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NOTICES

(a) Date of Commencement of Voting.—In normal circumstances the Commission starts to vote on applications published in the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature six months after the publication of each application. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications in the present part is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretariat of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretariat before the close of the six-month period.

(b) Possible use of the plenary powers.—The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the Bulletin:

1. Validation of the generic name *Doto* Oken, 1815 (Gastropoda). Z.N.(S.) 1006.
2. Validation of the specific name *caricæ* (Cynips) Linnaeus, 1762 (Insecta, Hymenoptera). Z.N.(S.) 1047.
5. Validation of the specific name *alveofrons* (Dasiops) McAlpine, 1961 (Insecta, Diptera). Z.N.(S.) 1492.
7. Validation of the generic name *Stereomastis* Bate, 1888 (Crustacea, Decapoda). Z.N.(S.) 1497.

8 March 1962.

W. E. CHINA
Assistant Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
STATEMENT REGARDING THE ARGUMENT OF W. I. FOLLETT AND DANIEL M. COHEN CONCERNING THE TYPE-SPECIES OF THE GENUS BATHYLAGUS.

Z.N.(S.) 1279

(see Volume 16, pages 73-78)

By G. S. Myers (Stanford University, California, U.S.A.)

Mr. Follett having requested (in October 1961) that I give an opinion on this matter, I offer the following:

I can see no obvious flaws in the argument as printed. Moreover, I understand that it would be zoologically advantageous to have Bathylagus antarcticus (rather than B. atlanticus) as the recognized type-species of Bathylagus, due to the fact that B. antarcticus is a better known species.

However, I do have a strong comment in regard to the question of whether or not Jordan and Evermann ("Fishes of North and Middle America," 4 vols., 1896-1900; also "Checklist." Rep. U.S. Comm. Fish and Fisher., vol. 21) designated type-species of genera by the parenthetical citation of a species (trivial) name after the bibliographical citation of the generic name.

To a user of the ichthyological works of D. S. Jordan (and his various collaborators and pupils) it is clearly evident that Jordan adopted the generic-type concept early in his career and used it thereafter throughout his work in systematic ichthyology. In fact he became the leader in the attempt to convert other ichthyologists to the following of a general code of nomenclature embodying that concept and other concepts of nomenclature. He and Gilbert designated generic-type-species quite clearly after generic-type citations in their "Synopsis of the Fishes of North America." (1882), which, as Follett and Cohen make clear, was really a forerunner (or "first edition") of "The Fishes of North and Middle America" (1896-1900). Moreover, Jordan was careful to see that his collaborators and many pupils in ichthyology made use of the concept of generic-type-species citation.

To agree, therefore, that Jordan (in collaboration with Evermann), in his most extensive work on ichthyology, published at the height of his ichthyological career, failed to cite type-species of genera simply because he adopted the abbreviated form of citing merely the species name in parenthesis, seems to me to be a purely legalistic argument not in accord with the known historical facts. These facts may be ascertained from a study of Jordan's own published papers. Moreover, having been personally acquainted with both Jordan and Evermann, and with many of Jordan's former pupils in ichthyology, I can state that the entire group of ichthyologists at Stanford accepted the parenthetical citations in Jordan and Evermann (1896-1900) for what they were intended to be; citations of type-species.

It is quite true that, in an infinitesimal minority of cases, Jordan and Evermann placed two names, or none, rather than one, in parenthesis after a generic name. Such inconsistency is to be expected in the state in which zoological nomenclature rested in 1896, and in a work which had been in the slow process of compilation (by Jordan and several collaborators) for nearly 20 years. It is true, also, in a work (the "Checklist") intended to precede their larger work, but actually published a few months after the first of the four volumes of the larger monograph, that Jordan and Evermann stated, "The name in parenthesis following the reference to the generic name is that of the species taken by the describer as the type of the genus." Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the attempt is being made to judge this work by an ex post facto rule. The best method of handling the matter of generic types had not yet been evolved by Jordan. However, it is abundantly evident that Jordan and Evermann themselves considered the single species names cited in parentheses to be the type-species of the genera concerned, no matter by what method they arrived at their conclusions. I think there can be no reasonable doubt of this. To argue otherwise would be to argue that Jordan abandoned his adherence to the generic type concept in the middle of his ichthyological career, only to resume adherence to it later. There is no evidence that Jordan did this other than a very few changes of type-species (such as occurred with Bathylagus) in his "Genera of Fishes" (1917-1920). The latter work was written after Jordan had become much more fully aware of the problems in relation to generic types, within the framework of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature, and through his membership in the International Commission.

It is also evident, in the "Genera," that the "rigidly construed" concept of type designation was not yet one accepted by Jordan, for he lists many type-species as such merely "by common consent," or as "unquestioned." Yet in the introduction to the "Genera," Jordan says: "Our main problem is the fixation of the type." In other words, if Jordan and Evermann (1896-1900) did not fix types, it could be argued legally that Jordan (1917-1920) also did not do so in certain instances, even though the latter work was evidently published for the purpose of fixing types.

Jordan and Evermann's monograph (1896-1900) was one of the most extensive of all treatises in systematic ichthyology, and the problem of whether or not they fixed types goes far beyond
the problems related to the single name Bathylagus. For this reason, I think the case of Bathylagus may prejudice many other nomenclatural problems unless, in a decision upon Bathylagus, the Commission specifically states that its decision does not embody such prejudices.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF PNOEPYGA HODGSON, 1844.
Z.N.(S.) 1457
(see volume 18, pages 209-210)

By A. L. Rand (Chicago Natural History Museum, Illinois, U.S.A.)

I wish to register a protest against the proposal of Dr. Mayr that the Commission suppress the generic name Microura Gould, 1837 (not Micrura Ehrenberg, 1831) in favour of Pnoepyga Hodgson, 1844, for an obscure, little-known wren-like bird of the Himalayas, Tesia albiventer Hodgson.

There is no argument that Microura has priority over Pnoepyga, nor that after about 100 years of being considered a homonym of Micrura, such is no longer the case.

However, Dr. Mayr has overstated his case.
(1) The name Microura is neither a name that has had "100 years of oblivion", nor has it been "a forgotten name". Microura is listed as a synonym, and is indexed in such standard works as "Catalogue of Birds British Museum", "Fauna of British India" and Hartert (Palaearctic Birds), with, in each case, the clear indication that if it was not a homonym of Micrura it would have been used instead of the younger Pnoepyga. Its identity is, and has been, readily available to any scholar.

(2) The fact that few ornithologists would know to what bird the name Microura applies is irrelevant, for the same is true of Pnoepyga. Indeed, the status of Pnoepyga as a valid genus was clarified, and the designation of its type-species as Tesia albiventer, was made only in 1954 (Zimmer and Vaurie, 1954, Bull. Brit. Ornith. Club 74 : 40,41).

(3) Currently, now that Microura is not considered a homonym of Micrura, the former is used to replace Pnoepyga in the recent (1961) "Checklist of Indian Birds" by Ripley, as being used in Deignan's book on the birds of the Indo-Chinese countries, and is being used in Salim Ali's forthcoming book on the birds of Sikkim.

(4) It would be unfortunate if the Commission should outlaw a name that is used in the three most recent books, covering practically the whole range of Microura albiventer, books which will be the standard references for a generation as far as local people of southeastern Asia are concerned. I strongly urge that Microura should not be suppressed.

XVIth International Congress of Zoology, Washington, 1963

Notice is hereby given that, in accordance with Article 77(1) of the Code, amendments to the Code can only be considered by the Congress if they have been received by the Commission not later than 22nd August, 1962, provided only that under the above Article the Commission may relax this rule in favour of proposed amendments received at a later date.
OPINION 629

PEDICULUS DENTATUS SCOPOLI, 1763; DESIGNATION OF A NEOTYPE UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby Ruled that, notwithstanding the fact that certain points in the original description of Pediculus dentatus Scopoli, 1763, are not consistent with the neotype designated by Clay & Hopkins, 1951, the species so named by Scopoli is to be interpreted by reference to that neotype.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
   (a) Anatoecus Cummings, 1916 (gender: masculine), type-species by original designation, Philopterus icterodes Nitzsch, 1818 (Name No. 1475);
   (b) Trinoton Nitzsch, 1818 (gender: neuter), type-species, by monotypy, Liothecum (Trinoton) conspurcatum Nitzsch, 1818 (Name No. 1476);
   (c) Philopterus Nitzsch, 1818 (gender: masculine), type-species, by designation by Neumann, 1906, Pediculus ocellatus Scopoli, 1763 (Name No. 1477).

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
   (a) dentatus Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen Pediculus dentatus, and as defined under the plenary powers in (1) above by the neotype designated by Clay & Hopkins, 1951 (Name No. 1809);
   (b) icterodes Nitzsch, 1818, as published in the binomen Pediculus icterodes, and as defined by the neotype designated by Clay & Hopkins, 1960 (type-species of Anatoecus Cummings, 1916) (Name No. 1810);
   (c) anserinus J. C. Fabricius, 1805, as published in the binomen Pediculus anserinus (Name No. 1811);
   (d) ocellatus Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen Pediculus ocellatus, and as defined by the neotype designated by Clay & Hopkins, 1951 (type-species of Philopterus Nitzsch, 1818) (Name No. 1812).

(4) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
   (a) Trinotum Burmeister, 1838 (an incorrect spelling for Trinoton Nitzsch, 1818) (Name No. 1546);
   (b) Trinotion Perry, 1876 (an incorrect spelling for Trinoton Nitzsch, 1818) (Name No. 1547);
   (c) Docophorus Nitzsch, 1818 (a junior objective synonym of Philopterus Nitzsch, 1818) (Name No. 1548).

(5) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
   (a) Philopteridae Burmeister, 1838 (type-genus Philopterus Nitzsch, 1818) (Name No. 323);
(b) TRINITONIDAE Eichler, 1941 (type-genus Trinoton Nitzsch, 1818) (for use by those zoologists who consider that Menopon Nitzsch, 1818, and Trinoton Nitzsch, 1818, belong to different family-group taxa) (Name No. 324).

(6) The family-group name docophoridae Mjöberg, 1910 (type-genus Docophorus Nitzsch, 1818) (a junior objective synonym of philopteridae Burmeister, 1838) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name No. 355.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1394)

A provisional draft of the present case was submitted to the Office of the Commission by Mr. G. H. E. Hopkins and Dr. Theresa Clay on 31 October 1958. The case was finally completed on 26 February 1960 and was sent to the printer on 28 March 1960. It was published on 16 September 1960 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17 : 337-340. Public Notice of the possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the Bulletin as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4 : 51-56) and to seven entomological serials.

