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ABSTRACT

The Vale do Forno archaeological sites (Alpiarça, central Portugal) document the earliest human occupation in the Lower Tejo River, well established in geomorphological and environmental terms, within the Middle Pleistocene. In a staircase of six fluvial terraces, the Palaeolithic sites were found on the T4 terrace (+24 m, above river bed) which is made of a basal Lower Gravels unit (LG) and an overlying Upper Sands unit (US). Geomorphological mapping, coupled with lithostratigraphy, sedimentology and luminescence dating (quartz-OSL and K-feldspar post-IRIR290) were used in this study. The oldest artefacts found in the LG unit show crude bifacial forms that can be attributed
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to the Acheulian. In contrast, the US unit has archaeological sites stratigraphically documenting successive phases of an evolved Acheulian. Luminescence dating and correlation with the Marine Isotopic Stages suggest that the LG unit has a probable age of ca. 335 to 325 ka and the US unit an age of ca. 325 to 155 ka. This is in contrast to previous interpretations ascribing this terrace (and lithic industries) to the Last Interglacial and early phases of the Last Glacial. The VF3 site (Milharós), containing Micoquian (Final Acheulian) industries (with fine and elaborated bifaces), found in a stratigraphic level located between the T4 terrace deposits and a colluvium associated with Late Pleistocene aeolian sands, is younger than 155 ka but much older than 32 ka.
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1. Introduction

Understanding of the Palaeolithic occupation of Northern Europe has been substantially based on evidence from rivers (e.g. Bridgland et al., 2006). For Western Europe and specifically in Iberia, insights into the Palaeolithic occupation is similarly derived from its major rivers (from north to south: Douro, Tejo/Tagus, Guadiana, Guadalquivir) (e.g. Santos and Villa, 2006). Within this context, the Vale do Forno archaeological sites (Alpiarça, in central Portugal; Fig. 1) provide the earliest and most well documented human occupation in the Lower Tejo (the Portuguese part of the Tejo basin). Lower Palaeolithic bifacial sites are common, often well represented by lithic industries. Their local stratigraphy and technological characteristics indicate successive phases of what is commonly named as the Acheulian. However, they were chronologically poorly constrained.
From the Spanish border to the Atlantic coast, the Tejo crosses major faults which provide a natural geomorphological subdivision of the river into a series of valley reaches (I to V; Cunha et al., 2005). In Reach I, within the Ródão and Arneiro depressions, the Tejo has cut well-developed staircases of alluvial terraces (Cunha et al., 2008, 2012), built on a sedimentary bedrock of the Lower Tejo Cenozoic Basin (LTCB; e.g. Pais et al., 2012). Here, the Tejo also flows across a series of highly resistant quartzite ridges. In Reach II, the Tejo flows over Paleozoic basement through a NE–SW orientated valley for some 30 km along which terraces are largely absent. In reach III, the Tejo is routed E–W, crossing three structural depressions with a Tertiary cover (Martins et al., 2009). In reach IV, the Tejo changes to a NNE–SSW trend, with valley sides displaying different degrees of terrace staircase development (Martins et al., 2010a, 2010b) (Figs. 1 and 2). Reach V corresponds to the Tejo estuary which covers a wide area but its final connection to the Atlantic is through a gorge. Here, terraces are not well described. Throughout the Lower Tejo region the best developed terraces, sometimes forming up to six levels, are typically associated with areas of weaker bedrock (e.g. Tertiary sediments in Reaches I, II and IV) where the river has been able to enlarge the valley.

The study area is located on the left flank of the middle part of a ~85 km long NNE–SSW orientated valley-section of reach IV, some ~100 km from the river mouth. The geomorphological characteristics of this reach are quite different from the Lower Tejo upstream (reaches I, II and III). In reach IV, the Tejo has a wide alluvial plain (up to 10 km wide) with an extensive staircase of six fluvial terraces (T1 to T6) developed along its valley sides (Martins, 1999). Here, the modern Tejo can be considered a low sinuosity, single-channel river with large sand bars, and its alluvial plain connects with a tide-dominated estuary.
The NNE-SSW oriented valley of reach IV is controlled by the NNE-SSW Lower Tejo Valley fault zone (e.g. Choffat, 1907; Bensaúde, 1910; Freire de Andrade, 1933; Cabral et al. 2003, 2004, 2013; Cabral and Ribeiro, 1988, 1989; Cabral, 1995, 2012; Vilanova and Fonseca, 2004; Carvalho et al., 2008, 2014; Martins et al. 2009; Besana-Ostman et al. 2012). This is expressed as a regional scale tectonic lineament concealed by Holocene sediments. This valley is developed in a low uplift area (<100 m during the last ca. 2 Ma) with some subsidence in the present estuary (reach V). The interplay between these regional tectonic characteristics and Pleistocene to Holocene glacio-eustatic sea-level changes has strongly influenced the formation of fluvial terraces and sedimentary valley-fill (e.g. Merritts et al., 1994; Blum and Törnqvist, 2000). The high amplitude sea-level changes that characterized the Middle and Late Pleistocene controlled the episodic down-cutting phases of the river during sea-level lowstands; these alternated with flooding and aggradation phases in the incised valley during highstands (Cunha et al., 2016). Such climate related eustatic oscillations are superimposed on a long-term uplift pattern, both phenomena having controlled the river terrace staircase development (Cunha et al., 2005, 2008; Martins et al., 2010a, 2010b).

In reach IV, several archaeological studies have been undertaken in the last 70 years (e.g. Breuil and Zbyszewsky, 1942, 1945; Zbyszewski, 1946; Raposo, 1995a, 1995b; Mozzi et al., 2000). The prehistoric human occupation of this area is of renewed interest because it contains evidence for an extensive Palaeolithic occupation. Related archaeological sites are present on both sides of the river, from the Lisboa area to the vicinity of Torres Novas (Fig. 2). The site of Santo Antão do Tojal (near the estuary) is considered especially important, because dated fossil remains of Palaeoloxodon antiquus and Equus caballus were found in association with lithic industries (Zbyszewski, 1943,
The study of these sites has brought new insights into the technology and the typology of the Lower and Middle Palaeolithic. Further new insights have been achieved by combining archaeological, geomorphological and lithostratigraphic studies. A chronological framework for the lithic industries found in these sites has been attempted, based on their stratigraphic position in the terrace deposits and by thermoluminescence (TL) dating (Mozzi et al., 2000). However, these TL dates from the Vale do Forno area were minimum age estimations. Furthermore, the validity/accuracy of these TL ages was unclear because of a lack of geochronological dating from other archaeological sites within reach IV (e.g. Raposo and Cardoso, 1998).

The main aim of this paper is to develop a new chronostratigraphy for the sedimentary succession of the Lower Tejo terrace T4 in the Vale do Forno area. A new and more robust chronologic framework will allow us to provide better dating of the Palaeolithic industries found here in situ and to estimate the duration of aggradation and down-cutting phases associated with this terrace. It will also allow correlation of these phases with extrinsic fluvial controls (climate, glacio-eustatic sea-level changes and tectonics). Finally, integration of the terrace sedimentology with an improved chronostratigraphic framework will allow a revised assessment of the palaeo-environmental conditions affecting this region of western Iberia during the Middle Pleistocene.

2. Geological setting

The study area mainly comprises siliciclastic sediments of the Lower Tejo Cenozoic Basin (LTCB), dominated by Miocene sediments on the western side and Pliocene sediments on the eastern side of the valley (Fig. 2). Eocene to Oligocene continental sediments outcrop along the western margin of the LTCB, forming a narrow fringe along a
thrust fault contact with Mesozoic limestones. The Neogene succession is composed of fluvial gravels, sands and silty clays, but also lacustrine/palustrine carbonates (Barbosa, 1995). Pleistocene sediments are represented by fluvial terraces, an aeolian cover unit (Carregueira Formation) and colluvium (e.g. Martins et al., 2009, 2010a, 2010b). Holocene sediments form an extensive alluvial plain, ca. 5 km wide at Alpiarça and up to 10 km wide in the downstream part of the study area. In reach IV, a deeply incised valley was excavated during the Marine Isotopic Stage (MIS) 2 sea-level fall, between 30,000 and 20,000 yrs ago; valley infilling occurred due to a combination of sea-level rise (20,000 to 7,000 yrs ago) and an increase in sediment supply, resulting from climate change and human impact (Van der Schriek et al., 2007; Vis et al., 2008, 2016; Vis, 2009).

3. Previous studies

Previous studies in reach IV by Breuil and Zbyszewsky (1942) and Zbyszewski (1943, 1946) identified only four fluvial terraces. These were represented in the 1/50,000 geologic maps using a stratigraphic framework based on the heights of terrace surfaces above river bed (a.s.l.): Q1 as +75–95 m; Q2 as +50–65 m; Q3 as +25–40 m and Q4 as +8–15 m. A glacio-eustatic model, based on the European Alpine glaciations, was used to explain the terrace formation as well as to provide a relative chronology. Q1 and Q2, the “upper terraces”, were considered to relate to the Gunz–Mindel interglacial, or even to the pre-Gunz (Q1). Q3, the “middle terrace”, was related to the late Mindel and the earliest Riss and Q4 (the “lower terrace”) was ascribed to the Riss–Würm interglacial.

