

hole penetrated two rock complexes differing in lithology and metamorphism. The rock complexes are in tectonic contact with each other. The upper unit contained Namurian B-C to Westphalian A conodonts. The rock complex is correlated with the Szendrő phyllites Formation (the Bükkium). The lower rock complex is correlated with Jurassic olistostromal formations of the Rudabánya facies (Meliaticum). So the Brusník anticline is not part of the Gemicicum s.s. It has the character of a nappe-imbrication zone comprising two higher-order tectonic units south of the Rožňava lineament.

The problem and its solution is dedicated to the 65th birthday of Profesor H. FLÜGEL from the Graz University.

References

- ÁRKAI, P. 1983: Very low- and low-grade Alpine regional metamorphism of the Paleozoic and Mesozoic formations of the Bükkium, NE-Hungary. *Acta Geologica Hungarica*, 26 (1–2), Budapest, 83–101.
- BAJANÍK, Š. — VOZÁROVÁ, A. — REICHWALDER, P. 1981: Litostratigrafická klasifikácia rakoveckej skupiny a mladšieho paleozoika v Spišsko-gemerskom rudoohori. *Geol. práce, Správy* 75, Geol. úst. D. Štúra, Bratislava, 27–56.
- FUSÁN, O. 1957: Paleozoikum gemerid. *Geol. práce, Zoš.* 46, Geol. úst. D. Štúra, Bratislava, 34–42.
- CHMELÍK, J. — JABLONSKÝ, J. 1964: Predbežná správa o petrografickom výskume mladšieho paleozoika v okolí Brusníka. *Správy o geol. výskumoch v r.* 1963, Geol. úst. D. Štúra, Bratislava, 77–78.
- KOVÁCS, S. 1987: Olisztosztrómák és egyéb, vizálati gravitációs tömegszáláttal kapcsolatos üledékek az észkmagyarországi paleo-mezozoikumban, II. *Földtany Közlöny, Bull. of the Hungarian Geol. Soc.*, 117, Budapest, 101–119.
- KOVÁCS, S. — KOZUR, H. — MOCK, R. 1983: Relations between the Szendrő-Uppony and Bükk Paleozoic in the light of the latest micropaleontological investigations. *MAFI, Évi Jelentése az 1981. Evről*, Budapest, 165–175.
- KOZUR, H. — MOCK, R. — MOSTLER, H. 1976: Stratigraphische Neueinstufung der Karbonatogesteine der Schichtenfolge von Ochtiná (Slowakei) in das oberste Vise-Serpukhovian (Namur A). *Geol. Pal. Mitt.*, 6, 1, Innsbruck, 1–29.
- KOZUR, H. — MOCK, R. 1977: Erster Nachweis von Conodonten im Paläozoikum (Karbon) der Westkarpaten. *Časopis pro mineral. a geol.*, 22, 3, Praha, 299–305.
- KOVÁCS, S. — PÉRÓ Cs. 1983: Report on stratigraphical investigations in the Bükkium (Northern Hungary). In: Sassi, F. P. — Szederkenyi, T. (Eds.): *IGCP, No. 5. Newsletter 5. Padova* — Budapest, 58–65.
- MAZZOLI, C. — VOZÁROVÁ, A. 1989: Further data concerning the pressure character of the Hercynian metamorphism in the West Carpathians (Czechoslovakia). *Rend. Soc. It. Mineral. Petrol.* (in press).
- MELLO, J. — VOZÁROVÁ, A. 1984: Je paleozoikum brusníckej antiklinálnej súčasťou silického príkrovu? *Geol. práce, Správy* 79, Geol. úst. D. Štúra, Bratislava, 263–266.
- SCHÖNLAUB, H. P. 1979: Das Paläozoikum in Österreich. *Abh. d. Geolog. Bundesanst.* 33, Wien, 3–124.
- SNOPKO, L. et al. 1970: Geologicko-ložisková štúdia Spišsko-gemerského rudoohoria. Manuscript. *Archív Geol. úst. D. Štúra, Bratislava*, 1–350.
- SNOPKO, L. — SNOPKOVÁ, P. 1979: Biostratigrafia gelnickej série Spišsko-gemerském rudoohorí na základe palinologických výsledkov (Západné Karpaty — paleozoikum). *Záp. Karpaty, sér. geol.* 5, Bratislava, 57–102.
- VOZÁROVÁ, A. — VOZÁR, J. 1988: Late Paleozoic in West Carpathians. *Geol. úst. D. Štúra, Bratislava*, 7–314.
- VOZÁR, J. et al. 1986: Geologický projekt vrtu BRU-1 (Brusník, 1 200 m). Manuscript. *Archív Geol. úst. D. Štúra, Bratislava*, 1–37.