A number of comments were received and these are set forth in full in the following Secretary’s Note which was sent to Commissioners with Voting Paper (61)17 :

"The present proposals have been criticised by both Commissioner Henning Lemche and Commissioner Per Brinck on the grounds that it would be better to use the plenary powers to suppress altogether the specific name dentatus than to designate a neotype which is not of the species Scopoli described under this name. Mr. Hopkins and Dr. Clay have written to the Secretary giving further reasons for the choice they made in proposing that the Commission designate a neotype rather than suppress the specific name. The correspondence relating to this point is here reproduced for the information of other Commissioners.

"Per Brinck (22.x.60)—‘We are informed that Scopoli’s description of Pediculus dentatus (1763) is not consistent with the neotype designated by Clay & Hopkins in 1951. I agree that confusion would arise if the name were to be transferred from one suborder to another and am not prepared to vote for such a proposal, but on the other hand I am reluctant to fix Scopoli’s name to a species which he did not name (or describe). I would prefer to suppress Scopoli’s name, if there is any possibility to do so without too much trouble for applied entomologists.’

"H. Lemche. (13.xii.60)—‘It appears to me that in general it is no good to validate a strongly misused and confused name to let it cover a definite taxon. My own experience in such matters goes to say that such arrangements are causing endless trouble.

‘Let us imagine a new specialist starting his career say five years after the question of restriction of a misused name has been decided upon by the Commission. He will certainly not begin by consulting the whole series of the B.Z.N. to find out everything about possible forbidden names.
He will take some major work of a rather recent date (if he gets no local advice he will rarely find the very latest ones first), and in his first two or three publications may easily apply the names in their old misused sense. Hence, in a publication appearing several years after the restriction of the name in question, inadvertence or lack of knowledge may well cause it to appear in its old sense. Still later, a second author may take these first publications of the—now senior—authority as guiding, and apply the said name once again to the confused concept.

'Such cases are unavoidable, so that we can never get rid of misuses of names even after restricting them officially. In cases where the confusion is grave, it is much better to use every possibility to change the names simultaneously with the taxonomical clearing up of the problems involved. Then the names alone tell whether the said revision has been observed or not by a certain author at a certain time, and no confusion can arise.

'This latter procedure was used when the Colymbus case was settled, and I much regret that the Commission did not do the same in the Pagurus one. In the latter case, it was maintained that the specialists themselves should be allowed to decide what they preferred. But isn't it false to think that systematists themselves are 'the specialists' in such cases. Wouldn't it rather be the Commission who has the pertinent experience to say what is the better course.

'So, I much prefer another name for the taxon defined by the neotype of 'Pediculus dentatus', and I would like very much to see this case used as a precedent in future cases of the same sort. They are by no means uncommon.

'Will it be possible to ask the applicants in the present case to publish a name for the taxon involved?'

''Clay & Hopkins (7.xii.60)— You were good enough to send us a copy of Commissioner Dr. Lemche's letter to you of 1.xi.60 on the above subject, and we have certain points to raise in reply. We feel that Dr. Lemche's opinion has been based entirely on general principles and not on the case under discussion, and we suggest that the Plenary Power to set aside any rule in suitable cases should also be used to set aside any general principle adopted by the Commission for their own guidance when the circumstances of any individual case make it appear to them that this course is desirable.

'We do not wish to dispute the principle which Dr. Lemche wishes the Commission to adopt, and in fact we are disposed to agree with him that it may be the most suitable in the majority of instances, but we want to point out that it has no relevance to the case of Pediculus dentatus. We perfectly see the difficulty of Dr. Lemche's hypothetical new specialist starting his career five years after the restriction of a misused name by the Commission and finding the name used in its wrong sense in the first few periodicals he consults. But in the case of Pediculus dentatus, this specialist would have to go back 200 years in the literature to find the name for a member of the genus Trinoton, for though Scopoli's description of 1763 suggests a species belonging to this genus, no later author has used it in this sense. The specialist would also find that the earliest comprehensive
list of the Mallophaga (Kellogg, 1908, Mallophaga, in Wytsman's Genera Insectorum) does not mention the name dentatus at all, that in the next list (Harrison, 1916, Parasitology 9 :1–154) it appears among the group which was described later in the same year as Anatoecus, and that all works which distinguish between the two rather recently separated species Anatoecus dentatus (Scopoli, 1763) and A. icterodes (Nitzsch, 1818) (long thought to be synonyms) use dentatus for the species to which we endeavoured to restrict it 9 years ago (Clay & Hopkins, 1951, Bull. Brit. Mus. (nat. Hist.), Ent. :17).

' The overwhelming argument (as it seems to us) in favour of fixing the name dentatus to the species to which we applied it is, however, the impossibility of finding a correct name for the species if we do not arbitrarily employ dentatus, and we think Dr. Lemche has not fully appreciated the objections to renaming the species. We have no insuperable objection to giving a new name to the specimen which we set up unofficially as neotype of Pediculus dentatus, but this would leave in doubt a number of senior names which may or may not apply to the species with which we dealt (the two species are separable only by the male genitalia, never mentioned in the descriptions) and which can never be elucidated except arbitrarily because the types of at least the four most senior (we have not investigated the others) are known to have been destroyed.

' We therefore maintain that—however desirable the principle advocated by Dr. Lemche may be in general—in this particular instance the proposal that we have put forward with regard to Pediculus dentatus would not have the undesirable consequences which he envisages and that, although we have no objection in principle to renaming Pediculus dentatus "auctorum omnium praeter Scopoli", the fact that this new name would be junior to many others of which at least the first four cannot be identified to a species and cannot be investigated because the types are destroyed, is an almost insuperable objection to taking this course. We think that no other course than to fix the name dentatus to a member of the genus to which it has been applied by all writers since we erected an unofficial neotype in 1951 is likely to obviate a state of confusion in the systematics of the genus Anatoecus which is unlikely ever to be resolved by any other means.'

"Lemche (13.xii.60)—'As correctly stated by Drs. Clay and Hopkins, I was not opposing their application on special grounds. My considerations were of a general nature, and I agree that the Commission is to take due regard to special reasons for taking decisions differing from what would be preferred by principle.

'As—although they accept my "considerations in principle" as potentially useful—Drs. Clay and Hopkins have now so fully explained their reasons for choosing a special course in the case of Pediculus dentatus, I can only accept their opinion as specialists as the better one. I had no intention of imposing the use of a strict principle even for cases where it would do more harm than good. On the other hand, I liked to propose to the Commission the idea that in all such cases we should ask whether there are special reasons why the Gordian knot is not cut by preferring
the use of a non-committed name in future. Where no such good reasons can be provided, we might go in for the principle of preferring the validation of neutral names, cancelling the disputed ones. 'When good reasons are produced, it is natural for the Commission to listen—and to act accordingly.'

"The proposed action is supported by Dr. K. C. Emerson (Arlington, Virginia) and was objected to by Mr. E. Raymond Hall as follows:

'The proposal to have the International Zoological Commission designate a neotype for Pediculus dentatus Scopoli, 1763 (Insecta, Mallophaga) "Z.N.(S.) 1394, it seems to me, should be rejected because Clay and Hopkins already (in 1951) designated a neotype, thus fixing the specific name dentatus for so long as neotypes are held to be of a significance sufficient to fix a name. Furthermore, the example of this neotype—now thought by those who designated it to belong in another genus—points up the dangers of selecting neotypes and argues for the simpler equally precise, practice of merely stating that a specimen in a given collection bearing a given catalogue number is accepted as a representative of a given species. So doing is not restrictive (as neotypes are) on future students who find new information that is helpful in erecting a still better classification."

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 3 July 1961 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (61)17 either for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17 : 339–340. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 3 October 1961 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—twenty-two (22), received in the following order: Boschma, Holthuis, Lemche, Munroe, Mayr, Vokes, Brinck, Obruchev, do Amaral, Key, Hering, Prantl, Hemming, Riley, Jaczewski, Uchida, Tortonese, Kühnelt, Bonnet, Bradley, Alvarado, Poll.

Negative Votes—one (1): Mertens.

On Leave of Absence—three (3): Evans, Miller, Stoll.

Commissioner Hemming returned the following comment with his Voting Paper (14.viii.61): "I agree with Dr. Henning Lemche that a question of principle as to the procedure best to be followed by the International Commission in dealing with applications designed to secure an unchallenged interpretation of individual nominal species is implicit in the present application and that the question of principle so involved deserves careful consideration by the International Commission.

"In approaching this subject, we must first recall that the interpretation of a great many nominal species established in the eighteenth century from Linnaeus downwards rest upon very shaky foundations, for many of the descriptions on which those nominal species are based are defective, either because objectively viewed they are insufficient to provide by modern standards a sure basis for identification or because they contain inaccuracies or because they were based upon specimens of more than one species. The difficulties involved in such cases can, however, readily be overcome in most cases where
any of the original syntypes are still in existence through the designation of one of those syntypes to be the lectotype of the species concerned.

"Where, however, as is the present case, the difficulty cannot be overcome by the designation of a lectotype, a serious situation inevitably develops, for the name to be used for the species concerned becomes a matter of opinion on which individual specialists may naturally take different views. In such a case it is only by the use by the International Commission of its plenary powers that that species to which the doubtful name has hitherto been applied, either generally or by some specialists, can be provided with a name which undoubtedly applies to it and which is moreover the oldest such name available for it. According to the circumstances of particular cases, this end can be secured, either by the Commission suppressing the doubtful name under its plenary powers or by its using those powers to direct that the nominal species bearing the doubtful name be interpreted by reference to a neotype designated for it.

"In those cases where there are no junior nominal species subjectively identified with the nominal species involved, the most convenient course would, in my view, be for the International Commission to suppress the specific name concerned under its plenary powers, for such action by the Commission would clear the way for the establishment of a new nominal species, fully and correctly described, the name so given to which would then become the oldest available name, and therefore the valid name, for the species concerned. To this extent therefore I am in agreement with the policy advocated by Dr. Lemeche and by Dr. Per Brinck in their correspondence with Mr. Riley. My adherence to this principle is however subject to the condition that this particular procedure would be undesirable and ought not to be followed by the Commission where the name in question has been in continuous and general use for a long period. In such a case, in the interests of nomenclatorial stability, it should not be suppressed, the proper course in that event being to provide a firm interpretation for the nominal species concerned by the validation by the Commission of a neotype as proposed in the present case.

