Int J Earth Sci (Geol Rundsch) (2017) 106:2131–2145
DOI 10.1007/s00531-016-1419-8

REVIEW ARTICLE

A review of definitions of the Himalayan Main Central Thrust

Aaron J. Martin[1]

Received: 7 October 2016 / Accepted: 18 October 2016 / Published online: 3 November 2016

Abstract Most workers regard the Main Central Thrust (MCT) as one of the key high strain zones in the Himalaya because it accommodated at least 90 km of shortening, because that shortening exhumed and buried hanging wall and footwall rocks, and due to geometric and kinematic connections between the Main Central Thrust and the structurally overlying South Tibet Detachment. Geologists currently employ three unrelated definitions of the MCT: metamorphic-rheological, age of motion-structural, or protolith boundary-structural. These disparate definitions generate map and cross-section MCT positions that vary by up to 5 km of structural distance. The lack of consensus and consequent shifting locations impede advances in our understanding of the tectonic development of the orogen. Here, I review pros and cons of the three MCT definitions in current use. None of these definitions is flawless. The metamorphic-rheological and age of motion-structural definitions routinely fail throughout the orogen, whereas the protolith boundary-structural definition may fail only in rare cases, all limited to sectors of the eastern Himalaya. Accordingly, a definition based on high strain zone geometry and kinematics combined with identification of a protolith boundary is the best working definition of the MCT.

Keywords Himalaya · MCT · Thrusts · Fold-thrust belts · Orogens · Definitions

Introduction

The identification of major high strain zones is a longstanding challenge in investigations of fold-thrust belt geology. By 1890, geologists had documented regional-scale thrusts in many orogens (Callaway 1883; Lapworth 1883; McConnell 1887; Tornebohm 1888; Hayes 1891). Controversies about the existence, definition, location, and tectonic significance of some of these high strain zones erupted only a few years after they were first proposed (e.g., Murchison 1860; Nicol 1861). Decades of research resolved these first debates, but newer disputes persist (e.g., Mazur et al. 2015, 2016; Narkiewicz and Petecki 2016). In the Himalaya, the definition and location of the Main Central Thrust (MCT) remain continuing sources of conflict.

The MCT accommodated more than 90 km of offset (e.g., Schelling and Arita 1991; Long et al. 2012, 2016; Webb 2013; Robinson and Martin 2014) and has been mapped continuously along the entire Himalayan fold-thrust belt (Fig. 1; Martin 2016). Most workers therefore consider it to be one of the major thrusts in the orogen (Fig. 2). The MCT figures prominently in models of the Cenozoic tectonic development of the Himalaya, both because of the large amount of Cenozoic shortening accommodated by the thrust and due to the implications for exhumation and burial, and resulting metamorphism, of hanging wall and footwall rocks (e.g., Le Fort 1975; Searle et al. 1992; Harrison et al. 1998; Jamieson et al. 2004; Celerier et al. 2009a; Long et al. 2011a; Rubatto et al. 2013). Further, some articles interpret the structurally higher South Tibet Detachment, another tectonically important high strain zone in the orogen, to have branched from the MCT in the up-dip (south) direction (Caby et al. 1983; Yin 2006; Webb et al. 2007, 2011a; He et al. 2015) or in the down-dip (north) direction (Burchfiel and Royden 1985; Burchfiel

✉ Aaron J. Martin
aaron.martin@ipicyt.edu.mx

[1] División de Geociencias Aplicadas, IPICYT,
CP 78216 San Luis Potosi, S.L.P., Mexico



Fig. 1 Geologic map of the Himalayan orogen and surrounding regions Modified from Webb (2013)

Fig. 2 Balanced cross section through the frontal half of the Himalaya in western Bhutan. Gross structural architecture is similar along-strike Modified from McQuarrie et al. (2014)



et al. 1992; Grujic et al. 1996; Dubey and Bhakuni 2007). Although most geologists agree on its importance, we face a challenge in identifying the MCT because it is just one of many thrusts in the Himalayan fold-thrust belt. How do we decide which thrust to designate as the MCT?



(A) Metamorphic-Rheological Definition

Definition: *The MCT is the base of the large-scale zone of high strain and ductile deformation, commonly coinciding with the base of the zone of inverted metamorphic isograds, which places Tertiary metamorphic rocks of the Greater Himalayan Sequence over unmetamorphosed or low-grade rocks of the Lesser Himalaya.*

Problems: Illustrated in figures 4-7.

Main Central Thrust is a fossil brittle-ductile transition in quartz

(B) Age of Motion-Structural Definition

Definition: *The MCT is the foreland-vergent thrust that was active in early to middle Miocene time.*

Problem: Cannot determine whether to label thrust Y or Z as the MCT

(C) Protolith Boundary-Structural Definition

Definition: *The MCT is the Cenozoic foreland-vergent thrust that juxtaposed Himalayan Assemblage A and B.*

Problem: In some locations, it might be difficult to distinguish Assemblage A from B.

Fig. 3 Contrasting definitions of the MCT. **a** Metamorphic-rheological definition (Searle et al. 2008). **b** Definition based on age of thrust motion (Webb et al. 2013). The listed ages are typical for thrusts along the orogen in general; the listed ages do not indicate actual times of motion in any particular location. **c** Protolith boundary-structural definition (Martin 2016). The South Tibet Detachment is not shown for clarity

Opposing workers answer this question differently through the use of unrelated definitions of the MCT (Fig. 3; Table 1). The original definition of the MCT was structural and metamorphic: The MCT is the thrust that produced a marked break in metamorphic grade between higher-grade hanging wall and lower-grade footwall rocks (Heim and Gansser 1939). Searle et al. (2008) reviewed the multiple definitions of the MCT employed by Himalayan geologists in the following 70 years, concluding that a metamorphic-rheological definition is the best choice. Subsequently, Webb et al. (2013) proposed a new definition based on the age of thrusting and Martin (2016) advanced a modified version of an older definition of the MCT as both a high strain zone and a protolith boundary. The merits and shortcomings of these three definitions have not been compared.

The competing definitions of the MCT place the high strain zone in locations that differ by up to 5 km of structural distance (Valdiya 1980; Martin et al. 2005; Robinson et al. 2006; Yakymchuk and Godin 2012; Parsons et al. 2016a, b, c). This lack of agreement on location hinders comparison of maps, cross sections, and tectonic models. For example, proximal hanging wall rocks according to one definition become distal footwall rocks in a different study. Tectonic models that explain the metamorphism of these

Table 1 Key MCT definition articles discussed in text

Authors	Year
Metamorphic-rheological definition	
Heim and Gansser	(1939)
Sinha-Roy	(1982)
Searle et al.	(2008)
Gibson et al.	(2016)
Age of motion-structural definition	
Yin	(2006)
Webb et al.	(2013)
Protolith boundary-structural definition	
Ahmad et al.	(2000)
Martin	(2016)

rocks as either in the footwall or hanging wall of the MCT consequently vary considerably (c.f. Robinson et al. 2006 versus Yakymchuk and Godin 2012; or Martin et al. 2010 and Corrie and Kohn 2011 versus Parsons et al. 2016b). The problem is so severe that some recent articles avoided the issue, refraining from using any definition of the MCT at all (e.g., Larson et al. 2013; From et al. 2014; Larson and Cottle 2014; Cottle et al. 2015; He et al. 2015; Larson et al. 2015). Consensus on a definition would advance tectonic research in the Himalaya by enabling direct comparison of maps, cross sections, and tectonic models.

In this article, I discuss pros and cons of the three recent MCT definitions and propose a working resolution to the definition conflict. The discussion focuses on the part of the Himalayan orogen between the western and eastern syntaxes, in Pakistan, India, Nepal, Bhutan, and Tibet (Fig. 1).

Definition of terms and geologic framework

Strain is a tensorial quantity that describes dilation and/or distortion of rocks (Passchier and Trouw 2005; Davis et al. 2012). Strain can accrue via brittle, ductile, or a combination of both processes. Throughout the article, compass directions are given using modern orientations. Brittle faults and ductile shear zones share similar geometries in that both occupy a volume of deformed rock, and this volume typically is tabular—much smaller in one dimension than the other two (e.g., Childs et al. 2009; Rennie et al. 2013; Sullivan et al. 2013). Further, some aspects of the kinematics of brittle faults and ductile shear zones are alike: both types of high strain zone accommodate shear offset of one side of the high strain zone relative to the other side. Based on these similarities, and for simplicity and consistency, throughout the article I use the general term “high strain zone” to refer to a tabular structure that accommodated shear offset via brittle or ductile mechanisms, or both.

The Himalaya is the orogen that formed at the leading edge of the broad region of deformation that has resulted from continuing convergence between India and Asia (Jade et al. 2007; Yin 2010). Initial collision between Indian continental crust and more northern terranes began in Middle or Late Paleocene time (DeCelles et al. 2014; Hu et al. 2015). The rear and frontal boundaries of the Himalayan orogen are the Indus-Yarlung Suture and the Main Frontal Thrust, respectively (Fig. 1; Martin 2016). The western edge of the orogen is the left-slip Chaman Fault (located in Afghanistan and Pakistan) and the eastern limit is the right-slip Sagaing Fault (located in Myanmar).