Abstrakt

Antiklinála pri Brusníku predstavuje jednu z problémových štruktúr južnej časti Slovenského rudoohoria. Vrt BRU-1 (1 043 m) bol situovaný do jadra antiklinály, v ktorej sa doposiaľ predpokladalo vystupovanie gelnickej skupiny (spodný až stredný devón). Profil vrtovej skutočnosti zastihol dva odlišné súbory hornín, ktoré sú v tektonickom styku. Vrchný súbor, na základe konodontov z hĺbky 75–116 m, zaradujeme k namuru B-C až vestfálu A. Litologicky i stratigraficky horniny v intervale do 598,8 m sú korelovateľné s formáciou

Szendrő fylitov. Sporný súbor hornín (pod 598,8 m), zatiaľ bez biostratigrafických dôkazov a len na základe litológie, môže zodpovedať jurásym olistostromovým sekvenciám rudabaňského vývoja. Tým sa zásadne mení názor na doterajšie postavenie antiklinály pri Brusníku vo vzáahu k južným časťiam geomerika.

steine aus dem Tiefenbereich bis zu 598,8 m können lithologisch und stratigraphisch mit der Szendrő-Phyllitformation korreliert werden. Der strittige Gesteinskomplex (von 598,8 m an), bisher ohne biostratigraphische Belege, dürfte nur aufgrund der Lithologie den jurassischen Olistostromschichtenfolgen der Rudabánya-Entwicklung entsprechen. Durch diese Erkenntnisse wird die bisherige Ansicht über die Stellung der Brusník-Antiklinale in bezug auf die südlichen Teile des Gemicikums grundsätzlich geändert.

A. E. REUSS' IMPORTANCE FOR RESEARCH INTO NEogene OSTRACODA IN THE VIENNA BASIN AND THE TAXONOMIC REVISION OF HIS DETERMINATIONS

Jaromír Zelenka, Ústřední ústav geologický, Praha, Czechoslovakia

The work of A. E. Reuss on the Ostracoda of the Neogene Austro-Hungarian Basins of the year 1850 ranks with the classic fundamental works devoted to ostracod fauna.

In his work, written in German, the author described a total of 90 ostracod species, the greatest part of which come from localities in the Vienna Basin. (In the supplements he described another 6 species from localities in Sicily, England and France.) The object of Reuss' investigations were 46 different localities, of which numbers of fossil Ostracoda were established in 28 places. They involve Baden, Möllendorf, Vöslau, Atzgersdorf, Meidling, Döbling, artesian wells near Vienna, Heiligenberg, Brunn, Moosbrunn, Nussdorf, Gainfahren, Steinabrunn, Garsenthal, St. Nikolai, Wurzing, Grossing, Freibühl, Grinzing, Rust, Mauer near Vienna, one undefined locality in Austria, Sopron (- Oedenburg) in Hungary, Kyjov (- Gaya), Podivín (- Kostel), Rudoltice (- Rudelsdorf) in Czechoslovakia, Lapugiu de Sus (- Felső-Lapugy) in Romania, Wieliczka in Poland. Of these localities, Nussdorf and Podivín in the facies of the Leitha limestones proved to be the richest in Ostracoda, then Brunn, Sopron, Grinzing and Rudoltice in the Teglian facies. Halite and "salt" clay of Wieliczka contained a lot of species, but as for the number of individuals, it was far behind the above-mentioned localities.

As far as the stratigraphic determination of layers of the investigated localities is concerned, they can be incorporated into the Badenian to the Pontian, the majority of them belonging to the Badenian. Reuss used the following, stratigraphically not very clear terms, rather facial terms: the Leitha limestone, which corresponds to the shallow-water facies of the Badenian, and the Teglian.

