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ABSTRACT

IMAGING THE UPPER MANTLE BENEATH TURKEY AND SURROUNDING REGIONS

This study includes two interdependent sections. The first section presents an analysis of $P_n$ travel times to determine $P_n$ velocity, $P_n$ anisotropy and crustal thickness variations beneath Turkey and surroundings. Between 1999 and 2010, more than 50,000 $P_n$ arrivals are compiled from 700 regional earthquakes by 832 stations of permanent and temporary networks operated in the study area. A regularized least squares inversion method is used to estimate crustal thickness variations and image velocity perturbations in the uppermost mantle. The results reveal features that correlate well with the surface geology and the active tectonics of the region.

The $P_n$ velocities show very fast ($> 8.4$ km s$^{-1}$) and very slow ($< 7.6$ km s$^{-1}$) anomalies indicating a heterogeneous lithospheric structure. The average velocity of 8.0 km s$^{-1}$ is determined from a linear fit to $P_n$ travel times. Relatively uniform $P_n$ velocities (7.9-8.1 km s$^{-1}$) are observed in the Western Turkey. Large velocity contrasts are located at subduction and suture zones. A sharp transition in the central Anatolia is apparent from the uniform $P_n$ velocities in the west to lowest velocities ($< 7.6$ km s$^{-1}$) in the east. The lowest velocities coincide with the volcanics of the easternmost Anatolia and the Central Anatolian Volcanic Zone. Beneath the Dead Sea Fault Zone and Dinarides-Hellenides, the upper mantle velocities are also low ($< 7.8$ km s$^{-1}$). High $P_n$ velocities are observed beneath oceanic lithosphere such as Mediterranean Basin ($> 8.3$ km s$^{-1}$), western Black Sea basin ($> 8.3$ km s$^{-1}$), Adriatic Sea ($> 8.3$ km s$^{-1}$), and Zagros suture zone ($> 8.3$ km s$^{-1}$). Large velocity contrasts are observed at subduction, suture zones and across the North Anatolian Fault.

$P_n$ anisotropy has maximum amplitude of ±0.8 km s$^{-1}$ in the study area corresponding to 10 per cent anisotropy. The coherent and largest anisotropic anomalies are observed in the western Anatolia, Aegean Sea, and Cyprian Arc. A significant anisotropic pattern is
observed in the Cyprian Arc region. \( P_n \) anisotropy in western Anatolia, Aegean Sea and Greece correlate well with the present state of tectonic deformation and GPS velocities. The Dinarides-Hellenides exhibit arc-parallel anisotropy. In Western Anatolia, anisotropy is aligned in N-S direction along the major principal strain orientation. Along the North Anatolian Fault, the anisotropy directions are E-W, aligned with the fault geometry in the western part while no correlation is observed on the central and eastern parts of the fault. Anisotropy in Eastern Anatolia is complex and the directions are varying strongly in the region of low \( P_n \) velocities. The absence of anisotropy is apparent in an area dominated by the neogene volcanism. Low \( P_n \) velocities and absence of clear anisotropic pattern beneath Eastern Anatolia may have resulted from thermal anomalies in the uppermost mantle possibly due to delamination processes.

Large positive station delays are observed along the southern coast of Anatolia, Eastern Anatolia and beneath Dinarides-Hellenides while large negative station delays are observed in Western Anatolia and the Marmara Region. The majority of the stations in Central Anatolia show small station residuals indicating the average crustal thickness of 35±2 km. Western Anatolia and the Aegean Sea have crustal thicknesses between 28±2 and 33±2 km. In Greece, the crustal thicknesses are increasing from 33±3 km from the western coast to a maximum of 48±3 km beneath Dinarides-Hellenides. The large crustal thicknesses (40-48 km) are also observed along southern coast of Anatolia. In eastern and Southern Anatolia the average crustal thicknesses are 40 km and 36 km, respectively.

In the second section of this study, shear wave splitting on records of core-refracted (SKS) phases are obtained. Waveform data from 850 teleseismic earthquakes occurred between 1999-2010 at epicentral distances between 84° and 130° with magnitudes greater than 6.0 are analyzed. A total number of 4163 splitting measurements are obtained from 217 broadband seismic stations located in and around Turkey.

The anisotropy parameters measured from SKS are consistent with the results of similar studies conducted in North-Central Anatolia, Eastern Anatolia and Aegean. Fast direction polarizations are dominantly in NE-SW direction in the Eastern Anatolia. In the Marmara Region, fast polarization directions are in NNE-SSW direction with greater lag times. There is a relatively sharp change in the fast polarization directions form NE-SW to
NW-SE at the Antalya Bay, Isparta Angle Region (~30°E). SKS measurements are non-uniform in Central and Northern Greece. There are progressive changes in the fast splitting directions as well as delay times from Eastern Turkey to the Aegean. The change in the fast splitting directions from NNE-SSW in the eastern Anatolia to N-S in the Aegean may be the result of the retreat of the Hellenic slab. Through the North Anatolian Fault, shear wave splitting directions are aligned NE-SW.
ÖZET

TÜRKİYE VE ÇEVRESİ ÜST MANTO YAPISININ GÖRÜNTÜLENMESİ

Bu çalışma iki ayrı bölümden oluşmaktadır. İlk bölümdede \( P_n \) hızlarını, \( P_n \) yön bağımlılığını ve kabuk kalınlığı değişimlerini elde etmek için \( P_n \) varış zamanlarını analizmiştir. Çalışma bölgesi Türkiye ve çevresi olarak seçilmiştir. Bu bölgede 1999-2010 yılları arasında meydana gelmiş 700 adet depremden elde edilen 50 000 den fazla \( P_n \) varışı, analizlerde kullanılmıştır. Bunun için bölgede bulunan farklı ağlara ait sabit ve geçici 832 adet istasyonu ait verilerden yararlanılmıştır. Üst mantodaki hız dağılımini ve kabuk kalınlığı belirlemek için, en küçük kareler ters çözüm yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar bölge jeolojisi ve aktif tektoniği uyumluluklar göstermektedir.

\( P_n \) hızları, tekduze olmayan bir litosfer yapısını işaret eden çok yüksek (\( > 8.4 \) km s\(^{-1}\)) ve çok düşük (\( < 7.6 \) km s\(^{-1}\)) anomaliler göstermiştir. \( P_n \) varış zamanlarından en küçük kareler yöntemi ile elde edilen ortalama \( P_n \) hızı 8.0 km s\(^{-1}\) dir. Türkiye’nin batısında homojen \( P_n \) hızları (7.9-8.1 km s\(^{-1}\)) ölçülmüştür. Dalma-batma ve bindirme bölgelerinde yüksek \( P_n \) hız değişimleri saptanmıştır. Batıdaki homojen \( P_n \) hızlarından, doğudaki en düşük hızlara (\( < 7.6 \) km s\(^{-1}\)) doğru Orta Anadolu’da keskin bir geçiş göze çarpmaktadır. En düşük hızlar Doğu Anadolu ve Orta Anadolu volkanizması ile uyumlu bir dağılmaktadır. Ölü Deniz Fay hattı ve Dinarit-Helenik zonu altında üst manto hızları düşüktür (\( < 7.8 \) km s\(^{-1}\)). \( P_n \) hızları Akdeniz (\( > 8.3 \) km s\(^{-1}\)), Karadeniz’in batısı (\( > 8.3 \) km s\(^{-1}\)), Adriyatik Denizi (\( > 8.3 \) km s\(^{-1}\)) ve Zagros bindirme hattı (\( > 8.3 \) km s\(^{-1}\)) gibi okyanusal litosfer altında yüksek hız farklılıkları gözlemlenmiştir.

Çalışılan bölgede en yüksek \( P_n \) yön bağımlılığı değer 0.8 km s\(^{-1}\) dir ve yüzde 10 yön bağımlılığına karşılık gelmektedir. En büyük ve tutarlı yön bağımlılık farklılıkları Batı Anadolu, Ege Denizi ve Kıbrıs Yayını’nda ölçülmüştür. Batı Anadolu, Ege Denizi ve
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Outline

To better understand the geodynamic behavior of the lithosphere, it is important to know composition and thermal state of the Earth's mantle. Seismic velocities have been used for decades to determine the physical parameters of mantle and how they are affected by the mantle composition. In this work P_n velocity variations are used to study the uppermost mantle and infer the state of the lithosphere beneath Turkey and adjacent regions. In order to fully characterize the influence of upper mantle on the active tectonic, shear wave splitting measurements which provide reliable measurements on anisotropy of the upper mantle are also investigated. Two observations provide more complete view of the upper mantle.

In this work seismic data from various networks between 1999 and 2010 are used for the analysis. More than 50 000 P_n arrivals from 700 earthquakes and 832 stations and 4163 shear wave splitting measurements from 217 seismic stations are obtained. P_n velocity and crustal thickness variations, anisotropy of upper mantle are determined from P_n travel times and SKS observations.

The geology and tectonic settings of Turkey and surrounding regions are presented in Section 1.2. Section 1.3 summarizes the previous studies on P_n velocity variations, P_n anisotropy and shear wave splitting measurements in the region. A general review of mineralogy, composition and structure of Earth’s mantle are presented in Section 1.4. In Section 1.5 the origin and types of anisotropy are presented and how anisotropy varies with depth, temperature and pressure is discussed.

Chapter 2 provides analysis and discussions on the tomographic P_n velocity and P_n anisotropy structure beneath Turkey and surrounding regions. The fundamentals of P_n travel time tomography used in this study are introduced in Section 2.2. The data and processing are presented in Section 2.3, the resolution and error analyses are discussed in Section 2.4. Inversion results are discussed in Section 2.5 with discussions in Section 2.6.
Shear wave splitting method is presented in Chapter 3 with brief introduction and methodologies to analyze shear wave splitting observations. The details of the computation and data processing with the obtained results are also provided in Chapter 3.

The conclusions are presented in Chapter 4.

1.2. Geology and Tectonic Settings

Turkey is an east-west trending segment of the Alpine-Himalayan orogenic belt and can be thought of as a collage of different pieces of ancient continental and oceanic basins named as Tethys Ocean stuck together by younger igneous, volcanic and sedimentary rocks (Şengör et al., 1981; Göncüoğlu et al., 2000; Okay, 2008). The geometry and evolution of the Tethys Ocean is still in debate. On the other hand there is a consensus regarding the presence of two mechanisms called Paleotethys and Neotethys located on the south and on the north respectively both rifted from Gondwana margin (Stampfl, 2000).

Two major E-W trending ophiolite belts were stated with the closure of Neotethys and while southern branch of it parted Arabian Platform in the south from Anatolide-Tauride Platform in the north, the northern branch was located between the Anatolide-Tauride Platform and Sakarya continent in the north (Okay, 2008) (Figure 1).

During Early Miocene – Late Oligocene in Central East, Bitlis-Pontid suture zone occurred as a result of Arabian-Eurasian collision (Facenna et al., 2006). This collision leads to formation of 2 km high plateau in the eastern Anatolia (Keskin, 2003). The northward motion of Arabia gave rise to the westward escape of the Anatolian block with the effect of the uplift of the Turkish-Iranian plateau. There are longitudinal mountain ranges extending along Black Sea and Mediterranean shores in the Northern and Southern Turkey. High Anatolian plateau is located between these mountains. North Anatolian Fault Zone (NAFZ), which is a right-lateral fault zone, lies in the Northern Turkey as one of the major neotectonic structures that form the northern boundary of the Anatolia-Eurasia plates. NAFZ runs for about 1500 km from Eastern Anatolia and splits branches in the Aegean Sea (Barka and Kadinsky-Cade, 1988; Şengör et al., 2005). The tectonic regime along the fault chanhes from east to west; collision zone of Bitlis-Zagros produced by northward movement of Arabian Plate with respect to Eurasia, Aegean extension procured
by Hellenic trench rollback (Faccenna et al., 2006). NAF accommodates most of the present day motion of Anatolia with respect to Eurasia (Reilinger et al., 1997; McClusky et al., 2000). The East Anatolian Fault (EAF) is a major left lateral strike-slip fault activated during the Late Miocene that extends from the northern end of the Dead Sea Fault (DSF) to the eastern end of the NAF (Arpat and Şaroğlu, 1971).

While the continental collision was active in the east, extension was taking place in the Eastern Mediterranean Region. In the middle to late Miocene (13-10 Ma) (Le Pichon and Angelier, 1981; Jackson, 1994) extension behind Aegean subduction system began and affected in N-S direction (Mckenzie, 1978). Crustal thickening and subsequent extension and magmatism followed the closure and the destruction of the Neotethyan oceans (Taymaz et al., 2007). This rapid extension has thinned the crust from 45-50 km down to 28-32 km (Şengör, 1993; Yılmaz, 1997; Saunders et al., 1998). The major factors on the distribution of deformation in the region have been the Hellenic and Cyprian trenches. Not only westward motion of Turkey with respect to Eurasia but also southeastward motion of the Aegean with respect to Eurasia, governs the large-scale deformation. Overall velocity field of the Anatolian-Aegean block relative to Eurasia accelerates toward the Hellenic Arc as a result of subduction roll-back. The subduction slab from Hellenic to Bitlis lost its continuity to the depths of least several hundred kilometers and was almost totally consumed on the east of Cyprus (Wortel and Spakman, 2000; Piromallo and Morelli, 2003; Faccenna et al., 2006; Biryol et al., 2011). Presently northern Aegean is extending to ~31°E within the Anatolian plate. In the south, the African oceanic lithosphere subduction beneath Hellenic Arc is retreating. Extension in Aegean dies out in the ~42°N in Bulgaria and Northern Greece (Al-lazki et al., 2004).
Figure 1.1. Tectonic map of the study area. Ab: Antalya Basin; A-T, Anatolide-Tauride Block; AsS, Assyrian Suture; BZS, Bitlis-Zagros Suture; EAF, East Anatolian Fault; EAP, Eastern Anatolia Plateau; DSF, Dead Sea Fault; IA, Isparta Angle; IAES, İzmir-Ankara-Erzincan Suture; IZ, Istanbul Zone; MM, Menderes Massif; LN, Lycian Nappes; NAF, North Anatolian Fault; PT, Pontides; PPF: Paphos Transform Fault; RS, Rhodope-Strandja Basin; SuLF, Sultandağ Fault; SZ, Sakarya Zone; ThB, Thrace Basin; WBsB, Western Black Sea Basin; EBsB, Eastern Black Sea Basin. Gray shaded area shows topography higher than 1500m. Green and light green units represent the ophiolites and ophiolitic mélanges, respectively. Red volcano signs show neogene and quaternary volcanism. Black triangles show the sutures and subduction zones. Black lines indicate the major faults. Bathymetry and Topography of the region derived from ETOPO5 and GTOPO30 (Okay and Tüysüz, 1999; Wessel and Smith, 1998; Yılmaz et al, 1998; Cambaz and Karabulut, 2010)

The western part of the Anatolian Plate is dominated by E-W trending horst and graben structures (Stampfli, 2000). The central Anatolia forms a broad transitional tectonic zone between the extensional tectonic regime of the western Anatolia and the strike slip tectonic regime of the Eastern Anatolia (Koçyiğit et al., 2000). The Central Anatolia is also a
continental back-arc of the north dipping Hellenic-Cyprus subduction zone. Most of the geological structures of Central Anatolia and the Taurides, including Isparta Angle, is a result of the tectonic and magmatic events related to this active convergent plate boundary (Glover and Robertson, 1998; Koçyiğit et al., 2000). The region is also characterized by ~13 Ma to recent post-collision related volcanism (Notsu et al., 1995).

1.3. Previous Studies

The first study on the use of $P_n$ velocities is performed by Hearn and Ni (1994) on the Turkish-Iranian Plateau. The aim of their study was to determine the effect of subduction and continental collision on the upper mantle structure beneath the plateau using regional earthquakes. First arrival times were selected for distances between 200 km and 1223 km of the event depth (< 30 km), event size (> 25 arrivals recorded) and residual (< 9 s). After these selections 70 755 $P_n$ first arrivals were used for analysis. They observed $P_n$ velocity variations from 7.6 km s$^{-1}$ to 8.2 km s$^{-1}$, low $P_n$ velocities (< 7.9 km s$^{-1}$) beneath most of the Turkish-Iranian Plateau and high $P_n$ velocities (> 8.1 km s$^{-1}$) beneath Black Sea and southern Caspian Sea. Average $P_n$ velocities (8.0-8.1 km s$^{-1}$) beneath south western Mediterranean were observed.