In more recent years the terrace stratigraphy in reach IV has been revised and now comprises six terrace levels (T1 is the uppermost and the T6 the lowermost; Corral, 1998a, 1998b; Martins, 1999; Rosina, 2002; Cunha et al., 2008; Martins et al., 2009, 2010a,
The additional terraces were recognised within the highest and lowest parts of the landscape, the new highest terrace occurring above the original Q1 level and the new lowest terrace occurring below the old Q4 level. Thus, the old Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 stratigraphy has now been reclassified as the T2, T3, T4 and T5 terrace levels.

In the study area, two lithostratigraphic units were identified within the T4 terrace (Mozzi et al., 2000): a “Lower Gravels unit” (LG) and an “Upper Sands unit” (US), which are locally separated by a disconformity. The LG unit was linked to glacial conditions and a sea-level lowstand, whereas the US unit was linked to an interglacial period of high sea level.

No pre-bifacial (pre-Acheulian) assemblages have been found at the Vale do Forno archaeological sites or elsewhere in the Lower Tejo basin. The scarce lithic tools that were found in the LG unit comprise crude bifacial forms attributed to an “Early Acheulian” (Zbyzewski, 1946), but they are not sufficiently representative as to be ascribed to any specific Acheulian evolutionary phase. In the US unit, prolific industries represented by a dozen sites have been registered since the 1940s, especially at Vale do Forno (VF) (Breuil and Zbyszewki, 1942; Zbyzewski, 1946; Raposo et al., 1985; Mozzi et al., 2000; Raposo, 2002). One such example is the VF1 site, comprising a classic bifacial industry within a thin gravel bed stratigraphically located in a lower sector of the US unit. The VF8 site is located in a stratigraphically higher position and contains an industry dominated by small to medium sized flake tools, but with some rare bifaces or biface-like tools. Finally, another relevant industry has been found at site VF3, on a thin gravel bed located between a sandy silt level at the top of the T4 terrace and an overlying aeolian-colluvial deposit. The VF3 industry, has traditionally been labelled as Micoquian and considered to represent the very end of the Acheulian complex (Raposo et al., 1985).
For the Acheulian industries that have been recorded in the Upper Sands unit, Raposo (1995a) and Mozzi et al. (2000) proposed an age of ca. 150 to 70 ka, corresponding to the last interglacial/early phases of the last glacial (MIS 5 and the end of MIS 6). This is considerably younger than the age proposed by the previous studies, which linked the T4 terrace to the late Mindel and early Riss (ca. 400 to 300 ka). The younger chronology was based upon three arguments:

a) The occurrence of Micoquian industries at the VF3 site, these are extremely evolved, both from the technological and typological point of view;

b) The palaeoenvironmental interpretation of a spatially extensive floodplain succession with palaeosols and grey clays containing temperate floral fossils located below the upper Acheulian horizons. These fine-grained deposits were thought likely to indicate the Eemian transgressive episode;

c) The thermoluminescence (TL) dates obtained from the VF8 sequence. These provided minimum ages for three stratigraphic levels of the US: 117 ka (-26 ka + infinite), 119 ka (-32 ka + infinite) and >124 ka (Raposo, 1995a; Mozzi et al., 2000).

Correlations by Martins et al. (2010b) and Cunha et al. (2012), based mainly on geomorphologic criteria and new luminescence dating, indicated that the terrace containing the Lower Palaeolithic industries at Vale do Forno is equivalent to the T4 terrace of the upstream reach III (at Abrantes) and reach I (at Ródão) of the Lower Tejo. In these reaches, finite infrared stimulated luminescence (IRSL, from K-feldspar) and optically stimulated luminescence (OSL, from quartz) ages were obtained for the T4, T5 and T6 terrace deposits (Cunha et al., 2008, 2012; Martins et al., 2010a, 2010b): T4 – ca. 280 to 136 ka; T5 – ca. 136 to 75 ka; T6 - 62 to 32 ka. Thus the OSL ages for the T4 obtained in the upstream reaches can be used to constrain the age of the Vale do Forno industries. However, this time range should be regarded as a first estimate, since the ages of the T4 terrace were ob-
tained using the conventional low-temperature (50°C) IRSL signal method, for which the fading correction used (Lamothe et al., 2003) is not completely appropriate. This resulted in a significant underestimation for the oldest samples (Cunha et al., 2008; Martins, et al., 2009, 2010a, 2010b). Because of this age underestimation issue, Cunha et al. (2012) proposed that the T4 aggradation should probably range in age from 340 ka to 160 ka. In the present study, these limitations in luminescence dating are largely overcome by a new protocol that uses the elevated-temperature post-IRIR stimulation (Thomsen et al., 2008; Buylaert et al., 2009) for measuring samples that have the quartz-OSL signal in saturation. The pIRIR_{290} dating method, using K-feldspar as the dosimeter, has negligible fading and can yield accurate results back to 600 ka (Buylaert et al., 2012).

4. Materials and methods

The information presented here is derived from geomorphological, stratigraphical, sedimentological and chronological data using a standard approach (e.g. Stokes et al., 2012): (1) a geomorphological study of the region, complemented by local detailed investigations and the generation of detailed maps using GIS, (2) field descriptions and stratigraphic correlation of the sedimentary units, (3) sedimentological characterization of the deposits and (4) luminescence dating.

Geomorphological mapping was undertaken in three stages: (1) field mapping onto topographical (1/25,000) and geological (1/50,000) base maps; (2) analysis of 1/25,000 black/white aerial photographs and of a digital elevation model (DEM) based upon a 1/25,000 topographic database; and (3) field ground truthing.
The T4 terrace deposits associated with the Vale do Forno archaeological sites and that of the equivalent alluvial sequence in the adjacent Vale de Atela sector were also studied in detail in order to improve our understanding of the local stratigraphy. Field work included stratigraphic logging and sedimentological characterization of the sedimentary deposits in order to obtain data on the depositional facies, including the sediment colour, texture, maximum particle size, clast lithology, fossil content, bedding and its overall depositional architecture. Soil features and horizons were described in the field, following international guidelines (Jahn et al., 2006).

Samples for OSL dating were collected from several Pleistocene sedimentary units that outcrop in the study area, namely fluvial sands of the T4 and T5 terraces and aeolian sands of the Carregueira Formation. A large number of different stratigraphic levels within the T4 terrace (from the base to the top) were sampled in order to improve the chronology of the terrace sequence and its associated lithic industries.

OSL dating is an absolute dating technique that measures the time elapsed since sedimentary grains of quartz or feldspar were last exposed to daylight (Duller, 2004). Exposure to daylight during sediment transport removes the latent luminescence signal from the quartz or feldspar crystals. After burial, the luminescence signal (trapped charge) starts to accumulate in the mineral grains due to ionising radiation arising from the decay of $^{238}$U, $^{232}$Th and $^{40}$K present in the sediment itself and from cosmic ray bombardment. In the laboratory, the equivalent dose ($D_e$, assumed to be the dose absorbed since last light exposure, i.e. the burial dose, expressed in Gy) is determined by comparing the natural luminescence signal resulting from charge trapped during burial with that trapped during a laboratory irradiation. Dividing the $D_e$ by the environmental dose rate (in Gy/ka) gives the luminescence age of the sediment. Environmental dose rates are calculated from the
radionuclide concentrations (U, Th, K) of the sediment. In this study, the radionuclide concentrations were measured by high-resolution gamma spectrometry (Murray et al., 1987). These concentrations were then converted to environmental dose rates using the conversion factors given by Olley et al. (1996). For the calculation of the dose rate of sand-sized K-feldspar grains an internal K content of 12.5±0.5% was assumed (Huntley and Baril, 1997). Sampling tubes were hammered into previously cleaned outcrops. Immediately adjacent to each tube, a sub-sample of sediment was collected for determination of field water content, saturation water content and dose rate.

Sample preparation for luminescence analyses was done in darkroom conditions. Samples were wet-sieved to separate the 180–250 μm grain size fraction followed by HCl (10%) and H₂O₂ (10%) treatments to remove carbonates and organic matter, respectively. The K-feldspar-rich fraction was floated off using a heavy liquid solution of sodium polytungstate (ρ = 2.58 g/cm³). The quartz fraction was obtained by etching another portion with concentrated HF (40%). The K-feldspar fraction was treated with 10% HF for 40 min to remove the outer alpha-irradiated layer and to clean the grains. After etching, both the quartz and K-feldspar fractions were treated with HCl (10%) to dissolve any remaining fluorides. Quartz purity was confirmed by the absence of a significant infrared-stimulated luminescence (IRSL) signal.

Equivalent doses were measured on automated Risø TL/OSL DA- 20 readers, each containing a beta source calibrated for irradiation on stainless steel discs and cups. Quartz measurements were made on large (8 mm) aliquots containing several thousands of grains mounted on stainless steel discs. Small (2 mm) aliquots of K-feldspar were mounted on stainless steel cups.

