

September 19, 1946

Dr. Myra Kean  
Department of Geology  
Stanford University  
Box 1563  
Stanford University, California

Dear Dr. Kean :

I have hesitated answering your letter of August 16 and acknowledging the receipt of the manuscript until I had time to go over your remarks carefully. Your examination of the manuscript was very valuable and your remarks are most welcome. I am profoundly grateful for the time and attention you have given. Your remarks are an improvement over the original and I shall be careful to follow them.

There are some points that I would like to clarify in this letter.

(1) Poli's names. This is a most troublesome work. I had the opportunity of seeing it in Chicago (Cramer library). Whether such a system is acceptable as binomial or not I am not certain. According to Dall and Jukes-Brown there is room for doubt. It is my opinion provisionally that a work to be binomial must be beyond any doubt rigorously binomial. However, I am aware that this point is not settled officially. It is not a case of one part of an animal being named first, that is without knowledge of the rest of the animal.

(2) Aetostreum Bayle. Your objection to a genus being based on a specimen is correct and has made it clear to me that I expressed the procedure involved very poorly. I should have made it clear that the original list of species of Aetostreum as given by Bayle included only one of the two component parts of the so-called "O. latissima Lam." Zittel in selecting a genotype could select only a species contained in the original list. He selected "O. latissima Lam.", which is the "Aetostreum latissimum, Lamarck sp." of Bayle which in turn is Gryphaea aquila Bronnigart 1822. Bayle's publication makes this procedure possible, because there is no text, in the strict sense, only figures and their explanations.

(3) Mimetostreum Bonarelli and Hagera. I am afraid you may be right. Here I was obviously not objective. If the subgenus is tied to the Australian species, it is impossible to tell what it is, because the figure is wholly inadequate. If the subgenus could be tied to the better illustrated Argentinian species it might be useful. Desire to save the subgenus is at the bottom of my interpretation.

Dr. Myra Keen  
Page 2

- (4) Fernostrea. You are right.
- (5) Sokolowia. Should be changed to conform with your remarks.
- (6) Lopha vs. Alectryonia and names proposed by Bayle. Ditto.

I am certainly relieved to be through with this work. This kind of work is not easily done in a place where library facilities are inadequate. However, with your help the paper seems to have reached the stage where it can safely be published.

With many thanks,

Sincerely,

H. B. Stenzel, Geologist

HBS:MJC