A tomographic study by Papazachos et al. (1995) revealed strong variations on the velocity and crustal thickness. Permanent stations in south east Europe (16°E-31°E, 34°N-43°N) between the years 1971-1987 were used in the study. From 4229 earthquakes, more than 100 000 P arrivals were used to determine detailed structure of the crust and the upper mantle. They presented P wave velocities for different depth ranges (0-10 km, 10-20 km, 20-30 km, 30-40 km, 40-60 km, 60-90 km, 90-120 km, 120-160 km). P wave velocities beneath northern and southern Aegean vary between 7.5-7.9 km s$^{-1}$ for the depths between 30 km to 40 km. $P_n$ tomography presented by Hearn (1999) beneath the European Region covered part of the Aegean Sea. In their study ISC (International Seismological Centre) data between the years 1960-1987 were used for regional events with first arrivals between 200 km and 1221 km. The study showed lower seismic velocities (7.6-8.1 km s$^{-1}$) beneath tectonically active mantle of Southern Europe than the more stable mantle of the sub-African Plate of Adriatic Sea (8.3 km s$^{-1}$). Al-Lazki et al. (2004) obtained the variations of $P_n$ velocities and anisotropy at the junction of the Arabian, Eurasian and African plates. For
the study, 64 seismic stations were used from different networks. 166 000 P_n first arrivals out of 8944 events were used in the analysis. They observed broad scale (~500 km) low P_n velocity structures (< 8 km s\(^{-1}\)) underlying the Anatolian plate. Smaller scale (~200 km) very low P_n anomalies (< 7.8 km s\(^{-1}\)) were also observed in Central Turkey and Isparta Angle. The most recent study that images high resolution velocity structure beneath Central Turkey was done by Gans et al. (2009). 39 broad band seismic stations were located in the central North Anatolian Fault. They observed very low P_n velocities (< 7.8 km s\(^{-1}\)) beneath east of the Central Anatolian Fault Zone and high P_n velocities (> 8.1 km s\(^{-1}\)) beneath west of the fault.

Azimuthal variations of P_n velocities have been observed in both oceanic and continental upper mantle. Detection and interpretation of seismic anisotropy is one of the ways to image deformation beneath continents. Direct estimate of seismic anisotropy in the uppermost mantle can be done by P_n anisotropy analysis. On the other hand, tradeoff between anisotropy due to aligned fabric and apparent anisotropy due to seismic velocity heterogeneity is one of the limitations of P_n anisotropy analysis. Hearn (1999) observed very low velocities and arc-parallel anisotropy beneath Mediterranean. Al-lazki et al. (2004) presented anisotropy from P_n analysis beneath Anatolian plateau. Orientations within the Anatolian plate and along the NAF vary from E-W in the center to N-S in the western parts. They observed largest anisotropy values in Aegean Sea (~0.6 km s\(^{-1}\)) and smaller (~0.2 km s\(^{-1}\)) in the Arabian Plate and eastern zone of the Arabian Plate.

Shear wave splitting is the most commonly used method to investigate mantle anisotropy. Hatzfeld et al. (2001) studied seismic anisotropy of the upper mantle from SKS splitting measurements from 25 seismic stations located in the Aegean. They observed large delay times and concluded their study by suggesting that the crust and upper mantle deform similarly beneath Aegean. Sandvol et al. (2003) performed shear wave splitting analysis for Eastern Turkey. In this study, shear wave fast polarization directions and delay times were computed for young continent-continent collision zone by using data from Eastern Turkey Seismic Experiment (ETSE) broadband experiment. 29 broad band seismic stations across the collision zone of the Arabian, Eurasian and Anatolian plates were used for the computations. They observed that the fast polarization directions are relatively uniform and exhibit primarily NE-SW orientations with average 1.0 second delay times.
Mainly sub-parallel fast polarization directions to the Anatolian, Arabian and Eurasian plates are observed. The more recent study was done by Biryol et al. (2010) in order to determine mantle anisotropy along the NAFZ by using the splitting of SKS and SKKS phases. Biryol et al. (2010) used array data from 39 seismic stations located that crossed the NAFZ. They interpreted the measurements with a single layer sub-horizontal anisotropic model. This model reveals fairly uniform NE-SW trending anisotropy directions with decreasing delay times from west to east. Evangelidis et al. (2011) studied shear wave anisotropy beneath Aegean and focused in the back-arc and near-trench areas of the Hellenic Arc. They used 54 seismic stations for splitting measurements. They observed trench perpendicular fast anisotropy directions in the back-arc area and trench parallel fast directions near the trench. There is no consistency observed between anisotropy and the GPS velocity or strain field in the Southern Aegean.

Studies summarized above are performed for specific geographical areas with datasets at limited durations. In this study 10 years of seismic data collected from temporary and permanent stations were merged to cover a greater area of Turkey and surrounding regions. As a result a higher resolution analysis of Pn velocity, Pn and SKS anisotropy is obtained.

1.4. An Overview of Mantle Structure

Mantle is the most massive and viscous part of the Earth located between Core below and Crust above. Based on the seismological observations during the last century the mantle structure could be resolved into several layers as upper mantle (from Moho at around 7 to 35 km, downward to 410 km depth), transition zone (between 410 km and 660 km depth) and D" layer (~200 km thickness in average).

With the observations of plate tectonics, the mantle convection theory has been developed in the late 1970s. Mantle convection occurs at the transition zone in a solid-solid phase transformations and the result of the temperature difference between outer core and Earth’s surface. Hot mantle material up-wells and cooling material sinks downward. At the spreading centers warm mantle material up-wells then transfer its heat to the ocean and cools. As a result of this cooling mantle below separates mechanically in two layers. The
layer above is called lithosphere with average thickness about 40 km under oceans and 150 km under continents. The layer below that reaches down to approximately 700 km depth is called asthenosphere. When oceanic lithosphere moves away from the ridge, it gets cold, dense and eventually reaches to the unstable gravity. Lithosphere reaches the subduction zone, it descends and sinks back to the mantle.

Observations show that the mantle structure varies with depth with the increase in temperature. The temperature beneath the crust is low (500-900° C) reaches to highest (4000° C) where the heat-producing core contact with the mantle material. The geothermal gradient is the main cause along with the increasing pressure with depth to separate mantle in two main layers as upper mantle and lower mantle. The rocks are cooler and more brittle in the upper mantle and hot and soft in the lower mantle.

The lithosphere is underlain by asthenosphere extending from the base of lithosphere to the 700 km discontinuity. Lithosphere is divided into plates and the plates move on top of the asthenosphere which is a semi-fluid layer with plastic-like materials. Rocks become ductile as a result of interaction between pressure and temperature. Asthenosphere is composed of iron-magnesium silicates while lithospheric materials contain more silica, less aluminum, sodium and potassium. When compared to the lithosphere, asthenosphere has relatively low density and seismic waves travel slowly through the asthenosphere.

The most abundant rock in the continental lithospheric mantle is peridotite. Peridotite, includes magnesium-rich silicates, olivine and orthopyroxene dominantly, and aluminium rich minerals. Peridotites are mainly composed of olivine between 40 per cent and 95 per cent. Secondary abundant rock is xenolith which includes eclogite. Eclogites are deep metamorphosed rocks under basaltic composition with high seismic velocities. The basaltic composition contains pyroxene and garnet dominantly. The mantle rocks shallower than 410 km consist of olivine, garnet, pyroxene. Olivine is orthorhombic and anisotropic mineral which is the combination of magnesium iron silicate. Under high temperature and pressure olivine transforms from α to β spinels. Upper mantle includes 57 per cent of olivine, 17 per cent of orthopyroxene, 12 per cent of clinopyroxene and 14 per cent garnet (Ringwood, 1979). Kimberlites, explosive volcanic rocks, bring mantle material to the surface and give
information about mantle. These mantle materials called xenolith which tells about composition, physical structure and temperature of the continental crust.

1.5. An Overview of Anisotropy

Anisotropy can be explained within the context of Hooke’s law relating stress and strain through stiffness tensor. The stress is related to internal forces acting on the volume of material which is called body forces. Strain is related to deformation in the volume of material under the effect of external forces, or contact forces. Body forces depend on the volume and density of the medium while contact forces proportional to the surface area of material. External forces deform the medium as they are applied both in shape and size and involve small elastic deformations or strains. Internal forces give response to this deformation which is called stress. Stress tensor “σ_{ij}” is defined as force acting on “i” plane and oriented in “j” direction. Stress at any point can be described with the nine independent parameters of stress tensor.

$$\sigma_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} & \sigma_{13} \\ \sigma_{21} & \sigma_{22} & \sigma_{23} \\ \sigma_{31} & \sigma_{32} & \sigma_{33} \end{bmatrix} \text{ with } i, j = 1, 2, 3 \quad (1.1)$$

An elastic body deforms under stress. This deformation is called strain “ε_{ij}” which is dimensionless. Strain tensor written as below,

$$\varepsilon_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{11} & \varepsilon_{12} & \varepsilon_{13} \\ \varepsilon_{21} & \varepsilon_{22} & \varepsilon_{23} \\ \varepsilon_{31} & \varepsilon_{32} & \varepsilon_{33} \end{bmatrix} \text{ with } i, j = 1, 2, 3 \quad (1.2)$$

Relationship between applied force resulted with deformation is depicted by Hooke's Law (Love, 1927) which assumes sufficiently small strain and stress.

$$\sigma_{ij} = C_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl} \text{ with } i, j, k, l = 1, 2, 3 \quad (1.3)$$
$C_{ijkl}$ is stiffness tensor which describes the elastic properties of the medium. Due to the symmetry considerations ($C_{ijkl} = C_{jikl} = C_{ijlk} = C_{klij}$) Hooke's Law is simplified. This symmetry decreases the number of independent parameters from 81 to 21. The most general form of anisotropy has 21 independent parameters. The number of the independent parameters decreases with the increasing symmetry in the structure. For the orthorhombic medium nine independent constants, for the hexagonal medium five independent constants exist. This hexagonal symmetry anisotropy is known as transverse isotropy. Solids with a special direction are called transversely isotropic which is a common form of anisotropy. Another common form of anisotropy is azimuthal anisotropy. In this form velocities change as a function of horizontal direction and specified by seven independent constants. A preferred orientation of the olivine crystals which is the most abundant mineral in the upper mantle is often thought as the cause of azimuthal anisotropy (Silver, 1996).

Thin layered isotropic materials with different velocities (Backus, 1965), fluid-filled aligned cracks and orientation of anisotropic minerals (LPO) may be the cause of anisotropy. The horizontal layering and aligned cracks and anisotropic mineral orientation in the medium are the cause of anisotropy. Under high strain, olivine fast axis aligns through the strain direction. Strain ellipse axis and olivine crystal orientations are correlated with each other. During the deformation, slow axis of the olivine orients with the short axis of strain, while vice versa is valid. Greater than 20 per cent difference in velocity between fast and slow axis of the olivine mineral may exist (Montagner, 1998).

Mapping the seismically fast direction gives the relationship between plate movement and material flow in depth. Although crystal structure of the olivine is homogeneous, it acts like anisotropic due to its acoustic properties. These properties change with direction according to the crystal lattice, which is called lattice-preferred orientation (LPO). When fast S-wave polarized along the strike of cracks shape preferred orientation (SPO) occurs as a result of fast and slow orientation of seismic wave propagation effect. Different mechanisms at different depths arouse seismic anisotropy.

Orientation of the minerals is affected by high temperature and high pressure. Under constant pressure, anisotropy increases with the increasing temperature although minerals
lose their anisotropy with partial melt and deformed olivine crystals cannot be reoriented easily. Partial melt increases the preferred orientation of the mineral which enlarges the grain size. The alignment increases with the bigger grain size which cause increase in anisotropy.

P and S waves propagate in an isotropic medium while quasi-P (qP) and two quasi-S (qSH, qSV) waves propagate in a weakly anisotropic medium. These waves propagate faster through the long axis of cracks than the short axis of cracks. Particle motion of the P and S waves are linear in an isotropic medium, while S wave particle motion is elliptical in an anisotropic medium. Anisotropy is generally expressed as the percentage difference between fastest and slowest oriented velocities;

\[ A = \frac{V_{\text{max}} - V_{\text{min}}}{V_{\text{average}}} \] (1.4)

V represents either P or S wave velocity. Anisotropy in the crust varies between 1.5 per cent and 4 per cent while it increases to 6-7 per cent along fault zones. It is approximately 4-5 per cent in lithosphere up to 100 km depth and decreases to 0.5 per cent in asthenosphere between 100 and 400 km depth (Marone and Romanowicz, 2007).

Seismic anisotropy can be related to mantle deformation. Relevant movement between mantle and overlying plate in the asthenosphere is the cause of this deformation. It has been indicated from body and surface waves data that anisotropy in the continental lithosphere changes over short length scales (Helffrich et al., 1994; Montagner et al., 2000; Conrad et al., 2007) while anisotropy in the oceanic upper mantle appears to be uniform (e.g. Montagner, 2002; Behn et al., 2004).
2. ANISOTROPIC P_n TOMOGRAPHY OF THE UPPERMOST MANTLE

2.1. Introduction

The Earth surface is covered by several rigid plates that move along the surface. The plate motion induces tectonic activities such as mountain building, earthquakes and magmatism mostly at plate boundaries, and the plate interiors are tectonically rather stable. Plate tectonics is a striking feature of the Earth mantle convection. The chemically differentiated mantle makes up to 82 per cent of the volume of the earth and 65 per cent of its mass with major discontinuities at depths of 410 km, 660 km and significant lateral heterogeneities (Chakrabarti et al., 2011).

Constraints on the variation of temperature in the Earth’s mantle are critical for our understanding of Earth’s convective behavior and mantle flow. A precise estimate of the mantle flow and its relationship with the surface velocity field is a key in order to understand the kinematics and dynamics of continental deformation. The best constraints on temperature in the deeper parts of the mantle obtained from seismic studies, particularly from tomographic studies. Tomographic imaging has been successful in understanding the mechanism of subducting slab, magmatism, and process in the deep structure of the Earth. Since the first global isotropic tomographic models of the mantle were published in 1984 (Woodhouse and Dziewonski, 1984; Dziewonski, 1984), many new tomographic models was developed, and a large number of techniques used for various seismic observations was made available. The tomographic images of the Earth interior completely renewed our vision of upper mantle dynamics, made it possible to relate surface geology and plate tectonics to the mantle convection, and to map the depth of geological objects such as continents, mountain ranges, slabs, ridges, and plumes.

The sensitivity of seismic velocities to mantle composition is investigated by several laboratory studies (Karato and Jung, 1988; Sato et al., 1989; Karato, 1995; Watanabe, 1993; Carlson et al., 2005) as well as observations from different tectonic regimes (Wagner, et al.,
2008, Eberhart-Phillips et al., 2006; Rossi and Abers, 2006; Zheng and Lay, 2006). Low and high seismic velocity anomalies were reported and interpreted in terms of tectonic processes. These variations mainly result from changes in upper mantle temperature, composition, presence of water and other volatiles. It is generally accepted that olivine rich ultramafic minerals are the main constituents of the upper mantle and the most important representatives of these minerals are peridotites, pyroxenites and eclogites (Babuska and Cara, 1991). The laboratory studies on dry peridodite samples at high pressure and temperature indicate that seismic velocities show a rapid decrease with increasing temperature (Sato et al., 1989). Small quantities of water can significantly lower the solidus temperature within the mantle and contribute to the creation of partial melt (Karato, 1995; Karato and Jung, 1988). Such melting is enhanced by the presence of water and carbon dioxide that has percolated into the mantle wedge from the slab beneath (Hearn and Ni, 1994; Karato, 1995). Tectonic activities, e.g. subduction, volcanism, riftting, significantly change upper mantle composition, through the changes of temperature and water content as well as the flow of material from asthenosphere. As the low velocities observed in the upper mantle can be attributed to increasing temperature. Both the laboratory and theoretical studies indicate that eclogite can have P wave velocities as large as 8.5 km s\(^{-1}\) or greater. However, the amount of eclogite present in the upper mantle is proposed to be less than 1 per cent.

A major change on the structure in the Earth takes place on crust-mantle boundary, which was identified early in 20th century. It was recognized on the earthquake records at regional distances by a Croatian geophysicist, Andrija Mohorovičić. It is one of the most distinct manifestations of Earth, with major changes in petrology, mineralogy, chemistry, seismic wave velocity, density and rheology. The compressional wave velocity increases rapidly and/or discontinuously to a value between 7.6 and 8.6 km s\(^{-1}\). A distinct phase, P\(_n\) that is a compressional wave travels through the Moho discontinuity. P\(_n\) velocities changes from ocean to continent. It is high in oceanic lithosphere, reaches up to 8.4 km s\(^{-1}\) while depends on the rheology of the crust and mantle boundary in continental lithosphere. In the continental lithosphere tectonically stable mantle lid shows higher P\(_n\) velocities (> 8.0 km s\(^{-1}\)) while very low P\(_n\) (< 7.8 km s\(^{-1}\)) velocities indicate partial melt in general (Hearn, 1999; Calvert et al., 2000). In order to investigate the upper mantle velocity and anisotropic structure at local and regional scales, P\(_n\) tomography has been proven to be
very useful (Hess 1964; Backus 1965; Hearn and Ni, 1994; Hearn 1996; Hearn 1999).

The uppermost mantle structure beneath the Anatolian-Aegean domain has a complex geological history, having experienced convergence, subduction, collision, slab break-off and extension since Cretaceous time (Hinsbergen et al., 2010). The forces driving the deformation are still discussed: basal drag by mantle flow, edge forces (Arabia pull and Hellenic slab pull) or body forces (gravitational potential energy differences) (e.g. Jolivet et al., 2009). Therefore, it is of great interest to determine the detailed structure of upper mantle of a region which contains the major questions posed by the deformation of continents.