The MCT stretches at least from the western to the eastern syntaxis, an along-strike distance of approximately 2500 km (Fig. 1). Estimates of the thickness of the MCT range from approximately 100 m to 10 km (Vannay et al. 2004; Yin et al. 2010; Law et al. 2013; Mukherjee 2013; Gibson et al. 2016; He et al. 2016; Long et al. 2016). This large span stems both from along-strike differences in the geology and from the application of different definitions of the MCT. Regardless of which MCT definition they prefer, most geologists agree that the MCT accommodated offset of at least 90 km (Schelling and Arita 1991; Long et al. 2012, 2016; Webb 2013; Robinson and Martin 2014) between ca. 23 and 10 Ma (Yin et al. 2010; Corrie and Kohn 2011; Webb et al. 2011b; Tobgay et al. 2012; Mottram et al. 2015; see also Larson and Cottle 2014). Most of this deformation occurred in the ductile regime (Martin et al. 2005; Larson and Godin 2009; Mukherjee and Koyi 2010; Law et al. 2013; Mukherjee 2013; Gibson et al. 2016; He et al. 2016; Long et al. 2016; Parsons et al. 2016b). Some high strain zones near or overlapping the MCT were active after ca. 10 Ma; this late offset was brittle in some locations (Whipple et al. 2016; review in Mukherjee 2015). In nearly all locations, the documented post-10 Ma offset was less than a few km (Mukherjee 2015).

Most geologists utilize the name “Lesser Himalayan” for rocks in the footwall of the MCT and “Greater Himalayan” or “Higher Himalayan” for hanging wall rocks (e.g., see reviews by Hodges 2000; Yin 2006; Dhital 2015). Unfortunately, different geologists use these terms to indicate disparate aspects of the fold-thrust belt: elevation, structural position, metamorphic grade, or stratigraphic and intrusive relationships. The resulting confusion is untenable for clear discussion of definitions of the MCT. The current article achieves the requisite disambiguation by following Martin (2016) in using the label “assemblage” to refer to a rock package with depositional or intrusive relationships between members of the assemblage. That is, the contact between adjacent members of an assemblage originally was either depositional or intrusive, not a high strain zone. In the Himalaya, there are two such assemblages with members that most geologists agree shared depositional or intrusive relationships, Himalayan Assemblage A and Himalayan Assemblage B (Fig. 1). Martin (2016) additionally argued that Assemblage A did not share depositional relationships with Assemblage B until the Early Cretaceous Epoch, a more controversial interpretation (cf. DeCelles et al. 2000; Myrow et al. 2003 versus Martin 2016). The resolution of this controversy is irrelevant for the discussion of MCT definitions in the current article. This article does not employ the terms Lesser Himalayan, Greater Himalayan, or Higher Himalayan except in reference to historical usage of these expressions.

The following brief summary of Assemblage A and Assemblage B sedimentation, intrusion, and metamorphism was adapted from Martin (2016). Along the entire northern margin of India, Assemblage A strata were deposited during Paleoproterozoic to early Mesoproterozoic and latest Cretaceous to Quaternary time, and additionally during late Carboniferous to Permian time in the eastern half of the margin. Paleoproterozoic granite and gabbro intruded the basal Assemblage A deposits. Neoproterozoic to Ordovician strata are present in the eastern part of Assemblage A. Assemblage B is a Neoproterozoic through Quaternary supracrustal succession, intruded by granite in Neoproterozoic, late Cambrian to middle Ordovician, Permian, and Cenozoic time. In both assemblages, depositional environments for most units were continental or shallow marine, on the continental shelf or slope. Both successions therefore mostly consist of interlayered mudstone, sandstone, and limestone, plus much less voluminous felsic and mafic volcanic and intrusive rocks. Where exposed in medial positions of the fold-thrust belt, Assemblage A and Assemblage B rocks contain evidence for Cenozoic metamorphism.

Metamorphic-rheological definition

The original method for identifying the MCT among the other high strain zones in the Himalayan orogen was recognition of the thrust that produced a marked contrast in metamorphic grade between high-grade hanging wall and lower-grade footwall rocks. Working with Auden (1937), Heim and Gansser (1939, p. 78) described a key geologic relationship in the region of the border between northwestern India and western Nepal:

> "With a sharp contact, called the Main Central Thrust, the crystalline Rocks at Darchula rest upon the metamorphic limestone series."

Heim and Gansser identified the hanging wall crystalline rocks as orthogneiss, augengneiss, and schist (p. 78), whereas the proximal footwall rocks are "slightly metamorphic" limestone and quartzite (p. 90). To facilitate application of the metamorphic-structural definition along the Himalaya, Sinha-Roy (1982) modified the original definition to place the MCT at the base of the package of rocks that exhibit inverted metamorphism.

Building on the work of Stephenson et al. (2000, 2001) in northwestern India, Searle et al. (2008) added rheology to the definition because Searle et al. (2008) viewed a wholly metamorphic definition as an inappropriate basis on which to define a structure such as a high strain zone (Fig. 3a). Note, however, that the Heim and Gansser (1939) definition was not completely metamorphic because Heim and Gansser (1939) called the contact a thrust, which is a structure that carries geometric and kinematic significance. Instead, Heim and Gansser (1939) utilized the metamorphic part of the definition to recognize and label a particular thrust among others in the orogen. Nevertheless, responding in part to the use of the metamorphic definition by more recent articles, Searle et al. (2008, p. 532) wrote that the definition of the MCT is:

> "The base of the large-scale zone of high strain and ductile deformation, commonly coinciding with the base of the zone of inverted metamorphic isograds, which places Tertiary metamorphic rocks of the Greater Himalayan Sequence over unmetamorphosed or low-grade rocks of the Lesser Himalaya".

In most sectors of the orogen, the position of the MCT indicated by the Heim and Gansser (1939) definition lies structurally higher than and hindward of the locations designated by the Sinha-Roy (1982) and Searle et al. (2008) definitions; the Sinha-Roy (1982) and Searle et al. (2008) locations are similar.

Many subsequent articles followed the Searle et al. (2008) definition nearly exactly (e.g., Larson et al. 2010, 2011; Searle 2010; Streule et al. 2010; Yakymchuk and Godin 2012; From and Larson 2014). Others emphasized the rheological part of the definition (e.g., Larson and Godin, 2009; Parsons et al. 2016a, b, c). Gibson et al. (2016) removed most of the metamorphic aspects from the definition, adopting an almost purely rheological definition. A wholly rheological definition could be written: "The MCT is the fossil brittle–ductile transition in quartz that currently outcrops on the foreland side of exposed ductilely deformed rocks." This rheological definition essentially maintains the position of the MCT delineated by the Searle et al. (2008) definition. For the purpose of identifying the location of the MCT, the brittle–ductile transition is taken as the edge of the zone of dynamically recrystallized quartz, including by workers such as Parsons et al. (2016b) who also examined calcite, dolomite, plagioclase, and alkali feldspar. I treat the metamorphic and rheological definitions together in this section because they are formally linked in the Searle et al. (2008) definition, and even when not so formally linked (Gibson et al. 2016), the identified locations of the MCT are nearly identical.

Pros of the metamorphic-rheological definition

1. The metamorphic-rheological definition of the MCT is similar to common definitions of the structurally higher South Tibet Detachment, which include separation of higher-grade rocks in the footwall from lower-grade rocks in the hanging wall (e.g., Searle and Godin 2003; Martin 2016). This correspondence of definitions can simplify interpretations of the tectonic evolution of the two high strain zones and the rocks that contain them (e.g., Streule et al. 2010; Parsons et al. 2016b, c; Soucy La Roche et al. 2016).
2. If multiple Himalayan thrusts moved at the same time, the definition would remain useful and valid.

