

Author responses to referee comments on “Thickness of the divide and flank of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet through the last deglaciation”

Perry Spector et al.
Pspector@bgc.org

Referee comments and our responses are shown in black and blue, respectively.

Response to Anonymous Referee #1

Spector et al. report new data from the Weddell Sea sector and from the Ross Sea Weddell Sea ice divide in West Antarctica. The last glacial maximum (LGM) highstand is determined from the elevation of young (post-60 kyr BP) Be-10 and saturated C-14 nuclide concentrations, and modelled scenarios of past ice thickness change at the sites. The authors then interpret these respective ice thickness changes to record a combination of snowfall accumulation and dynamic thinning through the deglaciation. The paper is generally well-written with clear figures and adequate provision of supplementary data. The data are new with robust lab, measurement and calculation procedures, and the approach to determine ice thickness change from these data is novel. The data are worthy of publication and the conclusions would be of interest to the readers of The Cryosphere. However, I have some concerns that need to be addressed, which have potential implications for the reliability of the paper's conclusions.

Thank you for the careful review of the manuscript and helpful comments. We have incorporated them as described below.

Main comments:

1. Treatment of Be-10 and C-14 data

As the authors point out, C-14 has an advantage over Be-10 owing to the shorter decay time, which prevents most inheritance from pre-exposure from being recorded in the sample concentrations. At Pirrit Hills, the Be-10 ages are used to indicate when the local ice surface reached a highstand (e.g. before 18 kyr BP; page 6, lines 19- 21). Yet, it is noted for other studies that the use of C-14 has highlighted that approx. LGM Be-10 ages are not reliable indicators of the highstand (page 7, lines 3-5). The authors do not acknowledge the possibility that their Be-10 ages may similarly record minor inheritance, which would therefore make them minimum age estimates and less reliable highstand indicators.

To address this, we have added the following sentences to the end of the first paragraph of Section 4.1.

“Strictly, we cannot rule out the possibility that the youngest ages also record minor prior exposure. However, the similarity of these ages to the youngest ages from the nearby

Heritage Range (discussed below) suggests that this effect is either absent or minor, amounting to less than 1-2 kyr.”

Samples with C-14 concentrations that are indistinguishable from saturation are used to delimit the LGM highstand at Whitmore Mountains (e.g. page 7, lines 8-9). The Nichols et al. TCD paper (which shares authors with this paper) discusses how high C-14 concentrations can result from analytical and geomorphic issues – what is there to say that any of these saturated samples do not suffer from the same issues? Can we trust this approach for delimiting the LGM highstand?

The delimitation of the highstand has implications for the interpretation of ice thickness change (e.g. which modelled scenarios are ruled out).

This comment is similar to a comment by Referee #2. Both comments will be addressed below in the response to Referee #2.

2. Calculation of ice-cover and exposure history scenarios

There is little discussion about the production rate in the method (page 7, line 31 to page 8, line 24). Do these model scenarios account for sample-specific production rate differences? It appears that production is calculated for spallation only, without any mention of production from muons. Muonic production near the surface is important for C-14 (Lupker et al., 2015; Hippe, 2017) – is this accounted for in these calculations?

This is a good point. Yes, the calculation does include ^{14}C production by spallation as well as from muon interactions. During times when the samples are simulated as being buried by ice or firn, we assume that all production ceases. This is obviously not fully realistic. However, because the thickness of overlying ice or firn is unknown, it is not possible to make a realistic estimate of the ^{14}C production rate by muons during times of burial. The effect of this simplification is minor. As discussed in Section 4.2, cover by only a few meters of firn is sufficient to block the majority of the cosmic-ray flux. We have changed the text to indicate that the production rate, P , includes both spallation and muon interactions.

Minor comments:

Page 1, lines 10-11 (abstract): The final sentence would be better as a conclusion/implications. Perhaps something about how the model(s) calibrated with geological observations performed best.

This is also a good point. We have added the following two sentences:

“Most of the models we consider do not match the observed timing and/or magnitude of thickness change at these sites. However, one model performs well at both sites, which

may, in part, be due to the fact that it was calibrated with geological observations of ice thickness change from other sites in Antarctica.”

Page 1, lines 22-23: Got a suitable reference for this sentence?

We have added a citation to Cuffey & Patterson (2010).

Page 2, lines 2-4: Is there evidence of atmospheric temperatures being warm enough to induce thinning in this region of Antarctica?

Surface temperature, as reconstructed at the WAIS Divide ice-core site, increased primarily between ~20 and ~15 kyr B.P. (Cuffey et al., 2016). Therefore, thinning due to warming may have either (i) not yet commenced to a significant degree or (ii) begun sometime during the Holocene. The only sites we are aware of that provide information about this question are the nunataks near the margin of lower Reedy Glacier in the southern Transantarctic Mountains. As summarized in Section 5.1 of the manuscript,

“Exposure dating at these sites establishes that thinning coincided with deglaciation of a large portion of the Ross Sea 9-7 kyr B.P (Spector et al., 2017; Todd et al., 2010). By ~7-6 kyr B.P., most of the thinning was complete; the ice sheet stood within ~50 of the present-day surface, down from a highstand that was at least ~150 m above present and likely 200-250 m or higher based on the height of depositional limits farther upstream on Reedy Glacier (Todd et al., 2010).”

The scenario in which thinning due to climatic warming began during the Holocene suggests that subsequent surface lowering would have occurred at these sites following ~7 kyr B.P. Such lowering is not observed. Exposure dating of erratics collected very near to the present-day ice level at these sites demonstrate that the ice surface has remained stable since ~7 kyr B.P. (Spector et al., 2017; Todd et al., 2010), which is consistent with the idea that thinning due to warming of the surface has not yet commenced in West Antarctica.

To clarify the manuscript, we have added the following sentence to the third paragraph of Section 1:

“Exposure ages from small nunataks on lower Reedy Glacier demonstrate that ice levels have remained stable since ~7 kyr B.P. (Spector et al., 2017; Todd et al., 2010), suggesting that thinning due to climatic warming following the LGM has not yet commenced to a significant degree in West Antarctica.”

Page 3, lines 19-20: Or, similar to what you mention later, the abundance of debris may relate to debris source (i.e. the ice sheet had access to more debris when near to its highstand).

Variations in debris abundance at different heights could, in part, be due to differences in debris source, as suggested by the reviewer; however, we think the simplest explanation is that debris

abundance varies as a function of the thinning rate and thus the amount of time the ice surface spends at a given height. At the Pirrit Hills, ice-sheet models predict a period of at least a few millennia of limited ice-thickness change when the WAIS is close to its highstand there, followed by more rapid thinning during the deglaciation (Figure 7). Given that thinning rates are generally expected to vary in this way, while there is no a priori expectation regarding the debris source, the most parsimonious explanation is that the abundance of debris is a function of the thinning rate.

This is essentially analogous to the idea that moraines and grounding-zone wedges accumulate when a glacier snout or ice-sheet margin resides in one position for a period of time. The absence of such features up-valley or shoreward are typically interpreted as an indication of the retreat rate, rather than as evidence that the glacier or ice-sheet ran out of rocks to deposit.

In this case, we have opted to not change the manuscript text.

Page 3, line 33 to page 4, line 1: This is an important point, but the data to support it has not been published. This point should be removed or the data included in the Supplement with suitable description and analysis to reach this conclusion.

The sentence about measurements of long-lived cosmogenic-nuclides on the till has been removed. We have replaced it with the following sentence: "The simplest interpretation is that the patch of weathered till is a remnant of a more extensive ancient deposit that has been largely eroded away."

Page 4, lines 23-27: As above. Is it necessary to include the data if the data "are not relevant to this paper"?

The reference to unpublished data has been removed.

Page 6, lines 6-7: Confusing sentence. Is CRONUS-A from the Whitmore Mountains or the McMurdo Dry Valleys?

We have changed this sentence to read: "CRONUS-A was collected from a slowly-eroding site in the McMurdo Dry Valleys (elevation: 1679 m; distance from Whitmore Mountains: 1650 km) that remained ice free during the LGM."

Page 7, lines 11-14: Overly complex sentence which could be made simpler for the reader.

We appreciate the suggestion, but we think that this sentence is relatively straightforward and works well in the context of the preceding and subsequent sentences.

Note that, in this sentence, we replaced “Because we can rule out that ...” with “Because it is very unlikely that...” This was due to the fact that the discussion of unpublished cosmogenic-nuclide data was removed from earlier sections of the manuscript.

Page 7, lines 16-17: Can you provide a reference for the typical West Antarctic snow density?

We have added a reference to Mayewski et al. (2005), who describe the shallow cores recovered as part of the ITASE project.

Page 9, lines 13-15: It is dangerous to use ice sheet models to support interpretations of data, and then use that data to assess the quality of the models. Reconsider using models to interpret the data.

This is a good recommendation. We have removed the references to ice-sheet models in Section 5.1.

Page 9, line 35: “ice” typo.

Fixed

Page 10, lines 9-10: Most of these cited studies do not record grounding-line changes.

These studies record ice thickness changes upstream of the grounding line that were interpreted by the original authors to be related to grounding-line changes. We have added the words “appear to have” to the sentence in question. It now reads “...while grounding-line changes in the Weddell Sea sector appear to have continued into the late Holocene...”

Page 11, lines 16-17: Yes, perhaps this suggests that the grounding line retreated too early, but, as you say previously, thinning is also dependent on changes in the accumulation rate.

This is a good point. We have changed the end of this paragraph to read:

“Because thinning at the Pirrit Hills is expected to have been primarily paced by the retreat of grounded ice in the southern Weddell Sea, this suggests that the grounding line retreats too early in all of the thermomechanical ice-sheet model simulations. Premature thinning in the models could also be caused by underestimating the magnitude and/or rapidity of the deglacial rise in snowfall, which as discussed by Hein et al. (2016) may have delayed the onset of thinning.”

Page 12, lines 1-3 and lines 15-16: Why not compare to other models calibrated with geological observations (e.g. Whitehouse et al., 2012; Briggs et al., 2014)? This would strengthen the conclusion that the best performing models are calibrated with geological observations.

This is also a good point. We have obtained model output for Whitehouse et al. (2012) for the Pirrit Hills and the Whitmore Mountains, and we have included this model in the evaluation.

Regarding the model of Briggs et al. (2014), we were only able to obtain model output of ice-surface elevation, not ice thickness, which is the variable we use in the analysis.

Figure 7: You should explain what the vertical dashed line represents in plot c.

The figure caption now explains what the vertical dashed line represents, along with the gray areas.

Response to Anonymous Referee #2

This well-written and well-considered manuscript contrasts LGM ice thickness changes from the centre of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet with those closer to its margins. The authors reveal new cosmogenic nuclide-derived constraints on ice sheet thickness at two unstudied locations (Pirrit Hills and Whitmore Mtns) derived through ^{10}Be surface exposure dating and novel interpretations of in situ ^{14}C data. The authors find support for a post-LGM highstand in the centre of the ice sheet as a likely consequence of increased precipitation during deglaciation, followed by dynamic thinning that propagated upstream from the ice sheet margin. The idea is not new, and there are other field studies from interior regions of the WAIS (Steig et al., 2001; Ackert et al., 1999), the Ross Sea (Todd et al., 2010; Hall et al., 2015) and Weddell Sea (Hein et al., 2016) and that find similar evidence for this balance between oceanic and atmospheric controls on ice sheet behaviour during deglaciation. The manuscript adds further support for this idea, obtained through novel application and interpretation of in situ ^{14}C from a rare, interior WAIS location. The modelling of in situ ^{14}C exposure histories is novel and will be of wide interest to those who work with cosmogenic nuclide data. The conclusions are supported by the data, and should be of wide interest to the readers of the Cryosphere. I recommend publication after addressing some minor points.

Thank you for the thorough review and constructive comments. We have addressed each comment as described below.

Specific comments:

- The mix of saturated and finite ^{14}C ages on Mt. Seelig is perplexing and requires further discussion. The saturated ^{14}C ages are used to “eliminate” the possibility that the WAIS was thicker than 190m (elevation of the lowest saturated age) during the LGM, without discussion on the reliability of those ages. It is worth discussing the reliability of those saturated ages given the recent study by Nichols et al. (2019), who repeated measurements of ^{14}C in samples that were previously reported as saturated (Balco et al., 2016) and got finite ages. As the data come from the same lab, further discussion is warranted.

As the reviewer mentions, some replicate ^{14}C measurements on Antarctic samples prepared at Tulane University scatter significantly more than expected from their analytical uncertainty alone. This problem, however, does not appear to plague samples at random, but rather it has only been observed on glacial erratics collected from the Schmidt Hills (Nichols et al., 2019; see figure below) and on samples from Hatherton/Darwin Glaciers (unpublished; not shown in figure). Other replicate analyses on Antarctic samples prepared at Tulane University do not exhibit this problem (see figure). For example, ^{14}C concentrations measured on the Antarctic rock standard, CRONUS-A, scatter by 5.2% ($n=13$; not shown in figure; Goehring et al., 2019).




Figure 1. ^{14}C concentration plotted against sample elevation for samples prepared at Tulane U. on which replicates have been measured. The black line shows predicted ^{14}C saturation concentrations, which are a function of elevation. White circles represent glacial erratics from the Schmidt Hills; gray circles represent bedrock samples from various sites in Antarctica.