Quartz dose estimates were made using a standard SAR protocol using blue light stimulation at 125°C for 40s with a 240°C preheat for 10 s, a 200°C cut heat and an elevated
temperature (280°C) blue-light stimulated clean-out step (Murray and Wintle, 2000, 2003). The OSL signal was detected through a U-340 filter. All samples have a strong fast component. The net OSL signal was calculated from the initial 0.0-0.8 s of stimulation and an early background between 0.8-1.6 s.

The K-feldspar $D_e$ estimates were measured with a post-IR IRSL SAR protocol using a blue filter combination (Thomsen et al., 2008; Buylaert et al., 2012). The preheat was 320°C for 60 s and the cut-heat 310°C for 60 s. After preheating the aliquots were IR bleached at 50°C for 200 s (IR$_{50}$ signal) and subsequently stimulated again with IR at 290°C for 200 s (pIRIR$_{290}$ signal). It has been shown by Buylaert et al. (2012) that the post-IR IRSL signal measured at 290°C can give accurate results without the need to correct for signal instability. For all IR$_{50}$ and pIRIR$_{290}$ calculations, the initial 2 s of the luminescence decay curve less a background derived from the last 50 s was used.

5. Results

5.1 Terrace staircase

In the study area, the culminant sedimentary surface (CSS) is the surface of the Serra de Almeirim Conglomerates (Barbosa, 1995). This uppermost sedimentary unit of the LTCB, and the upstream equivalent in Portugal, represented by the Falagueira Formation (Cunha, 1992, 1996), has been considered of latest Zanclean to Gelasian age (3.65 to 1.8 Ma; Cunha et al., 2012, 2016; Pais et al., 2012; Diniz et al., 2016). Previous studies (e.g. Cunha, 1992, 1996; Cunha et al., 1993, 2005, 2016) indicated that by ca. 3.65 Ma (end of the Zanclean) the westward draining Atlantic fluvial drainage (in the Lower Tejo basin), during a period of high sea-level (up to +40 m), also received drainage from the previous endorheic Madrid Cenozoic basin (e.g. Pérez-González, 1994). Our interpretation considers a spill-over drainage model (e.g. Douglass and Schmeekle, 2007) as responsible
for the change of the Douro and Madrid Cenozoic basins from endorheic to exorheic: when the hot climate of the Pliocene became very humid, the large water level increase in each endorheic basin (forming a huge lake) induced an overspill towards the west, to the lower Atlantic Ocean.

Ongoing studies indicate that in the Lower Tejo Basin the incision stage began by 1.8 Ma (Cunha et al., 2012, 2016), controlled both by climate (global cooling; see, e.g., Bridgland and Westaway, 2014), eustasy (sea-level lowering) and tectonics (ongoing crustal uplift since 9.5 Ma due to Iberia-Africa convergence) (e.g. Cunha, 1992; Cunha et al., 1993, 2016; De Vicente et al., 2011). During the subsequent fluvial incision, the Lower Tejo and its tributaries developed a staircase of six terraces into the fill of the LTCB (Fig. 3).

In the study area (Vale de Cavalos – Muge; Fig. 3), only five terraces are represented because the T6 terrace is buried by Holocene alluvium. The staircase can be characterized as follows (Table 1):

- The remnant surface of Serra de Almeirim conglomerates (CSS) is at ca. 133 m a.s.l. (+123 m, above river bed, a.r.b.) at Alpiarça; the unit has a thickness of ca. 35-40 m and consists of fluvial gravels interbedded with coarse sands;

- The T1 terrace is at ca. 115 m a.s.l. (+107 m) around Vale de Cavalos (upstream) and at ca. 90 m a.s.l. (+86 m) around Muge (downstream) (Fig. 3). T1 has a maximum thickness of ca. 5 m, and is made up of reddish gravels overlying the Miocene substratum.

- T2 is represented by the terrace treads at 82 to 72 m a.s.l. (+74 to 68 m). The T2 is a 6-7 m thick fill terrace, mainly composed of brown massive clast-supported gravels.

- T3 terrace is at 60 to 50 m a.s.l. (+52 to 46 m). It is well preserved on the north side of the Muge stream where it is ca. 10 m thick.

- T4 terrace is at 38 to 20 m a.s.l. (+30 to 16 m). It forms a 5 km long ramp, rising from 20 to 40 m a.s.l. north of the Muge stream. Boreholes for water extraction and the available
outcrops indicate that the T4 has a maximum thickness of ca. 30 m at Alpiarça (Mozzi et al., 2000) and ca. 23 m near Muge.

- T5 terrace forms a narrow strip at 13 to 10 m a.s.l. (+3 to 6 m), between Vale de Cavalos and Muge. In the study area, the base of T5 is below the top of the modern alluvial plain but downstream of Muge, the whole T5 thickness is buried by the Holocene valley fill;

- Boreholes indicate a thickness of 9-10 m.

- Boreholes indicate that the T6 terrace top is at -4 m a.s.l. and is ca. 18 m-thick.

- A late Pleistocene aeolian sand unit (Carregueira Formation), usually <3 m-thick, locally covers the T5 and T4 terraces.

- Boreholes revealed a ca. 30 m-thick Holocene succession (Vis, 2009).

The lithostratigraphy of the T4 terrace was described by Mozzi et al. (2000) (Figs. 4, 5 and 6). In the present study additional data were collected, with three stratigraphic logs being obtained from Vale do Forno and Vale de Atela (Fig. 7). Figure 8 shows the sand-pit (27 m high) used to produce the Vale de Atela-E log (Fig. 7).

Outcrops of the LG unit show a minimum thickness of 10 m, but the overall maximum thickness appears to be 13-15 m based upon water-well stratigraphy. The unit is made of subrounded to subangular gravels of quartzite (predominant) and quartz, with a coarse sandy matrix. The sediments usually occur as clast-supported imbricated gravels that display a crude horizontal bedding (lithofacies Gh), interpreted as longitudinal fluvial bars deposits. Locally, some small channel geometries can be seen and lenses of other facies can be intercalated with the dominant Gh. These include the lithofacies Gp, characterized by gravel with planar cross-beds, interpreted as transverse fluvial bars, and lithofacies Sm, comprising massive medium sand, interpreted as deposited by turbulent fluvial currents.

The LG unit deposits are interpreted as corresponding to a gravelly braided fluvial system,
transporting a coarse bed load (average maximum pebble size of 14 cm, but with rare boulders reaching 30 cm in diameter).

The US unit has a maximum thickness of 20 m. The basal 2-4 m of the unit (Fig. 7) comprises either (1) massive and pebbly coarse sands (lithofacies Sc) or (2) trough cross-beds (lithofacies St). These represent bed-load transport of sand, mainly as sinuous-crested fluvial dune bedforms. The middle part of the US unit (ca. 6-10 m) consists of very thick (up to 5.5 m) massive grey clayey silts (lithofacies Fm) that locally contain small fragments of coal. The silts are intercalated with thin beds (<1 m) of massive medium to fine yellowish sands (lithofacies Sm). Collectively, this alternation of silts and fine sands is interpreted as overbank deposits comprising crevasse splays (Sm) and backswamp deposits (Fm). Leaves of *Salix* and rhizomes of *Nymphaea* (*Zbyszewski, 1946*) and a pollen content limited to *Ericacea* and *Pinus* (*Montenegro de Andrade, 1944*) have been reported in the backswamp deposits. The backswamp deposits document a marked decrease in fluvial energy and the formation of an extensive flood-plain adjacent to channel deposits to the west (Fig. 5). The upper part of the US unit (ca. 8-9 m) is dominated by tabular beds (Fig. 8) of lithofacies Sc and Sm, with rare thin intercalations of facies Fm. Thus, the upper part of the US unit indicates that the environment changed to a system dominated by sand flats and large bars.

The <2 μm fraction of the US overbank deposits have as clay minerals essentially montmorillonite/vermiculite, associated with kaolinite and illite (*Mozzi et al., 2000*); a significant part of these clay minerals could be sourced from erosion of the local Neogene sedimentary units. *Zbyszewski (1946)* interpreted the US macrofloral assemblages to indicate a mild-temperate climate similar to that of the present day.
Palaeosols within the US unit provide some information regarding drainage and climate conditions. A trench (Fig. 9) excavated at location AL1 (see Fig. 4), records three separate palaeosols in lithofacies Fm, positioned in the middle part of the US unit between 27 and 21 m a.s.l. Each palaeosol can be traced over a wide area of some 4 km², being observed in numerous sections. The main palaeosol characteristics are reported in Table 2. All palaeosols show abundant mottles and coatings of Fe-Mn oxides along cracks and on the faces of soil aggregates, as well as slickensides and pressure faces in the more clayey horizons. These features are indicative of poorly drained soils within a fine-grained floodplain (Aslan and Autin, 1998). Slickensides and pressure faces suggest the occurrence of significant variations in soil water content (Dinka et al., 2013), implying strong seasonal variability with summer drought. Palaeosols displaying seasonal wet-dry cycles cover an area of several square kilometers, which suggests that they are not localized occurrences associated with periodic channel levee breaching. Instead, each palaeosol seems to be indicative of wider floodplain stability and, thus, corresponds to a potential hiatus in the sedimentary sequence. The degree of evolution of the palaeosol profile may provide some clue as to the time scale involved in its formation (Huggett, 1998; Zielhofer et al. 2009).