A study was done by Hearn and Ni (1994) in order to determine the subduction and continental collision effects on the upper mantle structure beneath Turkish-Iranian Plateau. They obtained \( P_n \) velocities varying between 7.6 km s\(^{-1}\) to 8.2 km s\(^{-1}\). Low \( P_n \) velocities (< 7.9 km s\(^{-1}\)) beneath most of the Turkish-Iranian Plateau, high \( P_n \) velocities (> 8.1 km s\(^{-1}\)) beneath Black Sea and southern Caspian Sea were observed. Average \( P_n \) velocities beneath southwestern Mediterranean were obtained as 8.0-8.1 km s\(^{-1}\). A tomographic study by Papazachos et al. (1995) revealed strong velocity variations and crustal thickness beneath Aegean. They presented \( P \) velocities for different depth ranges. \( P \) velocities beneath northern and southern Aegean vary between 7.5-7.9 km s\(^{-1}\) for the depth of 30 km to 40 km. Hearn (1999) computed \( P_n \) velocity distribution beneath the European Region and part of the Aegean Sea. Beneath tectonically active mantle of southern Europe, he obtained much lower seismic velocities (7.6-8.1 km s\(^{-1}\)) than the more stable mantle of the sub-African plate of Adriatic Sea (8.3 km s\(^{-1}\)).

Al-Lazki et al. (2004) obtained the variations of the \( P_n \) velocities and anisotropy at the junction of Arabian, Eurasian and African plates. They observed a broad scale (~500 km) low \( P_n \) velocity structures (< 8.0 km s\(^{-1}\)) underlying the Anatolian plate and smaller scale (~200 km) very low \( P_n \) anomalies (< 7.8 km s\(^{-1}\)) beneath Central Turkey and Isparta Angle. They associated low and very low \( P_n \) velocities with active volcanism since Late Miocene beneath Eastern Turkey, Northeastern Iran and the Caucasus. These low velocity zone may be the result of subducted Tethys oceanic lithosphere. The most recent study is done by Gans et al. (2009) relatively smaller area and dataset in Central Turkey. The
obtained high $P_n$ velocities (> 8.1 km s$^{-1}$) on the western part of the NAF and very low velocities (< 7.8 km s$^{-1}$) on the eastern part of the fault.

Other tomographic studies at various scales and resolutions were also computed in region (Karagianni et al., 2005; Pasyanos, 2005; DiLuccio and Pasyanos, 2007; Cambaz and Karabulut, 2010).

$P_n$ phase velocities also changes with direction which can be used to characterize anisotropy. The anisotropy then can be related to the deformation of the lithosphere. Previous studies based on $P_n$ data observed anisotropy in both oceanic and continental crust (Backus, 1965). Most of the anisotropy was observed beneath the upper mantle (Beghoul and Barazangi, 1990).

Sudden anisotropy changes are detected along plate boundaries by Al-Lazki et al. (2004) beneath Anatolia. Fast axis of anisotropy predominantly observed east-west in the east, north-south in the center and east-west in the west. There is anisotropy fast axis oriented NE-SW beneath southern part of the DSF and changes to E-W beneath north of the DSF observed. As a result of this study they basically obtained anisotropy orientations along easternmost segment of the NAF zone. These orientations are possibly sampling a large scale asthenospheric anomaly beneath a thin to absent mantle lid.

In this study, an analysis of $P_n$ travel times is presented to determine $P_n$ velocity, $P_n$ anisotropy and crustal thickness variations beneath Turkey and surroundings. The recent improvements on the number and quality of seismic stations in Turkey and surrounding regions have provided high quality seismic data and improved coverage of Anatolian and Aegean domain. Improved data quality and coverage have provided a better potential to obtain finer details beneath the region. The approach in this work is similar to Hearn (1996), Hearn (1999) and Al-lazki et al. (2004) but benefits from the improved coverage of stations and data quality. In this work, a total of 700 earthquakes with magnitudes greater than 4.0 which occurred between 1999 and 2010 are selected. The first arrivals between 180 and 1500 km distance range are defined as $P_n$ arrivals. More than arrivals recorded to study $P_n$ velocity and anisotropy beneath the region. For tomographic 50 000 images 832 seismic stations were used. Tomographic inversion of regional $P_n$ travel time residuals
used to image lateral variations of seismic velocity within the uppermost mantle of region is determined. Both isotropic and anisotropic velocity distributions and estimated variations of the crustal thickness computed. $P_n$ velocities are found to be highest in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea and Zagros Suture (> 8.3 km s$^{-1}$) and lowest in Eastern Turkey (< 7.6 km s$^{-1}$). An anomalous low velocity zone is obtained in central Anatolia.

The tomographic method of Hearn et al. (1999) is applied to determine $P_n$ velocities, anisotropy and station delays. Large $P_n$ anisotropy is observed in the Aegean, central Anatolia, along the southern coast of Anatolia. The result of the geodetic measurements and N-S aligned shear wave slitting directions in the extensional regime of Western Anatolia are consistent with the direction of the anisotropy in the Aegean. The station delays are found to be proportional to the crustal thickness. Large crustal thicknesses are observed along the Dinarides-Hellenides and along the southern coast of Anatolia.

A number of checker board tests were used to investigate the resolving power of the tomographic system and Bootstrap method is used to calculate standard deviation of $P_n$ velocities, anisotropy and station delays. The previous $P_n$ travel time tomography and anisotropy results discussed.

2.2. Time Term Method

Time term method has been widely used in the seismic refraction studies. This method is a simple travel-time inversion which was formulated and developed by Scheidegger and Willmore (1957) and Willmore and Bancroft (1960). Reitter (1970) developed time term method completely dependent upon the refraction structure and the angles of dip involved. An expanded form of this method has been used by Hearn (1984) in order to determine lateral velocity variations, delay times and regional anisotropy. By using this method, it is possible to study the effects of a vertical and lateral velocity variations and effect of a dipping interface.

The method assumes that there are three segments of a $P_n$ ray path: the ray path from the source to the mantle, the ray path through the upper mantle, and the ray path from the mantle to the receiver (Figure 2.1). The ray mainly travels below the Moho discontinuity
with wave velocity characteristic of the upper mantle. As a consequence, tomographic imaging of $P_n$ travel times yields the lateral distribution of wave velocity in the uppermost mantle.

The equation of the travel time of a seismic wave between two materials separated by a plane interface is given as below,

$$t = \frac{H_a}{\cos \theta V_1} + \frac{H_b}{\cos \theta V_1} + \frac{\Delta \cos \phi - H_a \tan \theta - H_b \tan \theta}{V_2} \quad (2.1)$$

where $H_a$ and $H_b$ (if source is assumed as a shot point $H_b = H_a - \Delta \sin \phi$) represents the perpendicular distances drawn from the source A to receiver B to the interface. $V_1$ and $V_2$ are the velocities of layers $\sin \theta = V_1/V_2$. $\Delta$ is distance between source and receiver. $\phi$ is the angle between AB and the interface. $\theta$ is the incidence angle of the refracted wave, which is also the critical angle (Figure 2.1).

The main idea beneath time term method is to calculate travel time for a refracted ray between source and receiver. That may be written as;

$$t = \frac{(H_a + H_b) \cos \theta}{V_1} + \frac{\Delta \cos \phi}{V_2} \quad (2.2)$$
In order to simplify the equations \( \cos \Theta \) assumed to equal one. This assumption increases the error in \( H_a + H_b \) which depends on the interface between two medium. If the interface is not a plane, errors may arise. Travel time roughly presented as;

\[
t = a + b + \frac{\Delta}{V_2}
\]  

(2.3)

a and b represent time terms of source A and receiver B.

Hearn (1984) wrote that basic form of the time term approach as the travel time between event (e) and station (s) for horizontal upper mantle layer is,

\[
t_{es} = \Delta_{es}S + \tau_e + \tau_s
\]  

(2.4)

where S refers to the slowness of the uppermost mantle, \( \Delta_{es} \) refers to the horizontal distance between station and event, and \( \tau_e \) and \( \tau_s \) are event and station time terms.

These time terms, or delay times, can be written as,

\[
\tau_s = \int_0^h (S(z)^2 - S^2)^{1/2} \, dz
\]  

(2.5)

\[
\tau_e = \int_z^h (S(z)^2 - S^2)^{1/2} \, dz
\]  

(2.6)

where \( h \) is the Moho depth, \( z \) is the event depth and \( S(z) \) is the crustal slowness profile. Delay times are effected by \( P_n \) velocity and crustal slowness. For a constant velocity crust, delay times are related to the crustal thickness.

In order to compute lateral velocity variations and anisotropy, travel time equation can be linearized with respect to slowness.

\[
t_{es} = \Delta_{es}S_0 + \tau_e(S_0) + \tau_s(S_0) + \left[ \Delta_{es} \frac{\partial \tau_e}{\partial S} + \frac{\partial \tau_e}{\partial S} \right]_{S=S_0} \delta S(x, y, \Theta)
\]  

(2.7)
Hearn (1984) expressed the event and station offset distances by \( F_e \) and \( F_s \). The horizontal path that ray travels from source to Moho or Moho to receiver is called “Offset Distance”.

Equation 2.7 may be written as;

\[
t_{es} = \Delta_{es}S_0 + \tau_e(S_0) + \tau_s(S_0) + [\Delta_{es} - F_e - F_s] \delta S(x, y, \theta) \quad (2.8)
\]

The horizontal offset distances for station and event are written as;

\[
F_e = \int_x^h \frac{s}{[S(x)^2 - S(x)^2]^{1/2}} \, dz \quad (2.9)
\]

\[
F_s = \int_0^h \frac{s}{[S(z)^2 - S(x)^2]^{1/2}} \, dz \quad (2.10)
\]

These offset distances depend on \( P_n \) velocity, crustal velocity, Moho depth and event depth which are all unknowns. Accordingly, by assuming \( F \) as constant, Equation 2.8 may be written as;

\[
t_{es} = \Delta_{es}S_0 + \tau_e(S_0) + \tau_s(S_0) + [\Delta_{es} - 2F] \delta S(x, y, \theta) \quad (2.11)
\]

The travel time of the ray passing through each cell might be written as;

\[
t_{es} = \tau_e(S_e) + \tau_s(S_s) + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \Delta_i S_i \quad (2.12)
\]

where \( S_e \) is \( P_n \) velocity at the event location, \( S_s \) is \( P_n \) velocity at the station location, \( \Delta_i \) is the horizontal distance that ray travels through the cell “\( i \)”, \( S_i \) is the slowness of cell “\( i \)”. The time term equation is;

\[
t_{es} = \tau_e(S_0) + \tau_s(S_0) + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \Delta_i S_i - F \delta S_e - F \delta S_s \quad (2.13)
\]

where \( S_0 \) is the mean slowness, \( \delta S_e \) and \( \delta S_s \) are the slowness perturbations at event and station. In order to compare time terms with each other \( \tau_e(S_0) \) and \( \tau_s(S_0) \) has to be
calculated instead of \( \tau_e(S_e) \) and \( \tau_s(S_s) \). Travel time equation solved for the relevant parameters is;

\[
t_{es} = (\tau_e(S_0) + 2FS_0) + \tau_s(S_0) + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \Delta_i S_i
\]

where \( \Delta_i' = \begin{cases} 
\Delta_i & \text{if } i \neq e \text{ and } i \neq s \\
\Delta_i & \text{if } i = e \text{ or } i = s
\end{cases} \)

\( \Delta_i' \) is the distance along the Moho in each cell that the ray travels. Unknowns \((\tau_e(S_0) + 2FS_0), \tau_e(S_0), S_0\) and mean \(P_n\) slowness for each cell be calculated.

Due to the mantle anisotropy or horizontal variations beneath isotropic mantle and crust, \(P\) wave velocity is depends on the azimuthal angle \(\varnothing\). A weak anisotropy perturbation described by 2\(\varnothing\) azimuthal variations (Backus, 1965; Crampin, 1977).

\[
\delta V_p^2 = A + B \cos 2\varnothing + C \sin 2\varnothing + D \cos 4\varnothing + E \sin 4\varnothing
\]

where \(\varnothing\) is the direction of maximum velocity. A, B, C, D and E are the constants which are related to the elastic tensor components and they are functions of the anisotropic elasticity of the upper mantle.

Hearn (1996) simplified \(P_n\) travel time problem by assuming a transverse anisotropy. By using magnitude of anisotropy and the direction of the fastest wave propagation, azimuthal \(P_n\) travel time variations can be simply described. Hearn (1996) formulated \(P_n\) travel time equation as;

\[
t_{es} = \tau_e(S_e) + \tau_s(S_s) + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \Delta_i (S_i A_i \cos 2\varnothing + B_i \sin 2\varnothing)
\]

\(\varnothing\) is the back azimuth angle. Time terms for station and event \((\tau_e, \tau_s)\), mantle slowness \((S_0)\), and anisotropy coefficients \((A_i, B_i)\) are unknowns.

Magnitudes of anisotropy for cell \(i\);

\[
(A_i^2 + B_i^2)^{1/2}
\]
and, direction of fastest wave propagation is given by;

$$\frac{1}{2} \arctan \left( \frac{B(t)}{A(t)} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.18)

In order to obtain slowness, anisotropy and station and event delays the set of equations solved by least-squares QR factorization algorithm for all source-receiver pairs (Hearn 1996). Assume waves from “n” sources observed by “m” stations. With many of source-receiver couples a linear system can be solved.

$$Ax = t$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.19)

t is observed travel times and x is station delays, event delays and slowness. Unknown “x” might be computed as;

$$x = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T t$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.20)

A has linearly independent columns. It has QR decomposition. Since the columns of Q are orthonormal and R is an invertible matrix $Ax = t$ can be written as;

$$Rx = Q^T t$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.21)

Since R is the upper triangular matrix system will be solved by using Gram-Schmidt process.

Solution of the inverse problem controls the trade-off between errors and resolution. Trade-off between the velocity and anisotropy is computed for each inversion.

2.3. Data Processing

A waveform database from 1999 to 2010 is formed from the permanent and temporary stations operated in the region (Figure 2.2). The main source of the data is the National Network of Turkey operated by Kandilli Observatory and Earthquake Research
Institute (KOERI-NEMC). The network has been continuously upgraded since 2004 and the total number of broadband stations has exceeded 130 in 2010. Supplementary data are obtained for the permanent stations from IRIS and ORFEUS in the region. The data from Eastern Turkey Seismic Experiment (ETSE) (Sandvol et al., 2003), Western Anatolia Seismic Recording Experiment (WASRE) (Akyol et al., 2006), Seismic Imaging beneath Aegean-Anatolia Domain (SIMBAAD) (Paul et al., 2008), the temporary networks, are also included in the analysis. The observations from several local and aftershock studies are added in the analysis (e.g, Karabulut et al., 2011).

The station spacing is not regular with greater density in the Marmara and Aegean Region and relatively less densely in the Central and Eastern Anatolia. The earthquake distribution is not uniform either. The majority of the earthquakes are located along the active seismic zones such as North Anatolian Fault (NAF), East Anatolian Fault (EAF) and Aegean. Few earthquakes were included from Caucasus and Iran.

KOERI-NEMC, International Seismological Centre (ISC) and European-Mediterranean Seismological Centre (EMSC) bulletins were compiled for initial Pn tomography catalogue. A total of 700 earthquakes with magnitudes Ml > 4.0 were re-located. Waveform database was constructed for the selected events (Figure 2.3). With the available waveform data more than 50,000 Pn arrival times recorded at 832 seismic stations were manually picked. Pn arrivals are defined as the first arrivals between 180 km and 2000 km. The data quality was generally good and only clear Pn arrivals were picked. Figure 2.4 shows an earthquake gather constructed from the stations sited between 27.5°E and 28.5°E for an earthquake approximately located in the middle of the profile.
Figure 2.2. Seismic stations (+) used for P_n tomography. A total of 695 stations are displayed from both permanent and portable deployments operated between the years 1999-2010.
Manually picked P and S arrivals at distances smaller than 180 km, are used to improve the locations of the selected earthquakes. Regional velocity models are constructed using Velest inversion code (Kissling et al., 1994). Hypocenter code (Lienert et al., 1986) is used to compute the locations of the earthquakes. The events with location errors more than 5 km and hypocentral depths greater than 40 km are discarded. Stations recorded less than 10 events and earthquakes with fewer than 10 P_n arrivals are also eliminated. Travel time residuals greater than 8 seconds are ignored as the residuals greater than 8 seconds are significantly larger than the data scatter. As a result, 596 of the relocated earthquakes and 695 stations are selected for the analysis and 40 826 first arrival phases used for iterations.
Figure 2.4. Recordings of an earthquake in Western Anatolia. The stations are located between 27.5°E and 28.5°E. The traces are normalized with their maximum amplitudes and plotted with a reducing velocity of 8.0 km s⁻¹.

Average Pn velocity and crustal delay for the data set by a least squares fit is determined as 8.0 km s⁻¹ for Pn velocity. An average crustal velocity of 6.3 km s⁻¹ and crustal thickness of 35 km are obtained from the slope of the Pg travel times and intercept time, respectively. Lateral variations of Pn velocity are imaged as perturbations from the average velocity of 8.0 km s⁻¹. Topography corrections at the station sites are applied assuming a constant velocity of 5.5 km s⁻¹. These initial estimates are used as the starting model for the subsequent tomographic inversion. The reduced travel times with a reducing velocity is depicted in Figure 2.5. The travel time residuals vary between ±10 seconds. Pg and Pn branches of the travel times are clearly visible. The critical distance for the dataset is observed at ~180 km. At distances greater than 800 km there is a sharp decrease on the number of observations (Figure 2.5).
Figure 2.5. Travel time observations at epicentral distances smaller than 2000 km. A reducing velocity of 8.0 km s\(^{-1}\) is used. The crossover distance is \(~180\) km. The box shows the range of the observations used in tomography.