Cons of the metamorphic-rheological definition

1. The Searle et al. (2008) definition of the MCT is inconsistent with these authors' reason for rejecting older definitions that traced a metamorphic isograd. Searle et al. (2008, p. 523) argued that an isograd should not be used to define a structure such as a thrust because isograds provide information about metamorphic reactions, not structures. However, the part of the Searle et al. (2008) definition that specifies metamorphic rocks placed over unmetamorphosed or low-grade rocks in fact follows an isograd. The boundary between low-grade and higher-grade metamorphism is an isograd.
2. Law et al. (2013) attempted to apply the Searle et al. (2008) definition in northwestern India. Law et al. (2013) successfully applied this definition in frontal parts of the orogen, but found the definition inadequate in hinterland positions (p. 26). In the hinterland, Law et al. (2013) reverted to the MCT definition of Vannay et al. (2004), which labeled one thrust among many based on metamorphic grade, but used a higher metamorphic grade than the Searle et al. (2008) definition. Using the Vannay et al. (2004) definition situated the MCT structurally higher than called for by the Searle et al. (2008) definition, thereby placing ductilely deformed, amphibolite facies rocks in the footwall of the MCT (Caddick et al. 2007). The inability of experts such as Law et al. (2013) to apply the Searle et al. (2008) definition consistently in both frontal and hinterland positions within the same sector of the orogen indicates a deficiency in the definition.
3. All high strain zones, brittle and ductile, consist of a volume of strained rock (e.g., Childs et al. 2009; Rennie et al. 2013; Sullivan et al. 2013). Nevertheless, unless discussing high strain zone processes, most authors depict a high strain zone as a line on maps and cross sections, even when the spatial scale would allow marking the volume of rocks deformed by motion on the high strain zone. Drawing the line that represents the MCT at the edge of the ductilely strained rocks places that line at a location that accommodated little displacement between proximal hanging wall and footwall rocks, even though the MCT as a whole accommodated offset of more than 90 km (e.g., Schelling and Arita 1991; Long et al. 2012, 2016; Webb 2013; Robinson and Martin 2014).
4. The Searle et al. (2008) definition utilizes only one component of the total strain, the ductile strain, and geologists who apply this definition likewise measure only ductile strain, not both brittle and ductile strain (e.g., Larson and Godin 2009; Larson et al. 2010; Yakymchuk and Godin 2012; Law et al. 2013; From and Larson 2014; Gibson et al. 2016; Parsons et al. 2016b). These authors place the MCT at an exposed steep gradient in recorded ductile strain in quartz: zero ductile, only brittle strain toward the foreland and some ductile strain in the hinterland (Fig. 3a). This location is thus an exhumed fossil brittle–ductile transition in quartz. For any chosen mineral, by definition, there is a steep gradient in ductile strain at the brittle–ductile transition in an orogen, from no ductile strain above the transition to some ductile strain below (Fig. 4). However, the brittle–ductile transition is not necessarily a high strain zone; the steep gradient in ductile strain does not necessarily indicate offset across the brittle–ductile transition (Fig. 4). It is impossible to determine whether a high strain zone exists at the location of the exhumed fossil brittle–ductile transition if the definition of the high strain zone, and measurements to recognize it, include only ductile strain. One means of exposing a fossil brittle–ductile transition that is not itself a high strain zone is shown in Fig. 5. In this scenario, the outcropping fossil brittle–ductile transition dips toward the foreland. Users of the Searle et al. (2008) definition of the MCT assume that the fossil brittle–ductile transition in quartz dips toward the hinterland, but there are no data that support this supposition. Note that brittle shear strain is present near the MCT in many sectors of the Himalaya (e.g., Mukherjee and Koyi 2010; Mukherjee 2013). Some of this brittle deformation overprints the ductile deformation, but it is possible that some preserved footwall brittle shear strain also occurred at the same time as some of the ductile shear strain.



Fig. 4 Diagram of the quartz brittle–ductile transition in a fold-thrust belt. By definition, the brittle–ductile transition is the location of a steep gradient in ductile strain, whether or not a high strain zone is present at the brittle–ductile transition. Measuring only ductile strain, not both brittle and ductile strain, it is not possible to determine whether a high strain zone is present at the brittle–ductile transition. In the case depicted here, the brittle–ductile transition is not the location of a high strain zone; the brittle and ductile strain depicted in the footwall of the thrust results only from motion on that thrust and structurally overlying high strain zones. In Figs. 4, 5, 6 and 7, the depicted thrusts represent structural architecture in general; they do not show structural geometry in any particular sector of the Himalayan fold-thrust belt. In these figures, the geometry of the brittle–ductile transition was inspired by, but does not replicate, the numerical modeling results of Bollinger et al. (2006). The figures do not depict the geometry of the brittle–ductile transition in any particular sector of the Himalayan fold-thrust belt



Fig. 5 One mechanism to expose a fossil brittle–ductile transition in quartz in which the fossil brittle–ductile transition is not a high strain zone. **a**–**c** Exhumation is constant across the cross section for simplicity. Spatially variable exhumation, though more geologically realistic, would not change the mechanism of exposure of the fossil brittle–ductile transition. **d** Exhumation is greater above the duplex than elsewhere



Problem: Searle et al. (2008) definition mis-locates the MCT if the high strain zone is present in quartz-poor rocks such as (meta)limestone.

Fig. 6 Illustration that the Searle et al. (2008) definition is blind to the presence of the MCT in quartz-poor rocks such as carbonate units. Offset on the high strain zones is not depicted



The Searle et al. (2008) definition only can work here, where ductile hanging wall rocks were juxtaposed against brittle footwall rocks.

Problem: It is impossible to recognize the MCT in frontal parts of the orogen if brittle hanging wall rocks are preserved there.

Problem: It is impossible to recognize the MCT down-dip of the brittle-ductile transition using the Searle et al. (2008) definition because in hinterland parts of the orogen, both hanging wall and footwall rocks deformed ductilely.

Fig. 7 Depiction of the MCT during motion. The Searle et al. (2008) definition is only applicable to one part of the high strain zone; the definition fails in up-dip and down-dip segments

5. The choice of quartz rather than another mineral when applying the Searle et al. (2008) or Gibson et al. (2016) definition is arbitrary from a structural perspective. Instead, quartz is chosen for the following two practical reasons. (A) Except in carbonate units, quartz is present throughout the exposed Himalayan rocks. (B) Quartz deforms ductilely over much of the range of temperature conditions of interest in the evolution of orogenic crust (Stockhert et al. 1999). Choosing plagioclase, white mica, or another mineral instead of quartz would change the location of the MCT identified by the Searle et al. (2008) and Gibson et al. (2016) definition. None of the possible locations using different minerals inherently carries structural or tectonic significance.
6. The Searle et al. (2008) definition is difficult to use in carbonate units. Quartz rheology is minimally or not applicable because many carbonate units in the Himalaya contain very little quartz. Similarly, the metamorphic part of the definition is difficult to employ because carbonate units lack the mineral assemblages necessary for traditional thermobarometry. The peak or deformation temperature experienced by carbonate units can be estimated using non-traditional geothermometers (e.g., Parsons et al. 2016b). However, uncertainties on these temperature estimates make recognition of potential temperature discontinuities challenging. Accordingly, geologists essentially ignore carbonate units when applying the Searle et al. (2008) definition to locate the MCT (Larson and Godin 2009; Larson et al. 2010; Yakymchuk and Godin 2012; Law et al. 2013; Gibson et al. 2016; Parsons et al. 2016a, b, c). It is thus difficult, and in practice effectively impossible, to test whether the MCT is present within a carbonate unit using the Searle et al. (2008) definition. One consequence is shown in Fig. 6. If the MCT passed in a lateral, oblique, or frontal ramp from a quartz-rich to a quartz-poor lithology, geologists would not be able to recognize the ramp or the high strain zone within the carbonate unit, instead drawing the MCT structurally too low or too high. This problem is relevant in the Himalaya because both Assemblage A and Assemblage B contain several thick carbonate successions along all of the orogen between the syntaxes (Martin 2016). Some layers within these successions are nearly devoid of quartz. This drawback to the Searle et al. (2008) definition was described by Yin et al. (2010) and Webb et al. (2013).
7. The Searle et al. (2008) definition of the MCT does not work in down-dip locations where both hanging wall and footwall rocks deformed ductilely and were metamorphosed beyond "low-grade" (Fig. 7).
8. Likewise, if hanging wall rocks that did not deform ductilely are preserved at the frontal tip of the MCT,

it is impossible to recognize the MCT there using the Searle et al. (2008) definition (Fig. 7).

9. Along much of the orogen between the syntaxes, exposed proximal footwall rocks to the MCT as defined by Searle et al. (2008) experienced greenschist facies metamorphism, so these footwall rocks are not unmetamorphosed (Kohn 2014; note that Kohn did not use the Searle et al. definition of the MCT). "Low-grade" or "slightly metamorphosed" are left undefined.
10. This definition does not guarantee that different segments of the MCT along strike moved at the same time.

Age of motion-structural definition

Building on the conclusions of Yin (2006) and Webb et al. (2011a, b, 2013) proposed to label as the MCT the Himalayan thrust that accommodated foreland-vergent motion in early to middle Miocene time (Fig. 3b).

Pros of the age of motion-structural definition

1. Applying this definition guarantees that all along-strike segments of the MCT experienced at least one episode of motion at approximately the same time, ca. 23–14 Ma.
2. Geologists can choose to draw a line that represents the high strain zone on a map or cross section at the location of the most intense deformation within the volume of the high strain zone.

Cons of the age of motion-structural definition

1. In many parts of the Himalaya, there are at least two separate early to middle Miocene thrusts that offset amphibolite facies metasedimentary rocks (Larson et al. 2015). Using a definition based on the age of motion, it is impossible to decide which of these high strain zones to label as the MCT.
2. Further, there are numerous foreland-vergent thrusts in the orogen (e.g., Webb 2013; McQuarrie et al. 2014; Robinson and Martin 2014). Picking one of these thrusts to call the MCT because that thrust moved in a selected time range is arbitrary; consequently, the choice does not necessarily carry tectonic significance.

