application, it had never been Kaicher's intention to actually designate lectotypes in her card-packs and I had never considered the *Card Catalogue* to be a likely place to scan for lectotype designations and other nomenclatural acts. Further, Kabat demonstrates the curatorial consequences of these inadequate designations, if they were regarded as nomenclaturally valid. Placing the *Card Catalogue* on the Official Index has a smack of censorship on an otherwise valuable identification tool, but regrettably there is no alternative. I approve the application.

(4) A.G. Beu

Institute of Geological & Nuclear Sciences, P.O. Box 30368, Lower Hutt, New Zealand

In my area of expertise I had quite a lot to do with Mrs Kaicher's card-packs and supplied the illustrations for several species. I am very aware that Mrs Kaicher had no intention of proposing any changes to nomenclature or new type designations, and any that appear on her cards are quite accidental. I am unable to discover any such unintended new type designations in the packs of cards illustrating RANELLIDAE and BURSIDAE, and feel that the number involved is quite small. However, it is entirely appropriate and within the spirit of Kaicher's intentions for the Commission to suppress these card-packs for nomenclatural purposes. I support Kabat's application for the suppression of this *Card Catalogue*.

(5) A.J. Kohn

Department of Zoology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195–1800, U.S.A.

I support the proposed suppression for nomenclatural purposes of S.D. Kaicher's *Card Catalogue of World-Wide Shells*. My primary basis is the author's intent. As Dr Kabat points out, 'there is no specific indication' that the purpose was 'providing a permanent scientific record' (Article 8a of the Code). Moreover, although I do not have it in writing, I asked Ms Kaicher personally some time in the mid- or late-1980s to characterize the purpose of her card-packs because of this problem. She responded that their purpose was as Kabat has stated in paragraph 3 of his application, and that they were not intended as scientific record.

The matter that occasioned my direct query of Ms Kaicher was a problem additional to those Kabat raises. I had received two inquiries concerning new species names of other authors that existed only as manuscript names but that Kaicher listed in her card-packs. Here the questions were, are these names available, and if so is Kaicher the author because a brief description and figure(s) appeared on the card? That is, did Kaicher's cards make such names available? Ms Kaicher assured me that it was not her intent to publish new species names in her card-packs. I also recall discussing the matter with the then Secretary of the Commission (R.V. Melville), who was also of the opinion that these names were not available.

(6) T. Schiøtte

Invertebrate Department, Zoological Museum, University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 15, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark

I fully support Kabat's proposal to suppress Kaicher's *Card Catalogue* for nomenclatural purposes. The main argument I would see against suppression would be that the *Card Catalogue* is not a true publication and especially that it was not intended to establish a permanent scientific record. However, that is, as already pointed out by Kabat, something that may be regarded differently by different researchers. Therefore, and especially in order not to have a number of inappropriate lectotypes selected by inference of holotype, I urge the Commission to use its powers to suppress the *Card Catalogue* for nomenclatural purposes.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the generic name *Glomeris* Latreille, 1802 (Diplopoda) and the specific name of *Armadillo vulgaris* Latreille, 1804 (Crustacea, Isopoda), and the application for a ruling on the status of the name *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802 (Crustacea, Isopoda)
(Case 2909; see BZN **52**: 236–244; **53**: 120–122)

Pekka T. Lehtinen
Zoological Museum, University of Turku, 20500 Turku, Finland

Reading the comments on the application to solve the problem of the name *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802 I have the impression that the complicated history was not carefully studied by those commenting (BZN **53**: 120–122). In this case we are not dealing with a simple situation of a much-used younger name and a less-used older name, but with the synonymy of names for two taxa that are now placed in different families.

I agree that the name *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802 has been much used in the sense of Brandt ([1831]) for a group of woodlice in the family ARMADILLIDAE Brandt in Brandt & Ratzeburg, [1831]. However, *Armadillo* Latreille is actually a subjective synonym of *Armadillidium* Brandt, [1831] (family ARMADILLIDIIDAE Brandt, 1833) (para. 12 of the application), since Latreille's (1802) and (1804) description of *Armadillo* was based solely on specimens that are now called *Armadillidium vulgare* (Latreille, 1804). The proposed (para. 14) type species *Armadillo officinalis* Duméril, 1816 belongs in Brandt's family ARMADILLIDAE (see paras. 9 and 12 of the application), but was not originally included and possibly not known to Latreille.

In placing *Armadillidium* on the Official List in 1928 (Opinion 104) with the type species '*vulgare* Latreille, 1804, *armadillo* Linnaeus, 1758' the Commission accepted that *Armadillidium* was based on the original concept of *Armadillo*. *Armadillidium* was withdrawn from the List in 1958 following recognition of unused earlier synonyms of *vulgare* and *armadillo* as composite (para. 2 of the application).

I willingly support most suggestions to stabilize names which have been much used, but the acceptance of two synonyms (*Armadillo* and *Armadillidium*) as the type genera of different families would be confusing and not stabilizing. The only realistic way to preserve Latreille's *Armadillo* would be to reject the younger (but very well used) synonym *Armadillidium*. This equally confusing solution has never been proposed.