Because of the possibility of contamination from modern carbon, it is more likely to measure an erroneously high ^{14}C concentration than an erroneously low concentration. Experiments with different sample preparation procedures by Nichols & Goehring (2019) suggest that, in some cases, excess scatter is due to contamination by modern carbon. The excess scatter exhibited by replicate analyses on samples from Hatherton/Darwin Glacier (mentioned above) is probably due to insufficient removal of organic surfactants used for quartz purification (Nichols & Goehring, 2019). Although samples from the Whitmore Mountains were exposed to these same surfactants, Nichols & Goehring (2019) have shown that the acid-etching procedure we followed sufficiently removes organic contaminants. Although samples from the Schmidt Hills (figure) were not exposed to surfactants, the replicates that produced the lowest ^{14}C concentrations were measured on the most aggressively-etched quartz (similar to the treatment received by the Whitmore Mtns. samples). In some cases, contamination by modern carbon is expected to produce ^{14}C concentrations higher than predicted saturation concentrations. This is not observed for samples from the Whitmore Mountains. Rather, three samples spanning ~300 m of elevation have concentrations indistinguishable from saturation. To summarize, while we cannot

prove that the ^{14}C measurements from the Whitmore Mountains are accurate, for the reasons discussed above, we have no reason to believe that there is unrecognized analytical error.

We feel that discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of the manuscript, and we rely on the open discussion format of this journal to disseminate this information.

References:

Nichols, K. A. and Goehring, B. M.: Isolation of quartz for cosmogenic in situ ^{14}C analysis, Geochronology Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gchron-2019-7>, in review, 2019.

Nichols, K. A., Goehring, B. M., Balco, G., Johnson, J. S., Hein, A. A., and Todd, C.: New Last Glacial Maximum Ice Thickness constraints for the Weddell Sea sector, Antarctica, The Cryosphere Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2019-64>, in review, 2019.

The authors consider the proximity to local ice caps and snowfields to explain the finite ^{14}C ages at higher altitudes, with distances of 5-20m reported. However, it is not discussed whether the saturated samples are located further away from the snowfields? Is there any sort of correlation here that could be used to support this argument?

We did not measure the distance from samples to the nearest snowfields while in the field, but from our photographs and notes there is no obvious relationship between snowfield proximity and whether a sample is ^{14}C saturated or not. To clarify the manuscript, we have added the following paragraph to the end of Section 4.2.

“While snow cover is the only simple explanation for ^{14}C concentrations below saturation in samples collected above 190 m, there is not an obvious relationship between proximity to present-day snowfields and whether a sample is ^{14}C saturated or not. The only exception to this is the highest sample from Mt. Seelig, which has a ^{14}C concentration below saturation and was collected from a very small outcrop (few square meters) that protrudes through the margin of the summit ice cap (Fig. 4c). All other samples from Mt. Seelig are estimated to have been collected within approximately 5-20 m of snowfields. How susceptible each sample site is to snow cover is likely related to local wind effects near the cliff edge, which are difficult to predict. Therefore the absence of a clear relationship between snowfield proximity and whether a sample is ^{14}C saturated is not surprising.”

- The authors cite unpublished Al/Be/Ne data to support their argument for low erosion rates and long exposure of bedrock surfaces in the Whitmore Mtns. The authors should either publish this data within this manuscript, or remove reference to them.

The reference to unpublished data has been removed.

- Comment on Section 5.1: the argument for simple monotonic post-LGM thinning of ice sheet margins despite a deglacial increase in snowfall is likely correct, but is overly simplified. In the Heritage Range, the competition between increased snowfall and dynamic thinning is argued to explain the delayed deglaciation at that site, which initiated in earnest only after ~10 ka when dynamic thinning began to outpace deglacial increases in snowfall (Hein et al., 2016). If correct, the influence of increased snowfall is more widespread than implied (i.e., its influence extends beyond the divide), even though it may not have caused local thickening. Similar competition between processes has been suggested to explain ice histories in the Ross Sea sector (Hall et al., 2015; Todd et al., 2010).

At the Pirrit Hills, the WAIS does appear to have thinned monotonically. The highstand was reached by the time that the accumulation rate in West Antarctica, as recorded at the WAIS Divide ice core site, began to increase from its ice-age low (see Figure 5a of manuscript). This implies that thickening did not occur at the Pirrit Hills in response to the accumulation-rate rise. As suggested by the reviewer, it is certainly possible that increased snowfall rates delayed the onset of thinning at the Pirrit Hills. To account for this, we have added the following sentence to the first paragraph of Section 5.1: “As discussed by Hein et al. (2016) in regard to the Heritage Range, the onset of thinning at the Pirrit Hills (and other sites) may have been delayed by the deglacial snowfall increase.” We have also added a sentence to this effect to the end of the third paragraph of Section 5.2.

Technical corrections:

- What is the distance of Pirrit Hills from the grounding line and the divide?

The Pirrit Hills are ~200 km from both the grounding line and from the divide. The first sentence of Section 2.1 has been modified to convey this.

-p3 line 30- statement that no glacially-transported cobbles found contrasts with next statement on discovery of indurated till. Rewrite to clarify.

We appreciate the suggestion, but the first sentence in question does not state that no glacially-transported cobbles were found. Rather, it states that “we found no glacially-transported cobbles or boulders perched on bedrock surfaces.” This is an important difference. One of the goals of these sentences is to contrast debris “perched on bedrock surfaces” with “indurated and weathered till”. We have opted to not change the manuscript text.

- P4L8 – replace “remove” with “minimize”

Changed.

-P4L15 – Perhaps include in Table the distance of each sample to the present snow/ice cap and reference here.

See response to previous comment on snowfield proximity.

-P4L19 –For clarity, state from where the ice margin elevation was determined at each site (given this can vary significantly around a nunatak).

We have changed the text to indicate that sample heights are measured relative to the blue-ice areas that are at the base of each ridge.

- P8L10 – can't use unpublished data to support your argument.

The reference to unpublished data has been removed.

- P9L35 – spelling of “ice”

Fixed.

Additional changes

In the abstract, we replaced the sentence “At the Pirrit Hills, ice reached a highstand ~320 m above present during the last glacial period.” with “At the Pirrit Hills, evidence of glacial-stage ice cover extends ~320 m above the present ice surface.” The purpose of this is because we cannot fully rule out the possibility that the highstand during the last glacial period was not somewhat higher than the highest deposits that we found.

Section 2.2 was accidentally labeled 2.1.1. This has been fixed.

Author responses to the Editor's comments on "Thickness of the divide and flank of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet through the last deglaciation"

Perry Spector et al.
Pspector@bgc.org

The Editors comments and our responses are shown in blue and black, respectively. At the end of this document we also provide point-by-point documentation of additional, unsolicited changes we have made to improve the clarity of the manuscript.

Responses to the Editor

I would like to thank both reviewers for their detailed and constructive comments on this manuscript and also the authors for posting their response to the reviewers' comments.

Several issues are not fully resolved by the authors' response to the reviewers' comments. I note these below, along with a few additional points that the authors may want to consider as they prepare a revised version of their manuscript.

Reviewer 1 raises some concerns that have potential implications for the reliability of the paper's conclusions. I share some of these concerns, and in particular I feel that you do not always provide a full discussion of the uncertainties on the data or explore alternative explanations for the evidence. Some of the assumptions you make when interpreting the data have significant implications for the exposure/burial history that you subsequently infer. I encourage you to acknowledge the limitations of the data more thoroughly and discuss the viability of alternative scenarios where relevant.

In general, both reviews are positive, and they highlight the novelty and importance of this study. I therefore encourage you to submit a revised manuscript that addresses the points mentioned below and in the individual reviews.

Kind regards,

Pippa Whitehouse

We thank Pippa Whitehouse for a thorough review of the manuscript and for providing constructive comments.

Specific points

Both reviewers comment on the reliability of the saturated ages reported on page 7, lines 7-9. You provide an extensive discussion on this point in your response to the reviewers' comments, but you also state that you do not plan to include any additional information in the manuscript. Given that both reviewers commented on this, and given the importance of these ages in determining the ice history at Mt Seelig, I think it is important to include a brief discussion on the reliability of the saturated ages in the main text - if only for the benefit of those readers who are unfamiliar with the issues associated with analysing and interpreting such samples. As you note, the full details can remain in the review documents.

We agree that this issue should be mentioned in the manuscript. Previously we had found it challenging to figure out how and where to discuss it. We have now added a paragraph to Section 3.3 discussing this issue, and we refer readers to the interactive online discussion of this article for a more detailed discussion of the issue.

In two places Reviewer 2 mentions a number of earlier articles that discuss the competing roles of precipitation change and grounding line dynamics in controlling post-glacial Antarctic change. Of the articles mentioned by the reviewer, all are already cited in the original version of your manuscript except Hall et al. (2015, Nature Geoscience). I encourage you to consider including a reference to this highly relevant article in the revised version of your manuscript.

We have added reference to Hall et al. (2015) in Section 5.1.

Reviewer 1 queried whether there is evidence of atmospheric temperatures being warm enough to induce thinning across West Antarctica. Much of your response (and the text in the manuscript) appears to rely on the assumption that there is a delay of 10-30 kyr between atmospheric warming and ice thinning. You include a reference to an entire textbook, which makes it difficult to determine the precise basis for this assumption, but the text on line 4 (page 2) suggests that it relates to the time required for surface warming to have an impact on conditions at the base of the ice sheet. However, on lines 2-3 (page 2) you also mention the process by which an increase in ice temperature (at any depth) will change the rheology of the ice, thus allowing it to deform and flow more easily. The time lag for this second process is presumably much shorter, perhaps negating your assumption that there must be a delay of at least 10 kyr between warming and thinning? And in fact, I don't think the reviewer is even asking whether warming-induced thinning has commenced, but rather whether the deglacial increase in atmospheric temperature was sufficient to trigger thinning by one of the processes described above. Please address this second point.

We agree that referencing an entire textbook was not particularly useful. In each case we were referring to Chapter 11.4.2 of Cuffey & Patterson (2010), which discusses the response of ice sheets at the end of an ice age. We have changed these citations to include the specific chapter.

As you mention, warming the ice at any depth will change its rheology and allow it to flow faster. However, because the bulk of ice deformation occurs near the base of the ice sheet, most of the effect of surface warming on ice-sheet thickness does not occur until that warming has propagated to near the base of the ice sheet. As discussed in Cuffey & Patterson (2010, Ch. 11.4.2), this is expected to require roughly 10 to 30 kyr.

In the previous draft of the manuscript, we had mentioned this thinning mechanism in the introduction, but then not discussed it further in the paper. This is because, given the time delay of this mechanism, along with the fact that surface temperatures remained relatively low until ~15 kyr B.P. (Cuffey et al., 2016, PNAS), it appeared unlikely that this mechanism could have significantly contributed to thinning in West Antarctica. In the revised manuscript, we acknowledge the possibility that some thinning by this mechanism could have occurred in the late Holocene. Mention of this now appears in Section 1 and Section 5.1. This does not actually affect our conclusions. At the Pirrit Hills, any thinning by this mechanism would likely have occurred only after the majority of thinning to the modern ice level was complete. At the Whitmore Mountains, the possibility of late Holocene thinning by this mechanism does not change the fact that, as stated in the text, “thinning to the modern ice level at Mt. Seelig could not have occurred before 7 kyr ago (i.e. before modern ice levels were reached on lower Reedy Glacier)”.

Opening sentence of section 5.1: “...despite the deglacial increase in snowfall...” It is not clear what evidence you are drawing on to support this statement, but elsewhere in the manuscript I note that you refer to the WAIS Divide ice core when discussing accumulation change across West Antarctica. The Pirrit Hills are in a different catchment to the WAIS Divide ice core (figure 1 of your manuscript) and hence they may have experienced a different snowfall history to that at WAIS Divide (page 10, line 24 of your manuscript). The statement at the start of section 5.1 therefore requires additional justification if you wish to use accumulation change at WAIS Divide as a proxy for accumulation change at the Pirrit Hills. If you are drawing on alternative evidence to support the statement about accumulation change at the Pirrit Hills then please make this clear. In light of my comments, please also check the robustness of the statement in the conclusions that refers to accumulation rates at the Pirrit Hills.

We agree that our justification for this sentence was not obvious. We had discussed this issue regarding the Whitmore Mountains, and the reasoning is the same for the Pirrit Hills. For both sites, the magnitude of accumulation-rate changes may not have been the same as at WAIS Divide, but the timing of changes were probably similar because (i) all three sites are fed by storms originating in the Amundsen Sea low, and (ii) the accumulation rate increased considerably in both East and West Antarctica at this time. To address this issue, we have moved this discussion (for both sites) to the beginning of Section 5.1.

On page 9, you draw on evidence from sites across West Antarctica to support your inference that ice was previously thicker in the Whitmore Mountains. Considering the likely flowlines of the

ice sheet during the last deglacial period, it is not clear to me that ice thickness changes at Mt Waesche (page 9, line 16) should necessarily be similar to those at the Whitmore Mountains. Similarly, one could envisage a scenario whereby ice was thicker than present at Byrd Station during the LGM (page 9, line 19) but not at the divide upstream of this site. It would be useful if you could include a statement about the degree to which ice thickness changes at Mt Waesche and Byrd Station can be expected to co-vary with ice thickness at the Whitmore Mountains (as you do when discussing evidence from the Ohio Range).

We agree that ice-thickness changes at Mt. Waesche are difficult to connect to changes at the Whitmore Mountains, and we have removed reference to Mt. Waesche here. Reviewer 1 strongly suggested that we not discuss the behavior of ice-sheet models in this section because later in the paper we evaluate those same models. We agreed that this was a good point, and we complied with the recommendation. Therefore, with regard to the evidence of thickness changes from Byrd Station, it is difficult to provide a quantitative statement about the degree to which thickness changes are expected to co-vary at this site and at the Whitmore Mountains, as you recommended.