Protolith boundary-structural definition

France-Lanord et al. (1993), Parrish and Hodges (1996), and Whittington et al. (1999) utilized whole-rock neodymium and strontium isotopic values along with detrital zircon uranium/lead ages to show that most parts of Assemblage A and Assemblage B were deposited at different times and received sediment from at least partially different sources. Note that these authors employed the term "Lesser Himalaya" instead of "Himalayan Assemblage A" as well as "Tethyan Himalaya" and "Greater Himalaya" in place of "Himalayan Assemblage B." Building on the conclusions from these articles, Ahmad et al. (2000) identified the MCT among the other Himalayan thrusts as the foreland-vergent thrust that juxtaposed these two rock packages that have different sedimentary provenance, depositional ages, or igneous crystallization ages. Using this definition, the MCT is a protolith boundary in addition to a thrust-sense high strain zone (see also Schmid et al. 1989). Many subsequent workers applied essentially this definition (e.g., DeCelles et al. 2000; Robinson et al. 2001; Kohn et al. 2004; Martin et al. 2005; Pearson and DeCelles 2005; Richards et al. 2005; Imayama and Arita 2008; Corrie and Kohn 2011; Long et al. 2011b; Mottram et al. 2014; Robinson and Martin 2014). Martin (2016) used the protolith boundary as a terrane boundary, proposing to label as the MCT the foreland-vergent thrust that accommodated Cenozoic motion and juxtaposed Himalayan Assemblage B against Himalayan Assemblage A or other units of the Indian Shield (Fig. 3c). Assemblage A constitutes the footwall between the syntaxes, the focus region for this article. The location of Assemblage B prior to the Cenozoic Era is controversial (Fuchs and Willems 1990; DeCelles et al. 2000; Myrow et al. 2003; van Hinsbergen et al. 2012; Huang et al. 2015; Martin 2016). The resolution of these controversies is irrelevant for this definition of the MCT. If Assemblage B were not exotic and never separated from Assemblage A and northern India, the thrust at the non-exotic protolith boundary would remain the MCT using this definition. Mottram et al. (2014) argued for a 5-km-thick zone of structurally interleaved MCT hanging wall and footwall rocks near their contact in Sikkim. This proposed zone of protolith mixing lies within the volume of deformed rock that is the MCT. This result does not affect the protolith boundary-structural definition of the MCT: the MCT remains the high strain zone that separates Assemblage A from Assemblage B, regardless of the extent of mixing near their contact.

Pros of the protolith boundary-structural definition

1. The position of the MCT employing this definition is consistent along- and across-strike: it is always the thrust at the protolith contact. The location of the MCT does not change depending on lithology, metamorphic grade, deformation temperature, deformation mecha-

nisms, up-dip or down-dip position of observation, or the age of high strain zone motion.

2. If multiple Himalayan thrusts moved at the same time, the definition would remain valid for identifying the MCT among other thrusts.
3. Geologists can choose to draw a line that represents the high strain zone on a map or cross section at the location of the most intense deformation within the high strain zone volume that juxtaposes Himalayan Assemblage B against Assemblage A.

Cons of the protolith boundary-structural definition

1. In areas where there is no chemical, depositional age, or igneous crystallization age difference between Himalayan Assemblage B and Neoproterozoic or Paleozoic members of Assemblage A, and additionally the original contacts between members within each assemblage have been obscured, it would be difficult to distinguish the two rock packages.
2. This definition does not ensure that all along-strike segments of the MCT moved at the same time.

Discussion

None of the three definitions of the MCT considered in this article is flawless; each can fail in some circumstances. Failures of the metamorphic-rheological definition are ubiquitous. In every sector of the Himalaya, there is no way to test whether the brittle–ductile transition is a high strain zone if geologists only account for ductile strain (Fig. 4). Both the metamorphic and the rheological aspects of the definition fail in the down-dip direction across the entire orogen (Fig. 7). Meta-limestone units are present in both Assemblage A and Assemblage B along nearly the entire fold-thrust belt, confounding both the metamorphic and rheological facets of the definition (Fig. 6). Likewise, the problems with the age of motion-structural definition occur commonly. In many sectors of the Himalaya, geologists have recognized at least two major thrusts that moved in early to middle Miocene time (Larson et al. 2015), and it is impossible to label just one of these thrusts the MCT using the age of motion-structural definition (Fig. 3b).

In contrast, the potential flaws in the protolith boundary-structural definition rarely materialize. West of central Nepal, Assemblage A does not contain Neoproterozoic or Paleozoic strata, and it is straightforward to distinguish the Paleoproterozoic-lower Mesoproterozoic and uppermost Cretaceous-Cenozoic Assemblage A deposits from Assemblage B rocks based on depositional age, crystallization age, and/or geochemical characteristics (e.g., Whittington et al. 1999; Ahmad et al. 2000). In and east of central Nepal, Neoproterozoic–Ordovician and upper Carboniferous–Permian Assemblage A strata share depositional ages, and in many cases geochemical characteristics, with members of Assemblage B. Paleoproterozoic–lower Mesoproterozoic Assemblage A strata were juxtaposed directly against Assemblage B strata in some eastern areas of the orogen such as the Kathmandu area, Tamar Khola Window, and Sikkim, and differentiating the assemblages there is as straightforward as west of central Nepal (e.g., Parrish and Hodges 1996; Imayama and Arita 2008; Mottram et al. 2014; Khanal et al. 2015). In other eastern areas, Neoproterozoic or Paleozoic Assemblage A strata were juxtaposed against Assemblage B, and it is difficult to distinguish the assemblages near their contact based on geochemistry or detrital zircon age spectra alone. For example, in Bhutan the Paleozoic Jaishidanda Formation is exposed directly structurally below undisputed Assemblage B rocks, and depositional ages and geochemical characteristics do not permit discrimination of the Jaishidanda Formation from Assemblage B deposits (McQuarrie et al. 2013). These and other authors interpreted the basal boundary of the Jaishidanda Formation to be depositional on incontrovertible Assemblage A members, whereas the top contact of the Jaishidanda Formation is a high strain zone against Assemblage B strata. This depositional relationship establishes the Jaishidanda Formation as part of Assemblage A. If the depositional contact were not exposed, it would not be clear whether to place the MCT structurally above or below the Jaishidanda Formation. Although the protolith boundary-structural definition does not guarantee movement of different along-strike segments at the same time, in practice geologists have found that the thrust at the Assemblage A–Assemblage B contact was active in early to middle Miocene time everywhere they have dated its motion (e.g., Kohn et al. 2005; Celerier et al. 2009b; Yin et al. 2010; Corrie and Kohn 2011; Long et al. 2012; Tobgay et al. 2012; Mottram et al. 2015). Thus despite its possible failures, the protolith boundary-structural definition appears to be the best of the three choices because its potential drawbacks are not actual problems in nearly every sector of the Himalaya, whereas the fatal defects in the other two definitions exist throughout the orogen.

Searle et al. (2008) objected to the use of the protolith boundary-structural definition largely because all along- and across-strike segments of the MCT did not follow one particular stratigraphic horizon; the definition is untenable if some parts of the MCT cut, rather than paralleled, a stratigraphic horizon that originally was the protolith boundary. The proposition that Cenozoic motion on the MCT reactivated a pre-Cenozoic high strain zone offers a resolution to the potential problem identified by Searle et al. (2008). In this scenario, the MCT followed an ancient high strain zone that separated protoliths with different provenances; this protolith division then was maintained during Cenozoic offset on the MCT. Numerous authors proposed that the MCT reactivated a pre-Cenozoic high strain zone, though there is disagreement about the older sense of motion. Yin (2006), Dubey and Bhakuni (2007), and Mottram et al. (2014) postulated pre-Cenozoic normal-sense motion, DeCelles et al. (2000) suggested Late Cambrian to Early Ordovician thrusting, and Brookfield (1993) and Martin (2016) proposed Late Jurassic to Early Cretaceous strike-slip on a high strain zone that was reactivated as the MCT during the Cenozoic Era. Regardless of which sense of ancient motion is correct, Cenozoic reactivation of a preexisting high strain zone could resolve the objection raised by Searle et al. (2008).

It is important to state explicitly that this article is not arguing that a south-vergent thrust does not exist at the position indicated by the Searle et al. (2008) definition. If there is a thrust at the Searle et al. (2008) location, the thrust should be labeled with a name other than the Main Central Thrust unless that position also corresponds to the contact between Himalayan Assemblage A and Assemblage B.

