

Comments on the proposed suppression for nomenclatural purposes of S.D. Kaicher's *Card Catalogue of World-Wide Shells (1973-1992)*

(Case 2964; see BZN 53: 96-98)

(1) Y. Finet

*Département des Invertébrés, Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, P.O. Box 6434,
CH-1211 Genève 6, Switzerland*

I support Kabat's proposal for the suppression for nomenclatural purposes of Sally Diana Kaicher's *Card Catalogue of World-Wide Shells*.

Mrs Kaicher contacted me once to get pictures of and information on Lamarck's type material of OLIVIDAE (housed in the Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle of Geneva) when she was preparing a new card pack on this family. I provided her with the most detailed information available, but unfortunately never saw the relevant information on this type material incorporated in her work.

As a research worker on the marine mollusks of the eastern Pacific, I wish to point out that for many gastropod species her cards may show type designations (sometimes inadvertent) or erroneous statements about type material, and that it would be a burden to check all her cards; her series is incomplete in many libraries and many of her cards are out of print.

(2) M.G. Harasewych & R.E. Petit

*National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
20560, U.S.A.*

We are writing to express strong opposition to the application to suppress Kaicher's *Card Catalogue of World-Wide Shells* for nomenclatural purposes on the grounds: (1) that the arguments for suppression are contrived and entirely without basis, and (2) that suppression of this publication would do more to obfuscate than to resolve the underlying cause for the petition, namely the designation of lectotypes of species described by W.H. Dall.

While the format of Kaicher's *Card Catalogue* is atypical of serial publications, the original petition does not dispute that it meets all criteria for publication (Articles 7-9 of the Code). Neither the taxonomic coverage, the address of the business office, nor a questionable inference of the purpose of this publication have the remotest bearing on the issue. Otherwise, many publications, including Berry's *Leaflets in Malacology*, would have to be rejected on this basis.

Kaicher's *Card Catalogue* has been catalogued by the Smithsonian Libraries, and quite possibly by other libraries. According to the cover sheet accompanying Card Pack 57, 20% of the subscribers were museums and universities. In any event, is the availability of a work for taxonomic purposes to be determined by librarians?

Kaicher made special efforts to illustrate species that had not been figured before (or in some cases since), often figuring their type specimens, thereby making the cards a valuable resource to researchers.

The reason given for the petition to suppress Kaicher's publications is the inclusion therein of 'inadvertent' type designations for Dall taxa. The four examples of problems cited in the original petition are trivial. The illustrated specimen of

Nassarius scissuratus (Dall) has, in fact, been easily recognized and is now segregated (USNM 86988). The outright error in attributing type status to a specimen of *Ptychosalpinx globulus* (Dall) that was not a syntype has no lasting nomenclatural consequences, is easily rectified, and was probably due to a labeling error at the Museum of Comparative Zoology. The specimen illustrated as 'holotype' of *Admete microscopica* (with a typographical error in one digit of the catalog number) is, in fact, the specimen that Dall (1902, pl. 9, fig. 4) illustrated as this species without attributing type status to it, and would be the logical choice for a lectotype should the need to designate one be brought about by suppressing Kaicher's 'inadvertent' designation. The original description of *Terebra acrior* (Dall, 1889, p. 66) restricts the taxon to Antillean specimens, and refers to Antillean specimens in the plural. Kaicher illustrates the only specimen from the only Antillean locality given by Dall that can now be found.

At the heart of the issue are problems with the status of type specimens of numerous taxa proposed by Dall. While Dall generally based species descriptions on individual specimens that may or may not have been illustrated, in many cases he did not specifically identify a holotype, making all specimens mentioned in the original description syntypes by default (Article 72). For a substantial portion of the marine taxa that Dall described on the basis of specimens collected by the U.S. Coast Survey Steamer *Blake*, some of the syntypes were deposited in the collections of the National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution (USNM), while others were catalogued in the collections of the Museum of Comparative Zoology.

Prior to World War II, type specimens at USNM were housed in the general collections, as they still are in many natural history museums today. During World War II, Drs Harald Rehder and Joseph P.E. Morrison, then curators in the Department of Invertebrate Zoology, removed type material from the general collections for safe storage in Luray, Virginia. These curators had, in most instances, selected one lot per species, even when other syntype lots were present in the collection. A cursory survey (M.G.H.), confirmed by Rehder (personal communication), revealed that illustrated specimens or specimens best conforming to the published descriptions were the ones selected for safekeeping.

