



## ***Laurentaeglyphea* Forest, 2006 (Crustacea, Decapoda, Glypheidae): a cautionary tale of *nomina nuda* and the unpredictability of publication schedules**

CHRISTOPHER B. BOYKO

*Department of Biology, Chemistry & Environmental Studies, Molloy College, 1000 Hempstead Avenue, Rockville Centre, NY 11571, USA and Division of Invertebrate Zoology, American Museum of Natural History, 79<sup>th</sup> Street & Central Park West, New York, NY 10024, USA. E-mail: cboyko@amnh.org*

Glypheid crustaceans have been the source of much recent discussion, particularly in a phylogenetic context (Schram & Ah Yong, 2002; Dixon et al., 2003; Ah Yong & O’Meally, 2004), an interest initiated by the discovery and report of a living example of this long-thought extinct group by Forest & de Saint Laurent (1975). Subsequent collections resulted in additional information about the biology, ecology, morphology, and biogeography of this “unique” living glypheid species, *Neoglyphea inopinata* Forest & de Saint Laurent, 1975 (Forest & de Saint Laurent, 1976; 1981; 1989; Bruce, 1988).

In October 2005, a second extant species of glypheid crustacean was collected by Bertrand Richer de Forges onboard the N.O. “Alis” in the New Caledonian area between the Coral Sea and the Tasman Sea (ca. 25°S 160°E). This specimen was described as the holotype of the new species *Neoglyphea neocaledonica* Richer de Forges, 2006. Soon after the description of *N. neocaledonica*, Jacques Forest submitted a series of 3 papers wherein he considered this species to belong to a new second Recent glypheid genus, which he named *Laurentaeglyphea*. A reading of the text of the 3 Forest papers, all published in 2006, clearly indicates that his intentions were to have the first paper be published in *Comptes Rendus Biologies*, where he indicates the genus as new in the title, with 2 expanded subsequent papers (essentially identical French and English versions of the same text) following in *Crustaceana*.

The first indication that there might be a potential problem with the order of publication came from examination of the dates as printed in the issues of the respective journals. The *Comptes Rendus Biologies* article listed an issue date for the Internet of 14 September 2006, but did not give any indication of the publication date for the printed copies of the issue. The *Crustaceana* articles were published in the July 2006 issue of that volume, but no indication was given of the precise date of issuance. This information initially suggested that the *Crustaceana* issue was published before the *Comptes Rendus Biologies* issue, which would be counter to the intent of Forest.

Further research determined that the date of issuance of the *Crustaceana* issue was 21 September 2006 (*vide* dates of publication as listed in *Crustaceana* 79(11) end matter), approximately 2 months after the cover date. No precise date of issue for the *Comptes Rendus Biologies* issue was given in the volume for 2006, but a request for information to the premier secrétaire de rédaction, as listed in the front matter for issues of the volume, yielded a publication date for the paper copy of the issue as 16 October 2006 (Jean-Michel Blengino, e-mail of 25 January 2008).

Clearly then, the articles published in *Crustaceana* (hereafter referred to as Forest, 2006a, b) were published in the sense of the International Code for Zoological Nomenclature [ICZN] (1999) Article 8 before the *Comptes Rendus* article (hereafter referred to as Forest, 2006c) that Forest intended to have published first. The date of distribution of Forest (2006c) on the Internet is irrelevant, as there is no statement of deposition in public libraries (as per ICZN Article 8.6) and, even so, those required paper copies were issued at a later date.

Because the date of publication for Forest (2006a, b) precedes that of Forest (2006c), it is necessary to examine each publication to determine which contains sufficient information to make the monotypic generic name *Laurentaeglyphea* available in the sense of the ICZN. A careful study of the wording in each paper indicates that the genus name is potentially made available from Forest, 2006a (Forest, 2006b, being merely an English translation of 2006a, is not relevant here). Both papers (Forest, 2006a, c) contain nearly the same content required to make the genus-group name available and satisfying the pertinent ICZN Articles (e.g., 8, 11, 13 and 15). In fact, the expanded discussion in Forest (2006a) actually contains a greater number of characters that purport to differentiate the taxon (*sensu* ICZN Article 13.1.1) than Forest (2006c). In terms of making the genus-group name available, the only possible difference between the content of the two publications is that which is relevant to ICZN Article 16.1: “Every new name published after 1999... must be