Page 9, line 33: "Thinning to the modern ice level at Mt. Seelig therefore could not have occurred before 7 kyr ago". To improve the clarity of your argument, please be more explicit about which of the constraints mentioned in the previous paragraph you are drawing on to make this quantified statement.

We agree that this sentence was not clear. It now reads "Thinning to the modern ice level at Mt. Seelig therefore could not have occurred before 7 kyr ago (i.e., before modern ice levels were reached on lower Reedy Glacier)."

Page 10, line 10: could the ice have been thicker than present for a brief period during the LGM? i.e. could it be that the samples were not completely saturated at the beginning of the ~15ka burial period?

This is a good question. The model we use to investigate the possible histories of exposure and ice cover (equation 1) assumes that samples were initially ^{14}C saturated. Relaxing this assumption actually restricts the set of exposure and ice-cover histories that are permitted by the observations. So, if the two lowest elevation samples from Mt. Seelig were not initially saturated, then the onset and duration of ice cover would be later and more brief, respectively, than implied by Figure 6a. To give an example, if we assume that the samples began with C-14 concentrations 5% below saturation, it implies that the highstand was reached within the past ~13 kyr as opposed to the past ~15 kyr. This would only strengthen our findings that ice cover was relatively recent and brief.

In the previous draft of the manuscript, the effect of this assumption (i.e., initial saturation) on our findings was not explained well. We have rewritten parts of Section 4.3 because we did not think that our explanations of the C-14 constraints and of Figure 6a were sufficiently clear. In

addition, we have also added a paragraph discussing the assumption of initial C-14 saturation and what effect relaxing this assumption would have. This issue is also discussed some in Section 5.1.

Page 10, line 31: ICE-6G is not really a 'model of glacial isostatic adjustment'; it is an ice history model in the sense you are using it

We now refer to ICE-6G as a model of ice-sheet history.

Please include latitude and longitude labels on figure 1

This issue was commented on previously, and we did add labels to the figure at that time. The labels are purposefully subtle, so as to not distract from the rest of the figure, but we believe that they are sufficiently visible and legible.

Additional Changes

Section 1: It was previously somewhat vague whether the second paragraph of the Introduction was referring to ice sheets generally or to the WAIS specifically. We have reworded parts of this paragraph to make it clear that we are talking about the behavior of the WAIS at the end of the last ice age. Other changes to the Introduction are either (i) discussed above in our response to the Editor or (ii) largely stylistic.

Section 2.1: We made a few very minor stylistic changes to this section.

Section 3.3: We have made the following changes to this section:

Paragraph 1

- We clarified the description of our analytical methods for extracting Be from quartz.
- We expanded the discussion about sample contamination by beryl or other Be-bearing minerals. The text now explicitly states that we calculated ^{10}Be concentrations using ICP-OES determinations of total Be rather than the amount of Be added as carrier.
- We expanded the description of our ^{10}Be blanks and our blank corrections.

Paragraph 2

- We have provided a more full account of the scatter and bias in Be isotope ratio measurements from LLNL, and how we have increased the uncertainty of our sample Be isotope ratios to account for this.

Section 4.1: We made minor stylistic changes to the third paragraph of this section. In the fourth paragraph, we have changed the first and last sentences so that the paragraph now describes exposure-dating results in the Weddell Sea sector before drawing inferences about them.

Section 4.2: We made minor changes to this section to (i) make it easier to read and (ii) better explain the relationship between sample sites and present-day snowfields.

Section 4.3: Previously, the explanation of the model we use to interpret the ^{14}C results was somewhat confusing. We have rewritten much of Section 4.3, and we believe that it is now much clearer, and that it makes Figure 6a easier to understand as well.

Section 5.1: Various changes to this section are described above in our response to the Editor. Additionally, we have combined the last two paragraphs of this section, which makes it easier to read.

Section 5.2: We have made a minor stylistic change toward the end of this section.

Author responses to the Editor's comments on "Thickness of the divide and flank of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet through the last deglaciation"

Perry Spector et al.
Pspector@bgc.org

The Editor's comments and our responses are shown in blue and black, respectively.

Responses to the Editor

I would like to thank the authors for addressing all comments on the previous version of the manuscript. In particular, the interpretation of your results is much clearer and your overall conclusions are more robustly justified.

We thank the editor for another thorough review.

In light of your edits, there are two points that require additional clarification:

1) Page 10, lines 26-27: you mention that your results are based on the assumption that the samples close to the present ice surface have "experienced only one period of exposure during the past ~30 kyr". This implies that you assume the samples were previously covered, but the timing or duration of this coverage is not clear. Please address this. In addition, in light of the text on lines 24-25 please make it clear which "pair of samples" you are referring to on line 26, and if appropriate adopt the terminology introduced above that refers to a "simple exposure age".

I see that this was worded in a confusing way. The first few sentences of the paragraph now read as follows:

The ^{14}C concentrations of the two samples collected near the modern ice surface would correspond to simple exposure ages of ~10-15 kyr, under the assumption that they were previously ice-covered for a sufficient amount of time to remove any pre-existing ^{14}C . This scenario is represented by the asymptote of the "zero snow cover" band in Figure 6a. However, under the three-stage model of Equation 1, this pair of samples could have also been exposed by WAIS thinning (i) within the past ~10 kyr, with more recent re-exposure requiring relatively brief prior ice cover, or (ii) prior to ~15 kyr B.P., given the possibility of cover by local snow fields (Fig. 6a).

2) Page 12, lines 34-35: In the previous paragraph you mention that it is possible the samples were not ^{14}C -saturated when they were last covered, i.e. they could have been briefly covered during the LGM, then uncovered, and covered again at 15 ka BP. Given this possibility, please re-consider the robustness of your statement that the "constraints demonstrate that the WAIS at the Whitmore Mountains was the same thickness or thinner than present during the LGM".

Please also clarify what time period you are referring to when you talk about the LGM (apologies if I have missed this).

We agree that this was confusing. We have changed the sentence to read: "These constraints demonstrate that the WAIS at the Whitmore Mountains was the same thickness or thinner than present prior to the most recent highstand, and that this highstand was reached sometime in the last ~15 kyr."

I list below a number of minor technical points that also require attention. Once these and the issues above are addressed, I would be happy to review a revised version of the manuscript.

Kind regards,

Pippa Whitehouse

Minor technical points (suggested edits in **bold**)

Page 2, line 29: delete 'also' as there is no previous mention that data are scarce

We believe that 'also scarce' is appropriate here because the prior sentence begins with "The only relevant constraints...", which implies a scarcity of data.

Page 3, line 17: 'isolated **glacial** deposits'

Fixed.

Page 6, line 12-13: 'of **the** UW standards'

Fixed.

Page 8, line 13: 'was **at** least'

Fixed.

page 10, line 25: revise back to '130 m **above the ice surface**'

Fixed.

Page 10, line 31: delete one instance of 'our' and edit 'initial' -> 'initially'

Fixed.

Page 11, line 19: clarify what type of deformation you are referring to, presumably ice

Clarified that we are referring to ice deformation here.

Page 11, line 22: the reference to Hall et al. (2015) seems a little out of place in this sentence that specifically talks about the Heritage Range and Pirrit Hills. It may sit more appropriately with the other references listed on page 2, line 19

We agree that this reference would be more appropriate in the introduction. Fixed.

Page 12, line 28/fig. 6b: in line with an earlier edit, remove references to Mt. Waesche

We have removed reference to Mt. Waesche in Section 5.1. However, we have kept Mt. Waesche in Figure 6b to provide the reader with more information about ice thickness changes across West Antarctica. This is analogous to including the Hudson Mountains and the Ford Ranges in Figure 6d, which provide the reader with the range of times when sites across West Antarctica reached present-day ice levels even though there is no expectation that these two sites share similar ice-thickness histories with the Whitmore Mountains.

Figure 2: refer to (a) and (b) in the first sentence of the caption

Good catch. Fixed.

Figure 7: add labels (a) to (d) on appropriate panels

Another good catch. Fixed.

Additionally, we made the following changes:

1. First paragraph of Section 3.3: Changed the beginning of the sentence from “One batch of samples...” to “The batch of samples...”.
2. Corrected a typo in the caption of Figure 6.
3. We have also added ' t_{cover} ' and ' t_{expose} ' to the axis labels of Figure 6a.

Thickness of the divide and flank of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet through the last deglaciation

Perry Spector¹, John Stone², and Brent Goehring³

¹Berkeley Geochronology Center, 2455 Ridge Road, Berkeley, CA, USA

²Department of Earth and Space Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

²Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, USA

Correspondence: Perry Spector (pspector@bgc.org)

Abstract. We report cosmogenic-nuclide measurements from two isolated groups of nunataks in West Antarctica: the Pirrit Hills, located midway between the grounding line and the divide in the Weddell Sea sector, and the Whitmore Mountains, located along the Ross-Weddell divide. At the Pirrit Hills, ~~ice reached a highstand~~ evidence of glacial-stage ice cover extends ~~~320 m above present during the last glacial period~~ the present ice surface. Subsequent thinning mostly occurred after ~14 kyr B.P., and modern ice levels were established some time after ~4 kyr B.P. We infer that, like at other flank sites, these changes were primarily controlled by the position of the grounding-line downstream. At the Whitmore Mountains, cosmogenic ¹⁴C concentrations in bedrock surfaces demonstrate that ice there was no more than ~190 m thicker than present during the past ~30 kyr. Combined with other constraints from West Antarctica, the ¹⁴C data imply that the divide was thicker than present for a period of less than ~8 kyr within the past ~15 kyr. These results are consistent with the hypothesis that the divide initially thickened due to the deglacial rise in snowfall, and subsequently thinned in response to retreat of the ice-sheet margin. We use these data to evaluate several recently-published ice-sheet models at the Pirrit Hills and Whitmore Mountains. Most of the models we consider do not match the observed timing and/or magnitude of thickness change at these sites. However, one model performs relatively well at both sites, which may, in part, be due to the fact that it was calibrated with geological observations of ice thickness change from other sites in Antarctica.

1 Introduction

Our knowledge of past thickness changes of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet (WAIS) is largely derived from geologic evidence collected from the continental shelf seafloor and from sites near the margin of the present-day ice sheet. Less is known about changes in the high-elevation WAIS interior where outcropping mountains and thus geologic evidence are sparse. The only geological constraints come from exposure dating at the Ohio Range and Mt. Waesche (Fig. 1) (Ackert et al., 1999, 2007, 2013). In this paper we describe glacial-geologic observations and cosmogenic-nuclide measurements from two isolated nunatak groups that rise through the WAIS: the Pirrit Hills located midway between the grounding line and the divide, and the Whitmore Mountains, which lie along the divide between the Weddell and Ross Sea sectors (Fig. 1). These data provide information about the magnitude and timing of thickness changes in interior West Antarctica since the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM), which, in turn, help to identify the glaciological processes that were most important for WAIS thickness over this time period.

At the end of ~~an ice age~~, the last ice age in West Antarctica, the three processes that likely exerted the greatest influence on ice thickness were (i) the retreat of the ~~ice-sheet margins~~ margin, (ii) the increase of the accumulation rate, and (iii) warming of the ice surface (Cuffey and Patterson, 2010, Chapter 11.4.2). Margin retreat is expected to have propagated a diffusive wave of thinning ~~to propagate upstream. The upstream, with the~~ greatest and earliest thinning ~~occurs~~ near the coast, ~~while and~~ the least and most delayed thinning ~~occurs~~ at the divide. This dynamic thinning ~~is would have been~~ opposed by the increase in the accumulation rate, which ~~climbs because a warmer atmosphere can carry more moisture, and because of other effects, at~~ the WAIS Divide ice-core site (Fig. 1), approximately doubled between 18 and 15 kyr B.P. (Fudge et al., 2016). Although the accumulation-rate increase was likely, in part, a result of higher atmospheric temperatures, Fudge et al. (2016) demonstrate that other factors, which may ~~include have included~~ reduced sea ice or changes in atmospheric circulation (Fudge et al., 2016).

~~Higher atmospheric temperatures warm~~, were also important. The deglacial warming would also have softened the ice sheet ; ~~which softens the ice, allows and allowed~~ it to flow faster, ~~and thereby induces thereby inducing~~ thinning. However, while the response of ice thickness to retreat of the margin and to increased snowfall is immediate, the response to surface warming is minimal until the base of the ice sheet warms, which, for West Antarctica, ~~requires is expected to require~~ roughly 10 to 30 kyr (Cuffey and Patterson, 2010). ~~At a single site in the ice sheet, the~~ (Whillans, 1981; Cuffey and Patterson, 2010, Chapter 11.4.2).

~~Because surface temperatures remained relatively low until ~15 kyr B.P. (Cuffey et al., 2016), any thinning due to surface warming was likely limited to the late Holocene.~~

The combined effect of these processes can result in a complex history of ice thickness change at a given site, with thickening and thinning potentially both occurring over the course of the deglaciation as the balance between the different processes shifts (e.g., Alley and Whillans, 1984; Cuffey and Clow, 1997; Steig et al., 2001) (e.g., Alley and Whillans, 1984; Cuffey and Clow, 1997; Steig et al., 2001).

At multiple sites arrayed along a flowline, the ice-thickness history of each site will vary depending, among other things, on whether the site is located closer to the divide or to the grounding line.