A total of 36 290 ray paths between events and stations are shown in Figure 2.6. A total of 532 earthquakes and 695 stations are used to compute ray paths. Each ray path passes through at least a single 0.5°x0.5° square cell. The ray paths provide a good coverage of the study area. Dense path coverage exists in the central and Eastern Anatolia and relatively high coverage exist in the Northwestern Turkey and Aegean region. The coverage is poor in the Black sea, Caucasus and Southern Mediterranean.

Figure 2.6. \(P_n\) ray paths for tomographic inversion
2.4. Resolution and Error Analysis

One of the main problems at the tomographic studies is to determine the quality of the results. Tomographic results are affected by not only velocity perturbations but also data errors, ray path geometry and model parameters. Checkerboard test is a way to check the resolution of the final model by using source-receiver configuration with different damping constants. This is a widely used method to evaluate the solution quality, ray coverage effect, parameterization of the model space and damping factors (Zelt, 1988).

Before to select the optimum cell size, smoothing and weighting parameters, a number of analyses are performed using both real and synthetic data. Same source-receiver configurations are used both on observations and checkerboard tests. Tests are performed with alternating input velocity patterns. Optimum damping parameters are determined as a result of checkerboard tests. The criterion for selecting optimum parameters is to obtain high level of resolution in which both magnitude and shape of the anomalies are preserved.

The initial checkerboard model for velocity contains alternating values of ±0.5 km s\(^{-1}\) for low and high velocity regions with 1°, 2°, 3° and 4° pattern sizes (Figure 2.7). For anisotropy tests, input is a model with 5 per cent variations with fast directions perpendicular in adjacent cells (Figure 2.8). The tests are performed by using various damping factors (200, 400, 600 and 800) for both velocity and anisotropy. Figure 2.7 presents the checkerboard tests on velocity only. In order to determine the effect of path coverage on various pattern sizes, a damping factor of 400 used for these tests. Figure 2.8 shows the tests on velocity only using fixed pattern size 2° with varying damping parameters (200, 400, 600 and 800). Figure 2.9 shows the tests on anisotropy (without velocity) with constant damping factor as 400 and various pattern sizes as 1°, 2°, 3°, 4°. Figure 2.10 shows the fixed pattern size of 2° and varying damping factors (200, 400, 600 and 800) of anisotropy tests without velocity. Checkerboard tests were performed for anisotropy with included velocity variations depicted in Figure 2.11 (constant damping factor 400) and varying pattern sizes (1°, 2°, 3°, 4°) and Figure 2.12 (constant pattern size as 2° and varying damping factors 200, 400, 600, 800). Figure 2.13 shows the P\(_n\) anisotropy magnitude checkerboard tests (without velocity) performed for fixed damping factor (400) with varying pattern size (1°, 2°, 3°, 4°). Figure 2.14 shows fixed pattern size
of 2° and various damping factors (200, 400, 600 and 800) for magnitude of anisotropy without velocity.

Figure 2.7. P_n velocity checkerboard tests. Synthetic data are generated with ±0.50 km s^{-1} isotropic velocity perturbations. Recovered isotropic model: starting from top to bottom, input pattern sizes are 1°, 2°, 3° and 4°. The damping parameter is assumed as 400.
Figure 2.7. Cont.
Figure 2.8. $P_n$ velocity checkerboard tests. Synthetic data are generated with ±0.50 km s$^{-1}$ isotropic velocity perturbations. Recovered isotropic model: starting from top to bottom, damping parameters are 200, 400, 600, 800. The input pattern size is assumed as 2°
Figure 2.8. Cont.
Figure 2.9. $P_n$ anisotropy checkerboard test (without velocity): Synthetic data are generated with 5 per cent anisotropy. Anomalies change between $\pm 0.50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ with a constant damping parameter of 400. Starting from top to bottom, pattern sizes are $1^\circ$, $2^\circ$, $3^\circ$ and $4^\circ$. 
Figure 2.9. Cont.
Figure 2.10. $P_n$ anisotropy checkerboard test (without velocity): Synthetic data are generated with 5 per cent anisotropy. Anomalies change between $\pm 0.50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ with a pattern size of $2^\circ$. Starting from top to bottom, damping parameters are 200, 400, 600, 800.
Figure 2.10. Cont.
Figure 2.11. $P_n$ anisotropy checkerboard test (with velocity): Synthetic data are generated with 5 per cent anisotropy. Anomalies change between $\pm0.50$ km s$^{-1}$ with a constant damping parameter of 400. Starting from top to bottom, pattern sizes are $1^\circ$, $2^\circ$, $3^\circ$ and $4^\circ$. 
Figure 2.11. Cont.
Figure 2.12. $P_n$ anisotropy checkerboard test (with velocity): Synthetic data are generated with 5 per cent anisotropy. Anomalies change between $\pm 0.50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ with a pattern size of $2^\circ$. Starting from top to bottom, damping parameters are 200, 400, 600, 800.
Figure 2.12. Cont.
Figure 2.13. $P_n$ anisotropy magnitude (without velocity) checkerboard tests. Starting from top to bottom, pattern sizes are $1^\circ, 2^\circ, 3^\circ, 4^\circ$. The damping parameter is assumed as 400
Figure 2.13. Cont.
Figure 2.14. $P_n$ anisotropy magnitude (without velocity) checkerboard tests. Starting from top to bottom, damping parameters are change as 200, 400, 600 and 800. The pattern size is assumed as $2^\circ$
In the areas with low ray coverage such as Black Sea and the Mediterranean Sea the patterns smaller than 2° cannot be well resolved. The smearing of the patterns also indicates insufficient ray coverage in the Arabian Plateau. The complete recovery resulted as highest level resolution obtained in the Aegean Region and Western Turkey. The resolution depends on the ray coverage and azimuthal coverage. The anisotropic anomalies cannot be determined accurately if the azimuthal coverage is poor. A good
anisotropy resolution occurs within the central to Eastern Turkey, Northern Mediterranean Sea and Western Turkey. The optimum results from the tests are obtained by using 400 for both damping constants and anisotropy. Pattern size is used as 2° for inversion.

It is important to quantify the errors to resolve the observed $P_n$ velocity variations. Bootstrap analyses are used to estimate errors (Hearn and Ni, 1994). This method is a re-sampling technique to determine standard deviation of $P_n$ velocities and station standard error parameters. Bootstrapping is a way to measure whether the distribution has been influenced by stochastic effects. It re-samples the data and reruns the inversion to create a sample data set from the original data. Standard errors of $P_n$ velocity and stations are estimated from 100 runs with replacement.

The results of bootstrap errors for velocity (Figure 2.15) and for the stations (Figure 2.16) are depicted. The velocity errors are high in the Eastern Anatolia (> 0.08 km s$^{-1}$), eastern Black Sea (> 0.08 km s$^{-1}$), Arabian platform (> 0.1 km s$^{-1}$) and Caucasus (> 0.12 km s$^{-1}$). Low values are observed Western Anatolia and the Marmara region (< 0.01 km$^{-1}$), Aegean Sea (< 0.02 km s$^{-1}$), Western Black Sea (< 0.04 km s$^{-1}$) and central Anatolia (< 0.05 km s$^{-1}$). Station standard error is between 0 and 1.15 s. In eastern Anatolia systematic large errors are observed due to low coverage. The systematic picking errors and low number of recordings caused large errors (> 2 s) at isolated stations. These stations are eliminated during the final stage of the inversion.
Figure 2.15. Standard deviations of $P_n$ velocity distribution computed from bootstrap analysis. The deviations are estimated from 100 runs with replacement.

Figure 2.16. Standard deviations of station delays computed from bootstrap analysis. The deviations are estimated from 100 runs with replacement.
2.5. Inversion Results

Tomographic images for velocity variations only and velocity-anisotropy are computed together. The inversion with velocity variations are presented in Figure 2.17. P_n velocity and anisotropy distributions from the combined inversion results are depicted in Figure 2.18. The differences are observed in the low velocity region of Eastern Anatolia, along the NAF and the Hellenic Arc between Figure 2.17 and Figure 2.18. Travel time residuals before and after the combined inversion with the histograms of the travel time errors are presented in Figure 2.19. The extension and magnitudes of the anomalies changes with additional anisotropy. Including anisotropy does not change the location of anomalies. The trade-off between velocity and anisotropy may exist in the areas of large velocity contrasts (Figure 2.20 and Figure 2.21). Figure 2.22 shows stations delays. Station delays for both inversions are nearly identical. Crustal thicknesses observed from station delays are presented in Figure 2.23.

Below, the general features of the P_n inversion and discuss the areas of particular interests were described.

2.5.1. P_n Velocity Variations

Large lateral variations in upper mantle velocities are reported in various tectonic settings (Wagner et al., 2008, Eberhart-Phillips et al., 2006; Rossi and Abers, 2006; Zheng and Lay, 2006). These variations mainly result from changes in upper mantle temperature, composition, presence of water and other volatiles (Karato and Jung, 1988; Sato et al., 1989; Karato, 1995; Watanabe, 1993; Babuska and Cara, 1991). The laboratory studies on dry peridotite samples, the main constituent of the upper mantle, at high pressure and temperature indicate that seismic velocities show a rapid decrease with increasing temperature (Sato et al., 1989). Small amount of water can contribute to partial melt by reducing the solidus temperature in the mantle (Karato, 1995; Karato and Jung, 1988).

Overall, the most striking feature of the P_n velocity maps in this study is the observation of very fast and very slow anomalies across the region which clearly shows the presence of a heterogeneous lithospheric structure (Figure 2.17). The P_n velocity is varying
from greater than 7.5 km s\(^{-1}\) to less than 8.4 km s\(^{-1}\) in the study area. High P\(_n\) velocities (8.1-8.5 km s\(^{-1}\)) are found beneath the oceanic crusts, i.e., Mediterranean Sea, Hellenic Arc, Adriatic Sea as well as Black Sea and Zagros suture zone. Velocities are generally higher beneath Western Anatolia and Aegean than in Eastern Anatolia.

![Figure 2.17. P\(_n\) velocity distribution with isotropic model only. Only cells with more than 10 arrivals are plotted](image)

Prominent low velocity anomalies are mainly observed in the east (> 33°E) of Central Anatolia with the lowest P\(_n\) velocities are observed beneath Eastern Anatolia plateau (< 7.6 km s\(^{-1}\)) (Figure 2.18). Many of the low P\(_n\) velocity anomalies are beneath volcanic regions. Widespread volcanic activity from upper Miocene to Quaternary is associated with the complete elimination of the Neoteyhyan ocean floor as a result of collision of Arabia and Eurasia during Early Miocene (Yılmaz et al., 1998). The volcanism in the region shows various compositional characters, calc-alkaline in the north and alkaline in the south. Keskin (2003) argued that the subduction component of the volcanics decreases from north to south. This indicates that the volcanism started earlier in the north (~11 Ma) and migrated to the south (~2.0 Ma) as a result of the slab detachment beneath the region (Şengör et al., 2003; Keskin, 2003). The mantle lithosphere was replaced with the low velocity material of asthenosphere beneath the plateau after the detachment of the
northward subducting Arabian lithosphere (Şengör et al., 2003; Keskin 2003). They suggested that the lithospheric mantle is either thinned or totally removed in the region with the complete destruction of subducting slab. Low velocities in P\textsubscript{n} tomography correlate with the volcanic activity in EAP. However, the anomalies do not appear to cover uniformly the entire region but show in two distinct patches with varying magnitudes and sizes. Similar anomalies both in magnitude and size are also observed by Al-lazki et al. (2004). However, in contrary to the previous studies two distinct low velocity zones are separated by relatively higher velocities (7.9-8.0 km s\textsuperscript{-1}). This can be either related to systematic picking errors associated with the attenuation of P\textsubscript{n} phases or mantle lid is not completely absent in the region. Another explanation could be the presence of velocity gradient in the mantle.

![Figure 2.18. P\textsubscript{n} velocity distribution with anisotropy. Only cells with more than 10 arrivals are plotted](image)

A prominent low velocity anomaly also appears in Central Anatolia Volcanic Zone (CAVZ) (Figure 2.18). The low velocities (< 7.7 km s\textsuperscript{-1}) coincide with the Neogene-Quaternary volcanism of the area. The tomographic images of Biryol et al. (2010) also show slow velocity perturbations as deep as 200 km beneath the CAVZ. However, the low velocities have limited spatial extent in contrast to low velocities of P\textsubscript{n} tomography. P\textsubscript{n}
velocity anomaly covers a larger area and extends toward the low velocities of Eastern Anatolia.

The volcanism in the CAVZ is mainly characterized by calc-alkaline and also mild alkaline compositions (Kuşçu and Geneli, 2008). The calc-alkaline volcanism is typically observed on convergent plate margins, but is not limited only to this tectonic setting (Kuşçu and Geneli, 2008). The presence of both calc-alkaline and alkaline magmatism is explained either by opening of an asthenospheric window within the subducting oceanic plate, or through channels along major lithospheric faults (Pasquare et al., 1988; Kuşçu and Geneli, 2008). Based on the analysis of the volcanic rocks in the Hasandağı of CAVZ, Deniel et al. (1998) also pointed the decreasing influence of the subducted or crustal component through time and the increasing contribution of melt enriched lithosphere. The calc-alkaline character of volcanism in absence of more recent subduction would indicate the influence of the early subduction of the African plate under the Eurasian plate from Eocene to Miocene (Deniel et al., 1998). They suggested that the evolution towards alkaline compositions through time is related to the development of extensional tectonics in Central Anatolia in the Late Miocene.

\(P_n\) velocities are higher on the south of the Bitlis suture zone, boundary between high velocity of the Arabian platform and low velocity zone of Eastern Anatolia. Very high \(P_n\) velocities are observed beneath the Zagros suture zone (> 8.3 km s\(^{-1}\)). The ray coverage in this region is poor. However, both magnitude and size of the anomaly are so large that the patterns with a size of 3° can be determined and the results are consistent with previous studies (Al-Lazki et al., 2004; Kaviani et al., 2007).

Lower velocities (< 7.9 km s\(^{-1}\)) are also observed in a narrow range elongating in the N-S direction of the DSF system which forms the plate boundary between Africa and Arabia. The lower velocities there coincide with the Neogene-Quaternary volcanic outcrops observed at the surface. The low velocity region is surrounded by higher velocities of Arabian platform and Mediterranean basin (Figure 2.18).

Beneath the Eastern Mediterranean basin, \(P_n\) velocities are generally higher (> 8.2 km s\(^{-1}\)) but do not show the same strength along the Cyprus and Hellenic belt. The
velocities are higher on the west of Cyprus than the east with a sharp transition at Paphos transform fault (Figure 2.18). The high velocity zone on the west of Cyprus extends from the Paphos discontinuity to Isparta Angle in the north-south direction with decreasing intensity. Further west, a more pronounced high velocity zone (> 8.4 km s⁻¹) on the south of the Rhodes Island is observed. The two high velocity zones seem to be continuous but the tomographic image has poor resolution on the south. On the north of these high velocity zones, lower velocities (< 7.8 km s⁻¹) are observed between the Rhodes Island and the Antalya Bay.

Based on the teleseismic tomography, it is proposed that once continuous subducting slab extending from Hellenic Arc to Bitlis suture have now lost its integrity and is discontinuous (Faccenna et al., 2006; Biryol et al., 2010). The teleseismic tomographic images show the termination of the slab on the east of Cyprus. On the west of Cyprus, a minor tear was located at the Paphos transform fault and a major tear was located at the Strabo transform zone (Faccenna et al., 2006; Biryol et al., 2010). The low velocity zones could be associated with the flow of low velocity asthenospheric material through the slab tears.

From the 35°E to the Aegean Sea, Pn velocities appear to be relatively uniform. The velocities are varying between 7.9 and 8.1 km s⁻¹ with slight decrease on the south and increase on the north. The higher velocities (8.1 km s⁻¹) coincide with the Menderes massif in Western Anatolia and Metamorphic Core Complexes in the Aegean. Western Anatolia is characterized by a broad scale lithospheric extension. Extension started as early as late Oligocene and widespread by the late Miocene (Angelier, 1978; McKenzie, 1978; LePichon and Angelier, 1981; Şengör et al., 1984; Taymaz et al., 1991). The GPS surveys show that N-S oriented crustal extension increases in amplitude from north to south (Kahle et al., 1998; McClusky et al., 2000). Significant crustal stretching and thinning is observed both in Western Anatolia and the Aegean Sea. An initial crustal thickness of 45 km is reduced to an average of 33 km since late Miocene. Metamorphic core complexes observed in the Aegean Sea is a result of such large stretching in the crust. It was pointed out that upper mantle rocks at high temperatures (> 800° C) become entirely ductile and the viscosity contrast between lower crust and mantle drops significantly (Ribe, 1989). As a result the Moho topography remains flat and the mantle velocities are more uniform.
Beneath central Greece and Dinarid-Hellenic Mountain chain, the velocities are low (< 7.8 km s\(^{-1}\)) and there is significant trade-off between velocity and anisotropy. In the Adriatic Sea, high P\(_n\) velocities (> 8.2 km s\(^{-1}\)) are observed. Similar anomalies are also observed in previous works (Hearn, 1999; Al-Lazki et al., 2004).