For example, the observed palaeosol characteristics can commonly form in relatively short time spans, possibly in the order of $10^3$-$10^4$ years (Yaalon, 1983). Nevertheless, it must be pointed out that the hydromorphic setting in which soil formation occurred is not adequate for producing unequivocal soil chronosequences, as the soil hydrology is expected to be a major controlling factor which may severely limit the evolution of the soil profile. As time may not be a predominant factor, the above time intervals should be regarded only as minimal age constraints.

5.2 Lithic industries
The supposedly “Early Acheulian” industries were found in the LG unit by Zbyszewsky (1946). Part of this unit is presently submerged by a local dam and for the last two decades it has not been possible to find additional artefacts in situ.

In contrast, archaeological sites are numerous in several stratigraphic levels within the US unit. Acheulian industries, containing “large cutting tools”, such as bifaces, cleavers and sidescrapers are present. Clear Middle Palaeolithic industries, the so-called “flake industries” or Mousterian, based on specific core reduction sequences (mainly discoid or Levallois), with no relevant occurrence of large cutting tools, are almost absent. In contrast, bifaces and cleavers do occur throughout the alluvial sequence, evolving technologically and typologically. Here, we summarize the three main archaeological sites excavated from the US unit in the Vale do Forno area, described in stratigraphic sequence (VF1, VF8 and VF3). The large number of artefacts discovered allows for a cultural diagnosis of the industries.

The VF1 site (Vale do Forno; Figs. 4 and 6) was found in the lowermost in the stratigraphy, within the basal channel sandy deposits of the US unit. Typologically, the lithic industry is represented by poorly evolved Acheulian tool types (Fig. 10). It contains a high percentage of flaked pebbles, unifacial choppers and hand axes, all of a quite rough manufacture; flakes show few implements.

At the VF8 site (Vale do Forno; Figs. 4, 5, 6, 7, 11 and 12) artefacts were recovered from the upper part of the US unit from a fine sand level (facies Sm) and an immediately overlying clayish silty bed (Fm). Approximately three thousand artefacts have been recovered from a thin archaeological horizon (ca. 10 cm-thick) interbedded in clays. A high concentration of flaked lithic materials (~140 artefacts per m² from an excavated area of 20
m²) and the presence of the entire reduction sequences, from manuports and tested cobbles, cores, initial flakes and large tools up to small retouched tools and abandoned debris, documents both the integrity of the site and the fact that local flaking activities were taking place in a flood-plain environment. Final retouched tools represent 15% of the total industry including waste products (or 24% without them). This observation is even more significant giving that finished tools represent more than 30% of the total weight of the lithic products, something that is directly related to the presence of the characteristic Acheulian large cutting tools. These large Acheulian tools are almost residual in numeric terms: 5% of bifaces and cleavers (“hachereaux”) and 9% of choppers and chopping-tools. Most of the retouched artefacts are retouched tools on flake (84% in numeric terms; 42% concerning weight), dominated by notches and denticulates, sidescrapers, dorsal knives, borers and “becs” (a Palaeolithic flake boring tool retouched on one edge to form a point). Discoid centripetal reduction sequences are rare and the Levallois method is absent.

The VF3 site (Milharós, Fig. 4) provided an assemblage of artefacts found on a thin layer located between a fluvial sandy silt level at the T4 terrace top and a colluvial deposit associated with aeolian sands (Raposo, 1996). After the archaeological excavation, a camping site (Fig. 6) was constructed on the VF3 site and later sampling for luminescence dating was not possible. However, the VF3 industry postdates the T4 terrace and predates the deposition of the Carregueira Formation (the aeolian unit covering the terrace). This stratigraphic position is important for understanding the likelihood of a much younger age for this typologically much evolved Acheulian industry, the so-called Micoquian. The VF3 lithic industry is mainly of quartzite composition with the most important typological groups being: bifaces (8%), cleavers (4%), side-scrapers (9%), pebble tools (15%), flake tools (9%), cores (13%) and flakes (42%) (Figs. 13 and 14).
This degree of evolution and the highly standardized character of the bifaces that are made from quartzite, indicate that the raw material did not constitute an impediment to producing evolved tools. The level of sophistication is similar to that of bifaces manufactured from flint, a raw material that is much more favorable for long knapping and retouching sequences than quartzite. Typologically (according to the Jacques Tixier system) cleavers from the VF3 appear to be quite “primitive”. However, this primitiveness is probably more apparent than real, and is probably related to the nature of the typological system in use – this is mainly technologically oriented, rather than morphologically oriented as it is more common in all traditional typological systems. In fact, due to the absence of the Levallois method and its corresponding flaked products, all cleavers are made on large entirely cortical or semi-cortical flakes, obtained from large cobles. These flakes have been referred to as “Acheulian flakes” since the 1940s (Zbyszewski, 1943). These flakes comprise a much more standardised support, either in terms of thickness indexes as in term of elongation indexes. The flaking platform is almost always cortical (rarely planar) and is often laterally situated, tending sometimes to the lower, proximal sector of the flake. From a strictly morphological point of view, the cleavers made on these flakes are as evolved as the bifaces (Raposo, 1996). They show high degrees of symmetry, corresponding to what can be considered the geometrical “mental template” of the prehistoric artisan. So, the differences between “evolved” bifaces and apparently “primitive” cleavers seems to derive from the intention of the Acheulian artisan to use a more complex reduction sequence to obtain the bifaces (successive retouch and edge refining) and to adopt a very limited knapping sequence to produce cleavers. The difference between the refinement procedures of the bifaces and cleavers seems to be more related to the system of classification used: a system oriented to the morphological
evaluation, in the case of the bifaces, and a system of classification oriented to the
evaluation of the technological procedures, in case of cleavers.

Recently published evidence from Britain recognizes assemblages with these same two
distinctive handaxe types (cleavers and ‘lanceolate’ forms) in combined assemblages dating
from around Marine Isotope Stage (MIS) 9, with the chronology based on the position of
such assemblages within the well-dated sequence of the Thames and its tributaries
(Bridgland and White, 2014, 2015). This new evidence arises from a reappraisal of high-
integrity assemblages of handaxes recognized by Roe (1968) (also see Chauhan et al., this
volume).

However, the VF3 bifaces are also similar to those found in the Manzanares Valley
Complex Terrace of Butarque (near Madrid, ~400 km away), which Middle Palaeolithic
stone tools have been dated to between the final Middle Pleistocene (MIS 6, 190-130 ka)
and the early Late Pleistocene (MIS 5, 130-71 ka) (Panera et al., 2014), but also in several
other areas of the Iberian Peninsula, where more evolved tools, such as lanceolate bifaces
and Micoquian forms, surpass the more “primitive” ovate and amygdaloid forms.

Based on the above discussion, we consider that the VF3 industry is likely to represent an
occupation on the surface of the US shortly after its deposition.

5.3 Luminescence dating

Quartz-OSL could only be applied to one palaeosample (132201) and to the two modern
river bed samples (102232, 102263); for all the other samples the quartz natural OSL
signals are too close to saturation to be useful for dating. For these older samples, signals
from K-rich feldspars were used instead because of the higher saturation dose of the
feldspar dose response curve (inset Fig. 15a; \(D_0\) of ~500 Gy, compared to typically ~80 Gy
for fast OSL component in quartz (Wintle and Murray, 2006). The pIRIR\(_{290}\) signal from
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feldspar was chosen because of its stability (Buylaert et al., 2012). We have also undertaken several direct tests of the stability of the pIRIR_{290} signal, the suitability of the applied measurement protocol and the completeness of bleaching of this signal at deposition. Buylaert et al. (2012) have suggested the use of first IR stimulation plateaus to examine the stability of the pIRIR_{290} signal. We have measured such a plateau for sample 102226 collected in the T1 terrace, estimated to have an age of ca. 1.1-0.9 Ma by ESR and OSL dating of the terrace staircase (Cunha et al., 2012, 2016; Rosina et al., 2014; Martins et al., 2010a, 2010b). This sample is old enough that its natural pIRIR_{290} signal is expected to lie at or close to the saturation in the dose response curve (samples of so-called non-finite luminescence age). The ratio of natural pIRIR_{290} signal to the saturation level of the dose response curve varies between 0.93 and 0.95 for first IR stimulations varying between 50°C and 230°C. This demonstrates that the pIRIR_{290} signal is sufficiently stable for dating (effects of fading in nature <10%) and we have adopted 50°C as a suitable prior IR stimulation temperature. The reliability of the SAR pIRIR_{290} dose measurement protocol was further tested using a dose recovery test based on two modern river bed samples (102232 and 102263). Laboratory beta doses ranging from ~15 to ~800 Gy were added to natural aliquots of these two samples and measured in the usual manner. The measured doses (after subtraction of the small natural dose) are plotted as a function of the given laboratory doses in Fig. 15b. It can be seen that large laboratory doses, given prior to heat treatment, can be accurately recovered with this protocol. It is obviously important to be confident that the pIRIR_{290} signal was well-bleached at deposition. For the single aeolian sample (132201) the agreement with the quartz age control confirms adequate bleaching prior to deposition. For the fluvial samples we have
two lines of argument. First of all we have taken two sand samples currently in transport
from the modern channel (102232 and 102263) and these both give pIRIR$_{290}$ $D_e$ values $\leq$
20 Gy, small or negligible compared with the other fluvial doses in this study (between 180
Gy and saturation). Secondly, Murray et al. (2012) and Buylaert et al. (2012, 2013) have
shown by exposing natural samples to artificial sunlight for different lengths of time that
the pIRIR$_{290}$ signal bleaches much more slowly than the IR$_{50}$ signal. This differential
bleaching rate can be used to identify samples for which the pIRIR$_{290}$ signal is likely to be
well-bleached (Murray et al., 2012; Buylaert et al., 2013). Fig 15c shows the IR$_{50}$ $D_e$
values as a function of the pIRIR$_{290}$ $D_e$ values. The data are consistent with a smooth curve
passing through the origin. The absence of obvious outliers suggests that all pIRIR$_{290}$
signals were probably well-bleached at deposition in comparison with their subsequent
burial doses. It could be argued that the two samples lying below the line on the pIRIR$_{290}$
axis might suggest incomplete bleaching of the pIRIR$_{290}$ signal. But we are fortunate that
the sample (102233; 81±4 ka) lying immediately above the layer with independent U-
series age control (81.9 +4.0/-3.8 ka; Raposo, 1995a) lies in this group, clearly confirming
that this sample was adequately bleached. The sample immediately below (102263; 75±14
ka) is also consistent with the age control and with a pIRIR$_{290}$ $D_e$ of 200±35 Gy lies on the
smooth line (Fig. 15c).