Exposure-age data Exposure ages from nunataks near the present-day WAIS margin indicate progressive surface lowering as the grounding line neared (e.g., Johnson et al., 2014; Hein et al., 2016; Spector et al., 2017), implying that dynamic thinning was the dominant process on the lower flanks of the ice sheet. ~~Such data is scarce upstream from the margin We have little knowledge as to whether any thinning due to ice-sheet warming has occurred in West Antarctica. The only relevant constraints we are aware of are exposure ages from lower Reedy Glacier (Fig. 1) that demonstrate that ice levels there have remained stable since ~7 kyr B.P. (Spector et al., 2017; Todd et al., 2010), which suggests that surface warming has not yet induced significant thinning. Constraints on thickness changes from the WAIS interior are also scarce (Ackert et al., 1999, 2007, 2013), and thus we have limited knowledge of the relative importance of different glaciological processes in the ice-sheet interior near the divide remains poorly known.~~ It has been hypothesized that, in contrast to the monotonic thinning near the coast, the divide region initially thickened in response to the deglacial rise in snowfall and subsequently thinned only once the dynamic effects of downstream retreat began to outpace the increased snowfall (Steig et al., 2001; Cuffey et al., 2016).

The data we report in this paper are consistent with this hypothesis. We find that at the Pirrit Hills, the WAIS stood at a highstand early in the deglaciation and thinned monotonically through the Holocene, similar to previously published records from sites near the ice-sheet margin. In contrast, at the Whitmore Mountains the WAIS appears to have (i) been no thicker

than present, and possibly thinner, during the LGM when snowfall rates were lowest, and (ii) reached a highstand sometime in the last ~ 15 kyr, once accumulation rates had climbed from their LGM low. Because these data are some of the only constraints on past ice thickness from the WAIS interior, they are particularly valuable for evaluating the performance of ice-sheet model ~~performances~~simulations of the last deglaciation, and we provide an example of this using several recently published simulations.

2 Field sites and glacial geology

2.1 Pirrit Hills

The Pirrit Hills emerge from the WAIS at an elevation of ~ 1300 m from a slow-flowing portion of the Institute Ice Stream catchment ~~, midway between in the Weddell Sea sector, ~ 200 km from both~~ the grounding line and ~~the divide in the Weddell Sea sector~~from the divide. The main massif of the Pirrit Hills is composed of granite, although some of the small satellite nunataks are metasedimentary. The massif consists of a few major and several minor peaks, linked by catenary arêtes and buttressed by steep spurs. The spurs divide cirque basins whose floors are concealed by the present-day ice sheet. Katabatic winds flow from SW to NE over these mountains and have deposited a ramp of snow on their upwind side that rises over a distance of 5-10 km to the saddle between Mt. Tidd and Mt. Turcotte (Fig. 2a). Northeast of here, where the winds are forced to descend, warm, and become turbulent, there is a 1-2 km wide blue-ice ablation zone, which sits 600 m below the saddle. Englacial debris has accumulated here in sheets and moraine ridges that onlap the base of the mountains. Above the level of the modern ice sheet, isolated glacial deposits occur on the narrow bedrock ridges of Mts. Axtell, Tidd, and Turcotte ~~that rise~~ above the modern ablation zone. The highest deposits we found were on the NE buttresses of Mt. Axtell and Mt. Tidd at ~ 320 m and ~ 340 m above the modern ice surface, respectively (Figs. 2a, 3a, 4a). The density of boulders and cobbles is considerably higher at these altitudes than lower on the two ridges, with debris covering most of the area where accumulation is possible. For example, compare Figure S1 to Figure S2. The deposits are typically lightly weathered and consist of granite lithologies that outcrop at the Pirrit Hills. In order to identify cobbles and boulders as having been glacially transported, we searched for rounded to sub-angular clasts bearing impact marks and blunted corners. The underlying bedrock is more oxidized than the glacial debris and displays very little evidence of glacial erosion (e.g. Figures S1 and S3). Uphill from the depositional limit, the intensity of bedrock weathering increases. Some of the most heavily-weathered bedrock surfaces at the Pirrit Hills ~~was were~~ found above the depositional limit, on the bench near Mt. Axtell's summit (Fig. 3a). The granite here exhibits gritty exfoliation sheets, case hardening, and delicate tafoni. Grus and felsenmeer has accumulated in low-lying areas between rounded joint-bound bedrock blocks.

Although the Pirrit Hills were carved by mountain glaciers, this is a relic alpine landscape unrelated to the present-day or Pleistocene WAIS. The glacial deposits establish that the ice sheet here was at least 320-340 m thicker than present at least once in the past. There is no evidence that ice has reached above the depositional limit, and the absence of any glacial debris on the Axtell bench, along with the difference in bedrock weathering between the bench and the ridge below, suggests that ice has not been more than ~ 450 m thicker than present. The observation that glacially-transported cobbles and boulders are less

weathered than the bedrock on which they rest indicates that past ice cover was largely frozen at its base, which is consistent with the limited expression of glacial erosion features or well-rounded glacial debris. The greater abundance of debris near the depositional limit suggests that the ice sheet stood at or near its highstand for longer than it did at lower levels.

2.1.1 ~~Mt. Seelig, Whitmore Mountains~~

5 2.2 Mt. Seelig, Whitmore Mountains

The northwest ridge of Mt. Seelig (the only site we visited in the Whitmore Mountains) divides two partially-buried cirques and climbs from the ice-sheet surface at ~ 2200 m to a local ice cap that drapes the mountain top (Fig. 2b). Easterly winds flowing toward the Ross Sea maintain a blue-ice area alee of the ridge. These winds have deposited small snowfields on the upper, wider portion of the ridge and drifts behind the lower, narrow ridge (Figs. 2b, 3c, 4b). To minimize the likelihood of
10 sampling from areas prone to snow cover, we kept to the windswept edge of the ridge overlooking the steep headwall shown in Figures 3c and 4b. Bedrock surfaces here display subaerial weathering features including oxidation, granular disintegration, and weathering pits (Fig. 4b). We observed no evidence of recent glacial erosion.

Unlike the Pirrit Hills, we found no glacially-transported cobbles or boulders perched on bedrock surfaces. Glacially transported rock is less likely here at the divide because there is little area from which to source debris. The only glacial deposit
15 we found was a small patch (several square meters) of indurated and weathered till ~ 150 m above the modern ice surface (Fig. S4). The till consists of poorly-sorted granite clasts and a few striated metasedimentary rocks embedded in a fine-grained matrix. ~~The characteristics of the till~~ These characteristics indicate deposition by wet-based ice. ~~Measurements of long-lived cosmogenic nuclides (^{26}Al , ^{10}Be , ^{21}Ne) establish that the till was deposited more than 1 Myr ago (Spector, unpublished data)~~ The simplest interpretation is that the patch of weathered till is a remnant of a more extensive ancient deposit that has
20 been largely eroded away. Therefore, to summarize, we find no geomorphic evidence in support of higher ice levels at Mt. Seelig during or since the LGM.

3 Methods

3.1 Sample collection

At the Pirrit Hills, we sampled elevation transects of glacial deposits to determine the age and height of the most recent
25 highstand and to chronicle the subsequent thinning (Figs. 3a-b, S5). Cosmogenic ^{10}Be has accumulated in these samples since their initial exposure in the ablation zones on the northeast side of the mountains. Anomalously young exposure ages can result from post-depositional erosion of the rock surface or shielding by snow or till. To ~~remove~~ minimize the possibility of post-depositional shielding, we sampled isolated deposits resting in stable positions on narrow, windswept bedrock ridges (e.g. Figures 4a, S3). To minimize the likelihood of erosion, we preferentially selected lightly-weathered rocks retaining evidence
30 of glacial modification.

On the northwest ridge of Mt. Seelig, where recent glacial deposits are absent, we collected an elevation transect of bedrock samples from stable surfaces to identify past highstands and compare exposure and ice cover at different altitudes. Despite targeting sites unlikely to have been snow covered in the past, in places the only exposed bedrock was located within meters of snowfields or the summit ice cap (e.g. Fig. 4c), and these samples may have been covered in the past.

At both sites, we measured sample elevations using drift-corrected barometric measurements, calibrated with geodetic GPS measurements. Accuracy is estimated to be ± 3 -4 m based on repeat measurements. Elevations are reported relative to the EGM96 geoid. At the Pirrit Hills, we determined the elevations of the modern ~~ice surface at~~ blue ice areas at the bases of Mts. Axtell, Tidd, and Turcotte, which are needed to calculate sample heights above the ice, using a high-resolution digital elevation model with < 1 m vertical uncertainty in this region (Howat et al., 2019). For ~~each sample~~ all samples, we measured the topographic shielding from the cosmic-ray flux from vertically-oriented fisheye photographs.

3.2 Analysis strategy for bedrock samples from Mt. Seelig

~~Measurements of~~ To determine the history of exposure and ice cover on million-year timescales, we measured the long-lived cosmogenic nuclides ^{26}Al , ^{10}Be , and ^{21}Ne ~~on bedrock samples from Mt. Seelig indicate prolonged exposure (>1 Myr for all samples), very low erosion rates, and limited changes in ice thickness on million-year timescales (Spector, unpublished data). The concentrations, however, cannot rule out thicker than present ice during or since the LGM that was frozen at its base. These data therefore are not relevant to this paper because they provide no constraint on the LGM-to-present glacial history. Here,~~ in quartz, which will be described in a forthcoming publication. Here we describe measurements of cosmogenic ^{14}C in quartz. Because ^{14}C decays quickly (5.7 kyr half-life), its concentration is only sensitive to exposure and ice cover that occurred in the past ~ 30 -35 kyr (Goehring et al., 2019a). After ~ 30 -35 kyr of continuous exposure, a sample will be saturated with respect to ^{14}C , at which point nuclide production is balanced by decay, and the concentration is no longer time dependent. Therefore, unlike longer-lived cosmogenic nuclides, ^{14}C has no memory of exposure or ice cover that occurred prior to ~ 30 -35 kyr ago.

3.3 Analytical methods

Quartz was separated from crushed rock samples, sieved to 0.25-0.5 mm, and purified using ~~surfactants, heavy liquid separation, surfactant separation, flotation in heavy liquids,~~ and repeated etching in 2 % HF. Beryllium was extracted from quartz aliquots at the University of Washington Cosmogenic Nuclide Lab by ~~an isotope dilution method consisting of~~ addition of ^9Be carrier, dissolution in HF, ion exchange chromatography, and ~~selective precipitation (Ditchburn and Whitehead, 1994). Granites from the Pirrit Hills contain beryl, which can be difficult to fully separate from quartz. To account for Be added to our samples from beryl, we measured total Be after sample dissolution~~ precipitation of Be hydroxide (Ditchburn and Whitehead, 1994). Measurements of total Be by inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry ~~-(ICP-OES) on aliquots taken after sample dissolution indicate that purified quartz separates were contaminated with 0.001-0.007 % beryl (and/or other Be-bearing minerals) not separated by the procedure described above. Therefore, we calculated ^{10}Be concentrations using the ICP-OES determinations of total Be rather than the amount of Be added as carrier.~~ Beryllium isotope ratios were measured at the

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Center for Accelerator Mass Spectrometry (LLNL CAMS). Beryllium isotope ratios were measured relative to the ICN 01-5-4 standard, ~~assuming a nominal and~~ ¹⁰Be concentrations given in Table S1 are calculated relative to a value of ¹⁰Be/⁹Be ~~value of 2.851×10^{-12} (Nishiizumi et al., 2007). Carrier and process blanks had $= 2.851 \times 10^{-12}$ (Nishiizumi et al., 2007).~~ The batch of samples from Mt. Axtell and Mt. Tidd produced a process blank of $5,000 \pm 900$ atoms ¹⁰Be~~for samples from Mts. Tidd and Axtell and~~. The batch from Mt Turcotte gave an unusually high process blank of $133,700-000 \pm 8,200-000$ atoms ¹⁰Be~~for samples~~, which is likely due to inadvertent cross-contamination from one of the accompanying samples. We have based the blank subtraction for these samples on this value, however it may be more appropriate to use a more typical laboratory average of $\sim 10,000$ atoms. This choice turns out to be unimportant because all of the samples from Mt. Turcotte ~~The blanks had 0.01 to 1.0 % of the total number of ¹⁰Be atoms measured for all samples except for one, for which the blank has~~ are pre-exposed (see Section 4.1 below). For samples whose exposure ages define the deglaciation history discussed below, blank subtractions amount to 0.1-0.7 % of the total ~~number of ¹⁰Be atoms in the sample.~~

~~For samples from Mt. Axtell and Mt. Tidd, the uncertainties assigned to the ¹⁰Be measurements are larger than the errors~~ Uncertainties in ¹⁰Be concentrations (Table S1) include all known sources of laboratory uncertainty combined in quadrature. For samples prefixed “13-NTK”, we assigned larger uncertainties to Be isotope ratios than those reported by LLNL CAMS. The ~~uncertainties have been increased by 4.8 % (added in quadrature) to account for excess scatter in 7 University of Washington~~ KNSTD standards (Nishiizumi et al., 2007) analyzed concurrently. ~~The added error is the amount~~ larger uncertainties are based on analyses of isotope ratio standards (Nishiizumi et al., 2007) prepared at the University of Washington (UW) and analyzed along with samples. During the period 2011-2015 these UW standards commonly scattered in isotope ratio by more than internal accelerator standards. To assess this additional source of isotope-ratio error we determined the additional percentage error required to bring the ~~reduced~~ chi-squared of the ~~standards to 1. Because the source of the excess scatter in this and other~~ LLNL CAMS ~~runs appears to vary from cathode to cathode, bias of UW standards to 1.0. In the case of the 13-NTK samples, this additional error of 4.8 %, based on 7 standard analyses, has been added in quadrature to the isotope ratio error reported by LLNL CAMS. Bias in the ratios of the UW standards run with the 13-NTK samples was -2.4 ± 3.9 % in the University of Washington KNSTD measurements from this run has not been corrected, and because the scatter exceeds the bias, no correction has been applied to the isotope ratios and resulting concentrations in Table S1.~~

Quartz aliquots for ¹⁴C measurement were twice etched in a 5 % HF and 5 % HNO₃ solution on a shaker table, each time for 24 hours, then twice in a 1 % HF and 1 % HNO₃ solution in a 50°C ultrasonic bath, each time for 24 hours. Experiments at Tulane University show that this removes potential organic contaminants from the surfactant separation ~~(Nichols et al., in prep.)~~ (Nichols and Goehring, 2019). Carbon was extracted from quartz using the Tulane University Carbon Extraction and Graphitization System (Goehring et al., 2019b). This entails fusion of quartz in vacuo using a LiBO₂ flux, cryogenic and redox collection and purification of CO₂, and manometric measurement of CO₂ yield. Carbon isotope ratios were measured at the National Ocean Sciences Accelerator Mass Spectrometry facility. The total process blank of $6.47 \pm 0.68 \times 10^4$ ¹⁴C atoms is based on the long-term average of blanks and represents approximately 1-2 % of the total ¹⁴C atoms measured in the samples. Measurements of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ were made at the Stable Isotope Facility at the University of California, Davis.