The observed dissimilarities in detrital zircon age spectra and geochemical characteristics between most members of Assemblage A and Assemblage B resulted from provenance differences. Whereas derivation of sediment from India alone can explain the ages of detrital zircon in Paleoproterozoic–lower Mesoproterozoic Assemblage A deposits (DeCelles et al. 2000; Gehrels et al. 2011; McKenzie et al. 2011), the sources of Neoproterozoic to Jurassic Assemblage B detritus comprised all major sectors of East Gondwana including Australia, East Antarctica, India, and East Africa or Arabia (DeCelles et al. 2000; Yoshida and Upreti 2006; Cawood et al. 2007; Myrow et al. 2010; Gehrels et al. 2011; McKenzie et al. 2011; McQuarrie et al. 2013). The eastern Himalayan Neoproterozoic to Ordovician and upper Carboniferous to Permian Assemblage A deposits are the Assemblage A rocks most geochemically similar to broadly coeval Assemblage B strata (Gehrels et al. 2011; McQuarrie et al. 2013). This similarity can be explained by a combination of the following factors. (1) Eastern India, and thus eastern Assemblage A, was adjacent to western Australia and East Antarctica in Gondwana (Torsvik and Cocks 2013). (2) Sediment sources at the times of deposition included nearly all of East Gondwana, and the resulting detritus was nearly homogeneous along the northern continental margin of East Gondwana (Myrow et al. 2010; Gehrels et al. 2011).

Some authors labeled multiple high strain zones in the same transect the MCT using variations such as MCT-I and MCT-II or Upper MCT and Lower MCT (e.g., Maruo et al. 1979; Arita 1983; Harrison et al. 1998; Sachan et al. 2001; Searle and Godin 2003; Catlos et al. 2004; Imayama and Arita 2008; Bhattacharyya and Mitra 2009; Mitra et al. 2010; Nandini and Thakur 2011). It is confusing to assign essentially the same name to multiple different high strain zones. Accordingly, I recommend applying the MCT label to only one high strain zone, and employing dissimilar names for other high strain zones (e.g., Valdiya 1980; Gururajan and Choudhuri 2003; Pearson and DeCelles 2005; Long et al. 2011b; McQuarrie et al. 2014; Khanal et al. 2015). The appellations do not change the geometric, kinematic, or mechanical properties of the high strain zones, but different labels do facilitate organization and discussion of different high strain zones as well as the rocks that contain them. Further, mapping one thrust within a high strain zone and also a second thrust at the edge of the same high strain zone is misleading because such a practice gives the appearance that there are two high strain zones when in fact there is only one.

Larson et al. (2015) elucidated the Cenozoic structural development of the MCT and nearby thrusts without defining or even identifying one particular thrust as the MCT. These authors implied that labeling one thrust as the MCT may no longer be constructive. If the name is not useful, perhaps it should be abandoned. Larson et al. (2015) and other authors such as Robinson et al. (2006), Webb (2013), McQuarrie et al. (2014), He et al. (2015), and Khanal et al. (2015) made compelling cases that there is nothing special about the Cenozoic geometry, kinematics, or mechanics of the MCT compared to other thrusts exposed in medial parts of the Himalayan orogen. However, from an organizational viewpoint, it is convenient to assign a name to the high strain zone that separates Himalayan Assemblage A from Assemblage B. In this article, I retain the historical term "Main Central Thrust," although any appellation that designates the thrust contact between the two assemblages could be acceptable. I leave the ultimate decision about applying a new name to this assemblage-bounding thrust to future workers.

Acknowledgements Alexander Webb and Nadine McQuarrie generously provided vector format files of Figs. 1 and 2, respectively. Discussions with Steven Kidder and Kyle Larson clarified some of the ideas presented in this article. I thank Sumit Chakraborty, Soumyajit Mukherjee, and an anonymous reviewer for insightful comments and Soumyajit Mukherjee and Wolf-Christian Dullo for able editorial handling. Sumit Chakraborty pointed out con 1 in section Cons of the metamorphic-rheological definition.

References

Ahmad T, Harris N, Bickle M, Chapman H, Bunbury J, Prince C (2000) Isotopic constraints on the structural relationships between the Lesser Himalayan Series and the High Himalayan Crystalline Series, Garhwal Himalaya. Geol Soc Am Bull 112:467–477. doi:10.1130/0016-7606(2000)112<467:ICOTSR>2.0.CO;2

Arita K (1983) Origin of the inverted metamorphism of the lower Himalayas, central Nepal. Tectonophysics 95:43–60. doi:10.1016/0040-1951(83)90258-5

Auden JB (1937) The structure of the Himalaya in Garhwal. Rec Geol Surv India 71:407–433

Bhattacharyya K, Mitra G (2009) A new kinematic evolutionary model for the growth of a duplex—an example from the Rangit duplex, Sikkim Himalaya, India. Gondwana Res 16:697–715. doi:10.1016/j.gr.2009.07.006

Bollinger L, Henry P, Avouac J (2006) Mountain building in the Nepal Himalaya: thermal and kinematic model. Earth Planet Sci Lett 244:58–71. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2006.01.045

Brookfield ME (1993) The Himalayan passive margin from Precambrian to Cretaceous times. Sediment Geol 84:1–35. doi:10.1016/0037-0738(93)90042-4

Burchfiel BC, Royden LH (1985) North–south extension within the convergent Himalayan region. Geology 13:679–682. doi:10.1130/0091-7613(1985)13<679:NEWTCH>2.0.CO;2

Burchfiel BC, Chen Z, Hodges KV, Liu Y, Royden LH, Deng C, Xu J (1992) The South Tibetan detachment system, Himalayan orogen: extension contemporaneous with and parallel to shortening in a collisional mountain belt, vol 269. Geological Society of Amercia Special Paper, Boulder, p 41. doi:10.1130/SPE269

Caby R, Pecher A, Le Fort P (1983) Le grand chevauchement central himalayen: nouvelles donnees sur le metamorphisme inverse a la base de la Dalle du Tibet. Revue de geologie dynamique et de geographie physique 24:89–100

Caddick M, Bickle M, Harris N, Holland T, Horstwood M, Parrish R, Ahmad T (2007) Burial and exhumation history of a Lesser Himalayan schist: recording the formation of an inverted metamorphic sequence in NW India. Earth Planet Sci Lett 264:375–390. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2007.09.011

Callaway C (1883) The age of the newer gneissic rocks of the northern Highlands. Quart J Geol Soc 39:355–414. doi:10.1144/GSL.JGS.1883.039.01-04.24

Catlos EJ, Dubey CS, Harrison TM, Edwards MA (2004) Late Miocene movement within the Himalayan Main Central Thrust shear zone, Sikkim, north-east India. J Metamorph Geol 22:207–226. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1314.2004.00509.x

Cawood PA, Johnson MRW, Nemchin AA (2007) Early Palaeozoic orogenesis along the Indian margin of Gondwana: tectonic response to Gondwana assembly. Earth Planet Sci Lett 255:70–84. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2006.12.006

Celerier J, Harrison TM, Beyssac O, Herman F, Dunlap WJ, Webb AAG (2009a) The Kumaun and Garwhal Lesser Himalaya, India: part 2. Thermal and deformation histories. Geol Soc Am Bull 121:1281–1297. doi:10.1130/B26343.1

Celerier J, Harrison TM, Webb AAG, Yin A (2009b) The Kumaun and Garwhal Lesser Himalaya, India: part 1. Structure and stratigraphy. Geol Soc Am Bull 121:1262–1280. doi:10.1130/B26344.1

Childs C, Manzocchi T, Walsh JJ, Bonson CG, Nicol A, Schopfer MPJ (2009) A geometric model of fault zone and fault rock thickness variations. J Struct Geol 31:117–127. doi:10.1016/j.jsg.2008.08.009

Corrie SL, Kohn MJ (2011) Metamorphic history of the central Himalaya, Annapurna region, Nepal, and implications for tectonic models. Geol Soc Am Bull 123:1863–1879. doi:10.1130/B30376.1

Cottle JM, Larson KP, Kellett DA (2015) How does the mid-crust accommodate deformation in large, hot collisional orogens? A review of recent research in the Himalayan orogen. J Struct Geol 78:119–133. doi:10.1016/j.jsg.2015.06.008

Davis GH, Reynolds SJ, Kluth C (2012) Structural geology of rocks and regions, 3rd edn. Wiley, Hoboken, p 839

DeCelles PG, Gehrels GE, Quade J, LaReau B, Spurlin M (2000) Tectonic implications of U–Pb zircon ages of the Himalayan orogenic belt in Nepal. Science 288:497–499. doi:10.1126/science.288.5465.497

DeCelles PG, Kapp P, Gehrels GE, Ding L (2014) Paleocene-Eocene foreland basin evolution in the Himalaya of southern Tibet and Nepal: implications for the age of initial India-Asia collision. Tectonics 33:824–849. doi:10.1002/2014TC003522

Dhital MR (2015) Geology of the Nepal Himalaya; regional perspective of the classic collided orogen. Springer, Cham, p 498. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-02496-7

Dubey AK, Bhakuni SS (2007) Younger hanging wall rocks along the Vaikrita thrust of the high Himalaya: a model based on inversion tectonics. J Asian Earth Sci 29:424–429. doi:10.1016/j.jseaes.2005.10.005

France-Lanord C, Derry L, Michard A (1993) Evolution of the Himalaya since Miocene time: isotopic and sedimentological evidence from the Bengal Fan. In: Himalayan Tectonics, vol 74. Geological Society, Special Publication, London, pp 603–621. doi:10.1144/GSL.SP.1993.074.01.40.