Six out of the nineteen samples reported in Tables 3 and 4 have $D_e$ values lying above
2xDD$_0$ (corresponding to 86% of luminescence saturation). Especially in view of the
possibility of small systematic errors in the measurement of the luminescence signal (Fig.
15a), we feel it prudent to adopt the strategy suggested by Wintle and Murray (2006) of
only presenting minimum doses for these samples (equivalent to 2xDD$_0$) and the derived
minimum ages. We also note that our measurement protocol has only been tested against
independent age control up to ~2xDD$_0$ (Buylaert et al., 2012).
To constrain the artefacts stratigraphically, most of the samples were collected in T4, at the Vale do Forno and Vale de Atela sections (Fig. 4). Others samples were collected in outcrops of T5 (Figs 3 and 16), one sample in the aeolian sands of the Carregueira Formation and two samples from the river bed (modern). The luminescence dating results are all summarised in Tables 3 and 4.

As stated above, dating by the pIRIR\textsubscript{290} protocol was tested using two samples from the topmost deposits of the T5 terrace of a Tejo tributary, at Santo Antão do Tojal (near Vila Franca de Xira; Fig. 2) from which a large elephant bone was collected and dated by using the U/Th series (Raposo, 1995a). The pIRIR\textsubscript{290} ages of the samples Atojal-1 and Atojal-2 (Table 4), taken from the same stratigraphic levels, corroborate the independent age obtained by the U/Th series (81.9 ±4.0/-3.8 ka).

Sample 132203 (Atela 3) was collected in the LG unit, from a gravel pit situated in the right-bank (northern side) of the Vale de Atela (V.Atela-W) (Figs. 4, 5 and 7). Stratigraphically, it is the lowest sample of the terrace T4 (LG – middle part), collected in the Alpiarça area. Because the natural pIRIR\textsubscript{290} signal is in saturation only a minimum age of >200 ka is given (Table 4).

The samples collected at the base of the US unit (AM-22 and VCaval-1) all gave minimum ages, respectively of >270 ka and >200 ka. Sample 052216 (AM-15) (>270 ka) was taken below the levels containing the Late Acheulian artefacts of the VF8 site and the other samples from sites located far away (Figs. 3, 4 and 17), but in an equivalent stratigraphic level of the sample AM 15.

From the middle part of the US unit a minimum age (AM-21; >300 ka) and a finite age (VForno 8-2; 201±16 ka), were obtained. The VForno 8-2 sample is located 4 m above the stratigraphic level containing the VF8 artefacts (Figs. 4, 6, 7) and therefore the artefacts of the VF8 site are older than 200 ka and, probably somewhat older than 300 ka.
Sample Atela 2 (132202) was collected at ca. 2.5 m below the local eroded surface of the T4 terrace and provided a minimum age (>200 ka). The samples VForno-1 (132244) and VForno-2 (132245) were collected at the T4 topmost deposits (Figs. 4 and 7) and gave ages of 158 ± 9 and 154 ± 10 ka, that are according to stratigraphy. Throughout the T4 sequence, the finite luminescence ages are always in stratigraphic order. Due to the high dose rates, the LG unit and the base of the US unit were found outside the upper range of the pIRIR\textsubscript{290} method. Sediments of the middle and upper part of the US unit provided finite ages (not minimum) only occasionally. The topmost deposits of the T4 terrace are on the threshold of the dating method and have an age of ca. 155 ka.

In summary, the new pIRIR\textsubscript{290} ages for the T4 deposits in the study area indicate that:

1) The LG unit, containing the artefacts reported by Zbyszewsky (1946), has an age much older than 300 ka;
2) The lower and middle part of the US unit, containing the VF1 and VF8 Acheulian industries, has a probable age of ca. 330 to 200 ka;
3) The upper part of the US unit has an age of 200 to 155 ka.

Samples Muge-1 (PC5239), Muge-2 (PC5240) and PSabug-2 (102231), collected from the T5 top deposits (Fig. 16), yielded ages of ca. 95 to 75 ka.

The sample Azinh-3 (39 ± 2 ka), taken from the topmost deposits of the terrace mapped near the village of Azinhaga (Fig. 3), confirms the geomorphological correlation of this terrace with the T6 level. From other luminescence dating studies, the T6 terrace has been dated as ca. 65 ka (base deposits) to ca. 32 ka (top deposits) and correlated with MIS 3 (Martins et al., 2010a, 2010b; Cunha et al., 2008, 2012).

Finally, the aeolian sands of the Carregueira Formation, that covers the T5 and T4 terraces in the study area, was dated at Almeirim (sample Almer-1; 132201) as 19.1±1.1 ka (Quartz-OSL).
6. Discussion

In an environment of continuous uplift, the formation of fluvial terraces has been correlated with climate changes (e.g. Gibbard and Lewin, 2002; Bridgland and Westaway, 2008; Bull, 2009) but lower reaches could be dominated by sea-level changes (e.g. Merritts et al., 1994; Blum and Törnqvist, 2000; Lewis et al., 2004). The data obtained in the study area indicate that the terrace aggradation episodes can be correlated with the Marine Isotope Stages (MIS; e.g. Wright, 2000; Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005). Being much older than 300 ka, the LG unit most likely corresponds to the earlier part of the MIS 9 (337 to 325 ka), immediately postdating incision promoted by the very low sea level (reaching ca. -140 m) during MIS 10 (362 to 337 ka) (Fig. 17). This suggests that the aggradation of the coarse-grained T4 terrace base has probably occurred during a period of low sea level and relatively cold climatic conditions (e.g. Gibbard and Lewin, 2002), probably marked by sparse vegetation cover on slopes (Roucoux et al., 2006). This climate relationship for valley floor aggradation is typical of many large European river systems (e.g. Bridgland and Westaway, 2008). During the post-MIS 10 period, sea level was rising fast (Murray-Wallace and Woodroffe, 2014). The sedimentary architecture of the amalgamated channel deposits of the LG unit seems compatible with the ca. 335 to 325 ka age estimate, as it suggests a coarse bedload river with high sediment supply.

The lower and middle parts of the US unit, comprising alternations of clayey silts, sands and palaeosols on clays to the east (flood-plain deposits) and dominant sand deposits to the west (channel belt), have a probable age of ca. 325 to 200 ka. This suggests formation during a period spanning MIS 9 through to MIS 7 (Fig. 17). This time period was characterised by: (i) high to medium sea levels (Murray-Wallace and Woodroffe, 2014); (ii) warm to
mild climatic conditions (the interstadials of the MIS 7 were similar to the present Mediterranean climate) intercalated with a cold period during the late part of the MIS 8 (Roucoux et al., 2006; White et al., in press).

The sandy upper part of the US unit, with a probable age of 200 to 155 ka, seems to relate to the early part of MIS 6 (Fig. 17). In this period, climate deterioration and a relative depletion of vegetation cover would have allowed enhanced sediment production in the catchment, while progressive sea-level lowering increased the longitudinal valley slope.

This would have resulted in down-valley progradation of coarse grained fluvial deposits along the Tejo valley. Within the study area this is recorded by the covering of the fine-grained floodplain deposits by the sandy deposits of the upper part of the US unit.

