

August 23, 1965

Professor Harold E. Vokes  
Geology Department  
Tulane University  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

Dear Harold:

Thank you for your letter of August 14 and the information it contains. Harold Harry has dissected the Indian Ocean oysters and found interesting anatomical features quite different than those found on Crassostrea. I have not yet definitely identified the specimens, so I do not know for certain what species (or genus) it is. Presumably it is O. folium (Linuè, 1758).

I have been trying, without luck sofar, to become one of the beneficiaries of the collecting pool of the expedition. My last one of several letters about this went to Dr. I. Eugene Wallen in Washington.

If you and Harold Harry get together on an expedition, you will find him a very pleasant friend. I consider myself very fortunate in having him here in Houston. It has been a most pleasant cooperation and friendship between us two and I am looking forward to some cooperative investigations between us. Results are really good sofar. You will enjoy his company.

Enclosed are xerox copies of my punch cards covering the authors you indicated. Thanks for pointing out my gaps. I shall have to go alter them. As to Paradoxia, I had some notes on it, but cannot find them now. It really does not pay to worry about such enigmatic material; let's just list it as indeterminate. Perhaps President Sukarno of Indonesia will see to it that it is investigated by his glorious developing science-minded and peace-loving democracy.

Concerning Ostracites Lamarck, 1799, the work is not accessible to me at present. However, I am sure Lamarck did not propose it as new at that time; he merely used a name well known at the time. It must be assumed, as a matter of courtesy to this eminent scholar, that he knew by the light of his time what he was doing and that he knew all pertinent literature. That means that he surely was aware that Ostracites meant fossil oysters in the widest sense. To assume otherwise would mean to label him an ignoramus. Every scientist in around 1799 knew that. Thus, Ostracites falls under Article 20. If you will check Lamarck's works, you will find he used "-ites" endings only for fossils.

In courtesy to Lamarck we must also assume that he was fully aware of the pertinent literature, including Gmelin. Whether he quoted Gmelin or anyone else or quoted no one, he must be assumed to have known Gmelin's work. If he did use Ostracites without showing that it was meant as a new taxon, it means to me that he was using Ostracites Gesner plus Oshacites Gmelin plus Ostracites of any other pre-1799 author. The nearest reference being Gmelin 1793, Ostracites Lamarck 1799 falls with Gmelin 1793 by reason of Opinion 296. In addition, Ostracites Lamarck 1799 is a nomen oblitum if I ever see one.

You may not like these arguments and you have my blessing if you submit the case to the Commission. However, the Commission is overloaded and this is not a burning issue nor a dubious case.

Azzaroli gives no definite family assignment for Somalidacna, but he says it has "evidenti affinita coi Tridacnidi" and a "convergenza verso gli ostreidi."

Sanostrea is accidentally listed in Zool. Record, v. 99, sect. 9, 1965, under Miyake, M., and Noda, H., Vitamin B-group in the extracts...Bull. Japanese Soc. Sci. Fish., v. 28, p. 597-601. Is that misprint in the Record or is it something copied from the Japanese Journal? I have not been able to obtain the Japanese text.

With best wishes for a successful collection.

Yours sincerely

H. B. Stenzel

HBS:bs

Enclosures: 5 xerox sheets

SHELL DEVELOPMENT COMPANY  
Exploration and Production Research Division