

## COMMENTS ON: Shells of Mollusca Collected from the Seas of Turkey\*

Bilal ÖZTÜRK

Ege University, Faculty of Fisheries, Department of Hydrobiology, 35100 Bornova, İzmir - TURKEY  
E-mail: ozturk@sufak.ege.edu.tr

Received: 01.03.2004

In a recent paper in the *Turkish Journal of Zoology* 27 (2003): 101-140, by Demir, the shells of Mollusca collected from the Turkish seas between 1951 and 1982 were examined and a list of 610 species determined was given. The distribution of the species according to the Turkish coasts was also provided in the same research. I have some comments concerning the paper that I hope will contribute to the knowledge of the biological diversity of the Turkish seas.

1. The author, according to the title, treats Mollusca shells collected. But the word "shell" is used only for the dead animal's shell in malacological literature. If the author used it advisedly, then the distribution given for the species in our seas may be inaccurate. Generally, information on species distribution should preferably be based on living animals.
2. In the species list given, the systematic classification is as in Sabelli et al. (1990) but some infra subspecific categories like "var. ex forma" and "var. ex color" have also been used by the author. Situations in which these infra subspecific categories, which may cause confusion at times, may be used are stated in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (Chapters 4 and 10), which took effect on 1 January, 2000.
3. Some of the species included in the list as different and valid species are synonyms (Table).

It can easily be seen in Sabelli et al. (1990), the paper that the author referred to while forming the species list, that these species are synonyms. Furthermore, many changes have recently been made to the systematic classification of Sabelli et

al. (1990). For this reason, if an up-to-date classification like that presented in CLEMAM had been referred to in the preparation of a list like this, it could have helped in reducing the errors which have occurred in some of the species names. Additionally, as is presented in the Table, *Ringicula minutula* Locard, 1897 has no distribution area in the Mediterranean Sea.

4. *Potamopyrgus jenkinsi* (Smith, 1889), *Theodoxus danubialis* (Pfeiffer, 1828) and *Theodoxus fluviatilis* (Linnaeus, 1758) are species of fresh and brackish waters. For example, *T. fluviatilis* may occur in water basins characterised by brackish water connected with the Black Sea (Butakov et al., 1997). The species at issue in this research may have been found in estuaries or in lakes connected to seas. However, the fact that no explanatory information has been given within the discussion part of the article, leads to the conclusion that these are marine species, which is impossible.
5. The aim of the research has been expressed within the introduction to the article as giving some general information about the Mollusca fauna living in Turkish seas. Although 468 references have been given, the study has been prepared without considering much recent research (see Öztürk and Cevik, 2000) on Mollusca fauna of the Turkish coasts. Moreover, although a long list of literature has been provided, it is not clear which one had been cited for any particular information.
6. It is clear from the acknowledgements in the article that the author has prepared the article without any support. But when the references are

\* Muzaffer Demir has declined to reply to Bilal Öztürk's letter about his article because of his current serious health problems. We wish him a speedy recovery.

Table. Some of the synonym names used in the species list given in the article.

Synonym	Valid name	Remarks
<i>Caecum tenue</i> Milaschewitsch, 1912	<i>Caecum armoricum</i> de Folin, 1869	
<i>Cyclope donovania</i> Risso, 1826	<i>Cyclope neritea</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	
<i>Cyclope westerlundii</i> Brusina, 1900	<i>Cyclope neritea</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	
<i>Bela aegeensis</i> (Reeve, 1844)	<i>Bela nebula</i> (Montagu, 1803)	According to Aartsen (1988)
<i>Bela ginnania</i> (Risso, 1826)	<i>Bela nebula</i> (Montagu, 1803)	
<i>Mangeliella pusilla</i> (Scachi, 1836)	<i>Mangelia multilineolata</i> (Deshayes, 1835)	
<i>Pseudoacteon pusillinus</i> (Forbes, 1844)	? <i>Liocarenus globulinus</i> (Forbes, 1844)	
<i>Ringicula minutula</i> Locard, 1897		Distributed along the coasts of the Atlantic Ocean far from the Mediterranean Sea. It has been reported as a result of an erroneous species identification from the Mediterranean basin (Sabelli et al., 1992: 424 and CLEMAM).
<i>Palliolum testae</i> (Philippi, 1836 ex Bivona ms)	<i>Palliolum incomparabile</i> (Risso, 1826)	
<i>Chlamys flagellatus</i> Lamarck, 1819	<i>Chlamys flexuosa</i> (Poli, 1795)	
<i>Pododesmus squamula</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	<i>Heteranomia squamula</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	

checked, the author seems to have done little or no previous work on the phylum Mollusca. For example, in identifying some groups like Turridae (now Conidae), a family in which species identification is very difficult, no professional assistance has apparently been received from a specialist, and this leads me to be suspicious of confirmation of the species, at least in part.

As a result, in spite of the fact that the article has been published nearly 25 years after the last sampling date, this research could have been more useful for researchers working in the field of malacology if the criteria below had been taken into consideration during the preparation of the work:

1. Species should have been classified according to the recent systematic arrangement, avoiding confusing infrasubspecific categories.

2. Findings should have been evaluated in the light of recent studies, especially those covering Turkish seas.
3. Ecological information should have been given on the species, based either on the results achieved at the end of the study or on the literature within the references.
4. The discussion part of the article based on original research, containing 610 species and providing 468 references, should comprise some explanatory notes, especially on some polemical species, whereas in fact the discussion part consists of just a few sentences, which fail to deal with any of the points at issue.

In conclusion, although the article provides some data on Mollusca species of the Turkish seas, it includes systematic confusion and some questionable information.

## References

- Aartsen, J.J. van, 1998. Nomenclatural notes 7. Forbes' Aegean Turridae. *Boll. Malac.* 24 (5-8): 141-144.
- Butakov, E.A, Chuhchin, V.D, Cherkasova, M.B. and Lelekov, S.G. 1997. Determinator of Gastropoda of the Black Sea. IBSS NASU, Sevastopol.
- CLEMAM (Check List of European Marine Mollusca, <http://www.somali.asso.fr/clemam/>)
- Demir, M. 2003. Shells of Mollusca collected from the seas of Turkey. *Turk. J. Zool.* 27: 101-140.
- Öztürk, B. and Cevik, C., 2000. Molluscs Fauna of Turkish Seas. *C. Conch. Inform.* 32 (1-3): 27-53.
- Sabelli, B., Gianuzzi-Savelli, R. and Bedulli, D. 1990. *Catologo Annotato dei Molluschi Marini del Mediterraneo*, Vol. 1, Edizioni Libreria Naturalistica, Bologna.
- Sabelli, B., Gianuzzi-Savelli, R. and Bedulli, D. 1992. *Catologo Annotato dei Molluschi Marini del Mediterraneo*, Vol. 2, Edizioni Libreria Naturalistica, Bologna.