

chosen not to include as paratypes certain specimens; yet we felt the need to distinguish those other specimens in a special way. We are aware that curators of certain museums to whom we distributed our hypotypes have entered them as paratypes. This is, of course, their prerogative, as long as the original label, supplied with the specimen, remains with it. The reasons for setting apart the hypotypes, as used in the paper mentioned, were more fully elaborated in the other paper to which Dr. Abbott takes exception (Stohler, 1962). It is only one of the three uses of the term 'hypotype' to which Dr. Abbott objects, but it is the one in which we are directly involved.)

COMMENTS ON A PAPER

BY R. T. ABBOTT

by Myra Keen

{This commentary by Dr. Keen was made by her as a member of the Editorial Board and is published with her permission.}

The terms "primary" and "secondary" were used in Schenk & McMasters' work to classify type terms by function, purely as a matter of convenience for students. This publication was not official and certainly did not preëempt the use of the two words for other ways of grouping. In The Veliger paper of Stohler (Vol. 4, No. 4, p. 217), the grouping of type terms is in a temporal sense: primary, first; secondary, later. I cannot see that Dr. Stohler is in error if he chooses to do this. His critic may think he is, but this is a different matter. Most of the sentences in the first paragraph of his paper should be prefaced with "I think" or "I believe", for they all (or nearly all) express personal opinion that is not necessarily based upon objective evidence.

It is true that the term "hypotype" was originally proposed in a rather restricted sense. This does not mean that in practice its use may not be broadened. I suspect that I have been one of the prime culprits in so doing, for it is the conviction at Stanford that type categories should be as few as possible. Our printed labels carry only the headings: holotype, paratype, syntype, neotype, lectotype, and hypotype. Any specimens that do not qualify for one of the first five categories must of necessity fall into the sixth. This is a purely practical consideration, aside from theory.

As to the objection to a restricted usage of "paratype". It is a logical corollary of the newer trend in zoology, regarding types as mere population samples. The type series should represent a single population as nearly as the author of the species can recognize it. If he

includes material from unknown or distant localities, he increases the risk of creating a composite species that will later have to be re-fined. From this viewpoint, it would seem more discreet to restrict the type series to that population at the type locality and to designate other material as supplementary or as extending the concept of the species — in other words, as hypotypes, even though the author may feel confident of his identification. The new International Code makes no provision at all for the category of hypotype, and paratypes are relegated to a Recommendation, in which authors are advised to label them as such after selecting the holotype. To me this means that we are free to derive, pragmatically, procedures that will insure a maximum of clarity and a minimum of later revisionary work. It would seem to be safer to err in the direction of under-inclusion than of over-inclusion in the type series and to consider that specimens separated from each other, either in time or space, by an appreciable gap are not members of a single population, even though they may be a part of a species unit.

The Disposition of Type Specimens

BY

RUDOLF STOHLER

Department of Zoology
University of California, Berkeley 4, California

Any holotype, being the name bearer of a species or subspecies, should be regarded as public property since it should be available to all qualified workers who need to refer to it. This availability should never be limited, as it would be if the type specimen were to remain in private hands. Logically, then, the holotype specimen should be deposited with some recognized public museum that is prepared to care for such material on a permanent and continuing basis.

Paratype specimens, especially if relatively numerous, might be distributed to a number of widely scattered public museums. This would have the advantage that workers in distant



Keen, A. Myra. 1962. "Comments on a paper by R. T. Abbott [use of hypotype in molluscan taxonomy]." *The veliger* 5, 95–95.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/134129>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/93411>

Holding Institution

Smithsonian Libraries and Archives

Sponsored by

Biodiversity Heritage Library

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: In Copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: California Malacozoological Society

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions/>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.