

December 9, 1968

Dr. R. A. Park
c/o Geology Department
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York 12181

Dear Dr. Park:

Thank you for sending me a copy of your paper on "Paleocology of Venericardia..." which I had already read in the Journal of Paleontology with considerable interest.

I wonder whether you have had the opportunity to study topotypes of the type species of Glyptoactis? Its dentition is so different that it seems impossible to include Baluchicardia and Claibornicardia in it too. I presume that at the University of Wisconsin topotypes of that species are not available. I have my doubts about Glyptoactis, that is, its typespecies, being a descendant or close relation of Claiborniacardia. Your argument "If these groups (Baluchicardia and Claibornicardia) are separated and each elevated to the rank of subgenus, their relationship will be obscured." has been used many times before in other groups, but is philosophically unsound. What about the recent discovered ancestors of Homo sapiens, should they all be included in the genus Homo? Generic and subgeneric names are for the use of taxonomy and cannot always indicate phylogeny. Besides, other scientists may disagree with the proposed phylogeny. Then this compounded genus would fall apart.

It is true that I assigned to Rutsch & Schenck the subgenus Baluchicardia. It was a case of my being, perhaps excessively, polite. They did not validly propose it, because they failed to designate a type species, if I remember correctly. Therefore, Baluchicardia will have to date from 1957, from Stenzel, Krause, & Twining and will have to be assigned to these authors.

You see your paper is quite stimulating and interesting.

With many thanks.

Sincerely yours,

COPY

H. B. Stenzel
Visiting Professor of Geology

HBS:cb