

TREATISE ON INVERTEBRATE PALEONTOLOGY  
RAYMOND C. MOORE, Editor

Sponsored by  
GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA  
THE PALEONTOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY  
THE PALEONTOLOGICAL SOCIETY  
SOCIETY OF ECONOMIC PALEONTOLOGISTS  
AND MINERALOGISTS

OFFICE OF THE EDITOR  
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, LAWRENCE, KANSAS

Executive members of  
JOINT COMMITTEE ON  
INVERTEBRATE PALEONTOLOGY  
G. A. Cooper, Washington, D.C.  
N. D. Newell, New York, N.Y.  
C. J. Stubblefield, London, England  
R. C. Moore, Chairman, Lawrence, Kan.

12 July 1966

Dr. Myra Keen  
Stanford University

cc: Teichert, Newell, Chavan, McAlester,  
Hertlein, Weir, Turner, Stenzel, Turner

Dear Myra:

This acknowledges your letter to me dated 7 July 1966 accompanying return of corrected *Tellinacea* typescript and figures. I will attend to all this as soon as possible, for with aid of Newell and authors I am endeavoring to arrive at press readiness on superannally by superannally of bivalves. Work has been proceeding steadily and mostly very satisfactorily--am disturbed by seeming need for rather considerable late-stage revisions, not easy at best and all but impossible at worst.

Your declared unhappiness about mode of Treatise recording of generic type species fixation has led me to reexamine the Code and I find that Art. 67,b definitely supports your view that OP is a particular kind of original fixation in that it calls for explicit action by an author in connection with his proposal of a new generic taxon (Art. 68,a). The category of 'indication' of type species in the original publication calls for observations or conclusions by later workers, as in finding one of the new species in a new nominal genus named typicus or typus (Art. 68,b), or only a single originally included species (Art. 68,c, monotypy), or use of a tautonymic specific or subspecific name (Art. 68,d). As you suggest, the latter three kinds of original fixation could be indicated simply and satisfactorily by TYP, M, and TAUT, which I prefer for avoidance of ambiguity and because TYP and TAUT are pretty rare. SP includes other kinds of type fixation and throughout earlier Treatise volumes this alone was recorded (in Part G only readily discovered examples given in the Editorial Preface, p. 8). Gradually things have changed (at cost of more and more work by authors and editor) and this may well continue. Bivalvia is the first possible unit in which distinction between OP, TYP, M, and TAUT could be introduced to go along with SP; adoption would call for a vast amount of editorial alterations of typescript in hand and in my opinion would conduce errors more than refinement.

What about subsequent monotypy (SM) not treated in the Code?

With personal best wishes and special thanks for your past and present unending devotion to Treatise high aims,

Cordially  
Ray