"Further, I am of the opinion that validation under the plenary powers of a neotype is the procedure which should be followed in those cases—often the majority—where in addition to the nominal species of which the interpretation is a matter of doubt, there are also junior nominal species which cannot be interpreted with certainty, the names of which are believed to be junior subjective synonyms of the name immediately in question. In such a case the suppression by the Commission of the oldest name would serve no useful purpose, for a similar situation of doubt and uncertainty would arise in connection with the interpretation of the next oldest nominal species. The species concerned would still be without a name firmly applicable to it; the establishment of a fully described nominal species for the taxon concerned would be useless in such a case, for the name so introduced would fall immediately as a junior subjective synonym whenever some specialist claimed to be able to identify with the species concerned any of the older subjective synonyms.

"Within the framework outlined above the case brought forward by Mr. G. H. E. Hopkins and Dr. Theresa Clay falls in the concluding category, for they
explain that the specific name dentatus Scopoli, 1763, as published in the combination Pediculus dentatus which they ask should be interpreted by the Commission under its plenary powers by reference to the neotype which they established in 1951, is commonly treated as a senior subjective synonym of several other names, the interpretation of the species so named being, they explain, open to doubts similar to those which arise in connection with the specific name dentatus Scopoli. The suppression by the Commission of Scopoli's dentatus and the publication of a new name for the species represented by the neotype referred to above would therefore contribute nothing to the stabilisation of the name to be used for the species here in question. The only means by which that end can be achieved is, as those authors recommend, by the use by the Commission of its plenary powers to direct that the nominal species Pediculus dentatus Scopoli be interpreted by reference to the neotype established in 1951.

"I am therefore of the opinion that the present application is well-based and I vote unhesitatingly in favour of its adoption."

**Original References**

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists and Indexes by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:


*Docophorus* Nitzsch, 1818, *Mag. Ent*. (Germar) 3 : 289

*icterodes*, *Philopterus*, Nitzsch, 1818, *Mag. Ent*. (Germar) 3 : 290

*ocellatus*, *Pediculus*, Scopoli, 1763, *Ent. carn.* : 382

*philopteridae* Burmeister, 1838, *Handb. Ent*. 2(2) : 422

*Philopterus* Nitzsch, 1818, *Mag. Ent*. (Germar) 3 : 288

*Trinotion* Perry, 1876, *Proc. lit. phil. Soc. Liverpool* 30 : lxxxi

*Trinoton* Nitzsch, 1818, *Mag. Ent*. (Germar) 3 : 300

*trinotonidae* Eichler, 1941, *Arch. Naturgesch. (N.F.)* 10 : 382


The following is the original reference for the designation of the type-species of a genus concerned in the present Ruling:


The following are the original references for the designation of neotypes for nominal species concerned in the present Ruling:


For *Pediculus ocellatus* Scopoli, 1763: Clay & Hopkins, 1951, *Bull. Brit. Mus.* (nat. Hist.) *Ent.* 2 : 8, figs. 8, 9, 11, pl. 1, fig. 2
CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (61)17 were cast as set out above, that the proposal set out in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 629.

N. D. RILEY
Secretary

W. E. CHINA
Assistant Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
24 October 1961

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF ODONTASPI8 AGASSIZ, 1838.
Z.N.(S.) 920
(see volume 18, pages 273–280 and volume 19, pages 100–102)

By L. S. Glückmann (A.P. Karpinsky Geological Museum, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad) and D. V. Obruchev (Palaeontological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Moscow)

We strongly support the proposal by E. I. White, D. W. Tucker, and N. B. Marshall to suppress such generic names as Triglochis, Prionodon, and especially Carcharias, in order to stabilize the names Carcharhinus, Carcharodon, and Odontaspis. The name Odontaspis has taken such deep root in the literature that even a validation of Carcharias wouldn’t prevent its being constantly used in the majority of general works. The name Carcharias has been applied to members of quite different families (Odontaspidae, Lamnidae, Carcharhinidae) and has produced an extreme confusion in ichthyological and especially comparative anatomical works.

It is appropriate here to recall L. S. Berg’s utterance (1940) about the Law of Priority as applied to the Selachians: “I think it inadvisable to reject in deference to a ‘law’ of priority, the old names which are widely used in the anatomical and biological literature and to replace them by names extracted from worthless and justly forgotten writings of a Rafinesque or Swainson... Owing to the ‘law’ of priority, it happens not infrequently that even a specialist cannot, without special references, make head or tail of the nomenclature. Try, for example, to understand anything in the nomenclature of Selachii, using the work of Garman (1914). Having unearthed a work, known to nobody, by an author of the middle of the eighteenth century, who did not follow the rules of binominal nomenclature, this eminent ichthyologist changed, on account of this work, the names of many well-known genera, putting one in the place of another. The nomenclature of Selachii has consequently been thrown into chaos.”
PHASIANELLA LAMARCK, 1804 (GASTROPODA); DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type-species for the nominal genus Phasianella Lamarck, 1804, made prior to the present Ruling are hereby set aside, and the nominal species Buccinum australe Gmelin, 1791, is hereby designated to be the type-species of that genus.

(2) The generic name Phasianella Lamarck, 1804 (gender: feminine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, Buccinum australe Gmelin, 1791, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1478.

(3) The specific name australe Gmelin, 1791, as published in the binomen Buccinum australe (type-species of Phasianella Lamarck, 1804) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1813.

(4) The family-group name phasiannellinae Swainson, 1840 (type-genus Phasianella Lamarck, 1804) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name No. 325.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1433)

An application in the present case was submitted by Dr. L. R. Cox on 15 May 1959. After some emendation this was sent to the printer on 14 July 1960 and was published on 16 September 1960 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17: 341–343. Public Notice of the possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the Bulletin as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4: 51–56), and to three palaeontological serials. Dr. Cox’s proposals were supported by Mr. Robert Robertson (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 18: 111).

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 3 July 1961 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (61)19 either for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17: 342–343. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 3 October 1961 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—twenty-three (23), received in the following order: Boschma, Holthuis, Lemche, Munroe, Mayr, Vokes, Obruchev, do Amaral, Key, Hering, Prantl, Hemming, Riley, Jaczewski, Uchida, Mertens, Tortonese, Brinck, Kühnelt, Bonnet, Bradley, Alvarado, Poll.

Negative Votes—none (0).

On Leave of Absence—three (3): Evans, Miller, Stoll.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

australe, Buccinum, Gmelin, 1791, Syst. Nat. (ed. 13) 1: 3490
Phasianellinae Swainson, 1840, Treatise Malac.: 354

CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (61)19 were cast as set out above, that the proposal set out in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 630.

N. D. RILEY
Secretary

W. E. CHINA
Assistant Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
24 October 1961

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED ADDITION OF PTEROPHORUS SCHÄFFER, 1766 TO THE OFFICIAL LIST. Z.N.(S.) 1463
(see volume 18, pages 159–160)

By L. Bigot (Station Biologique de la Tour du Valat, Le Sambuc, Carmargue, France)

La Commission Internationale de Nomenclature a été saisie par P. E. S. Whalley d’une proposition fixant comme type du genre Pterophorus l’espèce pentadactyla au détriment de l’espèce monodactyla.

Ce choix paraît très justifié car pentadactyla fut considérée comme la forme la plus typique parmi les Pterophoridae. Actuellement la plupart des auteurs utilisent pentadactyla comme type de Pterophorus, rangeant monodactyla dans le genre Emmelina (voir Amsel, Gozmany, etc.).

Il est donc sage d’accepter la proposition de P. E. S. Whalley destinée à uniformiser la systématique de ce groupe.
OPINION 631

AEDIPODA PELLARINI LE GUILLOU, 1841 (INSECTA, ORTHOPTERA): SUPPRESSED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers the following names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:
   (a) the generic name Oedipus Berthold, 1827;
   (b) the specific name pellarini Le Guillou, 1841, as published in the binomen Aedipoda pellarini.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
   (a) Oedipus Berthold, 1827, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above (Name No. 1549);
   (b) Oedipus Tschudi, 1838, a junior homonym of Oedipus Berthold, 1827 (Name No. 1550);
   (c) Oedipus Lesson, 1840, a junior homonym of Oedipus Berthold, 1827 (Name No. 1551);
   (d) Oedipus Menge, 1876, a junior homonym of Oedipus Berthold, 1827 (Name No. 1552);
   (e) Aedipoda Le Guillou, 1841, an incorrect spelling for Oedipoda Latreille, 1829 (Name No. 1553).

(3) The specific name pellarini Le Guillou, 1841, as published in the binomen Aedipoda pellarini, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name No. 698.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1436)

The application was received from Dr. K. H. L. Key on 21 July 1959. It was sent, together with a supplementary note by Mr. R. V. Melville (then Assistant Secretary to the International Commission), to the printer on 29 October 1959 and was published on 16 September 1960 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17 : 344–345. Public Notice of the possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the Bulletin as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4 : 51–56) and to seven entomological serials. The proposals were supported by Dr. D. R. Ragge (British Museum (Natural History), London) and Dr. V. M. Dirsch (Anti-Locust Research Centre, London) and opposed by Dr. E. Raymond Hall (Museum of Natural History, University of Kansas, U.S.A.).
DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 3 July 1961 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule, on Voting Paper (61)20 either for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17 : 344 and supplemented on page 345. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 3 October 1961 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—twenty (20), received in the following order: Boschma, Holthuis, Lemche, Munroe, Mayr, Vokes, Obrucev, do Amaral, Key, Hering, Prantl, Hemming, Riley, Uchida, Jaczewski, Tortonese, Brinck, Kühnelt, Bonnet, Alvarado.

Negative Votes—three (3): Mertens, Bradley, Poll.

On Leave of Absence—three (3): Evans, Miller, Stoll.

The following comments were made by Commissioners when returning their votes:


J. Chester Bradley (3.x.61)—“I agree with Dr. Hall. It has not been made clear that the case is of major importance or that confusion would arise if no action is taken. Any taxonomist may list pellarini as a nomen dubium without the Commission officially listing it as such.”

M. Poll (4.x.61)—“Je ne vois pas la nécessité de faire appel à la C.Z.N. Ce cas tranché affirmativement créait un dangereux précédent. La C.Z.N. ne doit pas à mon avis supprimer trop rapidement les noms spécifiques d’espèces mal décrites et dont les types sont perdus provisoirement. La C.Z.N. risque si elle s’engage dans cette voie d’être assaillie d’innombrables demandes.”

ORIGINAL REFERENCE

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Indexes by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

Aedipoda Le Guillou, 1841, Rev. Zool. 4 : 295
Oedipus Berthold, 1827, in Latreille, Nat. Fam. Thierr. : 441
Oedipus Lesson, 1840, Spec. Mamm. : 197
Oedipus Menge, 1876, Schr. Ges. Danzig N.F. 4(1) : 482
Oedipus Tschudi, 1838, Mém. Soc. Sci. Neuchâtel 2 : 28, 93
pellarini, Aedipoda, La Guillou, 1841, Rev. Zool. 4 : 295

CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (61)20 were cast as set out above, that the proposals set out in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted
under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 631.

