FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
HAYS, KANSAS 67602

Dr. H.B. Stenzel
Dept. of Geology
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Dear Dr. Stenzel:

I was interested to recieve your letter and the pages from your manuscript for the Treatise.

As far as dates of publication for Logan's papers are concerned, I just don't know. However, if some library copies stamped with the dates of receipt could be located, that should be a valuable clue. Unfortunately our library isn't old enough. I would suggest contacting the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences, or several other large libraries. Surely some will have cards bearing the date of acquisition of an "automatically" mailed journal. I know Kansas State publications are often predated by one or more months, even today. I believe priority is determined by the date of first availability or mailing and not by an often inaccurate "date of publication."

I haven't seen any type species designation, so I would simply assume the first named species, provided you can determine which publication was earliest, was the type. I (in 1958) thought the Kansas paper was first and used O. rugosa as the first named and only valid species for "Pseudoperna". I don't remember now why I gave priority to the Kansas paper in 1958. When I wrote my thesis, I failed to locate any of Logan's types of "Pseudoperna" and Ostrea from the Niobrara, and I assumed that he had split them into separate species based on growth, preservation and deformation as he had done with some of the inoceramus. I therefore equated all his oysters with O. congesta. Later field work uncovered specimens that were different from O. congesta, and were closer to Logan's description and illustrations. The specimens of "Pseudoperna" don't have as much of a vertical range as O. congesta, and differ from O. congesta in that they are larger, thicker valved, are broader near the beaks, and have strongly waved free edges to the valves. However, I don't consider "Pseudoperna" to be a valid genus, but I strongly suspect it to represent a valid species of Ostrea, that is O. rugosa (Logan). The specimens of "Pseddoperna" come from Santonian rocks only, and O. congesta ranges from into Coniacian through Santonian and possibly into the Campanian.

I have never seen any "Pseudoperna" specimens attached to inoceramus. Possibly the distinction here is that O. congesta was mainly benthonic and attached to inoceramus, and "Pseudoperna" was mainly pseudoplanktonic and attached to sea weed or other floating objects. Although "Pseudoperna" could have been benthonic and simply rested on the sea floor. I have seen some O. congesta attached to Uintacrinus colonies and to Baculites so it too may have been partly pseudoplanktonic.

Although these attachments could have occurred after death of the plankton. In this respect, I find many of the oysters on the baculites are very small, and may have been smothered by the more rapid covering of a dead baculite, than those living on a larger, current creating inoceram.

I would be glad to arrange to lend you some of our oysters, expecially Ostrea rugosa (Logan), and O. exogyroides Logan, so that you can make your own comparisons, Or I can get you some better photographs of our specimens.

I hope my ideas and comments will be of use to you, and I will be happy to help you further in any way

Yours sincerely,

Halsey Miller

Halsey W. Miller