As stated by Reuss, at the time he wrote the work five genera of fossil Ostracoda were known: Cypridella de KONINCK, 1841, Cypris O. F. MÜLLER, 1776, Cytherina LAMARCK, 1818, Cypridina EDWARDS, 1840, Cyprella de KONINCK, 1841. The material investigated by Reuss only contained representatives of genera Cypridina and Cytherina. The author also mentioned that of all the species investigated by him, only 12 were more widely distributed: Cytherina subdeltoidea (MÜNSTER, 1830), C. Müller REUSS, 1850, Cypridina trigonella REUSS, 1850, C. punctata (MÜNSTER, 1830), C. Haueri (RÖMER, 1838), C. deformis REUSS, 1850, C. hastata REUSS, 1850, C. sulcato-punctata REUSS, 1850, C. Haideri REUSS, 1850, C. cornuta (RÖMER, 1838), C. plicatula REUSS, 1850, C. Edwardsi (RÖMER,

List of ostracod fauna in REUSS (1850):

Original name	Revision
<i>Cytherina subdeltoides</i> v. MSTR.	<i>Bairdia subdeltoidea</i> (MÜNSTER, 1830)
<i>Cytherina abscissa</i> m.	<i>Amplocypris abscissa</i> (REUSS, 1850) unrevised, documentation material is missing
<i>Cytherina lucida</i> m.	<i>Pseudocandona semicircularis</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. JIRÍČEK (1985)
<i>Cytherina semicirculatis</i> m.	<i>Candona</i> (<i>Serbiella</i>) <i>unguiculus</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. KRSTIĆ (1985)
<i>Cytherina unguiculus</i> m.	<i>Casiolla unguiculus</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. JIRÍČEK (1985)
<i>Cytherina mytiloides</i> m.	unrevised, documentation material is missing
<i>Cytherina arcuata</i> v. MSTR.	<i>Phlyctenophora arquata</i> (MÜNSTER, 1830)
<i>Cytherina auriculata</i> m.	<i>Hungarocypris auriculata</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cytherina inflata</i> m.	unrevised, documentation material is missing
<i>Cytherina abbreviata</i>	<i>Cypria abbreviata</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. JIRÍČEK (1985)
<i>Cytherina gracilis</i> m.	unrevised, documentation material is missing
<i>Cytherina neglecta</i> m.	unrevised, documentation material is missing
<i>Cytherina recta</i> m.	<i>Amplocypris recta</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cytherina longa</i> m.	<i>Cushmanidea longa</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. BRESTENSKÁ, JIRÍČEK (1978), genus appurtenance is debatable
<i>Cytherina tenuis</i> m.	<i>Leptocythere tenuis</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cytherina compressa</i> v. MSTR.	<i>Cytherella compressa</i> (MÜNSTER, 1830)
<i>Cytherina sublaevis</i> m.	unrevised, documentation material is missing
<i>Cytherina Cytherella dilatata</i>	(REUSS, 1850) — rev. BRESTENSKÁ, JIRÍČEK (1978)
<i>Cytherina ovulum</i> m.	<i>Xestoleberis ovulum</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. OERTLI (1956)
<i>Cytherina exilis</i> m.	<i>Bairdia exilis</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. REUSS (1860), unrevised late, 1830
<i>Cytherina Mülleri</i> v. MSTR.	<i>Cytheridea muelleri</i> (MÜNSTER)
<i>Cytherina salinaria</i> m.	unrevised, documentation material is missing
<i>Cytherina heterostigma</i> m.	<i>Cyprideis heterostigma</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cytherina subteres</i> m.	a synonym to <i>Cyamocytheridea leptostigma</i> (<i>leptostigma</i>) (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cytherina obesa</i> m.	<i>Cyprideis heterostigma obesa</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. KOLLMANN (1960)
<i>Cytherina falcata</i> m.	<i>Bairdia falcata</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. REUSS (1860), unrevised later, documentation material is missing
<i>Cytherina leptostigma</i> m.	<i>Cyamocytheridea leptostigma</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cytherina tumida</i> m.	<i>Xestoleberis tumida</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cytherina crystallina</i> m.	<i>Parakrithe crystallina</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. BRESTENSKÁ, JIRÍČEK (1978)
<i>Cytherina strigulosa</i> m.	<i>Haplocytheridea strigulosa</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. KEY (1957)
<i>Cytherina setigera</i> m.	unrevised, documentation material is missing
<i>Cytherina pilosella</i> m.	<i>Xestoleberis pilosella</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cytherina glabrescens</i> m.	<i>Xestoleberis glabrescens</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cytherina trichospora</i> m.	unrevised, documentation material is missing
<i>Cytherina seminulum</i> m.	<i>Cyprideis seminulum</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cytherina tribullata</i> m.	unrevised
<i>Cytherina expansa</i> m.	<i>Ilyocypris expansa</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. KRSTIĆ (1985)
<i>Cypridina punctatella</i> m.	<i>Loxoconcha punctatella</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cypridina notata</i> m.	<i>Aurila notata</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cypridina philippii</i> m.	<i>Aurila philippii</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cypridina trigonella</i> m.	<i>Aurila trigonella</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cypridina cinctella</i> m.	<i>Aurila cinctella</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cypridina galeata</i> m.	<i>Aurila galeata</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cypridina cicatricosa</i> m.	<i>Aurila cicatricosa</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cypridina Kostelensis</i> m.	<i>Urocythereis kostelensis</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cypridina angulata</i> m.	<i>Aurila angulata</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cypridina punctata</i> v.M.	<i>Aurila punctata</i> (MÜNSTER, 1830)
<i>Cypridina deformis</i> m.	<i>Pokornyella deformis</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cypridina hastata</i> m.	<i>Loxoconcha hastata</i> (REUSS, 1850)