When the specimens were returned to USNM after the war, they were segregated as a separate 'Type Collection', which was subsequently inventoried. Numerous workers, among them Kaicher, visited the USNM collections and photographed specimens housed in the type collection. In cases in which the catalogued lot selected for the move to Luray contained a single specimen and was labeled 'type', these researchers inferred the specimen to be a holotype and attached this epithet to their figure. The publication of a figure of a syntype with the word 'type' or 'holotype' amounts to a lectotype designation (Article 74b), even when inadvertent. A similar situation existed for workers utilizing the collections of the MCZ where museum labels on some syntype material did not indicate that additional syntypes were at the USNM (e.g. Vokes, 1988).

Such type designations were not uncommon, occurring both before (e.g. Bartsch, 1911; Henderson, 1920; Oldroyd, 1927) and after (e.g. Keen, 1971; Bouchet & Warén, 1985; Abbott & Dance, 1982) the segregation of the USNM type collection, and were certainly not restricted to Kaicher. Some 'inadvertent' lectotype designations published by Kaicher were repeated by later authors. Were Kaicher's cards to be suppressed, researchers would be faced with, depending on taxon, the attribution of

inadvertent type designation to a subsequent author, formulating a petition to suppress the work of that author for nomenclatural purposes, or re-examining all of the original syntypes, housed in two museums, in order to repeat the process of lectotype selection. We regard the actions of Rehder and Morrison as constituting the actual selections of 'lectotypes' for the species in question, although not formalized by a published statement of such action. Our brief survey and the work of previous researchers have confirmed that they had selected either figured specimens or specimens that can be recognized from the published descriptions or measurements whenever possible. Suppressing Kaicher would, for many taxa, require that their work be repeated, taking into account MCZ specimens, a tedious and pointless exercise that would result in identical conclusions in the vast majority of cases.

In conclusion, the availability of Kaicher's *Card Catalogue of World-Wide Shells* for nomenclatural purposes is clearly not ambiguous. The overwhelming majority of the statements made by Kaicher concerning the type status of specimens merely serve to publish and fix the careful selections by Rehder and Morrison, making a duplication of their efforts unnecessary. Similar 'inadvertent' lectotype designations made by other authors should either be allowed to stand, or be evaluated in the course of systematic revisions on a taxon by taxon basis.

Additional references

- Abbott, R.T. & Dance, S.P.** 1982. *Compendium of seashells*. 411 pp. Dutton, New York.
- Bartsch, P.** 1911. The Recent and fossil mollusks of the genus *Alvania* from the west coast of America. *Proceedings of the United States National Museum*, **41**: 333–362.
- Bouchet, P. & Warén, A.** 1985. Revision of the northeast Atlantic bathyal and abyssal Neogastropoda excluding Turridae (Mollusca: Gastropoda). *Bollettino Malacologico*, Supplement 1: 1–296.
- Dall, W.H.** 1889. [Reports on the results of dredging, under the supervision of Alexander Agassiz, in the Gulf of Mexico (1877–78) and in the Caribbean Sea (1879–80) by the U.S. Coast Survey Steamer 'Blake', Lieut.-Commander C.D. Sigsbee, U.S.N., and Commander J.R. Bartlett, U.S.N., commanding]. XXIX. Report on the Mollusca. Part II. Gastropoda and Scaphopoda. *Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology*, **18**: 1–492.
- Dall, W.H.** 1902. Illustrations and descriptions of new, unfigured, or imperfectly known shells, chiefly American, in the U.S. National Museum. *Proceedings of the United States National Museum*, **24**: 499–566.
- Henderson, J.B.** 1920. A monograph of the east American scaphopod mollusks. *U.S. National Museum Bulletin*, **111**: 1–177.
- Keen, A.M.** 1971. *Sea shells of tropical west America*. Ed. 2. xi, 624 pp. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Oldroyd, I.S.** 1927. *The marine shells of the West coast of North America*, vol. 2, part 1. 297 pp. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Vokes, E.H.** 1988. Muricidae (Mollusca: Gastropoda) of the Esmeraldas Beds, northwestern Ecuador. *Tulane Studies in Geology and Paleontology*, **21**: 1–50.

(3) P. Bouchet

Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 55 Rue Buffon, 75005 Paris, France

I write in support of the application by Dr Kabat. The MNHN malacology department library has a set of the *Card Catalogue* published by Ms Sally Kaicher, and I have personally corresponded with the author in the 1980s when she photographed a number of MNHN type specimens. As pointed out in the

application, it had never been Kaicher's intention to actually designate lectotypes in her card-packs and I had never considered the *Card Catalogue* to be a likely place to scan for lectotype designations and other nomenclatural acts. Further, Kabat demonstrates the curatorial consequences of these inadequate designations, if they were regarded as nomenclaturally valid. Placing the *Card Catalogue* on the Official Index has a smack of censorship on an otherwise valuable identification tool, but regrettably there is no alternative. I approve the application.

