = 10–20 m/Ma; Figure 10) starts at 350 Ma with the onset of the main Gondwana (Carboniferous) glaciation and terminates at about 180 Ma as recorded at Mbadaka, Gilson, and Dekese (Figure 10). This corresponds to deposition of the Lukuga and Haute-Lueki Groups in the basin. The latter is attenuated to a thickness of only 40 m in the Dekese section, suggesting an episode of erosion during the Triassic.

A second main episode of subsidence (mean rate = 5–10 m/Ma; Figure 10) is apparent in all boreholes. It started at 160 Ma and lasted until 34 Ma. This corresponds to the deposition of the Stanleyville, Loia, Bokungu, and Kwango Groups. This history reveals two distinct phases of rapid subsidence: the late Jurassic, 160 Ma to 140 Ma, and the late Cretaceous to earliest Paleogene from 100 Ma to 34 Ma, in the four boreholes [Linol et al., 2015c].

7. Discussion

7.1. Tectonothermal Implications of the Thermochronological Data

Thermochronology documents a major period of accelerated cooling, interpreted here as exhumation (uplift and erosion), beginning in the early mid-Carboniferous (between 340 and 280 Ma). A summary of the estimated cooling and the inferred amount and rate of erosion implied by the thermal history modeling is presented in Table 3. Within the craton interior the episode of early Carboniferous-Triassic cooling appears to have been prolonged over periods of 50 to 140 Ma, ending at 200 ± 20 Ma. These rocks then remained at or very near the surface until the present day.

Basement rocks from the craton were within the uppermost 10 km of the crust by the mid-Paleozoic and were exhumed at moderate rates (56–96 m/Ma) to within 1–2 km of the surface by the early Triassic. For the Bulyanhulu site specifically, Nyblade [1997] determined a thermal gradient of 8.7 ± 2.6°C/km (2σ) from the borehole. This is within error of the paleogeothermal gradient of 9°C/km estimated by the T-t modeling of the Bulyanhulu borehole data (Table 3). Using this average geothermal gradient for the craton, 8.9 ± 2.4 km of crust has been removed at an average denudation rate on the order of 56 ± 21 m/Ma. Likewise, the Ubendian orogenic samples (CK14, CK15), with a geothermal gradient of 25°C/km, requires exhumation of 4.0 ± 1.7 km of crust since the Carboniferous (Table 3).

The Carboniferous-Triassic exhumation might be linked to the end Paleozoic far-field regional compressional tectonics during the formation of the Mauritanian-Variscan Orogeny when Pangaea assembled at 325–275 Ma, when Tanzania was at the heartland of Gondwana, and followed directly by the Gondwanide orogeny and formation of the Cape-de la Ventana fold and thrust belt between 276 and 248 Ma [Linol 2015c].
It is thus possible that the first commencement of exhumation in Tanzania may have been triggered by far-field intraplate stresses between 350 and 250 Ma. The timing of this phase of enhanced erosion between 340 and 280 Ma also overlaps with estimates of the period of major glaciation across Gondwana [Isbell et al., 2003], and so it is also possible that erosion rates were partly enhanced by glacial processes.

The later phase of exhumation most clearly detected by the samples closest to the western rift (CK14 and CK15) commenced at 70 ± 20 Ma and resulted in the removal of 1.2 ± 0.6 km of crust at a mean rate of 17 ± 10 m/Ma (Table 3). Notwithstanding the poor resolution of this later phase of cooling by our data, the modeling results indicate similar amounts (less than 1.3 km) at somewhat lower rates (between 5 and 12 m/Ma) of erosion since 200 Ma for the interior cratonic regions (Table 3). Paleogene exhumation has been reported in other studies in the region and in East Africa [e.g., Foster and Gleadow, 1992, 1996; Noble et al., 1997; Mbede et al., 1993; Bauer et al., 2010; Torres-Acosta et al., 2015]. The available published AFT data are summarized in Figure 11. The pattern of AFT dates clearly shows that the younger AFT dates (less than 100 Ma) occur predominantly along the rifted craton margin and within the rifts of the EARS, while the oldest dates occur within the craton interior. This spatial pattern of AFT dates across Tanzania provides an excellent proxy for the timing of major erosion and highlights that the younger phases of erosion are focused along the craton margins and rift flanks of the EARS.