The T5 terrace, located immediately below the T4, represents the MIS 5 in reach IV, and is correlated with the same terrace level in the upstream reaches of the Lower Tejo (ca. 135 to 75 ka). This time period was characterised by high to medium sea-levels (Fig. 17) and warm to mild climatic conditions (Salgueiro et al., 2010).

The Carregueira Formation is an aeolian sand unit represented in several reaches of the Lower Tejo valley and can be related to the cold and dry climatic conditions that occurred between ca. 32 and 12 ka, during the Last Glacial period (MIS 2; Roucoux et al., 2005; Martins et al., 2010b; Cunha et al., 2012) (Fig. 17).

Additional palaeoenvironmental interpretations concerning the genesis of T4 can be made using the palaeosols that occur interbedded in the clays at the top of the middle part of US unit (Figs. 9 and 17). Their position, just above the VF8 archaeological level and below the level of the VForno8-2 sample, suggests a period spanning ca. 300 to 200 ka. The mottles and concretions within these soils, together with the presence of well-developed pressure faces and slickensides in the more clay rich horizons, suggest that the soils were subject to
alternating wetting-drying cycles (Pal et al., 2009; Vepraskas and Lindbo, 2012). This hydromorphic interpretation is compatible with the position of soils within a fine-grained floodplain setting where the water table is close to the surface. Nevertheless, the variation of soil humidity suggests a strong seasonal variability in the floodplain, with waterlogged conditions presumably related to winter rain and flooding, and drying-up during the summer. Such a hydrological regime, typical of the Mediterranean climate, is consistent with palynological data from offshore Portugal (Roucoux et al., 2006), where forest expansions with a significant contribution from the Mediterranean floral elements were recorded during the three warm sub-stages MIS 7a, 7c, and 7e, that occurred between 243 and 185 ka (Fig. 17).

Each palaeosol represents a hiatus in the alluvial sequence and indicates a period of floodplain stability. Forest expansion in MIS7 warm sub-stages would be favourable to lower sedimentation rates in the alluvial plain, with deposition dominated by fines, and palaeosol development. In turn, the cold and dry sub-stages with pronounced contraction of tree populations would be favourable to slope erosion and increased sedimentation rates on the alluvial plain, with deposition dominated by sands. The minimum time for formation of each palaeosol is thought to be of the order of 10³-10⁴ years (Yaalon, 1983), consistent with the duration of sub-stages. A future detailed sampling in stratigraphy, for absolute dating, could address this topic.

Previous studies in the Alpiarça area linked the T4 US unit to the Late Riss to Early Würm period of the Alpine chronology (i.e. ca. 150 to 70 ka). This chronology was mainly based on the technical and typological refinement of the VF3 site industry and on the TL minimum ages then obtained (Raposo, 1995; Mozzi et al., 2000). Additionally, chronological constraints were also based on local and regional geomorphological
considerations. However, the new luminescence ages presented within this study suggests
the basal and middle parts of the US unit, containing the Middle and Late Acheulian VF1
and VF8 sites, are likely to be much older, ca. 310 ka.

The lithic industry of the VF3 site should not be considered as belonging to the alluvial
sequence of the T4 terrace, as already discussed by Raposo (1996). The VF3 artefacts were
worked on the T4 surface and were later covered by a colluvium and aeolian sands. If this
colluvium can be ascribed to the base of the Carregueira Formation, with an age of 32 to
12 ka and containing in situ Late Palaeolithic artefacts (Cunha et al., 2012), the VF3
industry should be younger than ca. 155 ka but much older than 32 ka. Based on the
typology of the handaxes, the age of this industry could not be much younger than 155 ka.

In the Middle and Upper Tejo/Tajo (in Spain) a maximum of 16 “true” fluvial terraces (not
considering fan-head trench terraces) have been identified and dated by combining
absolute ages and paleomagnetic data (Silva et al., 2016): (i) the first Palaeolithic materials
are represented by isolated large flint flakes of apparent early Acheulian fracture, and
these are associated with the +100-107 m to +80-85 m terraces (probably with ages ca. 1.4-
1.2 Ma); (ii) Acheulian sites were found in terraces ranging from +70-78 m (probably ca.
1.1-1.0 Ma) to +18-22 m (ca. 135 to 74 ka), the later terrace has upper stratigraphic levels
containing Middle Palaeolithic industry with Mousterian knapping technology; (iii)
Mousterian sites were found in terraces between +15-13 m to +8-10 m (ca. 60 to 28 ka)
(e.g. Santonja and Pérez-González, 2010; Pérez-González et al., 2013; Panera et al., 2014;
López-Recio et al., 2015; Roquero et al., 2015a, 2015b; Rubio-Jara et al., 2016). The most
complete list of artefacts associated with a warm faunal assemblage was found in the
Acheulian sites of Pinedo and Cien Fanegas (Tagus valley, near Toledo) in the +25-30 m
terrace, with top deposits dated as 226±37 ka (by Amino-Acid Racemization) and the base
deposits dated as >280 ka and 292±17 ka (pIR-IRSL) (López-Recio et al., 2013, 2015). So, this terrace of the Middle Tejo correlates well with the Lower Tejo T4 terrace. However, there are not enough reliable and precise absolute ages to support a detailed correlation between the staircases of the Middle and Upper Tejo/Tajo (in Spain, up to 16 fluvial terrace levels) and the Lower Tejo (in Portugal, only 6 terrace levels). We should also note that the sedimentary controls for the formation of the Lower Tejo staircases are different (mainly glacio-eustasy and differential uplift) and that the Lower Tejo is separated from the Middle and Upper Tejo by a large permanent knick zone of hard basement (Cunha et al., 2016; Silva et al., 2016). The ages already obtained from the terraces of the lower reach of the Portuguese Mondego River (Ramos et al., 2012) seem to correlate well with the Lower Tejo River terraces; both of the river reaches seem to have glacio-eustatic control on their development.

7. Conclusions

Geomorphological analysis of the Lower Tejo reach IV confirms the existence of six sedimentary terrace levels, discontinuously represented along the entire of the Lower Tejo valley. In the upstream reaches I and III, six terrace levels have already been recognized by previous workers. Longitudinal correlation between these terraces indicates that a graded profile ca. 200 km long was achieved during terrace formation periods and a strong control by marine base level was a key determinant for terrace formation. In the study area, the sedimentary units of the T4 terrace seem to record the fluvial response to sea-level changes and climatically-driven fluctuations in sediment supply. The thick, coarse and dominantly massive gravels of the LG unit indicate deposition by a coarse bed-load braided river, with strong sediment supply, high gradient and fluvial com-
petence, during conditions of rapidly rising sea level. Luminescence dating only provided minimum ages but it is probable that the LG unit corresponds to the earlier part of the MIS 9 (337 to 325 ka), immediately postdating the incision promoted by the very low sea level (reaching ca. -140 m) during MIS 10 (362 to 337 ka), a period of relatively cold climate conditions with weak vegetation cover on slopes and low sea level.

The lower and middle parts of the US unit, comprising an alternation of clayish silts with palaeosols and minor sands to the east (flood-plain deposits) and sand deposits to the west (channel belt), have a probable age of ca. 325 to 200 ka. This suggests formation during MIS 9 to MIS 7, under conditions of warm to cold conditions and a high to medium sea level.

The upper part of the US unit, dominated by sand facies and with an age of ca. 200 to 155 ka, correlates with the early part of the MIS 6. During this period, fluvial aggradation and progradation resulted from climate deterioration and relative depletion of vegetation that promoted enhanced sediment production in the catchment, coupled with initiation of sea-level lowering that increased the longitudinal slope.

The oldest artefacts previously found in the LG unit, display crude bifacial forms that can be attributed to the Acheulian, with a probable age of ca. 335 to 325 ka. The VF1 and VF8 Acheulian industries, situated in the T4 US unit, probably date 325 to 300 ka. Notably, these Lower Palaeolithic artisans were able to produce tools with different levels of sophistication, simply by applying different strategies. More elaborated reduction sequences were used in case of bifaces, and simpler reduction sequences to obtain cleavers. The VF3 artefacts were abandoned on the T4 surface and later covered by a colluvium and aeolian sands. This industry is younger than ca. 155 ka but much older than 32 ka; we
consider that the VF3 industry should be interpreted as representing an occupation on the T4 surface shortly after the end of deposition.

The differences observed in the lithic assemblages documented at each of these sites can be attributed to a certain degree to particular economic functionalities. But, simultaneously, taking into account the stratigraphic position of these sites and the global technological and typological characteristics of the most relevant tools types (bifaces, cleavers, side-scrapers) we are also impelled to consider the occurrence of local evolutionary chronological trends. More data is still needed, however, not only to narrowly establish the age of each site, but also to relate this local sequence to others, at the regional level. This will hopefully allow the development of a new and more complete technological framework.
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**Figure captions**

**Fig. 1.** Location of the study area in the Lower Tejo (central Portugal). Hipsometry and digital elevation model obtained from SRTM data.