N. D. RILEY
Secretary

W. E. CHINA
Assistant Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London
24 October 1961

AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF ENHYDRUS CASTELNAU, 1834, UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 398
(see volume 18, pages 137–139)

By W. E. China (Assistant Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

In the course of voting on this application, Commissioner Dr. L. B. Holthuis has stated that he believes that the work by Dahl (1823) "Coleoptera und Lepidoptera" is an available publication and has insisted therefore that the work must be suppressed under the plenary powers before it can be placed on the Official Index. In deference to Dr. Holthuis's opinion it has been decided, after some discussion with Mr. J. Balfour-Browne and Dr. Per Brinck, to request the Commission to suppress Dahl's 1823 work under the plenary powers.
OPINION 632

REGINA BAIRD & GIRARD, 1853 (REPTILIA) ; DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers:
(a) the specific name leberis Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen Coluber leberis, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
(b) all designations of type-species for the nominal genus Regina Baird & Girard, 1853, made prior to the present Ruling are hereby set aside, and the nominal species Coluber septemvittatus Say, 1825, is hereby designated to be the type-species of that genus.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
(a) Regina Baird & Girard, 1853 (gender: feminine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, Coluber septemvittatus Say, 1825 (Name No. 1479);
(b) Storeria Baird & Girard, 1853 (gender: feminine), type-species, by original designation, Tropidonotus dekayi Holbrook, 1842 (Name No. 1480).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
(a) septemvittatus Say, 1825, as published in the binomen Coluber septemvittatus (type-species of Regina Baird & Girard, 1853) (Name No. 1814);
(b) dekayi Holbrook, 1842, as published in the binomen Tropidonotus dekayi (type-species of Storeria Baird & Girard, 1853) (Name No. 1815);
(c) occipitomaculatus Storer, 1839, as published in the binomen Coluber occipitomaculatus (Name No. 1816).

(4) The specific name leberis Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen Coluber leberis (as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name No. 699.

(5) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
(a) Cora Bonaparte, 1854 (a junior homonym of Cora Selys, 1853) (Name No. 1554);
(b) Cora Jan, 1863 (a junior homonym of Cora Selys, 1853) (Name No. 1555).

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1443)

The present case was submitted by Professor Hobart M. Smith and Dr. James E. Huheey on 31 October 1959. After slight revision it was sent to the printer on 28 March 1960 and was published on 16 September 1960 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17: 346–348. Public Notice of the possible use by the
Commission of its plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the Bulletin as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4 : 51-56) and to two herpetological serials. Opposition to the use of the plenary powers was expressed by Dr. E. Raymond Hall.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

On 3 July 1961 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (61)21 either for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17 : 347-348. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 3 October 1961 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—eighteen (18), received in the following order: Boschma, Holthuis, Lemche, Munroe, Mayr, Vokes, Obruchev, Key, Hering, Prantl, Hemming, Riley, Jaczewski, Mertens, Brinck, Kühnelt, Bonnet, Alvarado.

Negative Votes—four (4): do Amaral, Uchida, Tortonese, Poll.

On Leave of Absence—three (3): Evans, Miller, Stoll.

Commissioner Poll returned the following comment with his Voting Paper: "Je vote contre car je crois comprendre que C. leberis peut être utilisé à la place de C. occipitomaculatus et C. leberis ne doit donc pas tomber en synonymie."

Commissioner Bradley returned his Voting Paper, having voted against proposals (1)(a) and (4) only, with the following comment: "On the grounds of misidentification of the type-species, I am willing to vote to correct the application of the name Regina to the taxonomic genus containing septemvittatus Say. The substitution of the Linnean name leberis for occipitomaculatus can cause no confusion, and the plenary powers should not be invoked to prevent it. However it seems possible that leberis Linnaeus has not been used as a senior synonym of occipitomaculatus for a period of more than fifty years, in which case it has become a nomen oblitum under action taken at London."

It may well be that Coluber leberis Linnaeus is a nomen oblitum in the sense of the Code as revised at the London Congress 1958. The provisions of this Code however, have not been regarded as coming into force until its publication. At the time of publication of the present case the Code was not published, nor was there any prospect of its being published in the very near future.

**Original References**

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and Indexes by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

- Cora Bonaparte, 1854, Ann. Sci. nat., Paris (4) 1(3) : 138
- Cora Jan, 1863, Elenco Sist. Ofidi : 74
- dekayi, Tropidonotus, Holbrook, 1842, N. Amer. Herpet. 4 : 54
- leberis, Coluber, Linnaeus, 1758, Syst. Nat. (ed. 10) 1 : 216
- occipitomaculatus, Coluber, Storer, 1839, Rept. Mass.: 230
- Regina Baird & Girard, 1853, Cat. N. Amer. Rept. : 45
- Storeria Baird & Girard, 1853, Cat. N. Amer. Rept. : 135
CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (61)21 were cast as set out above, that the proposal set out in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 632.

N. D. RILEY
Secretary

W. E. CHINA
Assistant Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
24 October 1961

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR 
XENOSTEGIUM WALCOTT, 1924. Z.N.(S.) 914

(see volume 18, pages 332–333)

By Alan B. Shaw (Pan American Petroleum Corporation, Tulsa 2, Oklahoma, U.S.A.)

I have received an off-print of the proposal by R. J. Ross, Jr., to designate Megalaspis belemnurus White, 1874, as the type-species of Xenostegium Walcott, 1924. Inasmuch as the proposals made by Dr. Ross would result in official recognition of current practice and promote nomenclatorial stability, I wish to recommend that the Commission act favourably on the three requests in Dr. Ross’s proposal.


I am glad to see this proposal which was foreshadowed in the Treatise on Invertebrate Palaeontology: 0 353, in print. I write to express my approval of, and support for, this proposal.

By J. T. Temple (Birkbeck College, London)

I am writing to support the application of R. J. Ross to designate Megalaspis belemnurus White, 1874, as type-species of Xenostegium Walcott, 1924. I consider that this action will be in the best interests of nomenclatorial stability.
RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type-species for the nominal genus *Norella* Bittner, 1890, made prior to the present Ruling, are hereby set aside, and the nominal species *Rhynchonella refractifrons* Bittner, 1890, is hereby designated to be the type-species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Norella* Bittner, 1890 (gender: feminine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Rhynchonella refractifrons* Bittner, 1890, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1481.

(3) The specific name *refractifrons* Bittner, 1890, as published in the binomen *Rhynchonella refractifrons* (type-species of *Norella* Bittner, 1890) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1817.

(4) The family-group name *norellinae* Ager, 1959 (type-genus *Norella* Bittner, 1890) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name No. 326.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1445)

The present case was submitted by Dr. D. V. Ager on 3 December 1959. It was sent to the printer on 4 March 1960 and was published on 16 September 1960 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 17 : 349–350. Public Notice of the possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 51–56). The proposals were supported by Professor Alan Wood (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 18 : 122).

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 3 July 1961 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (61)22 either for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 17 : 350. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 3 October 1961 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—twenty-two (22), received in the following order: Boschma, Holthuis, Lemche, Munroe, Mayr, Vokes, Obruche, do Amaral, Hering, Prantl, Hemming, Riley, Jaczewski, Uchida, Mertens, Tortione, Brinek, Kühnelt, Bonnet, Bradley, Alvarado, Poll.

Negative Votes—one (1) : Key.

On Leave of Absence—three (3) : Evans, Miller, Stoll.

Commissioner Key returned the following comment with his negative vote:

"I take rather a different view from that of the applicant regarding the status of the name ‘ *Rhynchonella sellaris* Laube spec.’, which was selected as the
type-species of *Norella* by Hall and Clarke. There is, of course, no such name as *Rhynchonella sellaris* Laube. This citation could acquire validity only if interpreted to mean ‘*Rhynchonella sellaris* (Klipstein)’. But Bittner expressly repudiates such an interpretation, for he writes ‘non *Terebratula sellaris* Klipst.’ In these circumstances one can only regard *Rhynchonella sellaris* Laube as a *nomen nudum*, and therefore its selection as type-species as invalid.

“The question now arises whether any other of the originally included species has been selected as type-species by any author subsequent to Hall and Clarke, and if so which. It may be that *refractifrons* itself was so selected, or some other species which would be in accord with the current interpretation of the genus. As long as these possibilities remain unexplored, it seems undesirable to invoke the plenary powers, and I am therefore voting against the application, although I am in agreement with its underlying objective.”

**Original References**

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:


**Certificate**

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (61)22 were cast as set out above, that the proposal set out in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 633.

**N. D. Riley**

Secretary

**International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature**

London

24 October 1961
MYALINA TRIGONALIS ETHERIDGE, 1876 (PELECYPODA);
SUPPRESSED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers the specific name trigonalis R. Etheridge, jr., 1876, as published in the binomen Myalina ? trigonalis, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name trigonalis R. Etheridge, jr., 1876, as published in the binomen Myalina ? trigonalis, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name No. 700.

(3) The specific name obesa R. Etheridge, jr., 1878, as published in the binomen Anthracoptera ? obesa, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1818.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1446)
The present case originated in a statement submitted to the Assistant Secretary to the Commission by Mr. R. B. Wilson in October 1959. An application was prepared and was sent to the printer on 4 March 1960. It was published on 16 September 1960 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17: 351-352. Public Notice of the possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the Bulletin as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4: 51-56). Mr. Wilson's proposals were supported by Dr. J. Wier (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 18: 142) and opposed by Dr. E. Raymond Hall.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION
On 3 July 1961 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (61)23 either for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17: 352. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 3 October 1961 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—twenty-one (21), received in the following order: Boschma, Holthuis, Lemche, Munroe, Mayr, Vokes, Obruchev, Key, Hering, Prantl, Hemming, Riley, Jaczewski, Uchida, Mertens, Tortonese, Brinck, Kühnelt, Bonnet, Alvarado, Poll.

Negative Votes—two (2): do Amaral, Bradley.

On Leave of Absence—three (3): Evans, Miller, Stoll.

Commissioner Bradley made the following comment in returning his negative vote: "Since trigonalis has not been used since 1876 it has become a nomen oblitum and under action taken at London cannot be resurrected as a valid senior synonym of obesus. Action under the plenary powers is not required. I therefore vote against (1); in favour of (2) as properly reworded; in favour of (3)."
The revised version of the Code has not been accepted as being in force before its publication. Neither at the time of publication of this application, nor at the time of voting on it was the provision referred to by Prof. Bradley published.