Repeat measurements of the CRONUS-A quartz standard (Jull et al., 2015) at Tulane University scatter by 5.2 %. This is higher than expected from analytical uncertainties for most samples. The samples from Mt. Seelig all have analytical uncertainties less than 1.5 %, and thus we adopt a uniform uncertainty of 5.2 % for all samples. Results of ^{10}Be and ^{14}C measurements are reported in the supplementary information as well as online in the ICE-D: ANTARCTICA database located at <http://antarctica.ice-d.org>.

Some replicate ^{14}C measurements on samples from elsewhere in Antarctica that were prepared at Tulane University scatter significantly more than expected from their analytical uncertainty alone (e.g. Nichols et al., 2019). Because of the possibility of contamination from modern carbon, it is easier to measure an erroneously high ^{14}C concentration than an erroneously low concentration. Analyses that result in erroneously low ^{14}C concentrations can typically be identified by automated monitoring of the C extraction process (Goehring et al., 2019b). None of the samples from Mt. Seelig either (i) produced ^{14}C concentrations in excess of predicted saturation values or (ii) indicated incomplete C extraction, and therefore we have no reason to believe that these measurements have unrecognized analytical error. The conclusions that we draw about thickness changes at the ice-sheet divide are subject to the accuracy of these data. Refer to the interactive online discussion of this article for a more detailed discussion of this issue.

3.4 Production rates of ^{10}Be and ^{14}C

We compute production rates for ^{10}Be and ^{14}C in quartz using the “LSDn” production-rate scaling method (Lifton et al., 2014), as implemented in version 3 of the online exposure calculator described by Balco et al. (2008) and subsequently updated. Beryllium-10 production rates by spallation are based on the CRONUS-Earth “primary” production-rate calibration dataset (Borchers et al., 2016). Carbon-14 production rates are calibrated using repeat measurements of CRONUS-A at Tulane University. CRONUS-A was collected ~~1650 km from the Whitmore Mountains from~~ a slowly-eroding site in the McMurdo Dry Valleys (elevation: 1679 m; distance from Whitmore Mountains: 1650 km) that remained ice free during the LGM. CRONUS-A is therefore assumed to be saturated with respect to ^{14}C (Jull et al., 2015). Calibrating production rates in this way minimizes uncertainties associated with scaling production rates from sites at lower latitudes. We assume that LSDn scaling is accurate over the ~ 1 km elevation range between CRONUS-A and our highest samples from the Whitmore Mountains.

4 Results

4.1 WAIS thinning history at the Pirrit Hills

Glacial deposits at the Pirrit Hills have apparent exposure ages that range from 1 Myr to ~ 4 kyr (Fig. 5a). 11 of the 18 samples have ages greater than 60 kyr ~~B.P.~~, while the remaining samples are all younger than 18 kyr ~~B.P.~~. Qualitatively, there appears to be a relationship between exposure-age and the degree of rock weathering (see, for example, Figure S6). Because, as discussed above, our sampling considerations minimize the possibility of post-depositional (i) cover by snow or till, (ii) disturbance, or (iii) erosion, all of which cause anomalously young ages, we interpret the youngest ages as dating deposition during or

30 following the LGM and the older ages as the result of prior cosmic-ray exposure. Strictly, we cannot rule out the possibility that the youngest ages also record minor prior exposure. However, the similarity of these ages to the youngest ages from the nearby Heritage Range (discussed below) suggests that this effect is either absent or minor, amounting to less than ~1-2 kyr.

The exposure age of a cobble from the depositional limit on Mt. Axtell, ~320 m above the modern ice surface, indicates that ice reached its highstand by 18 ± 1.0 kyr B.P. A boulder sampled ~15 m below the limit has an age of 14.4 ± 0.8 kyr B.P., demonstrating that ice levels persisted near the highstand for at least 3-4 kyr, which is consistent with the abundance of debris near the depositional limit. Because the ice surface varied slowly at this height, it is possible that samples may have been exposed in the ablation zone for centuries or millennia prior to physical deposition on bedrock (Ackert et al., 2011).

Below this level, deposits are ~~somewhat more scarce~~ more sparse (Figs. S1 and S2), suggesting that thinning from the highstand occurred relatively rapidly and that samples ~~resided-were exposed~~ in the ablation zone ~~briefly only briefly before being deposited~~. The thinning is constrained by only two samples from Mt. Tidd (Fig. 5a); other samples from Mts. Axtell and Turcotte are pre-exposed. By 6.9 ± 0.4 kyr B.P., the ice surface had lowered ~140 m from the highstand. Another 110 m of thinning occurred in the subsequent ~2.7 kyr, bringing ice levels to within ~60 m of the modern surface by ~4.2 kyr B.P.

This result is similar to thinning chronologies from the Heritage Range and from the Pensacola Mountains (~~Fig. 1~~), ~~which implies that ice levels at the Pirrit Hills were representative of the lower flank of the~~, sites in the Weddell Sea sector ~~of the WAIS, that are more seaward than the Pirrit Hills (Fig. 1)~~. At the Heritage Range, located in the southern Ellsworth Mountains, a highstand 250-500 m above the modern ice surface was reached by ~18 kyr B.P. and thinning to the modern ice level occurred ~6-3 kyr B.P. (Hein et al., 2016; Sugden et al., 2017; Bentley et al., 2010) (previously-published ages have been recalculated to be consistent with data presented here). At the Williams and Thomas Hills on the west side of the Pensacola Mountains, ice thinned at least 500 m between 11 and 4 kyr B.P. (Balco et al., 2016; Bentley et al., 2017). Although initial exposure dating from a third site in the Pensacola Mountains, the Schmidt Hills, found no evidence for thicker ice in the past 100 kyr (Balco et al., 2016; Bentley et al., 2017), recent cosmogenic ^{14}C measurements demonstrate that ice was at least 800 m thicker during the LGM (Nichols et al., 2019). Therefore, to summarize, exposure-dating results from the Pirrit Hills, Heritage Range, and Pensacola Mountains suggests that the timing of thinning during the last deglaciation was relatively similar across the lower flank of the Weddell Sea sector of the WAIS.

25 4.2 Upper limit on the highstand of the WAIS at Mt. Seelig

At Mt. Seelig, four bedrock samples have ^{14}C concentrations indistinguishable from saturation (Fig. 5b) and must have been continuously exposed for at least the past ~30 kyr. The elevation of the lowest saturated sample places an upper limit of ~190 m on the highstand of the Ross-Weddell divide, relative to its present altitude, over the past ~30 kyr. The remaining six bedrock samples have ^{14}C concentrations below saturation and ~~require shielding-were therefore shielded~~ from the cosmic-ray flux for some portion of the past ~30 kyr. Of these, three ~~are from altitudes above-were collected more than~~ 190 m above the modern ice surface, which eliminates the possibility that they could have been covered by the WAIS. Because ~~we can rule it is very unlikely~~ that these samples experienced significant surface erosion or till cover (refer to Sections 2 and 3), processes that would reduce ^{14}C concentrations, we interpret these samples to have been covered by expanded snow fields or the summit ice cap for

some portion of the past ~ 30 kyr. ~~The highest of these samples is from a small outcrop that protrudes through the margin of the summit ice cap (Fig. 4c), while the other two samples we estimate were collected within approximately 5-20 m of snowfields.~~ Only thin snow cover would be required to block the majority of the cosmic-ray flux. If we assume snow with an average density of 500 kg m^{-3} , a typical value for near-surface snow and firn in central West Antarctica (Mayewski et al., 2005), the ^{14}C production rate would be reduced by 75 % beneath 2 m of snow and by more than 90 % beneath 4 m. A lower limit on the duration of snow cover can be obtained by assuming (i) very thick snow, in which the ^{14}C production rate in the underlying bedrock approaches zero, and (ii) that snow cover occurred very recently. With these assumptions, the ^{14}C concentrations require cover for at least 1-2 kyr.

The other three samples with ^{14}C concentrations below saturation are more ambiguous. Because they were collected below 190 m, they are consistent with having been covered by a thicker WAIS. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that some or all of the shielding these samples require came from snow cover. These samples are discussed in more detail in the next section.

4.3 ~~Ice cover and exposure scenarios for bedrock samples from Mt. Seelig~~

~~Although, as discussed above, the~~ While snow cover is the only simple explanation for ^{14}C concentrations below saturation in samples collected above 190 m, there is not an obvious relationship between proximity to present-day snowfields and whether a sample is ^{14}C data-saturated or not. ~~Although all samples from Mt. Seelig do not require a thicker WAIS in the past, they usefully rule out many scenarios of WAIS thickness change. For example, consider the hypothetical scenario in which the two lowest elevation samples were initially ^{14}C saturated, then buried by WAIS thickening 20 kyr ago, and finally re-exposed 5 kyr ago (this scenario is represented by Figure 6g). This history predicts present-day ^{14}C concentrations that are well below what are observed in these samples, and therefore it is not permitted.~~

~~For each of the three samples are estimated to have been collected within approximately 5-20 m of snowfields, some, such as those from 236 and 295 m above the modern ice level, were collected from prominent outcrops along the cliff edge, and it is more difficult to envision that these sites were covered by thick snowfields. The exception to this is the highest sample from Mt. Seelig below ~ 190 m (i. e., those that may have been covered by a thicker WAIS), we calculate the set of ice-cover and exposure histories that are consistent with,~~ which has a ^{14}C concentration below saturation and was collected from a very small outcrop (few square meters) that barely protrudes through the margin of the summit ice cap (Fig. 4c). How susceptible each sample site is to snow cover is likely related to local wind conditions near the cliff edge, which may have changed since the LGM.

4.3 ~~Ice cover and exposure scenarios for the three lowest elevation bedrock samples from Mt. Seelig~~

~~As discussed above, the observed ^{14}C concentration. As in the example above, each scenario has~~ ^{14}C concentrations of the three lowest elevation samples from Mt. Seelig are compatible with multiple different scenarios of exposure and of cover by the WAIS and/or local snow fields. To explore the range of possible scenarios we consider a model consisting of the following three stages: (i) initial exposure of the sample for sufficient time ($> \sim 30$ kyr) that the sample is ^{14}C saturated, (ii) subsequent

ice cover by a thicker WAIS during which ^{14}C is lost to decay, and (iii) a final period of exposure that begins sometime in the past 30 kyr and continues to the present. ~~At the end of a scenario, the present-day ^{14}C concentration, N , is given by the following equation:-~~

$$N = \frac{P}{\lambda} \left[1 + \exp(-\lambda t_{\text{cover}}) - \exp(-\lambda t_{\text{expose}}) \right]$$

~~where P is the production rate, λ is the decay constant, t_{cover} is the time of initial cover, and t_{expose} is the time of re-exposure.~~ We do not consider scenarios with more than three stages because the response time of ice thickness changes at the divide to changes in accumulation rate or to the position of the margin is millennial (Cuffey and Patterson, 2010) (Cuffey and Patterson, 2010, Chapter 11.4.2), and thus high-frequency thickness fluctuations are unlikely. We assume that burial and re-exposure are immediate and that samples are buried by a sufficient thickness of ice or firn to completely halt production. We also assume that no subglacial or subaerial erosion occurs, which is supported by ~~the high concentrations of long-lived cosmogenic nuclides (e. g. ^{10}Be) in Mt. Seelig bedrock (see Section 3.2).~~ geomorphic observations (see Section 2.2). At the end of a three-stage scenario, the present-day ^{14}C concentration, N , is given by the following equation:

$$N = \frac{P}{\lambda} \left[1 + \exp(-\lambda t_{\text{cover}}) - \exp(-\lambda t_{\text{expose}}) \right] \quad (1)$$

where P is the total production rate from spallation and from muon interactions, λ is the decay constant, t_{cover} is the time of initial cover by the WAIS, and t_{expose} is the time of subsequent re-exposure.

