

4/28/58

Lexicon of Geologic Names

Information regarding the Bibliographic File and review of geologic literature for the file.

The bibliographic file is a continuing record of all the publications that have been reviewed. Each week the new periodicals, serials, and publications placed on the Survey's "new book shelf" are reviewed and appropriate entries are made in the Bibliographic File.

Includes:

1. A white 4x6 card for each periodical, serial, etc. (including serial publications of the various state and the national survey). The heading for each card bears the full title of the publication, including the name of the state or provincial survey (if any) and the U.S.G.S. call number. The card includes a column under each of the following headings:

Volume, Number, Date, and Code.

Some serial publications are designated by number only. In such cases the volume column is omitted.

Date is the date of publication.

Code is a letter (X or Z) used to indicate that the publication has been reviewed and whether or not it contains any information for the Lexicon. In the Code column "Z" indicates that the publication contains information for the Lexicon and this information has been recorded in the "Z" file. "X" means that the publication contains no information for the Lexicon.

2. A blue 4x6 card for each state and country upon which is entered miscellaneous publications reviewed that do not have a place of entry in (1) above. For each miscellaneous publication reviewed the following entries are made:

Author, Title, Publisher, U.S.G.S. library call number, date of publication, and code.

"Z" File

Our main concern is to make sure that we have cards on all new names and revisions of all names, old and new, which have appeared in the literature since the 1936 Lexicon of Geologic Names. The big question with which the reviewer is faced is which citations of names in the literature are important for our purpose. This is particularly vexing for revisions. There is no problem if the author of a publication clearly states that he is proposing a new name, revising a name

and states nature of revision, or if he cites previous publications, indicating that his usage is not new. However, if the above information is not clearly stated, then the possibility of a revision or a new name is in doubt in the mind of the reviewer. If the reviewer is not familiar with the general history of the name and is in doubt as to whether a citation is important he should narrow down the possibilities by the following general procedure:

(1) Check the "Z" file (which includes all information from Wilmarth, 1936). If there is no change in usage, no entry need be made normally. If a name is represented in the "Z" file by only the Lexicon card, yet it is used in the current literature without any apparent change from the pre-Wilmarth Lexicon (pre-1936) usage, it is desirable to have at least one good current reference in the "Z" file if for no other reason than to show that the name is still in current usage. Whenever a "Z" file card is made out to show only that the name is still in current usage, the statement "In use without apparent change from Wilmarth" should be put on the card (see No. 6 on Format for file cards).

(2) Use personal judgment, e.g., if no geographic or geologic extension or restriction or other change in usage is involved, yet the publication has a good stratigraphic, geographic, or historical review (summary) of the unit, it may be desirable to make an entry for the "Z" file; on the other hand, if the paper deals only with petrology, paleontology, economic geology, etc. in a purely non-stratigraphic sense and no extensions, restrictions, or other changes are involved, no entry is required. Some new names fall into the category of either economic or informal units. With discretion, some of these should be picked up because they might eventually become a part of the acceptable formal nomenclature in which case we will want the earliest use of the names.

(3) When the above operations have been performed and there is still reasonable doubt in the mind of the reviewer as to the existence of a possible revision, the name should be entered. In such cases of doubt, the "Nature of information" (see No. 2 on Format for file cards) will either not be indicated on the card or be accompanied by a question mark.

#### FORMAT FOR "Z" FILE CARDS

The accompanying sheet is provided as a format for cards entered in the "Z" file. Several of the positions on this card need explanation.

Position (1): Examples ---

- a. Compound names--require duplicate cards, e.g., Stones River-Black River group; make out 2 cards with the same information with the headings as follows:

Stones River  
Stones River-Black River group

Black River  
Stones River-Black River group

- b. Misspellings--consistent misspellings are noted; incidental misspellings are ignored--enter as follows:

Weverton quartzite  
Weaverton quartzite (sp.)

- c. If the unit is a subdivision of a larger geologic unit whose magnitude is no greater than formation, the name of the larger unit will be placed in parens immediately under the smaller unit, e.g.