**ORIGINAL REFERENCES**

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists and Indexes in the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

*obesa*, Anthracoptera, R. Etheridge, jr., 1878, *Quart. J. geol. Soc. Lond.* 34: 12, pl. 1, figs. 12-14


**CERTIFICATE**

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (61)23 were cast as set out above, that the proposal set out in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 634.

N. D. RILEY  
Secretary

W. E. CHINA  
Assistant Secretary

*International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*  
*London*  
23 October 1961
NOTOPHTHALMUS RAFINESQUE, 1820 (AMPHIBIA); ADDITION TO THE OFFICIAL LIST AS THE NAME TO BE USED FOR THE EASTERN NORTH-AMERICAN NEWT

RULING.—(1) The generic name Notophthalmus Rafinesque, 1820 (gender: masculine), type-species, by monotypy, Triturus miniatus Rafinesque, 1820 (a name selected by Baird, 1850, as first reviser, in preference to Diemictylus Rafinesque, 1820) is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1482.

(2) The specific name viridescens Rafinesque, 1820, as published in the binomen Triturus viridescens (a name selected by Cope, 1859, as first reviser, in preference to Triturus miniatus Rafinesque, 1820) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1819.

(3) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) Diemyctylus Hallowell, 1856 (an unjustified emendation of Diemictylus Rafinesque, 1820) (Name No. 1556);
(b) Diemichylus Cope, 1859 (an incorrect spelling for Diemictylus Rafinesque, 1820) (Name No. 1557);
(c) Diemyctelus Gunther, 1901 (an incorrect spelling for Diemictylus Rafinesque, 1820) (Name No. 1558);
(d) Notophthalmus Baird, 1850 (an incorrect spelling for Notophthalmus Rafinesque, 1820) (Name No. 1559);
(e) Notophthalmia Gray, 1850 (an incorrect spelling for Notophthalmus Rafinesque, 1820) (Name No. 1560);
(f) Notophthalma Gray, 1858 (an incorrect spelling for Notophthalmus Rafinesque, 1820) (Name No. 1561).

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 728)

The present case was submitted in November 1952 by Professor Hobart M. Smith, as a request for the use of the plenary powers to validate Notophthalmus Rafinesque which, under the rule of page and line precedence in force at that time, was considered to be an invalid synonym of Diemictylus Rafinesque, published on the same page of the same work. This application was supported by Dr. Gerd v. Wahlert of Bremen. The Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology (Copenhagen, 1953), however, revoked the rule in question and restored the "first reviser" principle, so that the use of the plenary powers was no longer necessary to place Notophthalmus on the Official List. In 1959 Prof. Smith therefore revised his proposal and, American usage in the intervening period having favoured Diemictylus, entirely recast the application in order to present it in as impartial a manner as possible, leaving the Commission
to decide whether *Notophthalmus* should be placed on the Official List, or whether the plenary powers be used to validate *Diemictylus*.

The application was sent to the printer on 7 October 1959 and published on 8 April 1960 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 17:205–208. Public Notice of the possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4:51–56) and to two herpetological journals. No comment was received.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

On 6 March 1961 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (61)2 either for or against the use of the plenary powers to determine the generic name for the eastern North-American newt. A vote for the use of the plenary powers involved the adoption of Alternative A in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 17:207; a vote against the use of the plenary powers involved the adoption of Alternative B in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 17:208. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 6 June 1961 the state of the voting was as follows:

Votes for the use of the plenary powers (i.e. for validation of *Diemictylus*),—fourteen (14), received in the following order: Riley, Stoll, Hering, Boschma, Dymond, Mayr*, Alvarado, Miller, Bonnet, Tortonesi, Kühnelt, Brinck, Lemche, Uchida.

Votes against the use of the plenary powers (i.e. for *Notophthalmus*)—nine (9): Holthuis, Vokes, Jaczewski, Hemming, Key, Obruchev, Evans, Bradley, Mertens.


Commissioner do Amaral returned a late vote for the use of the plenary powers and Commissioner Poll a late vote against the use of the plenary powers.

On 3 July 1961 the result of the vote taken on Voting Paper (61)2 was reported to the Commission with the following explanation:

"Alternative A, whilst having gained the majority vote, has not obtained the two-thirds majority necessary for a plenary powers decision of the Commission. In accordance therefore with Section J(c) of the Commission's By-Laws, the vote taken on V.P.(61)2 is treated as a preliminary vote only and the proposals are now re-submitted, on V.P.(61)24, for a final decision. If less than two out of every three members of the Commission voting on V.P.(61)24 vote in favour of the use of the plenary powers to suppress *Notophthalmus* (Alternative A), then Alternative B shall be treated as the decision adopted by the Commission, in accordance with the By-Laws.

"The following comments were submitted by Commissioners with their votes on Voting Paper (61)2:

"**Francis Hemming** (28.iii.61)—I consider that, when, as here, there is a substantial usage both for the correct name for a given taxon and for an incorrect name for that taxon, preference should be given to the valid name by the Commission and that the plenary powers should accordingly not be..."

* Commissioner Mayr requested that his vote be counted with the majority, and that only if there were a tie vote would he favour Alternative B (no use of the plenary powers).
used. It is for this reason that in the present case I vote for Alternative B.

"K. H. L. Key (6.iv.61)—Only a great preponderance of usage in favour of an invalid name can justify its validation under the plenary powers. In this case the name that is valid under the Code was used preponderantly in America up to 1953 and still is used preponderantly in Europe, while it is only 'recent' American usage that has 'tended' to favour the invalid name.

"M. Poll. (7.vi.61)—Les règles doivent être appliquées. Faire appel, contre elles, aux pleins pouvoirs de la Commission n'est pas souhaitable et crée un dangereux précédent. Si certaines règles donnent lieu à des situations fausses, celles-ci ne doivent pas être tranchées mais attendre révisions des règles qui son inappropriées."

On 3 July 1961 the Members of the Commission were again invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (61)24 either for Alternative A or for Alternative B as set out in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17 : 207-208. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 3 October 1961 the state of the voting was as follows:

Votes for Alternative A—five (5), received in the following order: Boschma, Hering, Tortonese, Brinck, Kühnelt.

Votes for Alternative B—fifteen (15): Holthuis, Lemche, Munroe, Mayr, Vokes, Obruchev, do Amaral, Key, Prantl, Hemming, Riley, Jaczewski, Mertens, Bonnet, Bradley.

Commissioners Alvarado and Poll returned late votes in favour of Alternative B.

On Leave of Absence—three (3): Evans, Miller, Stoll.


In returning his Voting Paper, Commissioner Bradley wrote (3.x.61):

I strongly agree with Commissioners Hemming, Key and Poll. I believe that the Commission should always be on guard never to use the plenary powers loosely merely to satisfy some temporary convenience.

Original References

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and Indexes by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:


Diemyctelus Gunther, 1901, Biol. centr.-Amer., Zool., Batrach. : 294


Notophthalmia Gray, 1858, Proc. zool. Soc. Lond. 26 : 138


Notophthalmus Rafinesque, 1820, Annals. Nat. : 5

Notophthalmus Baird, 1850, J. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad. (2) 1(4) : 284

viridescens, Triturus, Rafinesque, 1820, Annals Nat. : 5

The following are the original references to first revisers concerned in the present Ruling:

For Notophthalmus Rafinesque, 1820: Baird, 1850, J. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad. (2) 1(4) : 284

CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Papers (61)2 and (61)24 were cast as set out above, that the proposal set out as Alternative B in the latter Voting Paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 635.

N. D. RILEY  
Secretary

W. E. CHINA  
Assistant Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London  
24 October 1961

AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSAL TO VALIDATE UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS THE SPECIFIC NAME TROMBIDIUM AKAMUSHI BRUMPT, 1910. Z.N.(S.) 400  
(see volume 18, pages 140-142)

By W. E. China (Assistant Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

In course of voting on this application Commissioner Dr. L. B. Holthuis has insisted that the only way legally to get rid of Kishida's 1909 paper is to suppress it under the plenary powers. After some correspondence between Dr. Holthuis, Dr. C. B. Philip and the Secretary of the Commission, it has been decided to request suppression of Kishida's phantom paper under the plenary powers.
DOTO OKEN, 1815 (GASTROPODA); PROPOSED VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS.  Z.N.(S.) 1006

By Henning Lemche (Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark)

The rejection by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of the names published in Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* (1815–1816) in Opinion 417, has as a consequence the disappearance of the well-known name *Doto* Oken (and the family name Dotoidea) for some sea slugs. This application is presented to save that name.

2. In 1807, Oken (Göttingen Gelehrte Anzeiger: 1067) gave the name *Doto* to a polychaete worm. This name has been considered a *nomen nudum* (see Pruvot-Fol, 1931, Notes de systématique sur les Opisthobranches—Bull. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris (2) 3: 314). Oken, however, wrote "*Doto (Amphitr. alveolar)*" by which he presumably meant *Amphitrite alveolar = Sabella alveolar* Linnaeus, 1767, and the species constitutes an indication for the generic name. The Commission is asked to use its plenary powers to suppress *Doto* Oken, 1807, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy.

3. In 1815, Oken (Lehrbuch Naturgesch. (3) 1: 278) established a genus of sea slugs under the name *Doto* (the name of a sea nymph in Greek mythology—gender always regarded as feminine), including the two species *Doris maculata* and *Doris pinnatifida*, both of Montagu, 1804 (Trans. linn. Soc. Lond. 7: 80 and 78, resp.). Gray (1840, Syn. Cont. Brit. Mus. (ed. 42): 148) happened to introduce the name *Dota* as a printers' error for *Doto*. Thus *Dota* Gray, 1840, should be placed on the Official Index.

4. Of the two species mentioned under (3) above, J. E. Gray, 1847 (Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.: 165) selected *Doris maculata* as the type of the genus *Doto* Oken. All authors—the sole exception will be mentioned—agree that the species *maculata* Montagu is the same as *Doris coronata* Gmelin, 1791 (Syst. Nat. (ed. 13) 1: 3105) which specific name, therefore, should be placed on the Official List.