A velocity contrast between Pontides and Anatolia-Taurides is observed along the NAF with lower velocities located on the north (Figure 2.18). The contrast is continuous from the eastern part of NAF to the west (> 32°E) with decreasing magnitude. This is an indication that the NAF is following the zone of Neotethyan suture and penetrating into the uppermost mantle (Bozkurt, 2001; Şengör et al., 2005; Biryol et al., 2010). To the west of 32°E, the NAF is crossing a higher velocity zone (> 8.1 km s\(^{-1}\)) and a velocity contrast across the fault does not appear.

In Figure 2.19 travel time residuals before (red dots) and after (green dots) inversions were depicted. The critical distance for P\(_n\) arrivals are at ~180 km. Decrease in the residuals after inversion is obvious. The residuals are changing between ±10 seconds before inversion and ±4 seconds after inversion.
Figure 2.19. Observed travel time residuals (red dots) before and after $P_n$ tomography (green dots). A reducing velocity of 8.0 km s$^{-1}$ is used to plot travel times

2.5.2. $P_n$ Anisotropy

Work on the mantle anisotropy from various tectonic environments present examples of coherent deformation of crust and mantle (Silver, 1996; Savage, 1999; Polet and Kanamori, 2002; Kreemer et al., 2004). However, as in the case of the eastern Mediterranean it is not always possible to find such clear correlations. The source of anisotropy in the upper mantle is considered to be the lattice-preferred orientation (LPO) of olivine minerals as a result tectonic deformation (Nicolas and Christensen, 1987; Christensen, 2004). Deformation tends to align with the fast axis of olivine mineral in the
major strain direction (Ribe, 1992). Therefore, the coherent deformation of the crust and upper mantle would reflect the latest significant deformation on the mantle. In general, the deformation is parallel to the direction of maximum shearing under a simple shear regime. In subduction zones, the fast axis is parallel to the trench and in back arc regions the fast directions are either parallel or perpendicular to trench. Arc-parallel anisotropy may be due to water in the mantle wedge changing the deformation planes in the olivine (Karato and Sato, 1998). The fast axis is parallel to the direction of extension under extensional regime (Silver, 1996; Buttles and Olson, 1998; Savage, 1999; Jolivet et al., 2009).

Overall, the anisotropy anomalies observed in this study show a higher level of lateral variations than P\textsubscript{n} velocity anomalies (Figure 2.21). A maximum value of 0.8 km s\textsuperscript{-1}, which corresponds to about 10 per cent of anisotropy, is observed. We obtained large anisotropic anomalies on the southern coast of Anatolia, Western Anatolia and Central Greece. Large perturbations in anisotropy are observed in the areas of volcanic activity with no clear orientation.

The P\textsubscript{n} anisotropy in Eastern Anatolia is complex (Figure 2.20). Both directions and magnitudes of the fast axis are varying drastically in the region with low P\textsubscript{n} velocities (Figure 2.21). The anisotropy shows no apparent correlation with GPS velocities and SKS splitting directions (Sandvol et al., 2003; Biryol et al., 2010). Partial melt might prevent the formation of preferred orientation by promoting a transition from dislocation creep to diffusion creep (Savage, 1999). If the thermal evolution of Eastern Anatolia as a result of subduction detachment is accepted the absence of mantle lid could explain the observed anisotropic pattern in the upper mantle.

The anisotropy directions are strongly varying along the southern coast of Anatolia indicating significant influence of the subducting plates. An interesting pattern of the anisotropy takes place in the region of Hellenic-Cyprian arcs and DSF. A strong change on the anisotropy orientations is observed between the DSF and the Paphos transform fault. This anomaly is located in a region with the minor slab tear observed in deep tomographic images (Biryol et al., 2010). The flow of asthenospheric mantle through the slab tear could be responsible for such anisotropic fabric.
In Western Anatolia, the fast axis is almost in the N-S direction and the amplitude is increasing towards the south (Figure 2.20). However, deviations are apparent from N-S direction in the south, which may be related to the subduction geometry and tear in the slab. There is more consistency between the anisotropy directions and the maximum extension directions determined from GPS observations (Aktuğ et al., 2009). The magnitude of the anisotropy is quite uniform in the Aegean Sea from the north to south and starts diminishing in the area of arc volcanism. P_n anisotropy, SKS splitting directions and GPS vectors are coherent in the Aegean Sea, but significantly different beneath continental Greece (Figure 2.20). The fast axis is oriented at NE-SW in the Aegean Sea and N-S in Central Greece. Shear wave splitting vectors indicate NE-SW orientations in the Aegean Sea and NW-SE direction in Central Greece (Hatzfeld et al., 2001). Kreemer et al. (2004) indicated that the present-day extension orientations are systematically in Northern Aegean, and more N–S oriented than SKS splitting orientations and concluded that the current shear-dominated surface deformation pattern is not (yet) reflected by significant anisotropy in the lithosphere. Along the Dinarides-Hellenic belts, the fast axis is oriented in NW-SE direction parallel to the arc. The observed anisotropy is the result of the subduction although it is not active since the Miocene (Hearn, 1999).
Figure 2.20. $P_n$ anisotropy in the study area. The blue lines indicate fast direction of $P_n$ velocity. The length of the line is proportional to the strength of anisotropy. The major faults and plate boundaries and volcanoes are also shown (pink triangles)

Central Anatolia shows very small anisotropy between 33°E and 37°E where low $P_n$ velocities are observed (Figure 2.21). West of 33°E the fast axis is oriented almost in the N-S direction. Towards north along the İzmir-Eskişehir-Ankara suture, significant deviations from N-S direction are observed. No clear correlation was observed between the fast axis of $P_n$ anisotropy and the trace of the NAF. The orientation of the fast axis is changing within the central NAFZ from NW in the east to NE in the west.

In the Marmara Region, the anisotropy is small and oriented in E-W direction (Figure 2.21). However, the age of the NAF in the region may not be sufficient to create detectable anisotropic mantle fabric. In order to reorient LPO in the shear-plane orientation at least 4 Ma are needed and this is consistent with the other observations that the NAF propagated into the Aegean during the Pleistocene (Kreemer et al., 2004; Şengör et al., 2005). Between Greece and Marmara Region the fast axis of anisotropy aligns better with the geometry of the NAF, but this may be more related the NE-SW regional extension.
Figure 2.21. $P_n$ velocity, anisotropy with the major faults and plate boundaries. Pink triangles represent volcanic mountains

2.6. Station delays

Figure 2.22 shows the station delays obtained from the tomographic inversion. The station delays provide information only on the relative crustal thickness variations. Early arrivals indicate thinner-faster crust and late arrivals for thicker-slower crust. The station residuals in Central Anatolia show very low values ($< 0.1$ s) indicating relatively flat Moho topography. Early arrivals are observed at the stations in Marmara, Western Anatolia and Aegean Sea. Large positive delays are situated along the southern coast of Anatolia and Dinarides-Hellenides. In Eastern Anatolia positive station delays are observed while very small or negative stations delays are observed on the south of Bitlis suture zone.

We computed crustal thickness variations using the station delays. We selected the stations with station errors less than 0.5 seconds, which correspond to ±6 km crustal thickness errors. The selected station delays show non-uniform distribution throughout the
region. We used a krigging algorithm to interpolate the station delays for a more uniform distribution. We then converted the station delays to crustal thicknesses. The regional variations of crustal velocities are not well known. We therefore used a constant velocity of 6.3 km s\(^{-1}\). For 1.0 second delay time, the change in the crustal thickness is approximately 11 km and ±10 per cent perturbation of the crustal velocity would result in ±1.5 km change in the thickness assuming an upper mantle velocity of 8 km s\(^{-1}\). It is important to remember that the crustal thickness determined from the delay time of a station sample an area of ~70 km in diameter. Additional smoothing is imposed by the krigging limits the horizontal resolution.

![Figure 2.22](image)

**Figure 2.22.** Station delays. Negative delays (red circles) are indicative of a thinner crust (thinner than the average 35 km of the reference model); positive delays (blue squares) are indicative of a thicker than average crust.

Figure 2.23 shows the crustal thickness variations. Large thicknesses are observed along the southern coast of Turkey (40-48 km) and on the Dinarides-Hellenides Arc (40-48 km). In the Eastern Anatolia, thicknesses are varying from 38 to 40 km. The crust is thinner beneath the Arabian plateau varying between 32 and 36 km. In the Western Anatolia and the Aegean Sea, the thicknesses are varying between 28 and 32 km.
In Eastern Anatolia, Zor et al. (2003) computed crustal thickness between 40 and 48 km. The average crustal thickness is varying from 38 km beneath the Arabian platform to 50 km on the Pontides with a regional average of 45 km (Gök et al., 2007). The values obtained in this study are quite lower (40-42 km). The large station errors in the area are the indication of insufficient number of \( P_n \) arrivals and the average crustal velocity may not be representative of the region.

In the Marmara Region, the average crustal thickness is ~32 km. Laigle et al. (2008) obtained the crustal thickness beneath the Sea of Marmara as 26 km and thicker in the east and west of the sea. The receiver function analyses indicate average crustal thickness of ~30 km on the north of Marmara Sea and increasing to ~34 km on the south (Zor et al., 2006).

![Crustal thickness map](image)

Figure 2.23. Crustal thickness map computed from the stations delays. A constant velocity of 6.3 km s\(^{-1}\) and 35 km of crustal thickness are used

The Moho depths in the Aegean are varying between 28 and 32 km. Based on the receiver function analysis, Sodoudi et al. (2006) computed crustal thicknesses of 20-22 km on the southern part of the Aegean and found relatively thicker crust (25-28 km) on the Northern Aegean Sea. Similar values were obtained by DiLuccio and Pasyanos (2007).
indicating an increase of crustal thickness of 20-25 km in the southern, Central-Western Aegean, whereas reaching 32 km in the Northern Aegean.

The crustal thickness obtained from receiver function analysis at Isparta Angle is found ~42 km, significantly thicker than 35 km in Central Anatolia (Zhu et al., 2006). The results in this study indicate a significant increase in the crustal thickness from the Isparta Angle (~39 km) towards the southern coast of Anatolia (~48 km). Such a large increase can be attributed to the subduction of African lithosphere.

2.7. Conclusions

In this study a new tomographic image of P_n velocities beneath Turkey and surroundings were presented. Both the quality and quantity of the observations provided finer details of the upper mantle velocity perturbations and anisotropy. The most general feature of the tomographic images is the Anatolian block characterized by low-moderate P_n velocities surrounded by higher velocities of oceanic crust and often associated with volcanic arcs. The low velocity anomalies observed in the eastern Anatolia is associated with the volcanism following the break-off of the subducting oceanic lithosphere. Along the NAF a large velocity contrast but no clear anisotropic orientation related to shear deformation is observed. In Western Anatolia and the Aegean Sea, P_n velocities show relatively small perturbations from the average value of 8.0 km s^{-1}. The anisotropy is mostly in the N-S direction and consistent with the regional extension. Both P_n velocity and anisotropy along the coast of Southern Anatolia and easternmost Mediterranean shows strong perturbations. These perturbations are related to the present geometry of the subducting slabs and the flow of asthenospheric mantle due to the slab tears. The large crustal thicknesses are estimated along the southern coast of Anatolia and Dinarides-Hellenides. A gradual increase in the crustal thicknesses is observed from the Aegean Sea (28-30 km) to central Anatolia (35-37 km).

The results presented in this study put more constraints on the active tectonics in the region. The coherency of the P_n anisotropy, SKS splitting directions and GPS velocities show that the Aegean Sea is the only region in the study area that whole lithosphere is deforming coherently. This may indicate that one of the driving forces for the active
tectonics beneath the Aegean is mantle flow. In the other parts of the region, such coherency is not apparent. The mechanisms such as density driven convections (e.g., Faccenna and Becker, 2010), smaller scale mantle flow related to slab tears as well as the extrusion of the Anatolian plate should be considered for a more comprehensive model. More detailed observations on SKS splitting directions with better density models derived from teleseismic and surface wave tomography will allow us to evaluate the alternatives. The results of the $P_n$ tomography will play important role to validate the hypotheses as it provides the critical information on the deformation between surface observations and mantle flow.
3. UPPER MANTLE ANISOTROPY FROM SHEAR WAVE SPLITTING

3.1. Introduction

The relative motion of the tectonic plates is well constrained by the modern geodetic observations (e.g., Kreemer et al., 2003). However the motion of Earth’s surface or lithosphere relative to the deep mantle has been in debate since the advent of the plate tectonics (Conrad and Behn, 2010). The Absolute Plate Motion (APM) is a term to define the motion of the lithosphere relative to the lower mantle. Despite the importance of the APM on the motion of the lithosphere it is still poorly known. In computing APM there are some key assumptions: 1) the lithosphere is stable relative to the lower mantle; 2) hot plumes have the origin of lower mantle, therefore do not move significantly in time and space (Kreemer, 2009). In the absence of lateral viscosity variations the convection in the mantle which drives the plate motions induce no net moment on the lithospheric plates, and no net rotation of the lithosphere (Solomon and Sleep, 1970; Conrad and Behn, 2010). Therefore no-net rotation frame (NNR) can be considered as a reference frame to characterize the global motion of the plates. However the viscosity in the mantle is not homogenous and as a result, induce net lithosphere rotation (Becker, 2006; Conrad and Behn, 2010; Kreemer, 2009). The hot spot volcanism has also been used as a deep mantle reference frame with the assumptions that they are the surface expressions of the stationary plumes rising from the deep mantle. However the later studies indicated few cm per year of the relative motions of the active plumes (Morgan, 1972; Duncan, 1981; Molnar and Stock, 1987).

More recent studies suggested that the seismic anisotropy in the asthenosphere could provide better constraints on the motion of the lithosphere relative to deep mantle (Becker, 2008). The anisotropic propagation of seismic shear waves in the mantle involves two orthogonally polarized components that split and travel with different velocities (Silver, 1996; Savage, 1999). Splitting measurements of teleseismic shear SKS waves give the azimuth of the fast wave polarization and the delay time between fast and slow waves, and
the direction of fast polarization is considered as and indications for mantle deformation (Zhang and Karato, 1995; Karato et al., 2008). The most significant part of the anisotropy for SKS waves is due to the upper mantle (mostly the asthenosphere) and only ~10 per cent to the crust (Silver, 1996; Savage, 1999).

The anisotropy in the asthenosphere is controlled by the differential motion between lithosphere and mantle beneath asthenosphere (Savage, 1999) and is the result of the deformation by the dislocation creep in the asthenosphere between 100 and 300 km depths which align olivine crystals with lattice preferred orientation (Karato and Wu, 1993). It is assumed that SKS anisotropy originates in the asthenosphere and aligns with the APM. However this assumption is partly true. There have been better correlations underneath oceanic lithosphere but it is more complicated on the continental lithosphere (Conrad et al., 2007). In many continental areas shear wave splitting directions deviate significantly from the APM directions (Kreemer, 2009). Therefore it is important to characterize the components of the induced anisotropy in the asthenosphere: 1) induced by mantle flow, mainly by density heterogeneities; 2) relative plate motions in the NNR frame; 3) by the net rotation of the lithosphere (Conrad and Behn, 2010).

Shear Wave Splitting is a technique to detect anisotropy in the upper mantle. Shear waves refract from Core-Mantle Boundary (CMB) (such as; SKS, SKKS, PKS etc.,) and reaches to the station as almost vertically and polarize linearly in the ray path plane if the medium is isotropic. These phases are well observable between the epicentral distances of 90° and 130°. In this work, SKS phase, which travel through the mantle as an S wave, through the outer core as a P wave and through the lower mantle as an S wave (Figure 3.1), is used because of its high signal-noise ratio and easily recognized. The initial polarization of the SKS phase is well known due to control by P-to-S conversion at the CMB. If the medium is anisotropic, shear wave splits into two orthogonal directions traveling with different velocities. The splitting time between the fast and slow waves ($\delta t$) and the fast polarization direction ($\varphi$), provide good lateral resolution of upper mantle anisotropy. The polarization angle, $\varphi$, determines the orientation of the anisotropic symmetry system and delay time, $\delta t$, is proportional to the thickness of the anisotropic layer and strength of anisotropy.
3.1.1. Previous Studies in the Eastern Mediterranean

The Eastern Mediterranean has been the focus of international efforts during the last two decades. Both the geological research and the acquisition of GPS data make the region an important area in the current debate on the mechanics of the continental lithosphere. Figure 3.2 shows the GPS data from the observations of 20 years within the eastern Mediterranean (Cocard et al. 1999; McClusky et al. 2000; Clarke et al. 2002; Burchfiel et al. 2006; Kotzev et al. 2006; Reilinger et al. 2006; Aktug et al. 2009; Hollenstein et al. 2008; Özeren and Holt, 2010). The GPS data set shows an increase of the velocities with respect to Eurasia toward the west compatible with the observed active extension. Arabian plate moves NNE with constant velocity of 25 mm per year since 40 Ma. The relative motion between Arabian plate and Anatolia is consistent with EAF as 9±1 mm per year slip rate (McClusky et al., 2000). The age of NAF is about 11-12 Ma and drives Arabian plate to the west with 23-26 mm per year slip rate (McClusky et al., 2000; Reilinger et al., 2006; Le Pichon and Kreemer 2010). Central Anatolia rotates counterclockwise with 20-25 mm per year. GPS velocities are greater in Aegean than Anatolian and slip rates increasing from east to west and reaching 32 mm per year in the Mediterranean (Reilinger et al., 2006).
Different interpretations of the observed GPS data are proposed. The models agree on the rigid motion of the main part of Anatolia about an Eulerian pole north of the Egyptian coast and the different hypotheses seem to fit the GPS velocity field in the Aegean Sea. Several rigid blocks are proposed (Nyst and Thatcher, 2004) as opposed to a continuous velocity field in driven by gravitational forces between the elevated plateau of Eastern Turkey and the oceanic crust in the west (Floyd et al., 2000; Özeren and Holt, 2010) or a model using fracture mechanics and a propagating strike-slip fault (Flerit et al., 2004).