<i>Cypridina sagittula</i> m.	<i>Loxoconcha sagittula</i> (REUSS, 1850)
<i>Cypridina lacunosa</i> m.	<i>Cytheromorpha lacunosa</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. JIRÍČEK (1985)
	<i>Leptocythere</i> (<i>Amnicythere</i>) <i>lacunosa</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. KRSTIĆ (1985)
	<i>Aurila haueri</i> (RÖMER, 1838)
	<i>Hemicytheria reniformis</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Aurila opaca</i> (REUSS, 1850) unrevised, documentation material is missing
	<i>Hemicytheria loricata</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. JIRÍČEK (1985)
	<i>Hemicytheria folliculosa</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	probably a synonym to <i>Aurila haueri</i> (RÖMER, 1838)
	<i>Falunia spinulosa</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. BRESTENSKÁ, JIRÍČEK (1978)
	<i>Aurila hispidula</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Hemicytheria brunnensis</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Loxoconcha granifera</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Henryhowella aspermima</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	unrevised, documentation material is missing
	<i>Acanthocythereis hystrix</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Hemicytheria omphalodes</i> (<i>omphalodes</i>) (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Tenedocythere sulcatopunctata</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Callistocythere canaliculata</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Callistocythere daedalea</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Bosquetina carinella</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Occultocythereis bituberculata</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. RUSSO (1968)
	unrevised, documentation material is missing
	<i>Hermanites haidingeri</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Trachyleberis transylvanica</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. SCHEREMETA (1961)
	<i>Ambostracon ungeri</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. KOLLMANN (1971)
	<i>Pachycaudites ungeri</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Mutilus corrugatus</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. KOLLMANN (1971)
	<i>Cnestocythere truncata</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Verrucocythereis verrucosa</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	the material from REUSS' collection probably corresponds to <i>Pterygocythereis calcarata</i> (BOSQUET, 1852) — sensu BRESTENSKÁ, JIRÍČEK (1978)
	<i>Pterygocythereis cornuta</i> (RÖMER, 1838) — rev. KEY (1957)
	<i>Cytheropteron vespertilio</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Paracytheridea triquetra</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Eucytherura pygmaea</i> (REUSS, 1850) unrevised, documentation material is missing
	<i>Cythere plicata</i> (MÜNSTER, 1830)
	<i>Climacoidea polyptycha</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. RUSSO (1968)
	<i>Mutilus polypythochus</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Falunia plicatula</i> (REUSS, 1850), <i>Olimfalunia plicatula</i> (REUSS, 1850) — rev. CARBONEL P. (1985)
	<i>Costa edwardsi</i> (RÖMER, 1838)
	<i>Costa tricostata</i> (REUSS, 1850)
	<i>Costa reticulata</i> (REUSS, 1850)

1838). The occurrence of other species is confined to individual collecting localities or to a very small number of localities.

In the systematic part of the work, Reuss gave relatively detailed descriptions of both represented genera *Cytherina* and *Cypridina*. He characterized them and defined their mutual differences. The description of each species is preceded by a brief diagnosis in Latin, and the average size of the lengths of valves is given. The description proper is brief, as a rule, first the overall shape of the valve from the lateral view is given, further then the shape and size of the

MAGMATISM AND METAMORPHISM

anterior and posterior margins, frequently also the shape of the dorsal and ventral margins. This is followed by a description of sculptural elements, such as ribs, pits, nodes, spines, etc., and of their positions on the valve surface, sometimes, a brief description of the hingement is included. The imperfection of optical microscopes of that time is most likely responsible for some inaccuracies in Reuss' descriptions, e.g. on the valve surfaces of some species, he describes short hairs, which are obviously normal pore canals. The description is followed by a list of the localities, where the respective species was found.

