# SHORT NOTES

## PLACE NAMES IN THE ANTARCTIC

G. HATTERSLEY-SMITH*

*British Antarctic Survey, Natural Environment Research Council, High Cross, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0ET, UK*

In the past, members of successive expeditions have frequently not taken full account of the place names applied by their predecessors and have applied their own set of names to the same features, leaving the toponymist to unravel the resulting confusion. There is now no part of Antarctica that is *terra incognita* and, in every area with ice-free rock, there is now at least a framework of place names that can be found on an existing map or chart, or listed in the relevant gazetteer. The fundamental purpose of place naming is to ensure that geographical features can be unambiguously identified by successive visitors, that when a place name is used it should be known to what feature it refers and that it applies to no other feature. This is particularly important in the Antarctic where the main users of place names are scientists much of whose work now involves international co-operation.

It is unfortunate that political and linguistic considerations preclude a unified system of place names in Antarctica. There are now 32 signatory countries to the Antarctic Treaty, and place names appear in 17 or more languages and three scripts. In many cases the original name of a feature, in whatever language, is merely translated into other languages, or transliterated into other scripts. In many other cases, one or more completely different names in the same language, another language or other languages, are applied to the same feature. The first situation, which is bound to persist in Antarctica, causes far less confusion than the second. This paper is directed towards avoidance of double or multiple naming, and also offers some guidance on the need for and choice of new names. These are matters for the consideration of the place-name authorities that exist in most of the Antarctic Treaty countries.

### DOUBLE OR MULTIPLE NAMING

Most scientists would agree that the acceptance of a particular name is of secondary importance to the obvious desirability of a single name for the same feature, with allowance for its translation into other languages or transliteration into other scripts.

Existing place names should be accepted only when full account has been taken of all the available evidence for priority of discovery, priority of naming, established usage and suitability. In considering a proposal for a new name, it is important to determine whether or not the feature has been previously named and, if so, to what extent the name has become established. These requirements impose a responsibility on place-name authorities to undertake research on the history of names and to make liaison with other authorities before accepting new names. It would be unrealistic to suppose that national authorities would be prepared to alter decisions on names that may long have appeared on maps and charts and in gazetteers, but to avoid further double or multiple naming every effort should be made to reach agreement on new names.

* Secretary, UK Antarctic Place-names Committee, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London SW1A 2AH

## Need for New Place Names

The introduction of new place names is an unavoidable practical necessity in the course of field work. However, much confusion has been caused in the past when place naming has got ahead of adequate topographic mapping. With 1:250000 maps now available of much of the ice-free part of Antarctica, such confusion is now less likely to arise. But new names should be applied only to features defined beyond misidentification, and the generic part of the name should be appropriate. As a general rule, new names for minor features should be accepted only if there is a standard map or chart published at sufficiently large scale to show them. The *ad hoc* naming of minor features for use in a single report should be discouraged. Occasionally, as near permanent stations, intensive scientific work has led to large-scale maps of small areas being published. A higher density of names than elsewhere may then be permissible. Nevertheless, to avoid overloading the map with place names, field scientists should be encouraged to use a grid system for numbered collecting-station lists and to show the stations on a sketch map in their reports.

## Choice of New Names

### *Size of feature and and name*

The size of a feature to be named may affect the choice of name. The name needs to be appropriately placed and legible on a published map or chart, and this often rules out the use of long names for small features, particularly on charts where soundings have to be shown.

### *Personal names*

The use of rank or title in an eponymous place name, the use of more than one part of a double-barrelled surname, or the inclusion of a forename, is superfluous, except for special historical reasons.

### *Names composed of two generic terms*

Such names as 'Dome Peak', 'Pond Bay' or 'Ridge Mountain' should be avoided.

### *Descriptive names*

Names that might be mistaken on a map or chart for purely informative legends describing terrain or topography, instead of place names (e.g. 'Sandy Hills', 'Snow Plateau') should be avoided.

### *Names of obscure and private origin*

Such names should be avoided. The reason for a name should be neither complicated nor far-fetched.

### *Group names*

It has been found useful to name groups of geographically associated features after corresponding associated persons or ideas. For example, groups of names have been

applied in particular areas after 19th century sealers, Antarctic meteorologists and oceanographers, pioneers of navigation and photography, composers of music, and so forth. Group naming has the advantage of bringing to mind the locality of a feature by association with others similarly named, and of imparting an international flavour to the names.

### Procedure for New Names

In the Falkland Islands Dependencies and the British Antarctic Territory, proposals for new names are scrutinized by the Antarctic Place-names Committee. Since 1968 the Committee has been chaired by Sir Vivian Fuchs, FRS, and includes the Director of the British Antarctic Survey and a representative each from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the Hydrographic Department (Ministry of Defence) and the Permanent Committee on Geographical Names. The Committee is empowered to make decisions on place names through the Director of the British Antarctic Survey acting on behalf of the Governor of the Falkland Islands, who is also High Commissioner of the British Antarctic Territory. Members of the Survey and others, who have worked in the field, are invited to submit proposals of new names to the Secretary of the Committee.