Lovell member  
(Cloverly formation)

Position (2): Where the reviewer is sure of the nature of the information in the publication, one of the designations listed below is chosen. Where there is doubt in the reviewer's mind concerning this point, no designation is entered or one of the designations is entered followed by a question mark. The following designations cover the important possibilities and will serve also as a guide to determining what to look for in a publication:

1. Proposed - when author clearly states that he is proposing the name.
2. New - first published occurrence of the name.
3. Abandoned - formal abandonment by author of paper.  
Locally abandoned - name abandoned for particular area.
4. Revised - a general term used when one of the more specific designations is not suitable, e.g., name changes of existing subdivisions without adding or subtracting units; when more than one of the following designations is indicated:
  - a) Age change
  - b) Rank raised
  - c) Rank reduced
  - d) Stratigraphically extended (Strat. ext.) or restricted (Strat. restr.) extension or restriction of vertical limits.
  - e) Geographically extended (Geog. ext.) or restricted (Geog. restr.) - extension or restriction of horizontal limits. The smallest significant extension is from one county to an adjacent county.
  - f) Subdivided. Make sure that cards are made out from the reference for the subdivisions as well as for the unit that is subdivided.
5. Revived - reinstated.
6. Reallocated - shift of unit from one higher unit to another.
7. Redefined - may occasionally be more appropriate than any of the above designations.
8. Economic - used to designate ore beds, quarry terms, etc.

Position (4): Give authors surname first. An asterisk is to be used in front of the author's name only when the paper is approved for publication by the USGS, but the fact that a publication is approved by the USGS is not in itself a justification for entering cards in the "Z" file. Record only the page numbers on which important information is given for the particular unit. DO NOT record the all inclusive pages of the article unless the article is devoted in its entirety to the unit in concern!

Position (6): Give here only the most pertinent data which does not fall under any of the other positions. Do not try to record too much. Many cards will need no data in this position. A few concise statements that are often used here are as follows:

Good summary article for formation

In use without apparent change from Wilmarth

Type locality designated or ....indicated

For units that are indicated as "Subdivided" in Position (2) it is desirable to enter the subdivisions in Position (6) in stratigraphic order with oldest at bottom. When recorded in this order they will be enclosed with a large bracket to indicate a normal sequence-- otherwise omit the bracket, e.g.

On the card for the Wassuk group is the following entry in Position (6)

Includes { Morgan Ranch fm.  
Coal Valley fm.  
Aldrich Station fm.

Note: A separate card should also be made out for each of the sub-units from this reference.

Position (10): May include such designations as: county, quadrangle, mining district, etc. Name of state is always entered on bottom line by itself, e.g.

Bisbee Mining District  
Arizona

Format for "Z" file cards

- (1) Stratigraphic name for filing purposes and/or  
Stratigraphic name as it appears in publication
- (2) (Nature of information)
- (3) Year of publication

(-----fm.) [If above unit is of lower rank than fm.]

- (4) Author's name, title of paper, publication, dates if discrepancy between published date and true date, pages [only important ones containing information on card].

(5) Library Call No.

- (6) For new names - a concise statement covering stratigraphic relations, and type locality.

For old names - a brief statement of nature of revision, or any information which will be helpful in reviewing subsequent publications.

- (7) Group [rock term]

- (8) "Stage" or group correlation [e.g., "Trentonian" or Trenton]

Stage [Pleistocene only]

Series and/or System

Era [if no smaller divisions given]

[If age not given, state -] Not given

(9) Subsurface [no designation if surface]

(10) Geographic area

Moreno shale	(Subdivided)	1941
Payne, M. B., Moreno shale, Panoche Hills, Fresno County, California: (abs.) Geol. Soc. America Bull., v. 52, no. 12, pt. 2. p. 1953-1954		
		G(200) G29
Contains 4 newly named members and 2 newly named lenses in its type locality:		
Moreno shale	{	Dos Palos shale member
		(Includes Cima sandstone lens)
		Marcas shale member
		Tierra Loma shale member
		(Includes Mercy sandstone lens)
		<u>Dosados sand and shale member</u>
<u>Panoche formation</u>		
Cret. and Paleocene(?)		Fresno County, Central California

Wepo formation	1956
Kiersch, G. A., Metalliferous minerals and mineral fuels: Mineral Resources, Navajo-Hopi Indian Reservation, Arizona-Utah, v. 2. 1955 [1956]	
p. 7, fig. 1.	
[Credits name to Reppening and Page, 1956].	
Up. Cret.	Cent. and W. New Mexico

Eleana formation (New) 1957

Johnson, M. S. and Hibbard, D. E., Geology of the Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Proving Grounds area, Nevada: U. S. Geol. Survey Bull. 1021-K. (200)  
p. 357-360 E

Described - exposures noted.

Probably Late Miss.

Nevada

Wassuk group (Proposed) 1956

Axelrod, D. I., Mio-Pliocene floras from west-central Nevada: California Univ. Pubs., Geol. Sci., v. 33. p. 61-67 G(276)

Includes: { Morgan Ranch formation  
Coal Valley formation  
Aldrich Station formation  
gln4

Barstovian to Hemphillian  
Late Miocene to Mid. Pliocene

West-central Nevada