From R, Larson K (2014) Tectonostratigraphy, deformation, and metamorphism of the Himalayan mid-crust exposed in the Likhu Khola region, east-central Nepal. Geosphere 10:292–307. doi:10.1130/GES00938.1

From R, Larson K, Cottle JM (2014) Metamorphism and geochronology of the exhumed Himalayan midcrust, Likhu Khola region, east-central Nepal: recognition of a tectonometamorphic discontinuity. Lithosphere 6:361–376. doi:10.1130/L381.1

Fuchs G, Willems H (1990) The final stages of sedimentation in the Tethyan zone of Zanskar and their geodynamic significance (Ladakh-Himalaya). Jahrbuch der Geologischen Bundesanstalt, vol 133. Wien, pp 259–273

Gehrels G, Kapp P, DeCelles P, Pullen A, Blakey R, Weislogel A, Ding L, Guynn J, Martin A, McQuarrie N, Yin A (2011) Detrital zircon geochronology of pre-Tertiary strata in the Tibetan-Himalayan orogen. Tectonics 30:TC5016. doi:10.1029/2011TC002868

Gibson R, Godin L, Kellett DA, Cottle JM, Archibald D (2016) Diachronous deformation along the base of the Himalayan metamorphic core, west-central Nepal. Geol Soc Am Bull 128:860–878. doi:10.1130/B31328.1

Grujic D, Casey M, Davidson C, Hollister LS, Kundig R, Pavlis T, Schmid S (1996) Ductile extrusion of the Higher Himalayan Crystalline in Bhutan: evidence from quartz microfabrics. Tectonophysics 260:21–43. doi:10.1016/0040-1951(96)00074-1

Gururajan NS, Choudhuri BK (2003) Geology and tectonic history of the Lohit Valley, eastern Arunachal Pradesh, India. J Asian Earth Sci 21:731–741. doi:10.1016/S1367-9120(02)00040-8

Harrison TM, Grove M, Lovera OM, Catlos EJ (1998) A model for the origin of Himalayan anatexis and inverted metamorphism. J Geophys Res Solid Earth 103:27017–27032. doi:10.1029/98JB02468

Hayes CW (1891) The overthrust faults of the southern Appalachians. Geol Soc Am Bull 2:141–154. doi:10.1130/GSAB-2-141

He D, Webb AAG, Larson KP, Martin AJ, Schmitt AK (2015) Extrusion vs. duplexing models of Himalayan mountain building 3: duplexing dominates from the Oligocene to Present. Int Geol Rev 57:1–27. doi:10.1080/00206814.2014.986669

He D, Webb AAG, Larson KP, Schmitt AK (2016) Extrusion vs. duplexing models of Himalayan mountain building 2: the South Tibet detachment at the Dadeldhura klippe. Tectonophysics 667:87–107. doi:10.1016/j.tecto.2015.11.014

Heim A, Gansser A (1939) Central Himalaya: geological observations of the Swiss expedition 1936, vol 73. Memoirs of the Swiss Society of Natural Sciences, Zurich, p 245

Hodges KV (2000) Tectonics of the Himalaya and southern Tibet from two perspectives. Geol Soc Am Bull 112:324–350. doi:10.1130/0016-7606(2000)112<324:TOTHAS>2.0.CO;2

Hu X, Garzanti E, Moore T, Raffi I (2015) Direct stratigraphic dating of India-Asia collision onset at the Selandian (middle Paleocene, 59 ± 1 Ma). Geology 43:859–862. doi:10.1130/G36872.1

Huang W, van Hinsbergen DJJ, Lippert PC, Guo Z, Dupont-Nivet G (2015) Paleomagnetic tests of tectonic reconstructions of the India-Asia collision zone: reconstructing India-Asia collision. Geophys Res Lett 42:2642–2649. doi:10.1002/2015GL063749

Imayama T, Arita K (2008) Nd isotopic data reveal the material and tectonic nature of the Main Central Thrust zone in Nepal Himalaya. Tectonophysics 451:265–281. doi:10.1016/j.tecto.2007.11.051

Jade S, Mukul M, Bhattacharyya AK, Vijayan MSM, Jaganathan S, Kumar A, Tiwari RP, Kumar A, Kalita S, Sahu SC, Krishna AP, Gupta SS, Murthy MVRL, Gaur VK (2007) Estimates of interseismic deformation in Northeast India from GPS measurements. Earth Planet Sci Lett 263:221–234. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2007.08.031

Jamieson RA, Beaumont C, Medvedev S, Nguyen MH (2004) Crustal channel flows: 2. Numerical models with implications for metamorphism in the Himalayan-Tibetan orogen. J Geophys Res Solid Earth 109:B06407. doi:10.1029/2003JB002811

Khanal S, Robinson DM, Mandal S, Simkhada P (2015) Structural, geochronological and geochemical evidence for two distinct thrust sheets in the ‘Main Central thrust zone’, the Main Central thrust and Ramgarh-Munsiari thrust: Implications for upper crustal shortening in central Nepal. In: Mukherjee S, Carosi R, VanderBeek PA, Mukherjee BK, Robinson DM (eds) Tectonics of the Himalaya. Geological Society Special Publication No. 412, The Geological Society, London, pp 221–245. doi:10.1144/SP412.2

Kohn MJ (2014) Himalayan metamorphism and its tectonic implications. Annu Rev Earth Planet Sci 42:381–419. doi:10.1146/annurev-earth-060313-055005

Kohn MJ, Wieland MS, Parkinson CD, Upreti BN (2004) Miocene faulting at plate tectonic velocity in the Himalaya of central Nepal. Earth Planet Sci Lett 228:299–310. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2004.10.007

Kohn MJ, Wieland MS, Parkinson CD, Upreti BN (2005) Five generations of monazite in Langtang gneisses: implications for chronology of the Himalayan metamorphic core. J Metamorph Geol 23:399–406. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1314.2005.00584.x

Lapworth C (1883) VI.—The secret of the highlands. Geol Mag 10(3):120–128. doi:10.1017/S0016756800164313

Larson KP, Cottle JM (2014) Midcrustal discontinuities and the assembly of the Himalayan midcrust. Tectonics 33:718–740. doi:10.1002/2013TC003452

Larson KP, Godin L (2009) Kinematics of the Greater Himalayan sequence, Dhaulagiri Himal: Implications for the structural framework of central Nepal. J Geol Soc 166:25–43. doi:10.1144/0016-76492007-180

Larson KP, Godin L, Price RA (2010) Relationships between displacement and distortion in orogens: linking the Himalayan foreland and hinterland in central Nepal. Geol Soc Am Bull 122:1116–1134. doi:10.1130/B30073.1

Larson KP, Cottle JM, Godin L (2011) Petrochronologic record of metamorphism and melting in the upper Greater Himalayan sequence, Manaslu-Himal Chuli Himalaya, west-central Nepal. Lithosphere 3:379–392. doi:10.1130/L149.1

Larson KP, Gervais F, Kellett DA (2013) A P–T–t–D discontinuity in east-central Nepal: implications for the evolution of the Himalayan mid-crust. Lithos 179:275–292. doi:10.1016/j.lithos.2013.08.012

Larson KP, Ambrose TK, Webb AAG, Cottle JM, Shrestha S (2015) Reconciling Himalayan midcrustal discontinuities: the Main Central thrust system. Earth Planet Sci Lett 429:139–146. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2015.07.070

Law RD, Stahr DW III, Francsis MK, Ashley KT, Grasemann B, Ahmad T (2013) Deformation temperatures and flow vorticities near the base of the Greater Himalayan Series, Sutlej Valley and Shimla Klippe, NW India. J Struct Geol 54:21–53. doi:10.1016/j.jsg.2013.05.009

Le Fort P (1975) Himalayas: the collided range. Present knowledge of the continental arc. Am J Sci 275-A:1–44

Long S, McQuarrie N, Tobgay T, Hawthorne J (2011a) Quantifying internal strain and deformation temperature in the eastern Himalaya, Bhutan: implications for the evolution of strain in thrust sheets. J Struct Geol 33:579–608. doi:10.1016/j.jsg.2010.12.011

Long S, McQuarrie N, Tobgay T, Grujic D (2011b) Geometry and crustal shortening of the Himalayan fold-thrust belt, eastern and central Bhutan. Geol Soc Am Bull 123:1427–1447. doi:10.1130/B30203.1