The results of this calculation can be explained graphically by considering a diagram like Figure 6a that has axes of t_{cover} and t_{expose} . For a given ^{14}C concentration, there exists a set of possible ice-cover and exposure histories $\{t_{\text{cover}}, t_{\text{expose}}\}$ that define a curve. The curve begins at some point where t_{expose} is equal to zero and, at high values of t_{cover} , approaches a maximum t_{expose} equal to what is commonly referred to as the “simple exposure age”, that is, the exposure duration implied by the ^{14}C concentration assuming only one period of exposure. Uncertainty in the measured ^{14}C concentration widens the curve into a band. Although a separate band can be computed for each of the samples from below ~ 190 m, for the sake of simplicity we have combined the bands of the two lowest elevation samples in Figure 6a because they were collected at similar elevations and have similar ^{14}C concentrations (Fig. 5b). The gray band labeled “zero snow cover” therefore represents the set of ice-cover and exposure histories permitted by this pair of samples. The area in white to the left of this band represents the set of $\{t_{\text{cover}}, t_{\text{expose}}\}$ pairs that underpredict the observed ^{14}C concentrations and are thus forbidden. As discussed above, the ^{14}C concentrations of these samples require some combination of cover by the WAIS and/or by expanded local snow fields. ~~Because we cannot know the relative importance of these two effects, we solve for scenarios in which the proportion of cover due to a thicker ice sheet ranges from 0 to 1.~~

~~Figure 6a shows the result of this calculation for the two samples collected within ~ 30 m of the modern ice surface. As discussed below in Section 5.1, these samples were probably covered by a thicker WAIS, and they therefore provide information about when the divide became thicker than present and when it thinned to its modern level. We do not know whether.~~ Therefore, the gray area labeled “partial snow cover” represents the set of permissible $\{t_{\text{cover}}, t_{\text{expose}}\}$ pairs assuming

that some portion of the required cover was due to snowfields. The end-member scenario that the samples were never covered by the WAIS and that all cover was due to snowfields is represented by the 1:1 line. An equivalent diagram for the sample from ~130 m above the ice surface ~~was also covered by the WAIS, and thus it is not is~~ shown in Figure 6. The gray areas in Figure 6a represent the timing of all scenarios of a thicker-than-present WAIS that are consistent with the 7d.

5 The ^{14}C concentrations of the ~~lowest two samples~~. Scenarios that match the observed two samples collected near the modern ice surface would correspond to simple exposure ages of ~10-15 kyr, under the assumption that they were previously ice-covered for a sufficient amount of time to remove any pre-existing ^{14}C concentrations ~~plot in the region labeled~~. This is represented by the asymptote of the “zero snow cover” ~~, while scenarios that over-predict the observed concentrations plot in the region labeled “partial~~ band in Figure 6a. However, under the three-stage model of Equation 1, this pair of samples
10 could have also been exposed by WAIS thinning (i) within the past ~10 kyr, with more recent re-exposure requiring relatively brief prior ice cover, or (ii) prior to ~15 kyr B.P., given the possibility of cover by local snow fields (Fig. 6a). The primary assumption of our model is that these samples were initially ^{14}C saturated. Relaxing this assumption by considering scenarios with initial ^{14}C concentrations below saturation shifts the gray band in Figure 6a labeled “zero snow cover” ~~. Over-predicted concentrations are permitted because we do not know whether or for how long the samples were shielded by expanded snow~~
15 ~~fields, which would have~~ down and to the right (i.e., towards briefer and more recent WAIS cover). Therefore, because we also consider scenarios of partial snow cover, our assumption of initial ^{14}C saturation has the effect of ~~reducing concentrations~~. ~~Scenarios with excessive ice cover that underpredict~~ maximizing the number of exposure and WAIS-cover scenarios that are permitted by the observed ^{14}C concentrations ~~are ruled out and are represented by the white area on the left side of the diagram~~.

20 5 Discussion

5.1 Competition between snowfall and dynamic thinning at the divide

At the WAIS Divide ice-core site, the accumulation rate was lowest during the LGM and then doubled to near-modern values between 18 and 15 kyr B.P. (Figure 6c; Fudge et al., 2016). Although the magnitude of the accumulation-rate increase at the Pirrit Hills and the Whitmore Mountains (located 530 km and 360 km away, respectively) may not have been the same as
25 at WAIS Divide, the timing of changes was probably similar because (i) all three sites are fed by storms originating in the Amundsen Sea low (Hogan, 1997; Turner et al., 2013), and (ii) the accumulation rate increased considerably in both East and West Antarctica at this time (Bazin et al., 2013; Veres et al., 2013).

At the Pirrit Hills, ice levels appear to have lowered monotonically following the LGM (Fig. 5a) despite the deglacial increase in snowfall, implying that the dominant glaciological process was thinning induced by retreat of the grounding line
30 downstream. The same interpretation is implied by thinning records from the Heritage Range and the Pensacola Mountains (Hein et al., 2016; Balco et al., 2016; Bentley et al., 2010, 2017; Nichols et al., 2019), as well as other sites located near the present-day ice-sheet margin (e.g. Johnson et al., 2014; Stone et al., 2003; Spector et al., 2017). We note that, as discussed in Section 1, thinning due to surface warming (and the eventual increase of ice deformation rates near the bed) is not expected

to have occurred prior to the late Holocene at the earliest, by which time the majority of thinning to the modern ice level was complete at the Pirrit Hills and most other West Antarctic sites. As discussed by Hein et al. (2016) in regard to the Heritage Range, the onset of thinning at the Pirrit Hills (and other sites) may have been delayed by the deglacial snowfall increase. Below we show that, in contrast to the monotonic thinning near the margin, the divide appears to have initially thickened following the LGM due to the increased snowfall, and only thinned once the dynamic effects of margin retreat began to outpace the thickening from snowfall.

Figure 6a shows that if we know when the two lowest elevation samples from Mt. Seelig were most recently exposed by WAIS thinning, then we can place a constraint on when they were initially buried by thickening. Because ~~these two samples~~ were this pair of samples was collected very close to the modern ice surface, the onset of their burial and subsequent re-exposure are nearly equivalent to when the divide here became thicker than present and when it thinned to its modern level. However, for this to be meaningful, we must first establish that the divide actually was thicker than present. Although the flanks of the WAIS were certainly thicker during the LGM, the divide is where the smallest thickness changes are expected over glacial-interglacial cycles, and, as discussed in Section 4, the ^{14}C concentrations alone do not require cover by a thicker ice sheet.

The strongest evidence for thicker ice at the Whitmore Mountains comes from the Ohio Range in the southern Transantarctic Mountains (Fig. 1), where the WAIS was at a highstand ~ 125 m above present between 12 and 9 kyr ago (Ackert et al., 2007, Figure 6b). ~~Although the Ohio Range is ~ 300 km from the Whitmore Mountains, ice-sheet models of the last deglaciation show that ice thickness covaries at the two sites. Simulations by Pollard et al. (2016, 2017, 2018), Kingslake et al. (2018), and Tigheelaar et al. (2018) all predict that both sites thin as the ice-sheet margin recedes from the LGM to the present, with the Whitmore Mountains lagging the Ohio Range by 1-2 kyr and thinning 20-50 % less.~~ The inference of thicker ice at the Whitmore Mountains is further supported by (i) ~~exposure dating from Mt. Waesche, a nunatak near the divide in Marie Byrd Land (Fig. 1), which indicates that the ice surface stood at least ~ 45 m higher than present, and possibly as much as 85 m (Ackert et al., 1999, 2013), and (ii)~~ analysis of $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ records from the Byrd and Taylor Dome ice cores, which imply that the ice surface at Byrd Station, located in the upper portion of the Ross Sea catchment, lowered ~ 250 m during the Holocene (Steig et al., 2001).

These considerations strongly suggest that the less-than-saturated ^{14}C concentrations in the lowest two bedrock samples from Mt. Seelig are partially or fully attributable to cover by a thicker WAIS. These samples would have emerged only after sites downstream had thinned to present-day ice levels because dynamic thinning propagates upstream from the ice-sheet margin. In all sectors of the WAIS, present-day ice levels were reached in the mid-late Holocene (Figs. 5a and 6d; Stone et al., 2003; Todd et al., 2010; Johnson et al., 2014; Balco et al., 2016; Bentley et al., 2017; Hein et al., 2016; Spector et al., 2017); however, the most relevant sites are those nearest the flowlines that descend from the Whitmore Mountains. In the Weddell Sea sector, these are the Pirrit Hills and Heritage Range, where, as described in Section 4.1, present-day ice levels were reached after 4-5 kyr B.P. (Fig. 6d). In the Ross Sea sector, lower Reedy Glacier is the most relevant site. Exposure dating here demonstrates that thinning coincided with deglaciation of a large portion of the Ross Sea 9-7 kyr ago (Spector et al., 2017; Todd et al., 2010). By ~ 7 -6 kyr B.P., most of the thinning was complete; the ice sheet stood within ~ 50 m of the present-day surface, down from

35 a highstand that was at least ~150 m above present and likely 200-250 m or higher based on the height of depositional limits farther upstream on Reedy Glacier (Todd et al., 2010).

Thinning to the modern ice level at Mt. Seelig therefore could not have occurred before 7 kyr ago ~~-(i.e., before modern ice levels were reached on lower Reedy Glacier).~~ If the two lowest samples emerged 7 kyr ago, their ^{14}C concentrations require initial burial sometime after ~15 kyr B.P. (Fig. 6a), which ~~places~~ places an upper limit of 8 kyr on the duration of thicker-than-present ~~ie-ice~~ ice cover. More recent emergence would require more recent burial and a shorter burial duration. The finding of brief ~~and recent~~ ice cover (≤ 8 kyr ~~cover within the past ~15 kyr~~) is insensitive to the primary assumption in Figure 6a that these samples were ^{14}C -saturated prior to being ice covered. ~~Violation of Relaxing~~ this assumption would ~~actually~~ imply that the onset and duration of burial were later and more brief, respectively, than implied by Figure 6a. Although ice cover may have been relatively recent, such as scenario ‘e’ in Figure 6, histories with earlier cover, such as scenario ‘f’, are more consistent with the timing of the ~~highstands-highstand~~ at the Ohio Range ~~and Mt. Waesche (Fig. 6b; Aekert et al., 1999, 2007, 2013).~~ (Fig. 6b; Aekert et al., 2007, 2013). If true, a scenario like ‘f’ implies that modern ice levels were reached at the divide earlier than at flank sites in the Weddell Sea sector (e.g. Pirrit Hills), which would likely have been a consequence of the fact that deglaciation of much of the southern Ross Sea was complete by ~7 kyr B.P. (Spector et al., 2017; Todd et al., 2010), while grounding-line changes in the Weddell Sea sector ~~appear to have~~ continued into the late Holocene (Fig. 5a; Siegert et al., 2013; Hein et al., 2016; Nichols et al., 2019; Johnson et al., 2019; Siegert et al., 2019).

These constraints demonstrate that the WAIS at the Whitmore Mountains was the same thickness or thinner than present ~~during the LGM prior to the most recent highstand~~, and that ~~the-this~~ highstand was reached sometime in the last ~15 kyr. This suggests that, ~~unlike near the ice-sheet margin, the accumulation rate was the primary influence on ice thickness early in the deglaciation. The most representative record of the accumulation rate history at the Whitmore Mountains is the WAIS Divide ice core, which was drilled near the Ross-Amundsen divide 360 km away (Fig. 1). At the WAIS Divide site, the accumulation rate was lowest during the LGM and then doubled to near-modern values between 18 and 15 kyr B.P. (Figure 6c; Fudge et al., 2016).~~ The magnitude of the accumulation rate increase at the Whitmore Mountains may not have been the same as at WAIS Divide, but the timing of changes was probably very similar because (i) both sites are fed by storms originating in the Amundsen Sea low (Hogan, 1997; Turner et al., 2013), and (ii) the accumulation rate increased considerably in both East and West Antarctica at this time (Bazin et al., 2013; Veres et al., 2013). This implies that our data are ~~result is~~ consistent with the hypothesis described by Steig et al. (2001) and more recently by Cuffey et al. (2016) ~~that the divide thickened early in the deglaciation due to the rise in snowfall and subsequently thinned only once the dynamic effects of margin retreat began to outpace the thickening from snowfall.~~

~~A caveat is that even though~~ As noted above, any thinning induced by surface warming is expected to have been delayed until the late Holocene at the earliest and thus does not affect our findings. We note that our results are ~~consistent with this hypothesis, which was originally formulated for sites near the Ross-Amundsen divide, they are~~ not necessarily representative of thickness changes beyond the Ross-Weddell divide. This is because ~~each of the West Antarctic divides (other divide segments (e.g. Weddell-Amundsen and Amundsen-Ross; Fig. 1) likely experienced a somewhat different history somewhat different histories~~ of snowfall and ~~of~~ dynamic thinning induced by grounding-line retreat downstream (reviews of the retreat history in

the Ross, Amundsen, and Weddell Seas are given in the following publications: Anderson et al. (2014); Spector et al. (2017); Larter et al. (2014); Hillenbrand et al. (2014); Nichols et al. (2019); Johnson et al. (2019)).