(4) A.G. Beu

Institute of Geological & Nuclear Sciences, P.O. Box 30368, Lower Hutt, New Zealand

In my area of expertise I had quite a lot to do with Mrs Kaicher's card-packs and supplied the illustrations for several species. I am very aware that Mrs Kaicher had no intention of proposing any changes to nomenclature or new type designations, and any that appear on her cards are quite accidental. I am unable to discover any such unintended new type designations in the packs of cards illustrating RANELLIDAE and BURSIDAE, and feel that the number involved is quite small. However, it is entirely appropriate and within the spirit of Kaicher's intentions for the Commission to suppress these card-packs for nomenclatural purposes. I support Kabat's application for the suppression of this *Card Catalogue*.

(5) A.J. Kohn

Department of Zoology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195-1800, U.S.A.

I support the proposed suppression for nomenclatural purposes of S.D. Kaicher's *Card Catalogue of World-Wide Shells*. My primary basis is the author's intent. As Dr Kabat points out, 'there is no specific indication' that the purpose was 'providing a permanent scientific record' (Article 8a of the Code). Moreover, although I do not have it in writing, I asked Ms Kaicher personally some time in the mid- or late-1980s to characterize the purpose of her card-packs because of this problem. She responded that their purpose was as Kabat has stated in paragraph 3 of his application, and that they were not intended as scientific record.

The matter that occasioned my direct query of Ms Kaicher was a problem additional to those Kabat raises. I had received two inquiries concerning new species names of other authors that existed only as manuscript names but that Kaicher listed in her card-packs. Here the questions were, are these names available, and if so is Kaicher the author because a brief description and figure(s) appeared on the card? That is, did Kaicher's cards make such names available? Ms Kaicher assured me that it was not her intent to publish new species names in her card-packs. I also recall discussing the matter with the then Secretary of the Commission (R.V. Melville), who was also of the opinion that these names were not available.

(6) T. Schiøtte

Invertebrate Department, Zoological Museum, University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 15, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark

I fully support Kabat's proposal to suppress Kaicher's *Card Catalogue* for nomenclatural purposes. The main argument I would see against suppression would be that the *Card Catalogue* is not a true publication and especially that it was not intended to establish a permanent scientific record. However, that is, as already pointed out by Kabat, something that may be regarded differently by different researchers. Therefore, and especially in order not to have a number of inappropriate lectotypes selected by inference of holotype, I urge the Commission to use its powers to suppress the *Card Catalogue* for nomenclatural purposes.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the generic name *Glomeris* Latreille, 1802 (Diplopoda) and the specific name of *Armadillo vulgaris* Latreille, 1804 (Crustacea, Isopoda), and the application for a ruling on the status of the name *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802 (Crustacea, Isopoda)
(Case 2909; see BZN 52: 236–244; 53: 120–122)

Pekka T. Lehtinen

Zoological Museum, University of Turku, 20500 Turku, Finland

Reading the comments on the application to solve the problem of the name *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802 I have the impression that the complicated history was not carefully studied by those commenting (BZN 53: 120–122). In this case we are not dealing with a simple situation of a much-used younger name and a less-used older name, but with the synonymy of names for two taxa that are now placed in different families.

I agree that the name *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802 has been much used in the sense of Brandt ([1831]) for a group of woodlice in the family ARMADILLIDAE Brandt in Brandt & Ratzeburg, [1831]. However, *Armadillo* Latreille is actually a subjective synonym of *Armadillidium* Brandt, [1831] (family ARMADILLIDIIDAE Brandt, 1833) (para. 12 of the application), since Latreille's (1802) and (1804) description of *Armadillo* was based solely on specimens that are now called *Armadillidium vulgare* (Latreille, 1804). The proposed (para. 14) type species *Armadillo officinalis* Duméril, 1816 belongs in Brandt's family ARMADILLIDAE (see paras. 9 and 12 of the application), but was not originally included and possibly not known to Latreille.

In placing *Armadillidium* on the Official List in 1928 (Opinion 104) with the type species '*vulgare* Latreille, 1804, *armadillo* Linnaeus, 1758' the Commission accepted that *Armadillidium* was based on the original concept of *Armadillo*. *Armadillidium* was withdrawn from the List in 1958 following recognition of unused earlier synonyms of *vulgare* and *armadillo* as composite (para. 2 of the application).

I willingly support most suggestions to stabilize names which have been much used, but the acceptance of two synonyms (*Armadillo* and *Armadillidium*) as the type genera of different families would be confusing and not stabilizing. The only realistic way to preserve Latreille's *Armadillo* would be to reject the younger (but very well used) synonym *Armadillidium*. This equally confusing solution has never been proposed.