This late Cretaceous-early Tertiary exhumation significantly postdates the formation of the African plate during the start of the opening of the Indian (160 Ma) and South Atlantic (134 Ma) Oceans. However, this exhumation period partly overlaps in time with local kimberlitic emplacements which took place between 60 and 34 Ma within the craton (H. A. Jelsma, personal communication, 2013). This observation may suggest some degree of geodynamic interactions between the deep-seated mantle material and the cratonic lithosphere causing surface uplift by up-doming of the region [e.g., Torres-Acosta et al., 2015]. Because tectonomagmatic activities (e.g., kimberlite emplacement) documented in southern Africa and their role in triggering exhumation has been linked to the African Superswell, the exhumation during the Paleogene in Tanzania may also be associated with deep-seated mantle processes [Tinker et al., 2008; Wichura et al., 2015; French and Romanowicz, 2015; Torres-Acosta et al., 2015; Koptev et al., 2015].

7.2. Linking Exhumation and Subsidence

Evidence of significant exhumation and erosion across the heartland of Gondwana has been increasingly revealed through thermochronologic studies in eastern Central Africa [Foster and Gleadow, 1992, 1996;
Noble et al., 1997; Mbede et al., 1993; Spiegel et al., 2007; Kasanzu, 2014]. The record of sedimentation within adjacent basins might be expected to reflect the erosion of the basement rocks of these regions, including Tanzania. Deposition during these times took place between late Carboniferous and Triassic in the southern Tanzania Phanerozoic basins and possibly earlier (Visean-Namurian, 347–333 Ma) in the Congo basin [Kadima et al., 2011; Linol et al., 2015c].

AFT and AHe data reveal crustal erosion rates across the Tanzania Craton of 56 ± 21 m/Ma (Figures 7a and 8a) between 340 and 200 Ma. Evidence of accelerated subsidence (10–20 m/Ma; Figures 10 and 12) in the Congo basin during that time may indicate sediment influx, linking to erosion of surrounding hinterlands including the Tanzanian basement rocks. Detritus from Archean sources similar to dates of basement rocks of the craton is supported by detrital zircon dates reported in Linol et al. [2015b]. The weak zircon U-Pb Archean
Figure 11. Map illustrating the regional pattern of AFT dates of surface rocks across the Tanzanian Craton and adjacent rifts of the EARS. Data are from van den Haute [1984], Foster and Gleadow [1992, 1993, 1996], van der Beek et al. [1998], and this study. The location of the Bulyanhulu borehole is indicated by the white star.

Table 3. Erosion Estimates Derived From Thermal Model Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Onset (Ma)</th>
<th>End (Ma)</th>
<th>Duration (Ma)</th>
<th>Uncertainty (Ma)</th>
<th>Cooling (°C)</th>
<th>Uncertainty (°C)</th>
<th>Amount (km)</th>
<th>± Error (km)</th>
<th>Rate (m/Ma)</th>
<th>± Error (m/Ma)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CK15 and CK14</td>
<td>Early phase</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late phase</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK12, CK07, and CK08</td>
<td>Early Phase</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Phase</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulyanhulu borehole</td>
<td>Early Phase</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Phase</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>poorly resolved</td>
<td>&lt;1?</td>
<td>~5–10?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aTime of onset, duration, amount of cooling, and an indication of the uncertainty for each group of samples was extracted from the thermal history models discussed in the text. The erosion amounts and erosion rates are calculated using the thermal gradient (with nominal errors), and the errors on the amount of erosion and erosion rates were estimated by propagating the uncertainties on all estimates (added in quadrature). The geothermal gradients are in bold.
signal in the Congo basin may indicate that during that time, the Tanzania Craton was likely covered by late Neoproterozoic to Cambrian foreland basin sedimentary rocks, which were then part of the removed cover, consistent with the detrital zircon dates of Eburnian-Kibaran. In addition, recent stratigraphic analyses of the Karoo sedimentary sequences of Congo basin suggest a large easterly influx of sediments during the Carboniferous-Triassic and prior to Cretaceous [Linol et al., 2015b]. A total sediment thickness of about 3.5 km was deposited in the basin between 350 and 250 Ma during the time of extensive early exhumation of the Tanzanian Craton [Linol, 2013]. This cycle of exhumation-subsidence is roughly contemporaneous across central, southern, and eastern Africa and also overlaps in time with the Mauritanian-Variscan collision and the formation of the Sierra de la Ventana-Cape Fold Belts (Figure 10) [Linol et al., 2015c; Kasanzu, 2014]. The contemporaneous exhumation-subsidence events in the two regions (Figure 12) may indicate regional flexural readjustment of the lithosphere due to lithosphere buckling induced by far-field compressional tectonic processes, followed by deep mantle upwelling and epeirogenic processes. The change from rapid exhumation to slow cooling in the Tanzanian Craton at 200 ± 20 Ma overlaps with reduced sedimentation in the Congo basin between 180 and 160 Ma, as evidenced by a large hiatus [Linol et al., 2015c].