**Fig. 2.** Simplified geological map of the region (adapted from the Carta Geológica de Portugal, 1/500,000, Oliveira et al., 1992 and Barbosa, 1995). 1 – metasediments of the Hesperian Massif; 2 – granites of the Hesperian Massif; 3 – limestones and sandstones (Mesozoic); 4 – sandstones and conglomerates (Palaeogene); 5 – sands (Lower Miocene); 6 – silts and clays (Miocene); 7 – limestones, silts and clays (Miocene); 8 – gravels and sands (Pliocene); 9 – gravels of fluviatile terraces (Pleistocene); 10 – modern alluvium: mud, silt and sand (Holocene); 11 – thrust fault; 12 - fault; 13 - stream; 14 – archaeological site.
Fig. 3. Terrace staircase of the River Tejo reach IV. The T6 terrace is only visible near Azinhaga village, whilst T5 is buried by modern alluvium downstream of Muge. Note the asymmetric development of the terraces between the two sides of Tejo valley downstream of Chamusca. Terraces are very scarce on the west side of the river valley.

Fig. 4. Map of the Alpiarça area, comprising the River Tejo tributary valleys of Vale do Forno and Vale de Atela. Location of the sites and cross sections (A – Á and B – B’). It is deduced from the contour lines that the interfluves between the Vale do Forno and Vale de Atela is developed in eroded (dissected) uppermost T4 deposits.

Fig. 5. Stratigraphic cross section A – Á. See Fig. 4 for location of the cross section and location of the OSL samples AM 21 and Atela 3.

Fig. 6. Stratigraphic cross section B – B’. This section shows that the US unit is dominated by sand channel facies in the west and rich in flood-plain clayish silts in the east. The topographic position of sample AM 15 is at near distance from the cross section (see Fig. 4), in the west side of the Vale do Forno streamlet.

Fig. 7. Stratigraphic logs of the sections at V. Forno (the VF8 site), V. Atela–W and V. Atela–E (see Fig. 4 for location). Most of the samples for luminescence dating are from here (AM 15, VForno 8-2, VForno 8-7, VForno 1, VForno 2, Atela 2, Atela 3 and Atela 4). 1 – archaeological level; 2 – vegetal macro remains; 3 – coal fragment; 4 – channel geometry; 5 – fossil roots; 6 – Maximum pebble size (mean diameter of the larger 10 clasts per level); 7 – sample for luminescence dating; 8 – sample for sedimentology; 9 – paleocurrent derived from planar cross-bedding.

Fig. 8. The V. Atela-E outcrop, with the base at the transition of the LG unit to the US unit. Almost all of the local thickness of the US unit is exposed here (ca. 18 m). The Atela 2 sample was collected at ~2.5 m below the cliff top.

Fig. 9. Paleosols developed in the overbank deposits of the T4 terrace US unit, at the AL1 site.
**Fig. 10.** Large Acheulian cutting tools from VF1 site. 1 to 4 – Cleavers; 5 to 9 – Bifaces.

**Fig 11.** The Acheulian industry of VF8 site. Large cutting tools. 1 to 4 – Cleavers; 5 to 9 – Bifaces.

**Fig 12.** The Acheulian industry of VF8 site. Flake tools. 1 to 6 – Denticulates and notches; 7 to 10 – Sidescrapers; 11 to 20 – Borers; 21 and 22 – Scrapers on ventral face.

**Fig 13.** The final Acheulian industry of VF3 site (Milharós site). Bifacial tools. 1 to 5 – Bifaces (Micoquian, lanceolate, ovalar); 6 and 7 – Bifaces with distal cutting edge.

**Fig 14.** The final Acheulian industry of VF3 site (Milharós site). Large cutting tools on primary Acheulian flakes and cores. 1 to 3 – Cleavers; 4 – Chopper on probably broken cleaver; 5 – Sidescraper; 6 – Bypiramidal core; 7 – Proto-Levallois core.

**Fig. 15.** a) First IR stimulation plateau for sample 102226. The natural signals are expressed as a fraction of the saturation level of the dose response curve. Three aliquots were measured per temperature and error bars represent one standard error. The inset shows the sensitivity corrected natural pIRIR290 signal (horizontal solid line) interpolated on the dose response curve for one aliquot measured using a first IR stimulation temperature of 50°C. b) Results of the dose recovery measurements. At least three aliquots were measured per data point and error bars represent one standard error. c) IR50 De values plotted as a function of the pIRIR290 De values for samples for which the pIRIR290 De is ≤ 2xD0 (see Table 4); error bars represent one standard error. The dashed line is the best fit through the data points.

**Fig. 16.** Map of the Tejo terrace staircase in the Muge area, downstream of Alpiarça. Stratigraphic location of the samples collected for luminescence dating: AM-22 (T4, base of the US unit); PSabug-2 (T5 top); Muge-1 and Muge-2 (T5 top); Almer-1 (Carregueira Formation; aeolian cover sands, not mapped in this figure).

**Fig. 17.** Burial ages of samples collected from Middle to Late Pleistocene sedimentary units of the Tejo reach IV, plotted according to the respective elevation a.r.b. (right axis).
Horizontal bars indicate the dominant lithologies for the fluvial deposits (black – gravels; blue – sands; green – silty clays) and the probable age range of each sedimentary unit. For this reach, the periods of aggradation are represented by green line segments and the periods of river downcutting are represented by red line segments that cross the sea-level curve (scaled benthic isotopes from V19-30, after Cutler et al., 2003), testifying a dominant sedimentary control by glacio-eustasy. T3, T4, T5 and T6 – terraces; CS – Carregueira Formation (aeolian sands); AP – Alluvial plain deposits. MIS intervals are according to Lisiecki and Raymo (2005). ESR – Electron Spin Resonance age; pIRIR – post-IR IRSL$_{290}$ SAR age (m – minimum age); IRSL – IRSL$_{50}$ SAR age (m – minimum age); Qz-OSL – Quartz OSL SAR age.

Table captions

Table 1
Summary of the geomorphological and sedimentological characteristics of the sedimentary units present in the terrace staircase at Alpiarça. The main sites containing Palaeolithic industries located in the Lower Tejo reach IV are also listed. MPS – maximum pebble size (cm).

Table 2
The main features of palaeosols within the US unit.

Table 3
Burial depth, Radionuclide activities ($^{238}$U, $^{226}$Ra, $^{232}$Th and $^{40}$K) and water content used for dose rate calculations of the luminescence dating samples.