5. Pruvot-Fol (1951, Arch. Zool. exp. gén. 88: 49) records "*Doto coronata*" from Banyuls, stating that the specimens have "tubercules allongés digitiformes, ou à peine en forme de bosses ; toujours à points noirs. Je n'ai pas vu la variété à points rouges". From these observations she (1954, Faune de France 58: 408) concludes that *Doris maculata* Montagu, 1804—the type-species of *Doto*, and presented in the figure of Montagu as having red spots on the tubercles—is not conspecific with *Doris coronata* Gmelin, 1791, which, again, is characterized by the red spots on the tips of the tubercles, and by the whole body showing a more or less reddish tinge. A fortunate observation recently made by the present author in Sweden explains the misunderstanding underlying Pruvot-Fol's considerations. She is quite right in that at present two species are included under the taxon *Doto coronata*, one with a reddish hue, the other more or less greenish and with darker spots on the tubercles. For the moment I am trying to find the oldest available name for the greenish species. However, as both of the names *Doris coronata* and *Doris maculata* refer to the reddish species, there cannot be any doubt that the identification...
of *Doris maculata* Montagu, 1804, with the older nominal species *Doris coronata* Gmelin, 1791, is correct, and hence I do not hesitate to propose this latter name to be placed on the Official List as the type of the genus *Doto*.

6. In 1838, Forbes (*Malac. Monensis* : 4) described a species *Melibaea* (not *Meliboea*, as often spelled) *fragilis* now always referred to the genus *Doto*. *Melibaea* is an incorrect spelling of the valid generic name *Melibe* Rang, 1829. It seems convenient to take the present opportunity to place the name *Melibaea* Forbes on the Official List, together with the spelling *Meliboea* Forbes, 1838 (*Malac. Mon.* : 59). The specific name *fragilis*, being the oldest available name for the second common species of *Doto* from the Northern Atlantic, should be placed on the Official List.

7. Bergh (1871, *Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien* 21 : 1277) described the species *Doto pygmaea* which in another publication by the same author (*Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien* 28 : 574) was made the type of the new genus *Dotilla*. However, *Dotilla* Bergh, 1879, is a junior homonym of *Dotilla* Stimpson, 1858, a now generally used substitute name for the crustacean *Doto* de Haan, 1833 (in Siebold, *Fauna Jap.* : 24). As a consequence, the nominal genus *Dotilla* Bergh is invalid and should now be placed on the Official Index. As, however, the species for which the said generic name was intended, are now generally believed to belong to the genus *Doto* proper, there is no need to search for any valid substitute name for *Dotilla* Bergh.

8. Iredale introduced the new name "*Dotona* for the species *Meliboea fragilis* Forbes (*Malac. Monensis*, 1838, p. 4), the genus name *Doto* quoted as of Oken, 1815, having been used in 1807 by the same author in a different sense " (1918, *Proc. malac. Soc. Lond.* 13 : 30). The name *Dotona* was not available at that time, having been used by Carter (1880, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* 5 : 57) for a sponge. Thus, the name *Dotona* Iredale, 1918, is to be placed on the Official Index, and it is proposed to add also the *nomen nudum* *Dotona* Rafinesque, 1815 (*Analyse Nature* : 141).

9. Again, Iredale and O’Donoghue (1923, *Proc. malac. Soc. Lond.* 15 : 210) changed the name *Doto* to *Idulia* Leach, 1852 (*Synops. Moll. Great Brit.* : 25), type by monotypy *Doris maculata* Montagu, 1804, with the explanatory note that "*Dotona* was proposed for *Doto* preoccupied, as *Idulia* had been regarded as simply a misspelling of *Idalia*, but reference to Leach’s proof-sheets, printed in 1819, shows *Idulia* to have been invented years before *Idalia*, so *Idulia* must be used ". In consequence a number of authors, mostly from Great Britain, took over the name *Idulia* Leach in an attempt to obey the Rules. The leading authorities on the group (Baba, Pruvot-Fol, Odhner) simply refused to change, finding the arguments insufficient and the proposed name *Idulia* Leach very inappropriate, as it was easily confused with the then well-established nudibranch name *Idalia* Leach, of which—as mentioned above—it may be only another spelling. Thus, the name *Idulia* never came into general use, and at present almost all authors have returned to *Doto* as the name of the genus. Let it suffice to add here that the well-known authority on British mollusean names, the late R. Winckworth, intended to return to "*Doto*", as is seen from his posthumously published note "*Doto* Oken, replaces *Idulia* " (1951, *J. Conch.* 23 : 133).
10. In short, the name *Doto* Oken, 1815, has been consistently used for a certain genus of nudibranchs for more than a hundred years, with the exception of a short period of disturbance following the year 1923, as caused by the change to *Idulia* Leach in a list of British mollusca. General return to the name *Doto* has been rapid, and there does not seem to exist any desire to keep the name *Idulia* Leach with its risk of confusion with the name *Idalia* Leach. Thus, it will be most inconvenient, and even confusing, if the name *Doto* Oken, 1815, should now be declared invalid.

11. The first to have based a family-group name on the generic name *Doto* seems to have been Gray, 1853 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. (2)*11 : 220) who established the family name *dotonidae*. This name was also used by Jeffreys (1869, *Brit. Conch.* 5 : 59) who, however, added a footnote to explain that "a purist would say *dotoidae*. From the Rules as now accepted the latter spelling is the correct one, and it is proposed that *dotoidae* Gray should be placed on the Official List. On the adoption of the name *Idulia* Leach instead of *Doto* Oken, Iredale & O’Donoghue (1923, *Proc. malac. Soc. London* 15 : 210) introduced the substitute family name *iduliidae*. This name, however, is a junior synonym of *dotoidae*.

12. I therefore ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary powers:
   (a) to suppress the generic name *Doto* Oken, 1807, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;
   (b) to validate the generic name *Doto* Oken, 1815, with type-species *Doris coronata* Gmelin, 1791;

(2) to place the generic name *Doto* Oken, 1815 (gender: feminine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above, *Doris coronata* Gmelin, 1791, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *coronata* Gmelin, 1791, as published in the binomen *Doris coronata* (type-species of *Doto* Oken, 1815);
   (b) *fragilis* Forbes, 1838, as published in the binomen *Melibaea* [sic] *fragilis*;

(4) to place the following generic names on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Doto* Oken, 1807, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above;
   (b) *Dota* Gray, 1840, an incorrect spelling for *Doto* Oken, 1815;
   (c) *Melibaea* Forbes, 1838, an incorrect spelling for *Melibe* Rang, 1829;
   (d) *Meliboea* Forbes, 1838, an incorrect spelling for *Melibe* Rang, 1829;
   (e) *Dotilla* Bergh, 1879, a junior homonym of *Dotilla* Stimpson, 1858;
   (f) *Dotona* Rafinesque, 1815 (*a nomen nudum*);
   (g) *Dotona* Iredale, 1918, a junior homonym of *Dotona* Carter, 1880;

(5) to place the family-group name *dotoidae* (correction of *dotonidae*)
Gray, 1853 (type-genus *Doto* Oken, 1815) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology;

(6) to place the family-group name *Dotonidae* Gray, 1853 (type-genus *Doto* Oken, 1815), an incorrect original spelling for *Dotoidae*, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF FOUR GASTROPOD FAMILY-GROUP NAMES. Z.N.(S.) 1212

(see volume 18, pages 337-339)

By L. R. Cox (British Museum (Natural History), London)

I write to support the application by the late J. B. Knight, R. L. Batten, and E. L. Yochelson for preservation of the gastropod family names *Sinuitidae* Dall, 1913, *Macluritidae* Fischer, 1885, *Euomphalidae* de Koninck, 1881, and *Oriostomatidae* Wenz, 1938, by suppression of the respective prior family names mentioned in the application. The application is in accordance with Article 23d(ii) of the International Code, as revised in 1961, referring to cases where application of the rule that priority is to be followed in the choice of family-group names would upset general usage. Hitherto the general practice among Mollusca taxonomists has been in accordance with the principle that family names should be based on the currently accepted names of their type-genera and never on names discarded as synonyms. The four family names which I have cited above are thus in general use by specialists on Palaeozoic Gastropoda, are employed by W. Wenz in his work on "Gastropoda" forming Band 6 of the *Handbuch der Paläozoologie* (1938-44), and are also accepted by the applicants in their contribution to Part I of the *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology* (1960). It is undesirable that they should be replaced by names which have never been generally used and are not based on generic names which are now accepted.
CYNIPS CARICAEE LINNAEUS IN HASSELQUIST, 1762 (INSECTA, HYMENOPTERA): PROPOSED VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 1047

By W. E. China (Assistant Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

This case arose in November 1955 out of a request by the late Professor F. S. Bodenheimer of the University of Jerusalem for the reversal of Opinion 57 (Washington 1914) in which it was ruled that Gadebusch’s 1762 German translation Reise nach Palästina of Hasselquist’s Iter Palaestinum 1757 did not give validity to the names published in the Swedish edition of 1757. Bodenheimer wrote to the Commission as follows:—

"The Iter Palaestinum appeared in 1757. Its nomenclature, observance and descriptions are a model of correctness. If the book had appeared in 1759, all its names would have been incontestably valid names for all the new species. I cannot agree that an author of rare merits should be deprived of his dues because of an old Opinion which has been forgotten before it was published and which was obviously promoted by colleagues, interested in just one point, who cannot possibly have studied the Iter Palaestinum in all its aspects. I can only protest strongly against the Opinion and I assume that, certainly, nobody who signed the vote had gone into the merits of the case."

2. Hemming summed up the Case in November 1958 as follows:—

"Hasselquist’s work with binominal names supplied by Linnaeus was published in 1757 under the Latin title Iter Palaestinum. The same work, with an identical text, except that it had been translated into German, was published in 1762 under the German title Reise nach Palästina. After a great deal of internal argument the Commission in its Opinion 57 (published in March 1914) gave a Ruling rejecting both the editions of this book. So far as the 1757 edition is concerned this was clearly right, because it was published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature, i.e. 1st January 1758. So far as the German edition of 1762 is concerned, that decision, Professor Bodenheimer considers, was quite illogical and indefensible. I myself examined this work carefully before the war and I fully share Professor Bodenheimer’s view as to the merits of the Ruling given in the above Opinion. The Reise nach Palästina was rejected (implicitly) on the non-reinforcement provision in the old Opinion 5. But that argument is sheer nonsense, as Opinion 5 was concerned only to prevent the inadvertent validation after 1757 of books originally published by non-binominalists of the type then (1914) known as ‘binary authors’, who used single words as generic names and multi-verbal terms as specific names. The case of the Reise was totally different, for it was a post 1757 edition of a book which, though published before 1758, was even in that earlier edition fully binominal—its names having been supplied to its author (Hasselquist) by that worker’s own teacher and master, Linnaeus himself. On merits, therefore, there is, I consider, nothing to be said in favour of the portion of the Ruling in Opinion 57 rejecting the Reise of 1762 for nomenclatorial purposes.

"However it is now over 40 years since the publication of the Opinion rejecting the Reise and it would, in my view, be an extremely retrograde step at this stage to seek to overthrow that Opinion, in view especially of the fact that the problem whether the above work is acceptable or not is an actual one in a very limited number of cases and therefore that whatever practical problems there may be, these can be dealt with individually under the plenary powers without upsetting Opinion 57."