The work is supplemented with 4 tables which depict the valves or carapaces of each species from outer lateral, and ventral or dorsal views. Only with some few species the inner view is given, depicting first of all the selvage pattern. Singularly, there are details of valve surfaces. Although the level of the depictions is fairly good for that time, the resolution power in smooth, unsculptured forms is smaller.

Note to revisions: In some species I could not verify the genus classification. In such cases I refer by abbreviation „rev.“ (revised) to the respective work.

In his next work, Reuss (1860) presented a list of ostracod fauna of the Miocene deposits in the environs of Česká Třebová of localities Opatov, Třebovice and Rudoltice. With each species he only gave the occurrence frequency and another collecting locality. All the 26 ostracod species quoted here were already described by the author in his work of 1850. It is worth mentioning that the genus classification does not agree in any case with the original one, the species were re-classified to genera Cythere, Bairdia, Cytherella and Cytheridea.

List of the occurring species: *Cythere galeata* (REUSS), *C. bituberculata* (REUSS), *C. plicata* (REUSS), *C. Edwardsii* (RÖMER), *C. cinctella* (REUSS), *C. cicatricosa* (REUSS), *C. angulata* (REUSS), *C. deformis* (REUSS), *C. hastata* (REUSS), *C. Haueri* (RÖMER), *C. similis* (REUSS), *C. hystrix* (REUSS), *C. canaliculata* (REUSS), *C. Haidingeri* (REUSS), *C. corrugata* (REUSS), *C. verrucosa* (REUSS), *C. polyptycha* (REUSS), *C. plicatula* (REUSS), *C. reticulata* (REUSS), *Bairdia subdeltoidea* (MÜNSTER), *B. arcuata* (MÜNSTER), *B. exilis* (REUSS), *B. falcata* (REUSS), *B. glabrescens* (REUSS), *Cytherella compressa* (MÜNSTER), *Cytheridea Mülleri* (MÜNSTER).

References:

- Brestenská E., Jiříček R. (1978): Ostracoden des Badenien der Zentralen Paratethys. — In: Papp A., Cicha I., Seneš J., Steininger F. et al.: Chronostratigraphie und Neostratotypen, Bd. VI, Miozän M₄, Badenien, 405–439. VEDA, vydavatelstvo SAV, Bratislava.
- Carbonel P. (1985): Néogène. — In: Oertli H. J. (ed.): Atlas des Ostracodes de France. — Bull. Cent. Rech. Explor. — Prod. Elf-Aquitaine. Mém. 9, 313–335. Pau.
- Cernajsek T. (1974): Die Ostracodenfaunen der Sarmatischen Schichten in Österreich. — In: Papp A., Marinescu F., Seneš J. et al.: Chronostratigraphie und Neostratotypen, Bd. IV, Miozän M₅, Sarmatien, 458–491. — VEDA, vydavatelstvo SAV, Bratislava.
- Jiříček R. (1974): Biostratigraphische Bedeutung der Ostracoden des Sarmats s. str. — In: Papp A., Marinescu F., Seneš J. et al.: Chronostratigraphie und Neostratotypen, Bd. IV, Miozän M₅, Sarmatien, 434–457. — VEDA, vydavatelstvo SAV, Bratislava.
- Key A. J. (1957): Eocene and Oligocene Ostracoda of Belgium. — Mémoires (Inst. roy. Sci. natur. Belg.), 136, 1–210. Bruxelles.
- Kollmann K. (1960): Cytherideinae und Schulerideinae n. subfam. (Ostracoda) aus dem Neogen des östlichen Österreich. — Mitt. Geol. Gesell., 51, (1958), 89–195. Wien.
- (1971): Die Ostracoden der Eggenburger Schichtengruppe Niederösterreichs. — In: Steininger F., Seneš J. et al.: Chronostratigraphie und Neostratotypen, Bd. II, Miozän M₁, Eggenburgien, 605–717. Vydavatelstvo SAV, Bratislava.
- Krstić N. (1985): Ostracoden im Pannonien der Umgebung von Belgrad. — In: Papp A., Jámbor A., Steininger F. et al.: Chronostratigraphie und Neostratotypen, Bd. VII, Miozän M₆, Pannonien, 103–143. — Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Oertli H. J. (1956): Ostracoden aus der oligozänen und miozänen Molasse der Schweiz. — Schweiz. paläont. Abh., 74, 1–119. Basel.
- Reuss A. E. (1850): Die fossilen Entomostraceen des österreichischen Tertiärbeckens. — Haidinger's Naturwiss. Abh., 3, 41–92. Wien.
- (1860): Die marinen Tertiärschichten Böhmens und ihre Versteinerungen. — Sitz.-Ber. K. Akad. Wiss., math.-naturwiss. Cl., 39, 207–285. Wien.