Table 4
Summary of the luminescence ages obtained from sediment samples of the study area. All ages were obtained by using a post IRIR$_{290}$ protocol (K-feldspar; KF). For samples having natural pIRIR$_{290}$ signals >86% of the saturation level of the dose response curves, a minimum age is given based on the 2xD$_0$ value. The doses used to calculate ages are highlighted in bold. The IR$_{50}$ D$_e$ values were obtained as part of the pIRIR$_{290}$ measurement
protocol. Samples 132201 (Almer-1), 102232 (PSabug-3) and 102263 (Ptmuge) were also measured using standard large aliquot quartz SAR-OSL (Q).
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geomorphic unit, main site</th>
<th>Elevation above sea level and above river bed</th>
<th>Down-cutting from the previous geomorphic unit</th>
<th>Thickness of the associated deposits</th>
<th>Sedimentary characteristics of the associated sedimentary deposits</th>
<th>Main sites with lithic industries in stratigraphy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culminant surface of the sedimentary basin (CSS)</td>
<td><strong>152 m a.s.l.</strong> + <strong>144 m (a.r.b.)</strong></td>
<td>0 m</td>
<td>35-40 m</td>
<td>Gravels with very coarse sands with through cross lamination. Clasts of quartzite (80%) and quartz (20%). MPS = 15 cm</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 terrace</td>
<td><strong>115 m a.s.l.</strong> + <strong>107 m (a.r.b.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>42 m</strong></td>
<td>5 m</td>
<td>Gravels with clasts of quartzite (76%) and quartz (26%). MPS = 22 cm</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 terrace</td>
<td><strong>82 m a.s.l.</strong> + <strong>74 m (a.r.b.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>40 m</strong></td>
<td>6-7 m</td>
<td>Gravels with clasts of quartzite (69%) and quartz (31%). MPS = 17 cm</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3 terrace</td>
<td><strong>60 m a.s.l.</strong> + <strong>52 m (a.r.b.)</strong></td>
<td>32 m</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td>Gravels with clasts of quartzite (56%) and quartz (44%). MPS = 22 cm</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4 terrace</td>
<td><strong>38 m a.s.l.</strong> + <strong>30 m (a.r.b.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>52 m</strong></td>
<td>25-30 m</td>
<td>Gravels with clasts of quartzite (68%) and quartz (32%). MPS=20cm. Sands and clays.</td>
<td><strong>Acheulean</strong>; Vale do Forno; Vale da Atela; Quinta da Boavista; Ribeira da Ponte da Pedra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5 terrace (partially buried)</td>
<td><strong>15 m a.s.l.</strong> + <strong>7 m (a.r.b.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>33 m</strong></td>
<td>ca. 9-10 m</td>
<td>Coarse to fine sands and clays</td>
<td><strong>Mousterian</strong>; S. Antão do Tojal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6 terrace (buried)</td>
<td>-4 m a.s.l. + <strong>12 m (a.r.b.)</strong></td>
<td>ca. <strong>37 m</strong></td>
<td>ca. 18 m</td>
<td>Very coarse gravelly sands</td>
<td><strong>Late Mousterian</strong>; Santa Cita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial plain</td>
<td><strong>10 m a.s.l.</strong> + <strong>2 m (a.r.b.)</strong></td>
<td>ca. <strong>24 m</strong></td>
<td>ca. 30 m</td>
<td>Silty clays and coarse to fine sands</td>
<td><strong>Mesolithic</strong> and more recent industries (several sites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>Thickness (cm)</td>
<td>Grain size</td>
<td>Colour (Munsell)</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Slickensides pressure faces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(upper)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
<td>10YR 5/2</td>
<td>very coarse platy from sedimentary laminae</td>
<td>common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
<td>10YR 5/2</td>
<td>strong coarse prismatic</td>
<td>abundant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bw</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>5Y 6/3</td>
<td>strong coarse prismatic</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCi</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>clayey silt</td>
<td>2.5Y 6/2</td>
<td>moderate coarse prismatic</td>
<td>common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(middle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
<td>10YR 5/3</td>
<td>strong coarse prismatic</td>
<td>abundant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bw</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>2.5Y 5/4</td>
<td>strong coarse prismatic to angular blocky massive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>sandy silt</td>
<td>2.5Y 6/4</td>
<td>massive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>silty coarse sand</td>
<td>2.5Y 6/4</td>
<td>massive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lower)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
<td>10YR 5/3</td>
<td>strong coarse prismatic</td>
<td>Abundant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bw</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>2.5Y 6/4</td>
<td>weak coarse angular blocky</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>2.5Y 6/4</td>
<td>weak coarse angular blocky</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample code</th>
<th>Field code</th>
<th>Burial Depth (cm)</th>
<th>U-238 (Bq kg(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Ra-226 (Bq kg(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Th-232 (Bq kg(^{-1}))</th>
<th>K-40 (Bq kg(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Water content (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132201</td>
<td>Almer 1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12±4</td>
<td>17.4±0.4</td>
<td>22.8±0.5</td>
<td>808±14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072226</td>
<td>Azinh-3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49±8</td>
<td>34.1±0.7</td>
<td>46.5±0.8</td>
<td>853±17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102233</td>
<td>SATojal-1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>55±10</td>
<td>44.2±0.9</td>
<td>71.3±1.1</td>
<td>710±16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102272</td>
<td>Atojal-2</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>18±3</td>
<td>21.2±0.3</td>
<td>32.9±0.4</td>
<td>368±8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102231</td>
<td>PSabug-2</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>41±6</td>
<td>40.2±0.7</td>
<td>61.3±0.8</td>
<td>875±19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC5239</td>
<td>Muge-1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30±6</td>
<td>20.2±0.5</td>
<td>23.0±0.5</td>
<td>989±18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC5240</td>
<td>Muge-2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14±3</td>
<td>14.0±0.3</td>
<td>18.3±0.3</td>
<td>806±14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132245</td>
<td>VForo-2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14±6</td>
<td>12.2±0.5</td>
<td>14.2±0.5</td>
<td>1022±20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132244</td>
<td>VForo-1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14±6</td>
<td>17.5±0.5</td>
<td>22.3±0.6</td>
<td>964±18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072257</td>
<td>VForo8-2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>61±8</td>
<td>56.6±0.9</td>
<td>63.6±1.0</td>
<td>829±17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052216</td>
<td>AM-15</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>13±4</td>
<td>16.4±0.6</td>
<td>20.0±0.6</td>
<td>1054±21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052222</td>
<td>AM-21</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>24±6</td>
<td>19.9±1.0</td>
<td>24.6±0.9</td>
<td>800±29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052223</td>
<td>AM-22</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>20±4</td>
<td>19.6±0.5</td>
<td>14.3±0.4</td>
<td>873±15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132246</td>
<td>VCaval-1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>17±7</td>
<td>21.2±0.6</td>
<td>32.6±0.7</td>
<td>1003±20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132202</td>
<td>Atela-2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>26±6</td>
<td>25.4±0.5</td>
<td>30.4±0.6</td>
<td>907±17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132203</td>
<td>Atela-3</td>
<td>&gt;1100</td>
<td>28±6</td>
<td>18.6±0.5</td>
<td>17.5±0.6</td>
<td>962±19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102226</td>
<td>VgPeso-1</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>18±7</td>
<td>13.8±0.5</td>
<td>21.8±0.6</td>
<td>798±16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102263</td>
<td>Ptmuge</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21±3</td>
<td>24.5±0.3</td>
<td>28.8±0.4</td>
<td>1125±17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102232</td>
<td>Psabug-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28±7</td>
<td>22.7±0.6</td>
<td>22.6±0.6</td>
<td>1104±21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>NLL and field code</td>
<td>Altitude (m)</td>
<td>Lithology and Lithostratigraphic unit</td>
<td>IR$_{50}$ D$_e$ (Gy)</td>
<td>pIRIR$_{200}$ D$_e$ (Gy)</td>
<td>pIRIR$_{200}$ 2°Do (Gy)</td>
<td>Dose rate (Gy/ka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeirim</td>
<td>132201 Almer-1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Aeolian medium sand Carregueira formation</td>
<td>42.6±1.5</td>
<td>60.7±1.9 (Q)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.18±0.14 (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.6±1.7 (FK)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.00±0.15 (FK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azinhaga</td>
<td>072226 Azinh-3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>Pebbley coarse sand T6 (top)</td>
<td>102±7</td>
<td>181±8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.64±0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sto. Antão do Tojal</td>
<td>102233 SATojal-1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Medium sand T5 (top)</td>
<td>155±9</td>
<td>399±10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.93±0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto Sabugueiro</td>
<td>102231 PSabug-2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Coarse sand T5 (top)</td>
<td>104±11</td>
<td>200±35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.66±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib. Muge</td>
<td>PC5239 Muge-1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medium to fine sand T5 (top)</td>
<td>259±16</td>
<td>426±12</td>
<td>846±66</td>
<td>4.57±0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib. Muge</td>
<td>PC5240 Muge-2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>Medium to fine sand T5 (top)</td>
<td>235±5</td>
<td>355±13</td>
<td>838±14</td>
<td>3.81±0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale do Forno</td>
<td>132245 VForno-2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>Medium sand T4 (US topmost)</td>
<td>410±20</td>
<td>685±25</td>
<td>861±14</td>
<td>4.44±0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale do Forno</td>
<td>132244 VForno-1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Medium sand T4 (US topmost)</td>
<td>370±30</td>
<td>661±24</td>
<td>1042±25</td>
<td>4.19±0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale do Forno</td>
<td>072257 VForno8-2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Fine sand T4 (US middle)</td>
<td>490±20</td>
<td>1011±71</td>
<td>1022±55</td>
<td>5.03±0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale do Forno</td>
<td>052216 AM-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Coarse sand T4 (US base)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1130±90</td>
<td>963±10</td>
<td>3.64±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinta dos Patudos</td>
<td>052222 AM-21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Coarse sand T4 (US middle)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1330±270</td>
<td>1048±45</td>
<td>3.53±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Site Code</td>
<td>Site Code</td>
<td>Depth (m)</td>
<td>Sand Type</td>
<td>T4 Type</td>
<td>wt. (g/l)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonte da Burra</td>
<td>052223</td>
<td>AM-22</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Coarse sand</td>
<td>T4 (US base)</td>
<td>1180±50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale de Cavalos</td>
<td>132246</td>
<td>VCaval-1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Medium sand</td>
<td>T4 (US base)</td>
<td>1700±60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale de Atela</td>
<td>132202</td>
<td>Atela-2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Medium sand</td>
<td>T4 (US top)</td>
<td>1170±70</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale de Atela</td>
<td>132203</td>
<td>Atela-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pebbley medium sand</td>
<td>T4 (LG middle)</td>
<td>1500±290</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. geodésico Peso</td>
<td>102226</td>
<td>Vg Peso 1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Gravelly coarse sand</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>1600±50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto de Muge</td>
<td>102263</td>
<td>Ptnuge</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Medium sand</td>
<td>Modern river bed</td>
<td>3.6±1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto Sabugueiro</td>
<td>102232</td>
<td>PSabug-3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Coarse sand</td>
<td>Modern river bed</td>
<td>2.7±0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 15

Graph a) shows the relationship between first IR stimulation temperature (°C) and fraction of saturation. The x-axis represents the temperature in °C, ranging from 50 to 250, and the y-axis represents the fraction of saturation ranging from 0.00 to 1.00. The graph includes a curve labeled $D_0 = 550$ Gy.

Graph b) illustrates the relationship between measured/natural dose (Gy) and given dose (Gy). The graph includes data points for two different samples, labeled 102263 and 102232, with error bars indicating variability. The graph also includes lines representing +10% and -10% deviations.

Graph c) depicts the relationship between $pIRIR_{290} D_e$ (Gy) and $IR_{350} D_e$ (Gy). The graph includes a line with a slope of 1:1, indicating a linear relationship.