3. Linnaeus (in Hasselquist, 1762) described two species as follows:—

p. 424 " 111. CYNIPS Ficus

p. 425 Locus: Circa Smirnam
Ficus foeminis inhabitat, quorum germina excavata ab illo reperi & in quovis fere germine unum reconditum.

112. CYNIPS Caricae

p. 426 Locus: In eadem, cum altero, Ficu habitat.
An praecedens ex altero sexu? An diversa species?"

Linnaeus, 1758, Syst. Nat. (ed. 10) 1: 554 presumably having decided in the meantime that ficus and caricae were after all the sexes of the same species, united them under the new name Cynips psenes thus:—

Habitat in grossis Ficus Caricae orientalis."

4. It is now known that No. 112 Cynips caricae is a Chalcid parasite (or inquiline) of Cynips ficus, while Cynips ficus itself, No. 111, belongs to the Agaonidae (fig wasps). The fig wasp described by Linnaeus in Hasselquist has for many years been known as Blastophaga psenes (Linnaeus) while the parasite (or inquiline) is known as Philotrypesis caricae (Linnaeus). But in view of the Ruling given in Opinion 57 Cynips caricae (Linnaeus in Hasselquist) is not available as a specific name and there is thus no valid name caricae Linnaeus.

Professor Bodenheimer was anxious to preserve the names psenes Linnaeus and caricae Linnaeus in the accustomed sense.

5. As a first step towards clarifying the position with regard to current usage, the writer asked Professor Guido Grandi of the Istituto di Entomologia della Universita degli Studi di Bologna, author of the well-known monograph of the genus Philotrypesis (Boll. Lab. Ent. Bologna 3 : 1-181) for his opinion. He was asked in particular whether he would prefer the use of the plenary powers of the Commission to validate caricae (Linnaeus in Hasselquist), 1762, or whether he would prefer to use the oldest available name, ficarius Cavolini, 1782 (Opusc. soc. Sc. Art. 5 : 229 para. xlii) for this species. He replied that he preferred that the name Philotrypesis caricae should be validated.

A letter was sent also to Dr. van der Veeh the well-known hymenopterist of the Leiden Museum asking for his opinion and in particular whether he preferred ficarius Cavolini or caricae (Linnaeus in Hasselquist) for this species.

He referred the question to his colleague, Dr. J. T. Wiebes, who had been working on this problem. Wiebes replied as follows:—
"I had prepared a rough draft of a statement treating the matter discussed in your letter and I came to the same conclusion that the oldest available name for the parasite of Blastophaga psenes (Linn.) is Ichneumon ficarius Cavolini, 1782. This name, however, seems to be accepted by only one author: Mayer (1822, Mitth. zool. Stat. Neapel 3 : 583). Grandi (1921, Boll. Lab. zool. Portici 15 : 90) cites the original description, but he does not accept the name, remarking (jokingly) 'il nome di Ichneumon ficarius col quale 138 anni fa il Cavolini e poi il Mayer hanne indicato la P. caricae, ha continuato a godere di una straordinaria fortuna anche ai nostri giorni!'

"The supposition that Linnaeus described Cynips caricae in his Syst. Nat. (ed. 10) : 554 (Grandi, loc. cit. : 182 ; Joseph, 1958, Ann. Sci. nat., Zool. 11 : 201), and the citation of 'ficus caricae' as a specific name (e.g. Schmiedeknecht, 1909, Gen. Insect. 97 : 90), show that these authors did not consult the original descriptions. Most authors use Philotrypesis caricae (Linn.) and some mention Ichneumon ficarius Cavolini as a synonym, e.g. in the three important monographs (Grandi, loc. cit. : 33-191; 1930, Boll. Lab. Ent. Bologna 3 : 1-181; Joseph, loc. cit. : 197-260). Consequently, the name P. caricae was and will be used in all sorts of text-books, and this seems to be an argument in favour of the validation of the name. On the other hand it is not elegant to validate one name out of a number published in an invalid work while another, valid and usable name is available. I should prefer to use the name ficarius Cavolini, 1782, for the species."

6. "Another problem", continued Wiebes, "is the generic name of the insect in question. Probably, Polanisa lutea Walker, 1875 (Entomologist 8 : 17) is congeneric with the species of Philotrypesis Förster, 1878 (Ver. naturh. Ver. preus. Rheinl. 35 : 59-60). This should be confirmed by a closer study of the typical specimen, if this still exists (Grandi, loc. cit. : 102: 'L' assenza di Polanisa lutea fra i tipi di Walker era prevedibile!'). Grandi's conclusion is that Polanisa Walker must forever be standing as a doubtful genus (see concluding remark in Hoffmeyer, 1932, Ent. Medd. 18 (Ser. 2 Bd. 12) : 249); I remark that the genus may be of doubtful value, but its description is not invalid! Perhaps the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature could, when deciding between the names caricae and ficarius, at the same time suppress the generic name Polanisa Walker, 1875 (monotypical, type: P. lutea Walker)."

A search in the Hymenoptera collections of the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) by Dr. J. F. Perkins has failed to locate the type-specimen of Polanisa lutea Walker from India, but it seems doubtful whether at this stage Walker's genus and species should be suppressed, as suggested by Dr. Wiebes, in case the type specimen might eventually be found in some other museum, such as Oxford or Dublin, and prove to be generically distinct from the well-known Philotrypesis. It is perhaps better as suggested by Grandi to let the name remain a nomen dubium.

7. There seems no doubt that Philotrypesis caricae (Linnaeus) is the generally accepted name of Hasselquist's species 112, in spite of the fact that by the Rules it is not available. Any attempt to replace it by the oldest available name, Ichneumon ficarius Cavolini, 1782 would undoubtedly cause
conclusion, since this insect is associated in economic literature with the well-known fig-wasp *Blastophaga psenes* (Linnaeus) so important in the cultivation of figs. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested to take the following action:

(1) to use its plenary powers to validate the specific name *caricae* Linnaeus *in* Hasselquist, 1762, as published in the binomen *Cynips caricae* previously made unavailable under Opinion 57;

(2) to place the generic name *Philotrypesis* Förster, 1878 (gender: feminine), type-species by original designation. *Philotrypesis longicauda* Förster, 1878, a subjective junior synonym of *Philotrypesis caricae* (Linnaeus *in* Hasselquist), on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *caricae* Linnaeus *in* Hasselquist, 1762, as published in the binomen *Cynips caricae* (validated under the plenary powers in (1) above);

(b) *psenes* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Cynips psenes* (the oldest available name for *grossorum* Gravenhorst, 1829, type-species of *Blastophaga* Gravenhorst, 1829).
The purpose of this application is to lay before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature the facts relevant to the status of certain generic and specific names applied to South American snakes with protuberant snouts, and to request the Commission to allocate certain of these names to the appropriate Official Lists in the interests of stability. Although several names for several different groups are involved these are so tangled in the literature that it is convenient to treat them jointly rather than individually.

2. *Rhinostoma* was first proposed by Fitzinger (1826: 56) to include two new species, *rufo-fusca* from Santo Domingo and *proboscidea* from Brazil, neither of which, to the best of my knowledge, was ever described adequately. The genus was vaguely described in successive couplets of a dichotomous analysis on page 29, in a manner technically sufficient to validate the name but insufficient for purposes of satisfactory identification.


(1) *R. rufo-fusca*. M. Rothbraune R. Ex America, Insula St. Dominici

(2) *R. proboscidea*. Mus. Vind. Langrüsselige R. Ex America, Brasilia"
The terms "Rothbraune R." and "Langrüsselige R." are better considered vernacular names than descriptions. Since the only included species were *nomina nuda* the genus should be treated as one for which no species was distinctly named in the original publication and the first one subsequently placed in the genus becomes *ipso facto* the type.

4. *Rhinostoma* is again mentioned in a review article ascribed to Friedrich Boie (1827: 263, columns numbered rather than pages) with no further description or any specific citation, but with reference to two specimens in the Vienna Museum Collection. In another critique by Schlegel (l.c., column 284) the gender of the specific names is corrected in the citations *Rhinostoma rufo-fuscam* and *Rhinostoma proboscideum*, once more with no further biological information.

5. Wagler (1830: 171) described *Rhinostoma*, crediting its authorship to Fitzinger, and included as the only certain species *Vipera nasua* "Oppel" (a manuscript name taken from a label on a Paris Museum specimen) which Wagler described properly, thus fixing *nasuum* as the type-species by monotypy as well as representing the first described species to fit the generic diagnosis. *Rhinost. proboscideum Fitzing.* is included in parentheses with a query.
Rhinostoma nasuum Wagler has been applied only to species other than that characterized by Wagler in his original description.

6. Schlegel (1837: 100) described Heterodon rhinostoma, a species later becoming the type of the valid monotypic genus Simophis Peters (1860: 521, see paragraph 13 below).

7. In 1843 Fitzinger (page 26) designated Rhinostoma rufo-fusca Fitz. as type of a new sub-genus, Rhinosiphon, and Rhinostoma proboscideum Fitz. as the type of Rhinaspis, a new sub-genus of the genus Erythrolamprus, without supplying descriptions for any of these names. On page 28 he designated Rhinostoma nasua (Wagl.) the type of Rhinostoma Wagl. (Fitz.).

8. Troschel (1848: 653) described Heterodon guianensis, from near Pirara, British Guiana.

9. In 1843 Fitzinger (page 26) designated Rhinostoma rufo-fusca Fitz. as type of a new sub-genus, Rhinosiphon, and Rhinostoma proboscideum Fitz. as the type of Rhinaspis, a new sub-genus of the genus Erythrolamprus, without supplying descriptions for any of these names. On page 28 he designated Rhinostoma nasua (Wagl.) the type of Rhinostoma Wagl. (Fitz.).

10. At the same time Duménil, Bibron and Duménil (1854: 772) described a new snake with turned up snout as Heterodon Dorbignyi, a species later made the type of Lystrophis Cope (see 11 below).

This is actually the species previously described by Wagler 1830 as Rhinostoma nasua.

11. At the same time Duménil, Bibron and Duménil (1854: 991) described a new genus and species, Rhinosimus guerini from Bahia, Brazil, distinguishing the genus from Rhinostoma by virtue of single subcaudal scales in the former and a paired condition in the latter.

The subcaudal character now proves variable within the species guerini. In a forthcoming revision (Bailey ms.) guianensis Troschel and guerini D., B., and D. (nec Boulenger, Amaral et al.) are recognised as congeneric.