Figure 3.2. GPS velocities (red arrows) and interpolated GPS velocities (green arrows) in Turkey and adjacent regions are shown relative to the Eurasia fixed reference frame (Özeren and Bolt, 2010)

However, determining the driving force for the crustal deformation in continental environments is not a simple problem. Whether it is driven from the crust through horizontal forces or from below by the asthenospheric flow depends upon the tectonics and the thermal conditions of the lithosphere. Most of the proposed models in the Aegean do not consider the possibility of a contribution of the underlying asthenospheric flow to crustal deformation (Conrad and Behn, 2010).
Kremer (2009) used shear wave splitting measurements at both oceanic and continental paths to constrain net lithosphere rotation about a pole at 57.6°S and 63.2°E. He ignored the contribution of the mantle flow on the anisotropic fabric in the asthenosphere and assumed that LPO in asthenosphere always takes place parallel to absolute plate motion. He obtained a digital model (GSRM-APM-1) as the combination of horizontal velocities on Earth surface and horizontal strain rates for deforming plate boundaries (Figure 3.3). Velocities in Figure 3.3 correspond to the plate boundary motions and plate rotations. The model performs better in the global scale but is not sufficient to explain shear wave splitting measurements computed locally.

Figure 3.3. Velocity field for the study area in GSRM-APM-1 reference frame model (Kreemer, 2009)

Based on the density model produced from the seismic tomographic models Faccenna and Becker (2010) has modeled flow directions in the mantle of the Mediterranean region. They were able to reproduce the westward motion of Anatolia. However the model fails to account for the southward motion of the Aegean slab and the N-S extension in the back arc region.
Shear wave splitting measurements to analyze upper mantle was started with the work of Bowman and Ando (1987). Shear phases that propagate through the mantle (SKS, S, SKKS, etc.) were used at different splitting measurement methods (Vinnik et al., 1989; Silver and Chan, 1991). Several works based on SKS observations are performed in the Eastern Mediterranean Region. Hatzfeld et al. (2001) measured shear wave splitting in the Aegean from 25 stations which were located in the continental Greece and Aegean islands by using teleseismic and regional earthquakes that occurred during six month period. Earthquakes occurred at epicentral distances between 85° and 110° with magnitudes greater than 5.5. They observed 150 splitting parameter pairs which were not homogeneous over the Aegean Region. The largest delay times (> 1 s) and N20°E fast polarization direction were observed beneath the north Aegean Sea. Small delay times or Null measurements were obtained in the Sea of Crete and in the continental Greece. The fast polarization directions (NNE-SSW in the east and NNW-SSE in the west) were observed parallel to the Hellenic Arc. They claimed that fast polarization directions are consistent with the present-day strain rates based on GPS measurements and seismicity. They observed that the crust and upper mantle deform consistently in the Aegean.

Sandvol et al. (2003) studied upper mantle anisotropy using shear wave splitting in the Eastern Turkey. Using the waveform data from 29 seismic stations of the ETSE network, located in the Arabian, Eurasian and Anatolian Domain, they obtained splitting parameters from SKS, PKS and SKKS phases and observed 1s average delay time and consistent NE-SW fast direction at the stations in Eastern Anatolia and northerly fast direction in the Western Arabian Plates which are claimed to be consistent with Absolute Plate Motion (Sandvol et al., 2003; McClusky et al., 2000). Due to the inconsistency between shear wave splitting and surface deformation they suggested that the measured anisotropy is asthenospheric or weakly lithospheric.

Mantle anisotropy and upper mantle strain rate in the NAFZ was studied using 140 teleseismic earthquakes with magnitudes greater than 5.0 and occurred at distances 85°-120° recorded at 39 seismic stations that located across the NAFZ (Biryol et al., 2010). They computed splitting parameters by using Rotation Correlation (Bowman and Ando, 1987) and Minimum Energy (Silver and Chan, 1991) techniques with SKS and SKKS phases and observed uniform strain rate and approximately 43° NE-SW fast direction
polarization in average with increasing delay times from east (0.5 s) to west (1.6 s) beneath NAFZ. They suggested that the uniform anisotropy observed beneath major tectonic boundaries is asthenospheric rather than lithospheric. The SW directed asthenospheric flow from east to west is a result of slab roll-back in the Aegean and Cyprian (Biryol et al., 2010). NAF and San Andreas Fault (SAF) were compared in terms of anisotropy, lithospheric deformation and age differences and observed smaller delay times (0.5 s - 1.25 s) for SAF.

More recently, shear wave anisotropy beneath the southern Aegean and back-arc and near trench areas of Hellenic Arc was studied by Evangelidis et al. (2011) by using 54 broadband stations. Total of 14 teleseismic earthquakes recorded for approximately 2.5 years period and 66 deep earthquakes from 2003 to 2008 which occurred between 80°-120° distanced were used. In the Hellenic back-arc fast anisotropy direction was observed as perpendicular to the trench (NE-SW) with delay times increasing from south to north. No correlation was observed between anisotropy and GPS velocities.

In this study, shear wave splitting parameters are measured by using more than 850 teleseismic earthquakes with magnitudes greater than 6.0 that occurred between years 1999-2010 at epicentral distances between 84° and 130°. Total number of 4163 splitting parameter pairs are measured for 217 broadband seismic stations located in and around Turkey both from permanent and temporary networks. To compute the splitting parameters $\varphi$ and $\delta t$, rotation-correlation technique (RC) (Bowman and Ando, 1987) and minimum energy technique (SC) (Silver and Chan, 1991) were employed. Both RC and SC techniques are used together to detect anisotropy in the upper mantle and quality statistics are performed for each seismic station. Null and non-Null measurements classified as good, fair or poor (Wüstefeld and Bokelman, 2007). Shear wave splitting measurements are generally found to be consistent with the previous studies in Eastern Anatolia and NAFZ with NE-SW fast polarization direction. NNE-SSW splitting direction with 1.5 seconds delay time in average is observed for the Marmara Region. Delay time decreases from Eastern to Western Turkey. Around 31°N, there is a sharp orientation change observed in the splitting fast direction. Splitting directions and GPS velocities are consistent beneath the Aegean Region.
3.2. Methodology

In isotropic medium, two types of body waves propagate with different velocities, namely P waves and S waves (Bullen and Bolt, 1985). In anisotropic medium however, wave propagation is more complex and support three body waves with perpendicular polarizations, a quasi-P wave (polarized almost in the propagation direction) and two quasi-S waves (SV and SH) (Figure 3.4). The velocity of the quasi-P wave is greater than two quasi-S waves. Quasi-S waves travel with fast and slow directions and different velocities in anisotropic medium and results in delay time (Crampin, 1977).
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Figure 3.4. Schematic view of the shear wave splitting through anisotropic medium. Image on the top shows an incoming S wave entering anisotropic media and splits. Image below shows the fast polarization direction.

In isotropic medium SKS phase polarizes vertically and arrives to the receiver as SV (Babuska and Cara, 1991). If the medium is anisotropic, it polarizes in two different direction perpendicular to each other and reaches to the station as in near-vertical propagation. The two split SKS wave polarizations; fast $(s_1)$ and slow $(s_2)$ and shear wave signal on radial component $s(t)$ can be written as (Vinnik et al., 1989) (Figure 3.5);
\[ s_1(t) = s(t) \cos \varphi \quad (3.1) \]
\[ s_2(t) = s(t - \delta t) \sin \varphi \quad (3.2) \]

\( \varphi \) is the azimuthal angle between fast S wave polarization and radial direction. \( \delta t \) is delay time between fast and slow polarized split waves. The fast and slow polarized SKS waves on radial (\( R(t) \)) and transverse (\( T(t) \)) components are (Babuska and Cara, 1991);

\[ R(t) = s(t) \cos^2 \varphi + s(t - \delta t) \sin^2 \varphi \quad (3.3) \]
\[ T(t) = [s(t) - s(t - \delta t)/2] \sin 2 \varphi \quad (3.4) \]

The time derivative of the radial component will be approximately equal to the transverse component for weak anisotropy (\( \delta t \sim 0 \)) or strong anisotropy with fast or slow polarized backazimuth (Silver and Chan, 1988; Vinnik et al., 1989; Babuska and Cara, 1991).

![Figure 3.5. Schematic view of the shear wave splitting through anisotropic medium](image)

There are two inversion techniques to measure shear wave splitting; multi event method and single event method. Multi event method determines splitting parameters and combines several of them for a single station to map the energy on the transverse component (Kosarev et al., 1984; Vinnik et al., 1989, Wolfe and Silver, 1998). Single
event method determines splitting parameters and does grid search to determine fast polarization direction $\varphi$ and delay time $\delta t$ that best removes the splitting effect (Fukao, 1984; Ansel and Nataf, 1989; Silver and Chan, 1991; Menke and Levin, 2003). Two techniques of single-event method used in this study are described below briefly.

### 3.2.1. The Rotation Correlation Method

This method is also called cross-correlation method (Bowman and Ando, 1987) (in the following is called as RC). The technique assumes that the waveform of the fast component is alike to the slow component and searches for the polarization direction and delay time by maximizing the cross-correlation between Radial and Transverse components. The first shear arrival is seen on the fast direction, second shear arrival is seen on the slow direction, time between these two arrivals is $\delta t$.

### 3.2.2. Minimum Energy Method

Minimum energy method is a widely used method (in the following is called as SC). This method has a basis of minimizing energy on the transverse component (Silver and Chan, 1991). The main idea of this method is to remove anisotropy effect from the data by minimizing the energy on the transverse component. Core refracted and core reflected phases (SKS, SKKS, PKS etc.) can be used.

The formulation of projection horizontal and vertical seismograms to radial and transverse directions in two dimensional medium and three dimensional medium is given as below respectively:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
F \\
S
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \varphi & -\sin \varphi \\
\sin \varphi & \cos \varphi
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
R \\
T
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(3.5)

\[
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L \\
Q \\
T
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \delta & -\sin \delta \sin \beta & -\sin \delta \cos \beta \\
\sin \delta & \cos \delta \sin \beta & \cos \delta \cos \beta \\
0 & -\cos \beta & \sin \beta
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
Z \\
E \\
N
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(3.6)
\( \delta \) refers to the incidence angle measured from vertical (assumed to be radial in this case), \( \beta \) refers to the backazimuth. In three dimensional medium, vertical \((Z)\), north \((N)\) and east \((E)\) components of the seismogram need to rotated in to the ray system as longitudinal \((L)\), radial \((Q)\) and transverse \((T)\) components in order to determine time separation (Equation 3.6) (Wüstefeld et al., 2008). \( L \) is vertical component parallel to the ray, \( Q \) is radial component pointing direction from source to receiver and \( T \) is transverse component perpendicular to the ray. \( N \) and \( E \) are the North-South and East-West component seismograms respectively, \( Z \) is vertical component seismogram. If anisotropy is small or strong but the backazimuth is along the fast or slow polarization direction \( T(t) \) will be zero.

Shear wave splitting measurement is mainly based on the polarization analysis (Plesinger et al., 1986) due to the fact that in the single event method (both in RC and SC methods) initial polarization of the waveform is assumed to be radial. If the medium is isotropic or the initial polarization corresponds to the fast or slow direction or no splitting is observed this measurement called “Null”. RC and SC techniques behave differently in fast polarization direction and delay time near Null directions. By using this difference, Null measurements were identified and quality of the result was determined (Wüstefeld and Bokelmann, 2007). For a Null measurement,

\[
\Delta \varphi = \varphi_{SC} - \varphi_{RC} \approx n \times 45^\circ \tag{3.7}
\]

\( \Delta \varphi \) is the angular difference between RC and SC techniques. “n” is a positive or negative integer. RC technique is off and \( \delta t_{RC} \) goes to zero for near Null measurements.

By comparing the result of RC and SC techniques, it is easier to recognize measurements with very low delay time and measurements with zero (Wüstefeld and Bokelmann, 2007). When the splitting is Null at a station, the SC method gives very small values of \( \delta t \) for all non-Null measurements. Null or non-Null measurements can be recognized with quality criteria’s below:
\[ \Delta \varphi = |\varphi_{SC} - \varphi_{RC}| \quad \text{and} \quad \rho = \delta t_{RC}/\delta t_{SC} \quad (3.8) \]

For “Null” measurements;

if \( 37^\circ < \Delta \varphi < 53^\circ \) and \( 0 < \rho < 0.2 \) “good”

if \( 32^\circ < \Delta \varphi < 58^\circ \) and \( 0 < \rho < 0.3 \) “fair”

For “non-Null” measurements;

if \( \Delta \varphi < 8^\circ \) and \( 0.8 < \rho < 1.1 \) “good”

if \( \Delta \varphi < 15^\circ \) and \( 0.7 < \rho < 1.2 \) “fair”

Remaining measurements are considered as “poor” quality. The quality assessment for each splitting parameter pair is obtained by using these criteria’s for RC and SC methods are shown in Figure 3.6. Difference between fast axis estimates \( (|\Delta \varphi|) \) with respect to delay time ratio \( (\rho) \) of splitting measurements compared for RC and SC methods is depicted (Figure 3.6). Red areas represent good, blue represents fair and green represents poor Null and non-Null measurements. Time ratio between 0 and 0.2s refers good Nulls with fast axis difference between 37° and 53° while near-Null measurements classified as time ratio between 0 and 0.3 seconds and fast axis difference between 32° and 58° (Figure 3.6). This is a good way to determine the quality of the results and to identify real null splitting.
Figure 3.6. Delay times and fast axis misfits between RC and SC methods are calculated from 4163 observations. Good (red), fair (blue) and poor (green) measurements are shown with different colors.

In order to identify SKS phases and to measure splitting parameters SplitLab with a graphical user interface MATLAB code was used (Wüstefeld et al., 2007). SplitLab modules associate event and waveform database, performs measurements and view the results for qualification by user, respectively. Data managing is the first step of the SplitLab which includes catalog preparation, waveform and event association, input station information (such as latitude, longitude, elevation, network code etc.). Database view in ENZ or LQT coordinate systems, filter selection, SKS phase selection are done before running splitting measurements by using RC and SC methods. Qualification and decision of the results if they are Null or non-Null are done in the later stage (Figure 3.7). Result screen for both Null and non-Null single measurements is shown in Figure 3.8 and 3.9 which depict general information for the selected event (origin time, latitude, longitude, magnitude, depth, backazimuth etc.), selected SKS phase window, RC and SC corrected fast-slow and radial-transverse component plots, particle motion before and after.
correction and qualification for the result. The particle motion appears to be elliptical before correction and linear after correction.

The splitting parameters \( \phi \) (polarization orientation of the first-arrival phase) and \( \delta t \) (time delay between fast and slow polarizations) are measured using the rotation–correlation method (e.g. Bowman and Ando, 1987) and minimum energy method (Silver and Chan, 1991) after filtering the seismograms in the SplitLab environment (Wüstefeld et al., 2007), generally between 0.02 Hz and 0.2 Hz. The error for each measurement is defined by the 95 per cent confidence contour of the maximum correlation. The measurements are considered as acceptable when (1) the horizontal particle motion is elliptical when anisotropy is present, (2) the two horizontal fast and slow component waveforms are coherent, (3) the particle motion becomes linear following correction for anisotropy, and (4) time lags are larger than 0.5 seconds. Final result is presented only for stations with at least three non-Null fair and good measurements with different initial polarizations.
Figure 3.7. Flowchart of the SplitLab processing steps
Figure 3.8. SplitLab code output image for a single non-Null measurement for BALB (Balıkesir) station. Splitting parameters are measured using both RC and SC techniques. Upper panel presents radial (blue dashed line) and transverse (red line) components of SKS phase in selected window (shaded area) on the left, information about the teleseismic earthquake used for measurements in the middle and incidence angle on the right. Center panel displays in turn from left to right normalized, radial and transverse components after the correction from RC, particle motion before and after correction and map of correlation coefficient. The gray shaded area shows the location of the estimated splitting parameters. Lower panel displays in turn from left to right normalized components after rotation in SC anisotropy system, corrected radial and transverse components, particle motion before and after correction and map of minimum energy on transverse component for SC technique.
Figure 3.9. SplitLab code output image for a single Null measurement for BALB (Balıkesir) station. Splitting parameters are measured using both RC and SC techniques. Upper panel presents radial (blue dashed line) and transverse (red line) components of SKS phase in selected window (shaded area) on the left, information about the teleseismic earthquake used for measurements in the middle and incidence angle on the right. Center panel displays in turn from left to right normalized, radial and transverse components after the correction from RC, particle motion before and after correction and map of correlation coefficient. The gray shaded area shows the location of the estimated splitting parameters. Lower panel displays in turn from left to right normalized components after rotation in SC anisotropy system, corrected radial and transverse components, particle motion before and after correction and map of minimum energy on transverse component for SC technique.
3.3. Data Processing

SKS phases are analyzed by using teleseismic earthquakes recorded at epicentral distances between $84^\circ$ and $130^\circ$ on permanent broadband seismographs which are maintained by the KOERI and ORFEUS and temporary network of SIMBAAD (Appendix A). The station distribution is not irregular over the area. The distribution is sparse in Central and Eastern Anatolia and relatively denser in Northwestern Turkey and Aegean (Figure 3.10). Recordings from 217 seismic stations during the time period from November 1999 to December 2010 are used for SKS splitting analysis. Splitting parameter pairs are computed at 217 seismic stations, 35 of these stations are marked either Null or did not provide enough splitting measurements.