Russo A. (1968): Ostracodi tortoniani di Mantebaranzone. — Boll. Soc. paleont. ital., 7, 1, 1–56. Modena.

Scheremeta V. G. (1961): Nekotorye novye vidy ostrakod iz sarmatiskikh i pannonskikh otloženij Zakarpatja. — Paleont. Sbor., 1, 113–120. Lvov.

Abstrakt

Práce A. E. Reusse o ostrakodech neogenních pánví Rakousko-Uherska z roku 1850 patří mezi klasická, základní díla věnovaná ostrakodové fauně.

V této německy psané práci autor popsal celkem 90 druhů, z nichž převážná většina pochází z lokalit vídeňské pánve. Pokud se týká stratigrafického stáří vrstev zkoumaných lokalit, lze je zařadit do badenu až pontu, přičemž nejvíce jich patří badenskému stupni.

U všech Reussem popsaných druhů byla provedena taxonomická revize jejich rodového určení.

Zusammenfassung

Die von A. E. Reuß verfaßte Arbeit über Ostrakoden der neogenen Becken in Österreich-Ungarn vom J. 1850 gehört den klassischen, grundlegenden Werken an, die sich mit Ostrakodenfaunen befassen. In dieser in Deutsch erschienenen Arbeit beschrieb der Verfasser insgesamt 90 Arten, von denen die überwiegende Mehrheit aus Fundorten im Wiener Becken stammt. Was das stratigraphische Alter der Schichten an untersuchten Fundorten betrifft, kann man sie in das Baden bis Pont einstuften, wobei die meisten davon der Baden-Stufe angehören. An allen von Reuß beschriebenen Arten wurde eine taxonomische Revision ihrer Gattungsbestimmung durchgeführt.

METAMORPHIC EVOLUTION OF THE VEPORICUM (CONTRIBUTION TO POSSIBLE CORRELATION WITH THE EASTERN ALPS)

Vladimír Bezák, Geologický ústav Dionýza Štúra, Bratislava, Czechoslovakia

Metamorphism in the West Carpathians should be considered from several aspects. First of all there is a close relation between metamorphism and tectonics — like in the Alps (M. Frey et al. 1974) and in other regions (e. g. G. B. Haxel et al. 1984). Recent investigations of crystalline complexes in the West Carpathians revealed fragments of a formerly uniform Hercynian system. The nature of Lower Paleozoic sediments and volcanics indicates that the system was formed upon Proterozoic continental crust. In respect of geotectonics it is the evolution of intracratonic orogen also described from other parts of the Hercynides (e. g. Dalmayrac et al. 1980). The results of the study of European Hercynides indicate the dynamical character of the Hercynina orogeny (P. Matte 1986). Recently it was proved by the research in the Veporicum of the West Carpathians (V. Bezák 1988). In the West Carpathians the Hercynian system was completely destroyed during the Alpine tectogenesis. Fragments of the Hercynian system and Precambrian elements are incorporated in the structure of new Alpine tectonic units (Taticum, Veporicum) practically ignoring the Hercynian structure.

The Veporicum, mainly its southern part is most favourable for the analysis of metamorphism. On a relatively small area there are the elements of all the three structural and age levels, i. e. the Upper Paleozoic and Mesozoic (upper structural levels) units, Lower Paleozoic complexes (middle level) and the complexes of the lower level (their elementary classification was presented by V. Bezák 1988). Recently we advanced in the range of information about tectonic position of particular complexes, their lithological content and grade of metamorphosis, and in age determinations, mainly of Lower Paleozoic complexes.

In the Veporicum the lowest level is represented by