5.2 Evaluation of ice-sheet models

Our data provide an opportunity to evaluate the performance of Antarctic ice sheet models in the WAIS interior, where there are few other constraints on past ice thickness. We compare our results from the Pirrit Hills and the Whitmore Mountains to ~~four~~ five thermomechanical ice-sheet models ~~and one model of glacial isostatic adjustment~~ as well as the ICE-6G_C reconstruction of ice-sheet history. Two of the thermomechanical models (Kingslake et al., 2018) are identical except that they have very different accumulation-rate histories, and therefore produce different ice-thickness histories in West Antarctica. The first, which Kingslake et al. (2018) refer to as the “reference simulation”, is forced by an accumulation-rate history that is on average much higher over the past 35 kyr than what has been reconstructed from the WAIS Divide ice core. The second is forced by the WAIS Divide accumulation-rate record. The third ~~thermomechanical~~ model is by ~~Tigheelaar et al. (2018) and is a 800-kyr simulation (we show the last 35 kyr) that is driven by a coarse-resolution three-dimensional climate model. The fourth model is by~~ Pollard et al. (2017) and is the best-scoring member of a large ensemble of simulations that are scored by comparison to geological and modern observations. At the Pirrit Hills and Whitmore Mountains, this simulation is relatively similar to other simulations using the same model (Pollard et al., 2016; Pollard et al., 2018), which, for simplicity, are not shown here. The ~~last model is~~ fourth thermomechanical model is by Tigheelaar et al. (2018) and is a 800 kyr simulation (we show the last 35 kyr) that is driven by a coarse-resolution three-dimensional climate model. The fifth model is from Whitehouse et al. (2012) and is a semi-transient simulation constrained by geological and glaciological observations. The last model is the ICE-6G_C reconstruction of ~~glacial isostatic adjustment~~ ice-sheet history (Argus et al., 2014; Peltier et al., 2015), the Antarctic component of which is calibrated with a similar set of observations as used by Pollard et al. (2017) and Whitehouse et al. (2012).

Figure 7 shows the ice-thickness histories extracted from these models at the Pirrit Hills and Whitmore Mountains along with our constraints from these sites. We compare ice-thickness relative to present rather than absolute ice thickness or elevation relative to sea level because we are more interested in whether the models correctly simulate thickness changes during the last deglaciation and less interested in whether the present-day ice sheet is correctly represented.

At the Pirrit Hills, the best performing model is that of Pollard et al. (2017). The highstand in the model matches the depositional limit, and the subsequent thinning occurs only slightly earlier (within ~ 2 kyr) than indicated by the exposure-age constraints from Mt. Tidd (Fig. 7a). All of the other models depict highstands that are at least ~ 100 m too thick or too thin and thinning that occurs several millennia too early. Because thinning at the Pirrit Hills is expected to have been primarily paced by the retreat of grounded ice in the southern Weddell Sea, this suggests that the grounding line retreats too early in all ~~simulations~~ of the thermomechanical ice-sheet model simulations. We note that premature thinning in the models could also be caused by underestimating the magnitude and/or rapidity of the deglacial rise in snowfall, which as discussed by Hein et al. (2016) may have delayed the onset of thinning.

At the Whitmore Mountains, two of the simulations are ruled out because they depict ice considerably more than 190 m thicker than present, which is the upper limit on the highstand imposed by the ^{14}C -saturated bedrock samples (Fig. 7b). To

evaluate the timing of thickening and thinning, we use not only the ^{14}C constraints from the lowest two bedrock samples described in Section 5.1, but also those from the sample ~ 130 m above the present-day ice surface (Figs. 7c, d). In comparison to the lower samples, the ~ 130 m sample provides slightly more restrictive constraints on ice cover and exposure. The two best-performing models at the Whitmore Mtns. Mountains are (i) the simulation by Kingslake et al. (2018) that is forced by the WAIS Divide accumulation-rate record, and (ii) the simulation by Pollard et al. (2017). Neither simulates ice-cover of the ~ 130 m sample, so the constraints in Figure 7d are not applicable to these models. The former model is the only simulation with sufficiently brief thicker-than-present ice cover to be permitted by the ^{14}C concentrations of the two lowest samples from Mt. Seelig. However, it depicts thinning to the modern ice level prior to 7 kyr B.P., which, as discussed above, is earlier than when sites downstream of the Whitmore Mountains reached their modern ice levels. The latter model simulates the onset of ice-cover occurring a few millenia too early and/or re-exposure occurring a few millenia too late; but it successfully simulates thinning to the modern ice level within the past ~ 7 kyr. The other three-four models do not simulate burial of the two lowest samples by the WAIS during the past 35 kyr and therefore do not appear in Figure 7c. The Kingslake et al. (2018) reference simulation and the simulation by Tigheelaar et al. (2018) are consistent (or nearly consistent) with the ^{14}C constraints of the ~ 130 m sample (Fig. 7d); however, these models, along with ICE-6G_C, do not capture the general timing and magnitude of thickness changes at the Whitmore Mountains. The model of Whitehouse et al. (2012) is consistent with the highstand constraints from the Whitmore Mountains, however, because the simulation only spans the past 20 kyr, we have limited ability to evaluate the timing of thickness changes in the model.

The overall best performing model at both the Pirrit Hills and the Whitmore Mountains is that of Pollard et al. (2017). This is perhaps not surprising because ~~in contrast to the other thermomechanical models, this model uses parameters that have been calibrated~~ this is the best-scoring run of an ensemble of ice-sheet simulations that were scored based on how well they agreed with geological observations from many sites in Antarctica (though few from the ice-sheet interior). We note that the accumulation-rate history of this model ~~is biased low (i.e., at the WAIS Divide ice-core site, the accumulation-rate forcing in the model~~ is lower than the ice-core-derived accumulation-rate record (Fudge et al., 2016). Therefore, the performance of the model, especially near the divide, could probably be improved with a more realistic forcing.

25 6 Conclusions

We present cosmogenic-nuclide constraints on ice thickness changes since the LGM from the Pirrit Hills and Whitmore Mountains, located on the flank and the divide of the WAIS, respectively. At the Pirrit Hills, monotonic thinning occurred after accumulation rates had risen from their ice-age low, implying that the dominant control on ice thickness was the retreat of the ice-sheet margin downstream. In contrast, at the Whitmore Mountains, the WAIS appears to have initially thickened following the LGM due to the increased snowfall, and only thinned once the dynamic effects of margin retreat began to outpace the thickening from snowfall. We compare our ice-thickness constraints to several recently-published models of the Antarctic ice sheet over the last deglaciation and find that while most of the models poorly capture the timing and/or magnitude of thickness

changes at the Pirrit Hills and Whitmore Mountains, the model of Pollard et al. (2017) performs well at these sites, which, in part, is likely due to the fact that it is calibrated with geological observations of ice thickness change.

Data availability. Sample information and cosmogenic-nuclide data are available in the ICE-D: ANTARCTICA database (<http://antarctica.ice-d.org>)

- 10 *Author contributions.* PS and JS conducted the fieldwork. BG made the carbon-14 measurements. PS made the beryllium-10 measurements, analyzed all data, and wrote the manuscript.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements. Support for this work was provided by U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF) grants 1142162 and 1341728 and the United States Antarctic Program. P.S. received support from the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program. We thank Trevor Hillebrand,

- 15 Mika Usher, Taryn Black, and Maurice Conway for assistance in the field; Kier Nichols for lab assistance; Greg Balco and Eric Steig for insightful discussions; and David Pollard, Torsten Albrecht, Jonathan Kingslake, and Michelle Tigchelaar for providing ice-sheet simulations. Geospatial support for this work provided by the Polar Geospatial Center under NSF-OPP awards 1043681 and 1559691.

References

- Ackert, R. P., Barclay, D. J., Borns, H. W., Calkin, P. E., Kurz, M. D., Fastook, J. L., and Steig, E. J.: Measurements of past ice sheet elevations in interior West Antarctica, *Science*, 286, 276–280, 1999.
- Ackert, R. P., Mukhopadhyay, S., Parizek, B. R., and Borns, H. W.: Ice elevation near the West Antarctic Ice Sheet divide during the last glaciation, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, 2007.
- Ackert, R. P., Mukhopadhyay, S., Pollard, D., DeConto, R. M., Putnam, A. E., and Borns, H. W.: West Antarctic Ice Sheet elevations in the Ohio Range: Geologic constraints and ice sheet modeling prior to the last highstand, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 307, 83–93, 2011.
- Ackert, R. P., Putnam, A. E., Mukhopadhyay, S., Pollard, D., DeConto, R. M., Kurz, M. D., and Borns, H. W.: Controls on interior West Antarctic Ice Sheet Elevations: inferences from geologic constraints and ice sheet modeling, *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 65, 26–38, 2013.
- Alley, R. B. and Whillans, I. M.: Response of the East Antarctica ice sheet to sea-level rise, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 89, 6487–6493, 1984.
- Anderson, J. B., Conway, H., Bart, P. J., Witus, A. E., Greenwood, S. L., McKay, R. M., Hall, B. L., Ackert, R. P., Licht, K., Jakobsson, M., and Stone, J. O.: Ross Sea paleo-ice sheet drainage and deglacial history during and since the LGM, *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 100, 31–54, 2014.
- Argus, D., Peltier, W. R., Drummond, R., and Moore, A.: The Antarctica component of postglacial rebound model ICE-6G_C (VM5a) based on GPS positioning, exposure age dating of ice thicknesses, and relative sea level histories, *Geophysical Journal International*, 198, 537–563, 2014.
- Balco, G., Stone, J. O., Lifton, N. A., and Dunai, T. J.: A complete and easily accessible means of calculating surface exposure ages or erosion rates from ¹⁰Be and ²⁶Al measurements, *Quaternary geochronology*, 3, 174–195, 2008.
- Balco, G., Todd, C., Huybers, K., Campbell, S., Vermeulen, M., Hegland, M., Goehring, B. M., and Hillebrand, T. R.: Cosmogenic-nuclide exposure ages from the Pensacola Mountains adjacent to the Foundation Ice Stream, Antarctica, *American Journal of Science*, 316, 542–577, 2016.
- Bentley, M. J., Fogwill, C. J., Le Brocq, A. M., Hubbard, A. L., Sugden, D. E., Dunai, T. J., and Freeman, S. P.: Deglacial history of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet in the Weddell Sea embayment: Constraints on past ice volume change, *Geology*, 38, 411–414, 2010.
- Bentley, M. J., Hein, A., Sugden, D., Whitehouse, P., Shanks, R., Xu, S., and Freeman, S.: Deglacial history of the Pensacola Mountains, Antarctica from glacial geomorphology and cosmogenic nuclide surface exposure dating, *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 158, 58–76, 2017.
- Bindschadler, R., Choi, H., Wichlacz, A., Bingham, B., Bohlander, J., Brunt, K., Corr, H., Drews, R., Fricker, H., Hall, M., et al.: Getting around Antarctica: new high-resolution mappings of the grounded and freely-floating boundaries of the Antarctic ice sheet created for the International Polar Year, *The Cryosphere*, 2011.
- Borchers, B., Marrero, S., Balco, G., Caffee, M., Goehring, B., Lifton, N., Nishiizumi, K., Phillips, F., Schaefer, J., and Stone, J.: Geological calibration of spallation production rates in the CRONUS-Earth project, *Quaternary Geochronology*, 31, 188–198, 2016.
- Cuffey, K. and Patterson, W.: *The physics of glaciers*, Academic Press, 2010.
- Cuffey, K. M. and Clow, G. D.: Temperature, accumulation, and ice sheet elevation in central Greenland through the last deglacial transition, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 102, 26 383–26 396, 1997.

- Cuffey, K. M., Clow, G. D., Steig, E. J., Buizert, C., Fudge, T., Koutnik, M., Waddington, E. D., Alley, R. B., and Severinghaus, J. P.: Deglacial temperature history of West Antarctica, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113, 14 249–14 254, 2016.
- 20 Ditchburn, R. G. and Whitehead, N. E.: The separation of ^{10}Be from silicates, in: *Third Workshop of the South Pacific Environmental Radioactivity Association*, edited by Hancock, G. and Wallbrink, P., pp. 4–7, Australian National University, Canberra, 1994.
- Fretwell, P., Pritchard, H. D., Vaughan, D. G., Bamber, J., Barrand, N., Bell, R., Bianchi, C., Bingham, R., Blankenship, D., Casassa, G., et al.: *Bedmap2: improved ice bed, surface and thickness datasets for Antarctica*, *The Cryosphere*, 7, 2013.
- Fudge, T., Markle, B. R., Cuffey, K. M., Buizert, C., Taylor, K. C., Steig, E. J., Waddington, E. D., Conway, H., and Koutnik, M.: Variable
25 relationship between accumulation and temperature in West Antarctica for the past 31,000 years, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43, 3795–3803, 2016.
- Goehring, B. M., Balco, G., Todd, C., Moening-Swanson, I., and Nichols, K.: Late-glacial grounding line retreat in the northern Ross Sea, Antarctica, *Geology*, 47, 291–294, 2019a.
- Goehring, B. M., Wilson, J., and Nichols, K.: A fully automated system for the extraction of in situ cosmogenic carbon-14 in the Tulane
30 University cosmogenic nuclide laboratory, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms*, 2019b.
- Hall, B. L., Denton, G. H., Heath, S. L., Jackson, M. S., and Koffman, T. N.: Accumulation and marine forcing of ice dynamics in the western Ross Sea during the last deglaciation, *Nature Geoscience*, 8, 625, 2015.
- Hein, A. S., Woodward, J., Marrero, S. M., Dunning, S. A., Steig, E. J., Freeman, S. P., Stuart, F. M., Winter, K., Westoby, M. J., and Sugden,
35 D. E.: Evidence for the stability of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet divide for 1.4 million years, *Nature communications*, 7, 10 325, 2016.
- Hillenbrand, C.-D., Bentley, M. J., Stollendorf, T. D., Hein, A. S., Kuhn, G., Graham, A. G., Fogwill, C. J., Kristoffersen, Y., Smith, J. A., Anderson, J. B., Larter, R. D., Melles, M., Hodgson, D. A., Mulvaney, R., and Sugden, D. E.: Reconstruction of changes in the Weddell Sea sector of the Antarctic Ice Sheet since the Last Glacial Maximum., *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 100, 111–136, 2014.
- Hogan, A.: A synthesis of warm air advection to the South Polar Plateau, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 102, 14 009–14 020, 1997.
- Howat, I. M., Porter, C., Smith, B. E., Noh, M.-J., and Morin, P.: The Reference Elevation Model of Antarctica, *The Cryosphere*, 13, 665–674, 2019.
- Johnson, J. S., Bentley, M. J., Smith, J. A., Finkel, R., Rood, D., Gohl, K., Balco, G., Larter, R. D., and Schaefer, J.: Rapid thinning of Pine
5 Island Glacier in the early Holocene, *science*, 343, 999–1001, 2014.
- Johnson, J. S., Nichols, K. A., Goehring, B. M., Balco, G., and Schaefer, J. M.: Abrupt mid-Holocene ice loss in the western Weddell Sea Embayment of Antarctica, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 518, 127–135, 2019.
- Jull, A. T., Scott, E. M., and Bierman, P.: The CRONUS-Earth inter-comparison for cosmogenic isotope analysis, *Quaternary Geochronology*, 26, 3–10, 2015.
- 10 Kingslake, J., Scherer, R. P., Albrecht, T., Coenen, J., Powell, R. D., Reese, R., Stansell, N. D., Tulaczyk, S., Wearing, M. G., and Whitehouse, P. L.: Extensive retreat and re-advance of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet during the Holocene, *Nature*, 558, 430–434, 2018.
- Larter, R. D., Anderson, J. B., Graham, A. G. C., Gohl, K., Hillenbrand, C.-D., Jakobsson, M., Johnson, J. S., Kuhn, G., Nitsche, F. O., Smith, J. A., Witus, A. E., Bentley, M. J., Dowdeswell, J. A., Ehrmann, W. U., Klages, J. P., Lindow, J., Cofaigh, C. ., and Spiegel, C.: Reconstruction of changes in the Amundsen Sea and Bellingshausen Sea sector of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet since the Last Glacial
15 Maximum, *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 100, 55–86, 2014.
- Lifton, N., Sato, T., and Dunai, T. J.: Scaling in situ cosmogenic nuclide production rates using analytical approximations to atmospheric cosmic-ray fluxes, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 386, 149–160, 2014.