The recordings of 2324 teleseismic earthquakes between 1999 and 2010 with magnitudes greater than 6.0 are collected using the NEIC catalogue and more than 700 of them are identified as candidates for SKS analysis (Figure 3.11). The events with good signal-to-noise ratio are selected for the analysis and 4163 good, fair or poor non-Null splitting measurements for 182 seismic stations are presented (Figure 3.12).
Figure 3.10. Broadband seismic stations used to measure SKS splitting. Stations with non-Null measurements (+) and stations with Null or not enough measurements (+) are shown with different colors.
Figure 3.11. Equidistant projection of the locations of teleseismic events used in this study (red dots). The two circles (dashed lines) represent epicentral distances of 84° and 130°.

Figure 3.12. The number of non-Null splitting measurements at each broadband station.
3.4. The Analysis of SKS Measurements at Various Stations

BALB (Balıkesir), BAYT (Bayburt), CSS (Cyprus), ISK (İstanbul), ISP (Isparta), MALT (Malatya) and VANB (Van) stations are selected to discuss SKS measurements in detail. BALB broadband station is located in southern Marmara Region (39.64°N, 27.88°E). Total numbers of 347 teleseismic earthquakes from different back azimuths are analyzed between 15 January 2004 and 26 November 2010 (Figure 3.13). A total of 43 SKS splitting parameter pairs are measured. Of those measurements six of them are classified as good, 8 as fair, 23 as poor and 6 as Nulls (Figure 3.14). The average fast polarization direction is computed as 22° and average delay time as 1.4 seconds. ISK is located in the Marmara Region (41.06°N, 29.06°E) and 366 waveforms are processed between 15 January 2004 and 26 November 2010 (Figure 3.15). These measurements are qualified as 24 good, 15 fair, 29 poor and 15 Nulls (Figure 3.16) with average fast polarization direction as 40° and delay time as 1.3 seconds. Şapaş and Boztepe-Güney (2005) measured fast polarization direction as 43.7°±5° and delay time 1.96 s for ISP station. Average splitting angle in the Marmara Region is about 45° NE-SW direction and delay times are higher in the Northern Marmara (1.5s) with respect to Southern Marmara Region (1.0 s) (Figure 3.27).
Figure 3.13. Earthquake distribution statistics for BALB broadband station. Histogram view (top left) and globe view (down left) show distribution of the earthquakes with back azimuth. On the right hand side earthquakes are plotted in different colors according to their magnitude.
Figure 3.14. Polar diagram of BALB seismic station for good, fair and poor non-Null measurements. In the upper panel $\varphi$ and $\delta t$ are presented with standard deviations and black row represents the fast polarization direction. In the central panel polar plot of back azimuths are shown. The thick blue arrows in the lower hemisphere show the back azimuth of events with good or fair Null measurements. The thin blue arrows correspond to events with poor Null measurements. The lower panel displays delay times as a function of back azimuth. The black filled squares show Null measurements rated as good or fair. Poor Nulls are plotted as open black squares.
Figure 3.15. Earthquake distribution statistics for ISK broadband station. Histogram view (top left) and globe view (down left) show distribution of the earthquakes with back azimuth. On the right hand side earthquakes are plotted in different colors according to their magnitude.
Figure 3.16. Polar diagram of ISK seismic station for good, fair and poor non-Null measurements. In the upper panel $\varphi$ and $\delta t$ are presented with standard deviations and black row represents the fast polarization direction. In the central panel polar plot of back azimuth are depicted. The thick blue arrows in the lower hemisphere show the back azimuth of events with good or fair Null measurements. The thin blue arrows correspond to events with poor Null measurements. The lower panel displays delay time as a function of back azimuth. The black filled squares show Null measurements rated as good or fair.

Poor Nulls are plotted as open black squares.
ISP station is located in southwestern Anatolia (37.82°N, 30.52°E). This place called Isparta angle, a triangular-shaped region which is the boundary between Aegean and central Anatolia. Total numbers of 235 teleseismic earthquakes recorded between 2 March 2004 and 20 December 2010 are used to compute splitting parameter (Figure 3.17) and 59 waveforms are processed as 4 good, 2 fair and 24 poor. Total numbers of 29 Nulls are measured and average \( \varphi \) and \( \delta t \) are computed as -10° and 1.3 seconds respectively (Figure 3.18). ISP station is located in such a wedge where fast polarization directions change from NE-SW to NW-SE and crustal thickness is relatively thick. Fast polarization direction and delay time at ISP station were computed as 10.85° and 1.46 seconds by Schmid et al. (2004) and 56° ≤ \( \varphi \) ≤ 205° and 0.37 ≤ \( \delta t \) ≤ 4 seconds by Şapaş and Boztepe-Güney (2009).

CSS is located in Cyprus (33.33°N, 34.96°E). By using 341 teleseismic earthquakes occurred between 21 February 2004 and 23 December 2010 splitting parameters are measured (Figure 3.19). 48 SKS phases are marked as 4 good, 10 fair, 24 poor and 10 good Nulls (Figure 3.20). Average fast polarization direction is computed as 40° and delay time as 1.1 seconds.
Figure 3.17. Earthquake distribution statistics for ISP broadband station. Histogram view (top left) and globe view (down left) show distribution of the earthquakes with back azimuth. On the right hand side earthquakes are plotted in different colors according to their magnitude.
Figure 3.18. Polar diagram of ISP seismic station for good, fair and poor non-Null measurements is plotted. In the upper panel $\varphi$ and $\delta t$ are presented with standard deviations and black row represents the fast polarization direction. In the central panel polar plot of back azimuth are depicted. The thick blue arrows in the lower hemisphere show the back azimuth of events with good or fair Null measurements. The thin blue arrows correspond to events with poor Null measurements. The lower panel displays delay time as a function of back azimuth. The black filled squares show Null measurements rated as good or fair. Poor Nulls are plotted as open black squares.
Figure 3.19. Earthquake distribution statistics for CSS broadband station. Histogram view (top left) and globe view (down left) show distribution of the earthquakes with back azimuth. On the right hand side earthquakes are plotted in different colors according to their magnitude.
Figure 3.20. Polar diagram of CSS seismic station is performed for good, fair and poor non-Null measurements. In the upper panel $\phi$ and $\delta t$ are presented with standard deviations and black row represents the fast polarization direction. In the central panel polar plot of back azimuth are depicted. The thick blue arrows in the lower hemisphere show the back azimuth of events with good or fair Null measurements. The thin blue arrows correspond to events with poor Null measurements. The lower panel displays delay time as a function of back azimuth. The black filled squares show Null measurements rated as good or fair. Poor Nulls are plotted as open black squares.
MALT station is located in the eastern Anatolia near EAF (38.42°N, 38.31°E). By using 238 teleseismic earthquakes located between 2 March 2004 and 21 December 2010 (Figure 3.21). Forty-three waveforms are analyzed and as 4 qualified as good, 6 fair, 23 poor and 10 Nulls (Figure 3.22). Average splitting parameters for MALT station are computed as 22° for fast polarization direction and 1s delay time. The values are consistent with Sandvol et al. (2004) (φ = 17°±10°, δt = 1.1 ± 0.3 s). VANB station is located close to the eastern coast of Anatolia (43.38°N, 38.59°E). Splitting parameters of VANB station (φ = 58° and δt = 0.9 s) are computed by using 287 teleseismic events occurred between 15 January 2004 and 26 November 2010 (Figure 3.23). 26 SKS measurements provided 5 good, 1 fair, 15 poor and 5 Nulls (Figure 3.24). BAYT station is located in northern Anatolia (40.14°N, 40.39°E). Computed fast polarization direction (φ = 54°) and lag time (δt = 1.5 s) is consistent with the ETSE results (Sandvol et al., 2004). By using 153 teleseismic earthquakes occurred between 24 September 2008 and 26 November 2010 (Figure 3.25), 18 SKS phases are analyzed and marked as 2 good, 3 fair, 12 poor and 1 Null (Figure 3.26).
Figure 3.21. Earthquake distribution statistics for MALT broadband station. Histogram view (top left) and globe view (down left) show distribution of the earthquakes with back azimuth. On the right hand side earthquakes are plotted in different colors according to their magnitude.
Figure 3.22. Polar diagram of MALT seismic station for good, fair and poor non-Null measurements is depicted. In the upper panel $\varphi$ and $\delta t$ are presented with standard deviations and black row represents the fast polarization direction. In the central panel polar plot of back azimuth are depicted. The thick blue arrows in the lower hemisphere show the back azimuth of events with good or fair Null measurements. The thin blue arrows correspond to events with poor Null measurements. The lower panel displays delay time as a function of back azimuth. The black filled squares show Null measurements rated as good or fair. Poor Nulls are plotted as open black squares.
Figure 3.23. Earthquake distribution statistics for VANB broadband station. Histogram view (top left) and globe view (down left) show distribution of the earthquakes with back azimuth. On the right hand side earthquakes are plotted in different colors according to their magnitude.
Figure 3.24. Polar diagram of VANB seismic station is depicted for good, fair and poor non-Null measurements. In the upper panel φ and δt are presented with standard deviations and black row represents the fast polarization direction. In the central panel polar plot of back azimuth are depicted. The thick blue arrows in the lower hemisphere show the back azimuth of events with good or fair Null measurements. The thin blue arrows correspond to events with poor Null measurements. The lower panel displays delay time as a function of back azimuth. The black filled squares show Null measurements rated as good or fair. Poor Nulls are plotted as open black squares.
Figure 3.25. Earthquake distribution statistics for BAYT broadband station. Histogram view (top left) and globe view (down left) show distribution of the earthquakes with back azimuth. On the right hand side earthquakes are plotted in different colors according to their magnitude.
Figure 3.26. Polar diagram of BAYT seismic station is shown for good, fair and poor non-Null measurements. In the upper panel $\varphi$ and $\delta t$ are presented with standard deviations and black row represents the fast polarization direction. In the central panel polar plot of back azimuths are depicted. The thick blue arrows in the lower hemisphere show the back azimuth of events with good or fair Null measurements. The thin blue arrows correspond to events with poor Null measurements. The lower panel displays delay time as a function of back azimuth. The black filled squares show Null measurements rated as good or fair.

Poor Nulls are plotted as open black squares.
3.5. An Overview of the SKS Splitting Observations

Shear-wave splitting measurements are performed on the records of core-refracted SKS phases at the 182 permanent and temporary broadband stations located in Turkey and adjacent regions. The total dataset includes 4163 splitting measurements from 700 events at epicentral distances between 86° and 130°. Delay time ($\delta t$) and polarization orientation of the first-arrival phase ($\varphi$), splitting parameters, are measured using the rotation–correlation method (e.g. Bowman and Ando, 1987) and minimum energy method (Silver and Chan, 1991) in the SplitLab environment (Wüstefeld et al., 2007).

The station density and the number of measurements vary over the region. The permanent stations with more data yield better estimates of the splitting parameters. The mean standard errors are generally smaller than 27° for $\varphi$ and 0.8 seconds for $\delta t$. Figure 3.27 shows a map of the measured anisotropy at the stations in this study (blue lines) with previous measurements (red, green, orange).
Overall, the splitting parameters show regional patterns as a result of complex geodynamic process beneath the region. Fast splitting directions are almost uniform with NE-SW orientation (~43°) in the Eastern Anatolia. The delay times are also uniformly varying between 0.9 and 1.5 seconds in the region with a regional average of ~1.3 seconds. The measurements are mostly consistent with the results of Sandvol et al. (2003). Change from NE-SW to NNE-SSW on the splitting angles is observed in the Central North Anatolian Fault Zone (CNAFZ) with a decrease of delay times to ~0.5 seconds. The majority of the measurements in this zone (green lines) are from the CNAFZ experiment (Biryol et al., 2010). A gradual decrease of the delay times from the Eastern Anatolia to CNAFZ is observed. On the western part of the NAFZ (WNAFZ) the splitting angles are still in NE-SW direction with an average of 43°. There is an apparent increase on the delay times from ~0.5 seconds to ~1.3 seconds toward the east of 34°E and toward the west of
37°E (Biryol et al., 2010). On the continuation to the Marmara Region the delay times are largest (~1.5-2 s) with average splitting angle of NNE-SSW (~28°).

In the Central Anatolia the station coverage is not dense. There are significant variations on the splitting directions as well as delay times toward the Southern and Western Anatolia. The measurements are not uniformly distributed in region and the parameters are varying locally. As the splitting parameters are coherent in the regions closer to Marmara and NAFZ they change drastically in the Southeastern Anatolia. On the west of the Cyprus (< 31°E), a sudden change on splitting angles from NE-SW to NW-SE is apparent. This continues to the Aegean coast of the Western Anatolia. In the Western Anatolia the splitting angles are in NE-SW direction with average delay times of ~1.3 seconds and coherent with the Marmara Region (Figure 3.27). In the Aegean Sea few stations located on the islands show NE-SW direction with large delay times (~1.5 s), with the exception of the measurements on Southern Aegean Sea (e.g. Crete). There appear to be significant differences on the splitting parameters of the Southern Aegean Sea observed in this study and previous works (Hatzfeld, et al., 2001; Evangelidis et al., 2011). Beneath the continental Greece the splitting parameters are strongly varying from south to north and there is no regionally consistent splitting direction while the delay times are increasing from the Southern Greece (~1.3 s) to Northern Greece (~1 s).

Figures 3.28 and 3.29 compare the variations of splitting angles and delay times from the Eastern Turkey to the Western Greece for the latitude ranges 39°-43° and 35°-39°, respectively. The azimuth of fast directions starts changing on both profiles at 31°E to the west with increasing delay times. The change is smooth up to 23°E for the latitude range of 39°-43° and sharper for longitudes greater than 23°E. Similarly the delay times increase suddenly at latitudes greater than 23°E. The variations for the latitudes between 39°-43° are more striking. Larger perturbations on the splitting parameters are observed on the west of Cyprus (< 32°E). The geographical distribution of the observed delay dimes are shown in Figure 3.30. A general increase can also be seen clearly from Eastern Anatolia to Aegean.
Figure 3.28. Fast polarization directions (above) and lag times (below) for longitudes from Eastern Anatolia to Greece between 35°N and 39°N (same colors as in Figure 3.27 are used for the various studies)
Figure 3.29. Fast polarization directions (above) and lag times (below) for longitudes from Eastern Anatolia to Greece between 39°N and 43°N (same colors as in Figure 3.27 are used for the various studies)
Figure 3.30. The average delay times observed at each station. The figure shows all the observations of present and previous works (For better visibility the delay times are squared)

3.6. The Origin of SKS Anisotropy

It is assumed that the maximum crustal contribution to the splitting delay times is less than 0.2 seconds (Barruol and Mainprice, 1993). Large splitting delay times (> 1 s) suggest that both lithosphere and asthenosphere are involved in the process. Assuming 4 per cent anisotropy would require ~120 km of thick anisotropic layer for 1 s delay time. On the other hand, a more complicated anisotropic layering cannot be ruled out. In the presence of 2 layers with different anisotropic properties, systematic azimuthal variations for $\varphi$ and $\delta t$ with a $\pi/2$ periodicity should be observed (Silver and Savage, 1994). We checked the permanent stations with sufficient azimuthal coverage that neither delay times nor orientations show systematic variations, indicating that anisotropy is concentrated in a single layer.
A qualitative interpretation of the observed anisotropy is based on comparisons of the fast orientations with surface deformation or absolute plate motions (Silver and Holt, 2002). A regional coherency of anisotropy with surface motion suggests a lithospheric origin assuming a uniform vertical strain throughout the lithosphere. On the other hand a uniform distribution of fast axis orientations at broader scale coherent with plate motion directions would support an asthenospheric origin (Kaviani et al., 2009). To compare fast polarization directions with plate motions it is necessary to select an appropriate reference frame. A commonly used reference frame in the area is the relative motion of the Anatolia and surrounding plates with respect to fixed Eurasia (McClusky et al., 2000). In this case, the direction of lithospheric motion does not necessarily represent an absolute plate motion that can be used for comparison with anisotropy measurements (Figure 3.2). Kreemer (2009) attempted to put constraints on the absolute plate motions in a hotspot reference frame based on observations of shear wave splitting orientations (GSRM-APM-1). The results of Kreemer (2009) show an overall mismatch between observed anisotropy directions and absolute plate velocity directions (Figure 3.3).