Long SP, McQuarrie N, Tobgay T, Coutand I, Cooper FJ, Reiners PW, Wartho J-A, Hodges KV (2012) Variable shortening rates in the eastern Himalayan thrust belt, Bhutan: insights from multiple thermochronologic and geochronologic data sets tied to kinematic reconstructions. Tectonics 31:TC5004. doi:10.1029/2012TC003155

Long SP, Gordon SM, Young JP, Soignard E (2016) Temperature and strain gradients through Lesser Himalayan rocks and across the Main Central thrust, south central Bhutan: implications for transport-parallel stretching and inverted metamorphism. Tectonics 35:1863–1891. doi:10.1002/2016TC004242

Martin AJ (2016) A review of Himalayan stratigraphy, magmatism, and structure: Gondwana Research, (in revision)

Martin AJ, DeCelles PG, Gehrels GE, Patchett PJ, Isachsen C (2005) Isotopic and structural constraints on the location of the Main Central thrust in the Annapurna Range, central Nepal Himalaya. Geol Soc Am Bull 117:926–944. doi:10.1130/B25646.1

Martin AJ, Ganguly J, DeCelles PG (2010) Metamorphism of Greater and Lesser Himalayan rocks exposed in the Modi Khola valley, central Nepal. Contrib Miner Petrol 159:203–223. doi:10.1007/s00410-009-0424-3

Maruo Y, Pradhan BM, Kizaki K (1979) Geology of eastern Nepal: between Dudh Kosi and Arun. Bull Coll Sci Univ Ryukyus 28:155–191

Mazur S, Mikolajczak M, Krzywiec P, Malinowski M, Buffenmyer V, Lewandowski M (2015) Is the Teisseyre-Tornquist Zone an ancient plate boundary of Baltica? Tectonics 34:2465–2477. doi:10.1002/2015TC003934

Mazur S, Mikolajczak M, Krzywiec P, Malinowski M, Buffenmyer V, Lewandowski M (2016) Reply to Comment by M. Narkiewicz and Z. Petecki on “Is the Teisseyre-Tornquist Zone an ancient plate boundary of Baltica?”. Tectonics 35:1600–1607. doi:10.1002/2016TC004162

McConnell RG (1887) Report on the geological structure of a portion of the Rocky Mountains, accompanied by a section measured near the 51st parallel: Montreal, Geological and Natural History Survey of Canada, Annual Report Part D, p 41

McKenzie NR, Hughes NC, Myrow PM, Xiao S, Sharma M (2011) Correlation of Precambrian-Cambrian sedimentary successions across northern India and the utility of isotopic signatures of Himalayan lithotectonic zones. Earth Planet Sci Lett 312:471–483. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2011.10.027

McQuarrie N, Long SP, Tobgay T, Nesbit JN, Gehrels G, Ducea MN (2013) Documenting basin scale, geometry and provenance through detrital geochemical data: lessons from the Neoproterozoic to Ordovician Lesser, Greater, and Tethyan Himalayan strata of Bhutan. Gondwana Res 23:1491–1510. doi:10.1016/j.gr.2012.09.002

McQuarrie N, Tobgay T, Long SP, Reiners PW, Cosca MA (2014) Variable exhumation rates and variable displacement rates:

documenting recent slowing of Himalayan shortening in western Bhutan. Earth Planet Sci Lett 386:161–174. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2013.10.045

Mitra G, Bhattacharyya K, Mukul M (2010) The Lesser Himalayan duplex in Sikkim: implications for variations in Himalayan shortening. J Geol Soc India 75:289–301

Mottram CM, Argles TW, Harris NBW, Parrish RR, Horstwood MSA, Warren CJ, Gupta S (2014) Tectonic interleaving along the Main Central Thrust, Sikkim Himalaya. J Geol Soc 171:255–268. doi:10.1144/jgs2013-064

Mottram CM, Parrish RR, Regis D, Warren CJ, Argles TW, Harris NBW, Roberts NMW (2015) Using U-Th-Pb petrochronology to determine rates of ductile thrusting: time windows into the Main Central Thrust, Sikkim Himalaya. Tectonics 34:1355–1374. doi:10.1002/2014TC003743

Mukherjee S (2013) Higher Himalaya in the Bhagirathi section (NW Himalaya, India): its structures, backthrusts and extrusion mechanism by both channel flow and critical taper mechanisms. Int J Earth Sci 102:1851–1870. doi:10.1007/s00531-012-0861-5

Mukherjee S (2015) A review on out-of-sequence deformation in the Himalaya. In: Mukherjee S, Carosi R, van der Beek PA, Mukherjee BK, Robinson DM (eds) Tectonics of the Himalaya, Geological Society, London, Special Publication, vol 412, p 67–109. doi: 10.1144/SP412.13

Mukherjee S, Koyi HA (2010) Higher Himalayan Shear Zone, Sutlej section: structural geology and extrusion mechanism by various combinations of simple shear, pure shear and channel flow in shifting modes. Int J Earth Sci 99:1267–1303. doi:10.1007/s00531-009-0459-8

Murchison RI (1860) Supplemental observations on the order of the ancient stratified rocks of the north of Scotland, and their associated eruptive rocks. Quart J Geol Soc 16:215–240. doi:10.1144/GSL.JGS.1860.016.01-02.30

Myrow PM, Hughes NC, Paulsen TS, Williams IS, Parcha SK, Thompson KR, Bowring SA, Peng S-C, Ahluwalia AD (2003) Integrated tectonostratigraphic analysis of the Himalaya and implications for its tectonic reconstruction. Earth Planet Sci Lett 212:433–441. doi:10.1016/S0012-821X(03)00280-2

Myrow PM, Hughes NC, Goodge JW, Fanning CM, Williams IS, Peng S, Bhargava ON, Parcha SK, Pogue KR (2010) Extraordinary transport and mixing of sediment across Himalayan central Gondwana during the Cambrian-Ordovician. Geol Soc Am Bull 122:1660–1670. doi:10.1130/B30123.1

Nandini P, Thakur SS (2011) Metamorphic evolution of the Lesser Himalayan Crystalline Sequence, Siyom Valley, NE Himalaya, India. J Asian Earth Sci 40:1089–1100. doi:10.1016/j.jseaes.2010.12.005

Narkiewicz M, Petecki Z (2016) Comment on "Is the Teisseyre-Tornquist Zone an ancient plate boundary of Baltica?" by Mazur et al. Tectonics 35:1595–1599. doi:10.1002/2016TC004127

Nicol J (1861) On the structure of the north-western Highlands, and the relations of the gneiss, Red Sandstone, and quartzite of Sutherland and Ross-shire. Quart J Geol Soc 17:85–113. doi:10.1144/GSL.JGS.1861.017.01-02.11

Parrish RR, Hodges KV (1996) Isotopic constraints on the age and provenance of the Lesser and Greater Himalayan sequences, Nepalese Himalaya. Geol Soc Am Bull 108:904–911. doi:10.1130/0016-7606(1996)108<0904:ICOTAA>2.3.CO;2

Parsons AJ, Law RD, Searle MP, Phillips RJ, Lloyd GE (2016a) Geology of the Dhaulagiri-Annapurna-Manaslu Himalaya, western region, Nepal. 1:2000,000. J Maps 12:100–110. doi:10.1080/17445647.2014.984784

Parsons AJ, Law RD, Lloyd GE, Phillips RJ, Searle MP (2016b) Thermo-kinematic evolution of the Annapurna-Dhaulagiri Himalaya, central Nepal: the Composite Orogenic System. Geochem Geophys Geosyst 17:1511–1539. doi:10.1002/2015GC006184

Parsons AJ, Phillips RJ, Lloyd GE, Law RD, Searle MP, Walshaw RD (2016c) Mid-crustal deformation of the Annapurna-Dhaulagiri Himalaya, central Nepal: an atypical example of channel flow during the Himalayan orogeny. Geosphere 12:985–1015. doi:10.1130/GES01246.1

Passchier CW, Trouw RAJ (2005) Microtectonics. Springer, Berlin, p 366. doi:10.1007/3-540-29359-0

Pearson ON, DeCelles PG (2005) Structural geology and regional tectonic significance of the Ramgarh thrust, Himalayan fold-thrust belt of Nepal. Tectonics 24:TC4008. doi:10.1029/2003TC001617

Rennie SF, Fagereng A, Diener JFA (2013) Strain distribution within a km-scale, mid-crustal shear zone: the Kuckaus Mylonite Zone, Namibia. J Struct Geol 56:57–69. doi:10.1016/j.jsg.2013.09.001

Richards A, Argles T, Harris N, Parrish R, Ahmad T, Darbyshire F, Draganits E (2005) Himalayan architecture constrained by isotopic tracers from clastic sediments. Earth Planet Sci Lett 236:773–796. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2005.05.034

Robinson DM, Martin AJ (2014) Reconstructing the Greater Indian margin: a balanced cross section in central Nepal focusing on the Lesser Himalayan duplex. Tectonics 33:2143–2168. doi:10.1002/2014TC003564