The exhumation of the Tanzanian Craton during the Paleogene (~70 Ma onward; rates = 5–17 m/Ma; Figures 7 and 8) indicated by the surface and borehole samples postdates the onset of major subsidence in the basin during the Cretaceous (Figures 10 and 12). The amount of erosion ranges from 1.2 ± 0.6 km along the western craton margin to 1.3 ± 0.6 km of denudation within the interior of the craton at rates between 5 and 17 m/Ma. These reduced erosion rates and presumably reduced sediment flux from the craton coincides with a distinct but moderate (400–500 m) phase of uplift of the Congo basin that began at ~60 Ma (Figure 10).

8. Conclusions

Analysis of model thermal histories constrained using combined AFT and AHe thermochronometry data from the Tanzania Craton and sedimentation and subsidence histories of the Congo basin indicates that the emergence and exhumation of the craton and sediment accumulation and subsidence of the basin in central Gondwana, and later Africa, operated in tandem.

The study has documented an important Phanerozoic tectonic uplift/exhumation phase affecting basement rocks of Tanzania during the Carboniferous-Triassic (340–220 Ma; rate = 56–96 m/Ma). The cratonic interior subsequently remained stable with the current exposed rocks at or near (~1 km) the surface from ~200 Ma until final exhumation through the Cretaceous and Tertiary at much reduced rates of ~17 m/Ma. The onset of exhumation during the Carboniferous is coeval with major subsidence of the Congo basin, and we suggest that it is most likely induced by far-field stress due to compressional tectonics during Pangaea assembly (325–275 Ma) and the Gondwana Orogeny (276–248 Ma).

In contrast, the post-Jurassic history of the cratonic interior is characterized by relative stability and much reduced erosion (Table 3). The regional pattern of uplift and erosion across the craton and extending into the rifts to the east and west includes discrete phases of younger uplift and erosion during the early
Cretaceous and late Cretaceous-early Tertiary, which primarily effected the margins of the craton and the uplifted rift flanks (Figure 11) and which are also partly contemporaneous with subsidence in the basin. These younger events have been ascribed to a combination of African plate reorganization and the formation of the EARS, which has been linked with deeper mantle dynamics that dictated the evolution of the African Superswell during the Neogene by numerous studies [Koptev et al., 2015; Burov and Gerya, 2014; Moucha and Forte, 2011; French and Romanowicz, 2015].

Using the estimated paleogeothermal gradient of −9°C/km and mean surface temperature for the craton of 20°C, the thermal histories indicate erosional removal of up to −9 ± 2 km overburden from the Tanzanian Craton since the Carboniferous (Ubendian samples record denudation of −4 ± 1.7 km). The record of coeval (3–5 km thick) sedimentation within adjacent Karoo basins of southern Tanzania and the Congo basin supports the interpretation that most of the exhumation/cooling in the basement rocks in Tanzania was due to erosion. The key finding of our work is that subsidence and accelerated sedimentation timings in the Congo basin overlap with major exhumation periods in Tanzanian crustal rocks during the Paleozoic-Mesozoic times. The subsidence constrained in the depocenter may indicate regional flexural geodynamics of the lithosphere due to lithosphere buckling induced by far-field compressional tectonic processes and thereafter by deep mantle upwelling and epeirogenic tectonic processes [e.g., Koptev et al., 2015]. Possible synchronization and/or feedback between these two geodynamic systems remain to be tested.
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