The general principles set out above have been found useful during many years of place naming. If this paper succeeds in checking the indiscriminate use and proliferation of place names in various languages on maps and charts, it will have served its purpose.

*Received and accepted* 9 *May* 1985

## COMMENTS ON BELEMNITE FRAGMENTS FROM 'CUMBERLAND BAY TYPE' SEDIMENTS, SOUTH-EASTERN SOUTH GEORGIA

P. Doyle

*British Antarctic Survey, Natural Evironment Research Council, High Cross, Madingley Road, Cambridge, CB3 0ET*

Two belemnite fragments (M.533.3a, b) were described by Stone and Willey (1973) from cobbles of fine-pebble conglomerate found in the terminal moraine of the Ross Glacier in Little Molkte Harbour (54° 32′ S, 36° 04′ W). These cobbles were identified as Cumberland Bay type greywackes (Stone and Willey, 1973), and the belemnites were considered to be *Belemnopsis*-like, with a probable age of Late Jurassic to Early Cretaceous. However, other fossil evidence suggests an Aptian (Early Cretaceous) age for the Cumberland Bay Formation (Thomson and others, 1982; Macdonald, 1982). In the British Antarctic Survey collections are three further cobbles of Cumberland Bay type sediments containing belemnites: M.635.5 from the southeast part of Will Point (54° 33′ S, 35° 59′ W) overlooking the Weddell Glacier, M.659.3 from the south side of the Ross Glacier snout (54° 33′ S, 36° 09′ W) and M.4203.5 from Ross Glacier Medial Moraine (54° 34′ S, 36° 07′ W). The only other belemnites known from South Georgia are two fragmentary dimitobelids of probable Aptian–Albian age from Annenkov Island (Pettigrew and Willey, 1975).

## The Fragments

Specimen M. 533.3b of Stone and Willey (1973, fig. 2 – incorrectly labelled as M.533.3a) is a stem or apical fragment of a small (maximum diameter 3.5 mm), slightly depressed rostrum, with no diagnostic features apart from an eccentric apical line. The second example, M.533.3a (referred to as M.553.3b by Stone and Willey, 1973) is a fragmentary long section (length 6 mm) without apical or alveolar regions. Stone and Willey (1973) reported the presence of a shallow, *Belemnopsis*-like groove in this specimen, but no trace of such a feature could be found upon close examination. It is possible that the authors were misled by alteration of the central region of the section, and by a protruding fragment of matrix which may have been taken as a groove infill. This fragment is central to the section and is more likely to be the tip of its infilled alveolus. Although both specimens are clearly belemnites, they are otherwise unidentifiable.

The three other specimens are similarly indeterminate. Specimen M.635.5 is a fragment of long section of a (?) depressed rostrum (preserved length 5 mm, estimated diameter 4 mm). Specimen M.659.3 is a slightly crushed alveolar cross section (maximum diameter 4 mm), with fine mud infilling the alveolus. There is no trace of an alveolar groove in this section. The last specimen, M.4203.5 collected by I. Turnbull and D. Craw of the New Zealand South Georgia Expedition (1984–85), may represent a fragment of an infilled alveolus, but all traces of the original rostrum are lost.

## Conclusions

The suggestion by Stone and Willey (1973) that specimen M.553.3a (referred to as M.553.3b) is *Belemnopsis*-like and therefore specifically of Late Jurassic to Early Cretaceous age cannot be upheld on this evidence alone. The five fragmentary belemnites described display no diagnostic features, and as such are indeterminate and could be either Jurassic or Cretaceous in age.

*Received and accepted 24 May 1985*

## References

Macdonald, D. I. M. 1982. Palaeontology and ichnology of the Cumberland Bay Formation, South Georgia. *British Antarctic Survey Bulletin*, No. 57, 1–14.

Pettigrew, T. H. *and* Willey, L. E. 1975. Belemnite fragments from Annenkov Island. *British Antarctic Survey Bulletin*, No. 40, 33–6.

Stone, P. *and* Willey, L. E. 1973. Belemnite fragments from the Cumberland Bay type sediments of South Georgia. *British Antarctic Survey Bulletin*, No. 36, 129–31.

Thomson, M. R. A., Tanner, P. W. G. *and* Rex, D. C. 1982. Fossil and radiometric evidence for ages of deposition and metamorphism of sedimentary sequences on South Georgia. (*In* Craddock, C., *ed. Antarctic Geoscience*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 177–84.)