3.7. Discussions

In general the measurements in this study show a complicated behavior of anisotropy. The splitting parameters are regionally coherent in the Eastern Anatolia with splitting directions consistent with the APM (Sandvol et al., 2003). The regional average delay times of ~1.3 seconds indicate the source of anisotropy is in the asthenosphere as the thickness of the lithosphere is ~60-80 km (Özacar et al., 2010). A similar argument has been assumed for the observations on the CNAFZ by Biryol et al. (2010). Changes on the regional behavior of the splitting parameters are observed for longitudes less than 31°E. A relative increase on delay times from east to west in the central part of the NAFZ was interpreted by the influence of the differential motion between Hellenic and Cyprus trenches on the flow of the asthenosphere (Biryol et al., 2010). The regional changes on the observed splitting parameters indicate rotation of the splitting angles and increase in the delay times to the west. The variations are more pronounced by the stations closer to the Hellenic and Cyprus Arcs (compare Figures 3.28 and 3.29) indicating the influence of the distance from the Hellenic and Cyprian trenches. However the mechanism is not just a function of geometry. Seismic tomographic images of Hellenic and Cyprus Arcs indicate
discontinuities on the geometry slabs, suggesting tears at least in two locations (Faccenna et al., 2006; Biryol et al., 2010). The first one is associated with an alkaline volcanism along a N-S trending line parallel to the western coast of Anatolia during the Middle Miocene (Pe-Piper and Piper, 2007; Dilek and Altunkaynak, 2009). The second slab tear is located in Eastern Turkey below the Bitlis collision zone. Tomographic models show that the slab is detached there and that the continental lithosphere is thin and hot. Volcanism suggesting an asthenospheric window and slab delamination is recognized in the Late Miocene below Eastern Turkey (Şengör et al., 2008). The strong variations observed on the anisotropy along the tear zones indicate the influence of mantle flow.

In Western Turkey the direction of the anisotropy is NE-SW on the north and progressively NNE-SSW on the south (Figure 3.27). Aktuğ et al. (2009) computed the strain rate from GPS velocities. They observed that the main direction of extension is NE-SW to NNE-SSW in the northern half of Western Turkey (38°N). This direction rotates counterclockwise as one moves southward, becoming NNW-SSE in the Southeastern Aegean. The orientation of the anisotropy is along the direction of principal extension in the Western Turkey. In the Aegean Sea, between Western Anatolia and continental Greece the anisotropy is oriented in NE-SW (~35°) direction and consistent with the GPS velocities.
4. CONCLUSIONS

This study is an attempt to contribute to the understanding of a long debated question on active tectonics in the eastern Mediterranean region: What is the source of continental deformation? It is a fact that this is not a simple question to answer. Two competing hypothesis exist on the deformation of the continental lithosphere. The first one suggests that the lithosphere consists of rigid blocks which float on the asthenosphere separated by lithospheric faults and the deformation is a result of forces at their edges (England and McKenzie, 1982; Taymaz et al., 1991; Le Pichon et al., 1995; McClusky et al., 2000). The second one assumes that flow in the asthenosphere control the deformation in the upper crust and a component of shear at the base of the lithosphere can be transmitted all the way to the crust (Molnar, 1988; Bokelmann, 2002). There is compelling evidence that two hypothesis are not completely independent, but coupled in a complex and nonlinear way (Jolivet et al., 2009; Le Pichon and Kreemer, 2010). The viscosity and thermal state of the lithosphere are the key elements of the degree of such coupling. It requires observations, analyses and models contributed from various disciplines of science. Seismology can only provide a snapshot on the evolution of this complex system with vaguely known initial and boundary conditions. The imprints on the present state can be useful to infer the past of a long and complex evolutionary process.

The Mediterranean Region has been the focus of international efforts to reconcile geological evolution with mantle structure and plate tectonics (Dewey and Şengör, 1979; Şengör and Yılmaz, 1981; McKenzie, 1972; Aktuğ et al., 2009; Le Pichon and Kreemer, 2010; Reilinger et al., 2010). High-resolution tomographic models and geological studies and GPS surveys have become available during the last two decades. The tomographic images of various resolutions and depths have provided the details of the upper mantle structure and the anisotropic properties have been revealed through the studies of body and surface waves. This study is a similar attempt to some of the previous works but take into account of the improved data quality and quantity. The results therefore present a higher resolution look to the upper mantle structure.
Pn velocities and anisotropy provide information on the chemical, thermal state of the uppermost mantle and the deformation patterns as a result of the shear forces between crust and mantle. On the other hand, the SKS splitting measurements provide the thickness of the anisotropic layer of the asthenosphere. Therefore both measurements are complementary yielding a better characterization of the upper mantle. Overall, there are significant differences on the Pn anisotropy and SKS splitting directions. The differences are partly due to the tradeoff between velocity and anisotropy perturbations from the Pn tomography. In the presence of large velocity perturbations in a region with low azimuthal coverage of the station and events may result larger errors on the estimates of the Pn anisotropy. However, the majority of the Anatolian and Aegean domain are well covered by the crossing rays and the influence of the poor coverage was evaluate in detail in Chapter 2.3.

Figure 4.1 compares the SKS splitting parameters with Pn velocities. The strong velocity perturbations observed in Eastern Anatolia has no apparent correlations with the splitting parameters. The observed low velocities indicate that the lithosphere is thin and most of the anisotropy is asthenospheric origin. Therefore the splitting directions are more related to the asthenosphere. However, this changes on the west of Cyprus (< 32°E). High Pn velocities between 30°-32° longitudes show strong correlations with the splitting parameters (Figure 4.1). The splitting directions change their orientations across the slab characterized by the high Pn velocities and these variations continue to the western coast of Anatolia. There is no obvious coherency between Pn anisotropy and splitting angles. This can be related to the influence of the subducting plate. The flow of the asthenospheric mantle through the tear zones and in the mantle wedge will have varying orientation of anisotropy at crust mantle boundary and beneath the slab.

The influence of the Hellenic slab can be observed on the splitting parameters and Pn anisotropy at different magnitudes. In Western Anatolia the Pn anisotropy is well correlated with the principal extension direction (Figure 4.2). Longer wavelength variations are observed on the splitting parameters starting at longitudes greater than 31°E even at the stations of large distances, e.g. NAFZ (Figures 3.28 and 3.29). The gradual rotation of the splitting angles and increasing delay time to the west indicate that the slab roll back is the dominant mechanism on the deformation of the lithosphere and mantle.
The coherency of $P_n$ anisotropy and splitting directions increases in the Aegean Sea. Similar observations were reported by Hatzfeld et al. (2001).

Figure 4.1. $P_n$ velocities and SKS splitting (gray) measurements with major tectonic boundaries (thick black lines)

The observations in this study and previous works cannot be explained by a simple model for the whole region. The coherency between $P_n$ anisotropy, SKS splitting and GPS vectors in the Aegean show that the crust and mantle deforms similarly (Figure 4.2). This requires a good coupling between the crust and mantle. The coupling may indicate that the lithospheric mantle and the lower crust are weak. However, the alternative may also be a valid hypothesis. When the crust and the mantle are subjected to the same boundary condition imposed along the retreating Hellenic trench they also deform coherently which would fit the observed $P_n$ anisotropy, SKS splitting directions and GPS vectors.
The incoherency in the Eastern and Central Anatolia between $P_n$ anisotropy, SKS and GPS observations cannot be explained easily (Figure 4.2). A simple approach to explain observed GPS vectors in the Anatolia is to consider the westward motion of Anatolia through an extrusion model with the Arabia-Eurasia collision zone. In this case the Anatolian plate would be pushed by the Arabian plate across the Bitlis suture zone and most of the stress would be transmitted through the upper crust. The lithosphere is thin in the region and the asthenosphere is decoupled from the lithosphere. This could explain the observed differences between SKS splitting and the GPS measurements. However, we cannot completely rule out the effect of the mantle flow on the motion of the lithosphere. It is still possible to present a model to explain the westward motion of Anatolia by a westward mantle flow. If the flow is too recent, the anisotropic fabric may not be recorded. The source of the westward flow could be a gradient of dynamic topography between an upwelling of asthenosphere below the collision zone and the downgoing slab in the Aegean as proposed by Faccenna and Becker (2010). Based on the seismic tomographic models and using the distribution of temperature anomalies, Faccenna and Becker (2010) have...
modeled flow directions of the mantle. They were able reproduce the westward motion of Anatolia but failed to explain the southward motion of the Aegean slab and the N-S extension in the backarc region. However it is promising to observe that more comprehensive models including the effect of slab retreat with its complex geometry and better parameterized lithosphere may explain the majority of the observations.
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# APPENDIX A: LIST OF STATIONS USED IN SKS MEASUREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Name</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVT</td>
<td>29.7383</td>
<td>40.4332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSR</td>
<td>33.0707</td>
<td>39.4468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG</td>
<td>22.3303</td>
<td>39.0222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>42.9870</td>
<td>39.6088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHLR</td>
<td>32.7735</td>
<td>40.8867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALN</td>
<td>26.0457</td>
<td>40.8972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>30.1103</td>
<td>39.0552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTB</td>
<td>28.7400</td>
<td>40.0880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTB</td>
<td>30.6538</td>
<td>36.8998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTO</td>
<td>32.7937</td>
<td>39.8688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOS</td>
<td>23.8800</td>
<td>39.1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>25.5307</td>
<td>37.0688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARG</td>
<td>28.1262</td>
<td>36.2162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMT</td>
<td>28.8617</td>
<td>40.5657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYDB</td>
<td>27.8908</td>
<td>37.9465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYDN</td>
<td>27.8792</td>
<td>37.6608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALB</td>
<td>27.8800</td>
<td>39.6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Aly</td>
<td>27.6195</td>
<td>39.7403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYT</td>
<td>40.1410</td>
<td>40.3935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>41.6223</td>
<td>41.4450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCK</td>
<td>30.5890</td>
<td>37.4608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>31.2645</td>
<td>37.9708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGKT</td>
<td>28.7730</td>
<td>40.1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLCB</td>
<td>27.0420</td>
<td>38.3853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLKV</td>
<td>32.7517</td>
<td>40.8613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNGS</td>
<td>40.6790</td>
<td>38.9913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNN</td>
<td>35.8667</td>
<td>38.8462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BODT</td>
<td>27.3103</td>
<td>37.0622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLV</td>
<td>30.9502</td>
<td>38.7138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANB</td>
<td>27.0623</td>
<td>40.0167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANT</td>
<td>33.6197</td>
<td>40.6062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDAG</td>
<td>34.3718</td>
<td>39.6237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEYT</td>
<td>35.7473</td>
<td>37.0107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOS</td>
<td>26.0550</td>
<td>38.3868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLDR</td>
<td>43.9170</td>
<td>39.1432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORM</td>
<td>34.5467</td>
<td>40.1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRLT</td>
<td>27.7360</td>
<td>41.1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>33.3307</td>
<td>34.9622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTKS</td>
<td>28.5065</td>
<td>41.2363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTYL</td>
<td>28.2890</td>
<td>41.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUKT</td>
<td>43.6075</td>
<td>37.2473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALT</td>
<td>28.6372</td>
<td>36.7692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALY</td>
<td>28.6532</td>
<td>36.8162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARE</td>
<td>37.4830</td>
<td>38.5712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>27.5767</td>
<td>36.7307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGO</td>
<td>43.3712</td>
<td>40.4088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIKM</td>
<td>35.2577</td>
<td>41.6495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYBB</td>
<td>40.1393</td>
<td>37.9531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E08</td>
<td>30.4050</td>
<td>39.8970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>30.7140</td>
<td>38.3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>30.7133</td>
<td>37.3208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18</td>
<td>30.6810</td>
<td>37.1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23</td>
<td>30.4300</td>
<td>36.3668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDC</td>
<td>27.8618</td>
<td>40.3463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRB</td>
<td>26.7440</td>
<td>41.8470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIL</td>
<td>34.9512</td>
<td>29.6698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>29.9085</td>
<td>36.7483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENEZ</td>
<td>26.1530</td>
<td>40.7362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPOS</td>
<td>42.7279</td>
<td>41.5035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERBA</td>
<td>36.7547</td>
<td>40.6813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EREN</td>
<td>34.1700</td>
<td>35.5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIK</td>
<td>26.5132</td>
<td>40.6708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERMK</td>
<td>32.9128</td>
<td>36.6417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER2N</td>
<td>39.7220</td>
<td>39.5867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESY</td>
<td>38.7272</td>
<td>40.9165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZN</td>
<td>26.3253</td>
<td>39.8258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FETY</td>
<td>29.0835</td>
<td>36.6353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNA</td>
<td>21.3762</td>
<td>40.7838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GADA</td>
<td>25.8987</td>
<td>40.1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZ</td>
<td>37.2113</td>
<td>37.1722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB2X</td>
<td>29.4502</td>
<td>40.7865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDZ</td>
<td>29.4812</td>
<td>39.0888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GELI</td>
<td>26.4742</td>
<td>40.3980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEMT</td>
<td>29.1890</td>
<td>40.4350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEVA</td>
<td>43.0587</td>
<td>38.3122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLHS</td>
<td>29.4983</td>
<td>37.1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GONE</td>
<td>27.6860</td>
<td>40.0465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRG</td>
<td>22.4013</td>
<td>40.9567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GULT</td>
<td>30.5150</td>
<td>40.4323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVD</td>
<td>24.0873</td>
<td>34.8392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAKT</td>
<td>43.7072</td>
<td>37.5578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDMB</td>
<td>32.4860</td>
<td>36.9640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNZ</td>
<td>29.2696</td>
<td>37.7495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORT</td>
<td>23.0997</td>
<td>40.5978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRFI</td>
<td>35.0370</td>
<td>30.0363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRTX</td>
<td>29.6730</td>
<td>40.8008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFL</td>
<td>33.6853</td>
<td>36.2387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILGA</td>
<td>33.7165</td>
<td>41.0522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILIC</td>
<td>38.5700</td>
<td>39.4540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INL</td>
<td>32.5502</td>
<td>36.1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISK</td>
<td>29.0592</td>
<td>41.0657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>30.5222</td>
<td>37.6227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Name</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARA</td>
<td>35.0543</td>
<td>37.2597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARN</td>
<td>23.9200</td>
<td>35.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARS</td>
<td>43.0788</td>
<td>40.6277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAVA</td>
<td>24.5137</td>
<td>40.9967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCTX</td>
<td>28.3353</td>
<td>40.2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD2E</td>
<td>31.4428</td>
<td>41.3132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELT</td>
<td>39.2557</td>
<td>40.1495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEMA</td>
<td>38.4932</td>
<td>39.2688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHAL</td>
<td>29.4917</td>
<td>38.3703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLYT</td>
<td>29.0420</td>
<td>41.2530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMRIS</td>
<td>36.9000</td>
<td>37.5087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNT</td>
<td>22.8982</td>
<td>41.1618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KONT</td>
<td>32.3605</td>
<td>37.9453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KQZT</td>
<td>35.8263</td>
<td>37.4795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRGB</td>
<td>27.2977</td>
<td>40.3932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRNZ</td>
<td>32.7847</td>
<td>40.9093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRTS</td>
<td>35.3748</td>
<td>36.5730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTUT</td>
<td>39.7665</td>
<td>40.9893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVT</td>
<td>36.0463</td>
<td>41.0807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADK</td>
<td>32.3648</td>
<td>38.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>26.7602</td>
<td>40.3727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAST</td>
<td>25.4787</td>
<td>35.1612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEF</td>
<td>32.8903</td>
<td>35.1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFK</td>
<td>33.5325</td>
<td>35.2792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>22.4900</td>
<td>40.1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LKD</td>
<td>20.6507</td>
<td>38.7072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOD</td>
<td>32.7497</td>
<td>39.9195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTK</td>
<td>22.9673</td>
<td>38.0228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALTA</td>
<td>38.4273</td>
<td>38.3133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>31.7250</td>
<td>36.7820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATE</td>
<td>16.7040</td>
<td>40.6490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAZI</td>
<td>40.4465</td>
<td>37.4593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDNY</td>
<td>28.8845</td>
<td>40.3708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDU</td>
<td>31.1975</td>
<td>40.4712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERS</td>
<td>34.5217</td>
<td>38.8665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFTX</td>
<td>27.2977</td>
<td>40.7867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLR</td>
<td>25.9450</td>
<td>45.4908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLSB</td>
<td>27.7765</td>
<td>37.2953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORC</td>
<td>17.5425</td>
<td>49.7768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRMT</td>
<td>27.5957</td>
<td>40.6032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRMX</td>
<td>27.5830</td>
<td>40.6088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUR</td>
<td>23.9818</td>
<td>40.3343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIG</td>
<td>23.6797</td>
<td>39.9272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASA</td>
<td>32.6240</td>
<td>40.8693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHSR</td>
<td>27.5237</td>
<td>41.6308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLD</td>
<td>24.7032</td>
<td>42.1048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>