Robinson DM, DeCelles PG, Patchett PJ, Garzione CN (2001) The kinematic evolution of the Nepalese Himalaya interpreted from Nd isotopes. Earth Planet Sci Lett 192:507–521. doi:10.1016/S0012-821X(01)00451-4

Robinson DM, DeCelles PG, Copeland P (2006) Tectonic evolution of the Himalayan thrust belt in western Nepal: implications for channel flow models. Geol Soc Am Bull 118:865–885. doi:10.1130/B25911.1

Rubatto D, Chakraborty S, Dasgupta S (2013) Timescales of crustal melting in the Higher Himalayan Crystallines (Sikkim, Eastern Himalaya) inferred from trace element-constrained monazite and zircon chronology. Contrib Miner Petrol 165:349–372. doi:10.1007/s00410-012-0812-y

Sachan HK, Sharma R, Sahai A, Gururajan NS (2001) Fluid events and exhumation history of the main central thrust zone Garhwal Himalaya (India). J Asian Earth Sci 19:207–221. doi:10.1016/S1367-9120(00)00036-5

Schelling D, Arita K (1991) Thrust tectonics, crustal shortening, and the structure of the far-eastern Nepal Himalaya. Tectonics 10:851–862. doi:10.1029/91TC01011

Schmid SM, Aebli HR, Heller F, Zingg A, (1989) The role of the Periadriatic Line in the tectonic evolution of the Alps. In: Coward MP, Dietrich D, Park RG (eds) Alpine Tectonics, vol 45. Geological Society, Special Publication, London, pp 153–171. doi:10.1144/GSL.SP.1989.045.01.08

Searle MP (2010) Low-angle normal faults in the compressional Himalayan orogen; Evidence from the Annapurna-Dhaulagiri Himalaya, Nepal. Geosphere 6:296–315. doi:10.1130/GES00549.1

Searle MP, Godin L (2003) The South Tibetan Detachment and the Manaslu Leucogranite: a structural reinterpretation and restoration of the Annapurna-Manaslu Himalaya, Nepal. J Geol 111:505–523. doi:10.1086/376763

Searle MP, Waters DJ, Rex DC, Wilson RN (1992) Pressure, temperature and time constraints on Himalayan metamorphism from eastern Kashmir and western Zanskar. J Geol Soc 149:753–773. doi:10.1144/gsjgs.149.5.0753

Searle MP, Law RD, Godin L, Larson KP, Streule MJ, Cottle JM, Jessup MJ (2008) Defining the Himalayan Main Central Thrust in Nepal. J Geol Soc 165:523–534. doi:10.1144/0016-76492007-081

Sinha-Roy S (1982) Himalayan Main Central Thrust and its implications for Himalayan inverted metamorphism. Tectonophysics 84:197–224. doi:10.1016/0040-1951(82)90160-3

Soucy La Roche R, Godin L, Cottle JM, Kellett DA (2016) Direct shear fabric dating constrains early Oligocene onset of the South Tibetan detachment in the western Nepal Himalaya. Geology 44:403–406. doi:10.1130/G37754.1

Stephenson BJ, Waters DJ, Searle MP (2000) Inverted metamorphism and the Main Central Thrust: field relations and thermobarometric constraints from the Kishtwar Window, NW Indian Himalaya. J Metamorph Geol 18:571–590. doi:10.1046/j.1525-1314.2000.00277.x

Stephenson BJ, Searle MP, Waters DJ, Rex DC (2001) Structure of the Main Central Thrust zone and extrusion of the High Himalayan deep crustal wedge, Kishtwar-Zanskar Himalaya. J Geol Soc 158:637–652. doi:10.1144/jgs.158.4.637

Stockhert B, Brix MR, Kleinschrodt R, Hurford AJ, Wirth R (1999) Thermochronometry and microstructures of quartz—a comparison with experimental flow laws and predictions on the temperature of the brittle–plastic transition. J Struct Geol 21:351–369. doi:10.1016/S0191-8141(98)00114-X

Streule MJ, Searle MP, Waters DJ, Horstwood MSA (2010) Metamorphism, melting, and channel flow in the Greater Himalayan Sequence and Makalu leucogranite: constraints from thermobarometry, metamorphic modeling, and U-Pb geochronology. Tectonics 29:TC5011. doi:10.1029/2009TC002533

Sullivan WA, Boyd AS, Monz ME (2013) Strain localization in homogeneous granite near the brittle–ductile transition: a case study of the Kellyland fault zone, Maine, USA. J Struct Geol 56:70–88. doi:10.1016/j.jsg.2013.09.003

Tobgay T, McQuarrie N, Long S, Kohn MJ, Corrie SL (2012) The age and rate of displacement along the Main Central Thrust in the western Bhutan Himalaya. Earth Planet Sci Lett 319–320:146–158. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2011.12.005

Tornebohm AE (1888) Om fjallproblemet. Geologiska Foereningan i Stockholm Foerhandlingar 10:328–336. doi:10.1080/11035898809444211

Torsvik TH, Cocks LRM (2013) Gondwana from top to base in space and time. Gondwana Res 24:999–1030. doi:10.1016/j.gr.2013.06.012

Valdiya KS (1980) Geology of Kumaun lesser Himalaya. Wadia Institute of Himalayan Geology, Dehradun, p 291

van Hinsbergen DJJ, Lippert PC, Dupont-Nivet G, McQuarrie N, Doubrovine PV, Spakman W, Torsvik TH (2012) Greater India Basin hypothesis and a two-stage Cenozoic collision between India and Asia. Proc Natl Acad Sci 109:7659–7664. doi:10.1073/pnas.1117262109

Vannay J-C, Grasemann B, Rahn M, Frank W, Carter A, Baudraz V, Cosca M (2004) Miocene to Holocene exhumation of metamorphic crustal wedges in the NW Himalaya: evidence for tectonic extrusion coupled to fluvial erosion. Tectonics 23:TC1014. doi:10.1029/2002TC001429

Webb AAG (2013) Preliminary balanced palinspastic reconstruction of Cenozoic deformation across the Himachal Himalaya (northwestern India). Geosphere 9:572–587. doi:10.1130/GES00787.1

Webb AAG, Yin A, Harrison TM, Celerier J, Burgess WP (2007) The leading edge of the Greater Himalayan Crystalline complex revealed in the NW Indian Himalaya: implications for the evolution of the Himalayan orogen. Geology 35:955–958. doi:10.1130/G23931A.1

Webb AAG, Schmitt AK, He D, Weigand EL (2011a) Structural and geochronological evidence for the leading edge of the Greater Himalayan Crystalline complex in the central Nepal Himalaya. Earth Planet Sci Lett 304:483–495. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2011.02.024

Webb AAG, Yin A, Harrison TM, Celerier J, Gehrels GE, Manning CE, Grove M (2011b) Cenozoic tectonic history of the Himachal Himalaya (northwestern India) and its constraints on the formation mechanism of the Himalayan orogen. Geosphere 7:1013–1061. doi:10.1130/GES00627.1

Webb AAG, Yin A, Dubey CS (2013) U-Pb zircon geochronology of major lithologic units in the eastern Himalaya: implications for the origin and assembly of Himalayan rocks. Geol Soc Am Bull 125:499–522. doi:10.1130/B30626.1

Whipple KX, Shirzaei M, Hodges KV, Arrowsmith JR (2016) Active shortening within the Himalayan orogenic wedge implied by the 2015 Gorkha earthquake. Nat Geosci 9:711–716. doi:10.1038/ngeo2797

Whittington A, Foster G, Harris N, Vance D, Ayres M (1999) Lithostratigraphic correlations in the western Himalaya—an isotopic approach. Geology 27:585–588. doi:10.1130/0091-7613(1999)027<0585:LCITWH>2.3.CO;2

Yakymchuk C, Godin L (2012) Coupled role of deformation and metamorphism in the construction of inverted metamorphic sequences: an example from far-northwest Nepal. J Metamorph Geol 30:513–535. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1314.2012.00979.x

Yin A (2006) Cenozoic tectonic evolution of the Himalayan orogen as constrained by along-strike variation of structural geometry, exhumation history, and foreland sedimentation. Earth Sci Rev 76:1–131. doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2005.05.004

Yin A (2010) Cenozoic tectonic evolution of Asia: a preliminary synthesis. Tectonophysics 488:293–325. doi:10.1016/j.tecto.2009.06.002

Yin A, Dubey CS, Kelty TK, Webb AAG, Harrison TM, Chou CY, Celerier J (2010) Geologic correlation of the Himalayan orogen and Indian craton: part 2. Structural geology, geochronology, and tectonic evolution of the Eastern Himalaya. Geol Soc Am Bull 122:360–395. doi:10.1130/B26461.1

Yoshida M, Upreti BN (2006) Neoproterozoic India within East Gondwana: constraints from recent geochronologic data from Himalaya. Gondwana Res 10:349–356. doi:10.1016/j.gr.2006.04.011