The Ibero-Armoricán arc: indentation versus self-subduction
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In the Iberian Variscides it is possible to distinguish major arcuate structures; although highly studied, their characterization and genesis are still a matter of controversy. The main Ibero-Armoricán Arc (IAA) is essentially defined by a NW–SE trend in the Iberian branch and an E–W trend in the Brittany branch; however, in northern Spain it is rotated 180°, sometimes known as the Cantabrian Arc (CA). The relationship between these arcs is debatable, being considered either as a single arc generated in one tectonic event, or the result of polyphase bending process. According to the last assumption, there is a later arcuate structure (CA), overlapping a previous major one (IAA). Whatever the proposed models, they must explain the presence of a sinistral transpression regime in Iberia and a dextral one in Armorican branch, and the temporal deformation range of Devonian to Upper Carboniferous (Dias and Ribeiro, 1995).

Another arcuate structure in continuity with the IAA, the Central Iberian Arc (CIA) was recently proposed (e.g., Martínez Catalán et al., 2014; Shaw et al., 2014) mainly based on magnetic anomalies, the geometry of major folds and Ordovician paleocurrents. However, this definition didn’t take into account the described deformation events in the southern sectors of the Portuguese Central Iberian zone.

Considering the models proposed for the genesis of Iberian Variscan arcs, they could be ascribed to two major processes: oceanic lithosphere self-subduction and the indentation of a Gondwana promontory. The first argues that self-subduction of Paleotethys oceanic lithosphere induces whole-lithosphere buckling around vertical axes and thus the major Variscan arcuate pattern – according to this model, a previous linear chain was bent in a late and very fast stage (about 10 Ma). Although this model could be applicable to the CA, its extrapolation to the IAA does not explain either the transpressive deformation regimes that prevail in large sectors (dextral in Armorica and sinistral in Iberia), or the Devonian age of part of the Variscan deformation. If a polyphase indentation model is considered it becomes possible to explain the observed situations: mainly the presence of important transcurrent kinematics in both branches of the IAA, and the progressive deformation from Devonian to Carboniferous times (with an earlier IAA genesis and a latter arcuate structure that is represented by the CA). We do not consider that the CA could be supported by the described Variscan structures.