- Mayewski, P. A., Frezzotti, M., Bertler, N., Ommen, T. V., Hamilton, G., Jacka, T. H., Welch, B., Frey, M., Dahe, Q., Jiawen, R., et al.: The international trans-antarctic scientific expedition (ITASE): an overview, *Annals of Glaciology*, 41, 180–185, 2005.
- 20 Nichols, K. A. and Goehring, B. M.: Isolation of quartz for cosmogenic in situ ^{14}C analysis, *Geochronology Discussions*, 2019, 1–14, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gchron-2019-7>, <https://www.geochronology-discuss.net/gchron-2019-7/>, 2019.
- Nichols, K. A., Goehring, B. M., Balco, G., Johnson, J. S., Hein, A. A., and Todd, C.: New Last Glacial Maximum Ice Thickness constraints for the Weddell Sea sector, Antarctica, *The Cryosphere Discussions*, 2019, 1–21, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2019-64>, <https://www.the-cryosphere-discuss.net/tc-2019-64/>, 2019.
- 25 Nishiizumi, K., Imamura, M., Caffee, M. W., Southon, J. R., Finkel, R. C., and McAninch, J.: Absolute calibration of ^{10}Be AMS standards, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms*, 258, 403–413, 2007.
- Peltier, W. R., Argus, D. F., and Drummond, R.: Space geodesy constrains ice age terminal deglaciation: The global ICE-6G_C (VM5a) model, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 120, 450–487, 2015.
- Pollard, D., Chang, W., Haran, M., Applegate, P., and DeConto, R.: Large ensemble modeling of the last deglacial retreat of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet: comparison of simple and advanced statistical techniques., *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 2016.
- 30 Pollard, D., Gomez, N., and Deconto, R. M.: Variations of the Antarctic Ice Sheet in a Coupled Ice Sheet-Earth-Sea Level Model: Sensitivity to Viscoelastic Earth Properties: Variations of the Antarctic Ice Sheet, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 122, 2124–2138, 2017.
- Pollard, D., Gomez, N., DeConto, R. M., and Han, H. K.: Estimating Modern Elevations of Pliocene Shorelines Using a Coupled Ice Sheet-Earth-Sea Level Model, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 123, 2279–2291, 2018.
- 35 Siebert, M., Ross, N., Corr, H., Kingslake, J., and Hindmarsh, R.: Late Holocene ice-flow reconfiguration in the Weddell Sea sector of West Antarctica, *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 78, 98–107, 2013.
- Siebert, M. J., Kingslake, J., Ross, N., Whitehouse, P. L., Woodward, J., Jamieson, S. S., Bentley, M. J., Winter, K., Wearing, M., Hein, A. S., et al.: Major ice-sheet change in the Weddell Sector of West Antarctica over the last 5000 years, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 2019.
- Spector, P., Stone, J., Cowdery, S. G., Hall, B., Conway, H., and Bromley, G.: Rapid early-Holocene deglaciation in the Ross Sea, Antarctica, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44, 7817–7825, 2017.
- Steig, E. J., Fastook, J. L., Zweck, C., Goodwin, I. D., Licht, K. J., White, J. W., and Ackert, R. P.: West Antarctic ice sheet elevation changes, *The West Antarctic Ice Sheet: Behavior and Environment*, pp. 75–90, 2001.
- Stone, J. O., Balco, G. A., Sugden, D. E., Caffee, M. W., Sass, L. C., Cowdery, S. G., and Siddoway, C.: Holocene deglaciation of Marie Byrd land, west Antarctica, *Science*, 299, 99–102, 2003.
- 600 Sugden, D. E., Hein, A. S., Woodward, J., Marrero, S. M., Rodés, Á., Dunning, S. A., Stuart, F. M., Freeman, S. P., Winter, K., and Westoby, M. J.: The million-year evolution of the glacial trimline in the southernmost Ellsworth Mountains, Antarctica, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 469, 42–52, 2017.
- Tigheelaar, M., Timmermann, A., Pollard, D., Friedrich, T., and Heinemann, M.: Local insolation changes enhance Antarctic interglacials: Insights from an 800,000-year ice sheet simulation with transient climate forcing, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 495, 69–78, 2018.
- 605 Todd, C., Stone, J., Conway, H., Hall, B., and Bromley, G.: Late Quaternary evolution of Reedy Glacier, Antarctica, *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 29, 1328–1341, 2010.
- Turner, J., Phillips, T., Hosking, J. S., Marshall, G. J., and Orr, A.: The Amundsen Sea low, *International Journal of Climatology*, 33, 1818–1829, 2013.
- 610 Whillans, I. M.: Reaction of the accumulation zone portions of glaciers to climatic change, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 86, 4274–4282, 1981.

Whitehouse, P. L., Bentley, M. J., and Le Brocq, A. M.: A deglacial model for Antarctica: geological constraints and glaciological modelling as a basis for a new model of Antarctic glacial isostatic adjustment, *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 32, 1–24, 2012.

Zwally, J., Giovinetto, M., Beckley, M., and Saba, J.: Antarctic and Greenland Drainage Systems, GSFC Cryospheric Sciences Laboratory,

615 http://icesat4.gsfc.nasa.gov/cryo_data/ant_grn_drainage_systems.php, 2012.




Figure 1. Map of West Antarctica. Hillshade of ice-sheet surface topography (Howat et al., 2019) is vertically exaggerated 20 \times and is overlaid on marine bathymetry (Fretwell et al., 2013). The continental shelf is shown in light blue. The grounding line (Bindschadler et al., 2011) and major ice divides (Zwally et al., 2012) are traced in gray.




Figure 2. WorldView satellite imagery (copyright 2012 DigitalGlobe, Inc.) of the Pirrit Hills (a) and Mt. Seelig in the Whitmore Mountains (b). Circles show the locations of samples discussed in the text, and their colors correspond to the circles in Figure 3. Wind direction arrows are based on the orientation of snowtails visible in the satellite imagery. The range of wind directions shown in panel (a) reflects the fact that the wind orientation varies with location around the mountains. The wind direction is relatively constant in panel (b) and so a single vector is used.




Figure 3. Views facing south of Mts. Axtell and Tidd **(a)** and facing west of Mt. Turcotte **(b)** at the Pirrit Hills. **(c)** View to the south of the northwest ridge of Mt. Seelig. Note that all circles in **(a)** and **(b)** denote samples of glacial deposits, while circles in **(c)** denote bedrock samples. The white circle in **(a)** represents samples from the depositional limit on Mt. Tidd, which have not been analyzed. Circles are labeled with abbreviated sample names. Mt. Turcotte samples, as well as the unanalyzed samples from Mt. Tidd, begin with the prefix “16-PRT-” (e.g. 16-PRT-042-TCT); all other samples begin with the prefix “13-NTK-”.



Figure 4. (a) View looking up the steep NE buttress of Mt. Axtell at the Pirrit Hills. The granite ridge crest is generally a few meters wide, oxidized, and, in places, displays evidence of exfoliation. In contrast, the glacial deposits, which are visible in the foreground as well as next to the two geologists, are typically only lightly weathered. The boulder with a very flat upper surface in the central foreground is sample 13-NTK-019-PRT. The depositional limit, where sample 13-NTK-013-PRT was collected, is ~ 15 m higher, near the level of the two geologists. (b) View looking up the NW ridge of Mt. Seelig in the Whitmore Mountains. The geologist is collecting sample 13-NTK-041-WHT (236 m above the modern ice surface) from the bedrock knob. Other samples come from the narrow ice-free strip of bedrock close to the cliff edge that is visible in the background. (c) Photo of bedrock sample 13-NTK-044-WHT, the highest elevation sample from Mt. Seelig. The sample was collected from an outcrop only a few meters wide that is likely kept ice-free by strong wind near the cliff edge.




Figure 5. (a) Beryllium-10 exposure age of erratics from the Pirrit Hills plotted against their height above the modern ice surface. Inset shows the apparent ages of all glacial deposits, the majority of which are pre-exposed. **(b)** Carbon-14 concentrations in bedrock samples from the Whitmore Mountains plotted against their height above the modern ice surface. The black line and surrounding gray band represent calculated ^{14}C saturation concentrations, which are a function of elevation, and their uncertainty. As discussed in the text, ^{14}C saturation occurs after ~ 30 - 35 kyr of continuous exposure, at which point nuclide production is balanced by decay, and the ^{14}C concentration is no longer time dependent. Error bars for both **(a)** and **(b)** are one standard error.




Figure 6. (a) Chronological constraints on exposure and ice cover of the two bedrock samples within ~ 30 m of the modern ice surface at Mt. Seelig. Scenarios that plot in the gray regions are permitted by the ^{14}C concentrations. The lower-right half of the diagram is forbidden because re-exposure cannot occur prior to ice cover; the white area on the left side of the diagram is forbidden because these scenarios underpredict the observed ^{14}C concentrations. The gray areas left of the curved dashed line assume that less-than-saturated ^{14}C concentrations are only due to cover by WAIS thickening, while the areas to the right allow for the possibility that the samples experienced cover by a combination of a thicker WAIS and expanded snow fields. The position of these regions accounts for 1σ measurement uncertainties of both samples. The 1:1 line represents end-member scenarios of zero ice-sheet cover, which are permitted by the ^{14}C data. The three circles correspond to the hypothetical ice-cover scenarios shown in panels (e-g). (b) Timeline showing when ice was at a highstand at the Ohio Range and at Mt. Waesche, sites near the WAIS divide, based on exposure dating of glacial deposits (Ackert et al., 1999, 2007, 2013). Note that the highstands could have begun before and/or persisted after the ages shown. (c) The accumulation-rate record from the WAIS Divide ice core (Fudge et al., 2016). (d) Timeline showing when modern ice levels were established at nunatak sites in West Antarctica. The vertical dashed lines in panels (a, d) represent the earliest time (7 kyr B.P.) that the modern ice level could have been reached at the Whitmore Mountains, which is based on constraints from Reedy Glacier, the Pirrit Hills, and the Heritage Range, sites that share similar flow paths to the Whitmore Mountains. The dark gray region in panel (a) represents scenarios that are both (i) permitted by the ^{14}C concentrations, and (ii) consistent with the constraints shown in panel (d). (e-g) Timelines showing hypothetical burial intervals of the lowest two Mt. Seelig samples, which correspond to the red-circles in panel (a).




Figure 7. Evaluation of ice-sheet models at the Pirrit Hills and Whitmore Mountains. Panels (a) and (b) show ice-thickness histories from five ice-sheet models at the Pirrit Hills and Whitmore Mountains, respectively. The horizontal dashed line in panel (a) represents the height of the highstand, while in panel (b), it represents the upper limit of the highstand. (a) also depicts ^{10}Be exposure ages as in Figure 5a. (c) shows chronological constraints on exposure and ice cover from the two lowest elevation bedrock samples. The gray areas are permitted by the bedrock ^{14}C data, and the vertical dashed line represents the earliest time (refer 7 kyr B.P.) that the modern ice level could have been reached at the Whitmore Mountains. Refer to the caption of Figure 6 a for details a full explanation of this figure. (d) shows the same constraints, except from the bedrock sample ~ 130 m above the ice surface. In comparison to the lower samples, the ~ 130 m sample provides slightly more restrictive constraints on ice cover and exposure. For panels (c) and (d), only models that simulate both cover and re-exposure of the sample(s) within the past 35 kyr appear on the diagrams.