12. Cope (1860: 79) noted that Rhinosimus D., B. & D., 1854, was pre-occupied by Rhinosimus Latreille, 1802, for a genus of beetles, and proposed Phimophis as a substitute name.


14. Jan (1863: 42-43), revived Rhinaspis proboscideus Fitz. (see 7 above) describing the genus in analytical fashion in a key to the genera of his family Coronellidae. Since only one species is involved the description serves to validate both the genus and species, thus making the specific name available as of 1863. Heterodon rhinostoma Schlegel, 1837, was placed in synonymy and the Vienna Museum was indicated as the repository of (a) specimen(s).

Presumably this was done on the basis of the considered priority of Fitzinger's name (a nomen nudum) over that of Schlegel. The validation of Rhinaspis follows by three years the establishment of Simophis as a valid genus, hence it may be considered a strict synonym. Similarly, as the specific name proboscideus was only validated in 1863 it is a synonym of rhinostoma Schlegel 1837.
15. Cope (1885: 193) proposed the generic name *Lystrophis* for *Heterodon dorbignyi* Duméril, Bibron and Duméril, 1854.

This genus and species have both had uncomplicated nomenclatorial histories since originally proposed. Wagler's earlier description of *Rhinostoma nasua* fits this species rather than the species to which it has been applied, and a strict application of priority would require replacement of *Lystrophis dorbignyi* (D., B. and D.) by *Rhinostoma nasuum* Wagler.

16. Boullenger (1896: 114) pointed out in a footnote that "The Vipera (Rhinostoma) nasua of Wagler, Syst. Amph. p. 171, is, to judge by the definition given, probably identical with *Lystrophis dorbignyi* D. and B." Accordingly he rejected *nasua* and restored Troschel's specific name *guianensis* but continued using *Rhinostoma* for the genus.

Confusion was added when Boullenger, 1896 (loc. cit.) continued an error of Jan 1863 and Jan and Sordelli 1870 in applying the specific name *guerini* to a species originally described by D., B. and D. as *Scytale neuwiedii* var. *nigrum.* The skull of *nigra* is distinctive and was clearly described. At the same time Boullenger (pp. 114-115) included a specimen of the true *guerini* (see 10 above) under *Rhinostoma guianensis.* In both of these errors he has been followed by most recent authors, notably Amaral 1929 et al.

17. *Rhinostoma* has been used also as the generic appellation of the North American *Cemophora coccinea* (Blumenbach) by Holbrook (1842 : 125) and by Baird and Girard (1853 : 118).

18. Dunn (1944 : 202) upon my advice revived *Phimophis* Cope 1860 as the correct generic name for *guianensis* Troschel, 1848.

19. Since the snakes of this group are relatively scarce and as yet have had little or no place in popular or experimental literature any name changes would be of present concern primarily to taxonomists dealing with the South American snake fauna. The least disturbance to our present nomenclature and the least confusion in our understanding of the past literature would seem to be effected by the actions recommended below. Likewise the spirit of the Règles is not violated by (unnecessary) arbitrary changes of clearly established type-species. Such arbitrary decisions should be enacted only to save a name with an extensive non-taxonomic history.

20. For the reasons set forth above the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested in the interests of stability, universality and sound nomenclatorial practice:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the following names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

(a) the generic name *Rhinostoma* Fitzinger, 1826;
(b) the specific name *nasua* Wagler, 1830, as published in the binomen *Vipera nasua*;

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Lystrophis* Cope, 1885 (gender : masculine), type-species, by original designation *Heterodon dorbignyi* Duméril, Bibron & Duméril, 1854;
(b) *Phimophis* Cope, 1860 (gender: masculine), type-species, by monotypy, through *Rhinosimus* Duméril, Bibron & Duméril, 1854, *Rhinosimus guerini* Duméril, Bibron & Duméril, 1854;

(c) *Simophis* Peters, 1860 (gender: masculine), type-species, by monotypy, *Heterodon rhinostoma* Schlegel, 1837;

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *dorbignyi* Duméril, Bibron & Duméril, 1854, as published in the binomen *Heterodon dorbignyi* (type-species of *Lystrophis* Cope, 1885);

(b) *guianensis* Troschel, 1848, as published in the binomen *Heterodon guianensis*;

(c) *guerini* Duméril, Bibron & Duméril, 1854, as published in the binomen *Rhinosimus guerini* (type-species of *Phimophis* Cope, 1860);

(d) *nigrum* Duméril, Bibron & Duméril, 1854, as published in the combination *Scytale newiedii* var. *nigrum*;

(e) *rhinostoma* Schlegel, 1837, as published in the binomen *Heterodon rhinostoma* (type-species of *Simophis* Peters, 1860);

(4) to place the following generic names on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Rhinostoma* Fitzinger, 1826 (suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above);

(b) *Rhinosiphon* Fitzinger, 1843 (a nomen nudum);

(c) *Rhinaspis* Fitzinger, 1843 (a nomen nudum);

(d) *Rhinosimus* Duméril, Bibron & Duméril, 1854 (a junior homonym of *Rhinosimus* Latreille, [1802-3]);

(5) to place the following specific names on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *nasua* Wagler, 1830, as published in the binomen *Vipera nasua* (suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above);

(b) *proboscidea* Fitzinger, 1826, as published in the binomen *Rhinostoma proboscidea* (a nomen nudum);

(c) *proboscidea* Fitzinger, 1843, as published in the binomen *Rhinostoma* (*Rhinaspis*) *proboscidea* (a nomen nudum).

**Alternative Proosals**

21. Consideration has been given to possible alternatives to the suppression of either or both the generic name *Rhinostoma* and the specific name *nasuum*. Three possibilities offer themselves; but none is recommended.

(a) To restore *Rhinostoma nasuum* Wagler, 1830, to its original sense thus relegating to synonymy the current *Lystrophis dorbignyi* (D., B. & D.). Since *Rhinostoma nasuum* has never been used since its original proposal for the species intended, and since it would replace *Lystrophis* (in continual use since its proposal in 1885) and *dorbignyi* (in continual and uncontested use since its proposal in 1854), there would appear no virtue other than priority in its re-establishment. In fact it would only add confusion by being used in a
context different from that in which it was formerly used.

(b) Return to the old use (1854–1896) of Rhinostoma nasuum as a valid senior synonym for Phimophis guianensis by designating a specimen of the current guianensis as neotype of nasuum. This alternative would have the virtue of utilizing a familiar generic name in its usual context, but would cause the replacement of the long established specific name, guianensis, by the previously rejected nasuum, and would require an arbitrary displacement of the original context of the specific name.

(c) Return to the use (1896–1944) of Rhinostoma as a valid senior synonym of Phimophis but not recognise nasuum as a valid senior synonym either of dorbignyi or guianensis. This would entail relegation of nasuum to the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology and an arbitrary ruling by the Commission changing the type-species of Rhinostoma from nasuum to guianensis (which would be preferable to one of the other species which are little known).

### ANNEXE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wagler, 1830</td>
<td>Rhinostoma nasua</td>
<td>Heterodon rhinostoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlegel, 1837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heterodon rhinostoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troschel, 1848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dorbignyi nasuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duméril, Bibron &amp; Duméril, 1854</td>
<td>Heterodon rhinostoma</td>
<td>Rhinostoma nasuum</td>
<td>Rhinosimus guerini</td>
<td>Scytale neuwiedii</td>
<td>nasuum of col. B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan, 1863</td>
<td>Heterodon rhinostoma</td>
<td>Rhinostoma nasuum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scytale guerini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan &amp; Sordelli, 1870</td>
<td>Heterodon rhinostoma</td>
<td>Rhinostoma nasuum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scytale guerini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulenger, 1894</td>
<td>Lystrophis dorbignyi</td>
<td>Rhinostoma guianensis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ozyrhopus guerini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulenger, 1896</td>
<td>Lystrophis dorbignyi</td>
<td>Rhinostoma guianensis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pseudoboia guerini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most recent authors</td>
<td>Lystrophis dorbignyi</td>
<td>Phimophis guianensis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pseudoboia nigra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This proposal</td>
<td>Lystrophis dorbignyi</td>
<td>Phimophis guianensis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pseudoboia nigra</td>
<td>Simophis rhinostoma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 1

Summary of usage of specific names referred to herein by principal authors. Synonyms are in vertical columns.
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By D. Keith McE. Kevan (Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology, McGill University, Macdonald College, P.Q., Canada)

The purpose of this application is to seek recognition as the type of *Gryllus campestris* Linnaeus, 1758, of a specimen other than that upon which the original description was based. The application is made in the interests of stability in zoological nomenclature.

2. For the past two centuries there has been no doubt concerning the identity of the taxonomic species known universally as *Gryllus campestris* Linnaeus, 1758, the common European field cricket, type-species of the genus *Gryllus* Linnaeus, 1758, and of the family Gryllidae. In almost any work concerning European Orthoptera a description, more or less adequate, of the species will be found. A recent visit to the Linnean Collection in the Linnean Society's rooms at Burlington House, London, made in order to determine if the type-specimen was still extant, however, has resulted in an unexpected discovery. The true type of Linnaeus's *Gryllus campestris* (described under the name *G[ryllus] A[cheta] campestris* ; Systema Naturae (ed. 10) 1 : 428, no. 21) proves to belong to a taxonomic species of *Gryllus* other than that to which the name has for so long been applied : namely, *Gryllus bimaculatus* De Geer, 1773 (Mém. Hist. Ins. 3 : 521, no. 4 ; pl. 43, fig. 4). The facts are as follows:

3. In the Linnean Collection, as it at present stands, are three specimens of the genus *Gryllus* in its restricted modern sense (referring to the group of large, dark crickets known as field crickets, and excluding the species *domesticus* Linnaeus, 1758, the type-species of the currently recognised genus *Acheta* Fabricius, 1775, types of which are also preserved in the collection—see Kevan, in press). One of these specimens is a male and the others female. The male is immature and thus lacks tegmina and wings and its abdomen is covered with mould; the first female is rather well preserved, retaining most of its legs and having its hind wings more or less intact; the second female is not in good condition, lacking hind legs, cerci and apical parts of the hind wings so that these organs do not protrude beyond the ends of the tegmina. The immature male undoubtedly belongs to the taxonomic species currently known as *Gryllus campestris* Linnaeus; the females both belong to the taxonomic species currently known as *Gryllus bimaculatus* De Geer.

4. It is clear from Linnaeus's original description that he had a female before him, since he refers to the "stylus" or ovipositor. He also mentions that the hind wings do not protrude and it is therefore obvious that the second of the two females mentioned is the true type of *Gryllus campestris*. Furthermore, whereas the immature male and the other female are without labels, the
female in question bears a label in Linnaeus's own hand "21. campestris" (the old long script being used for both "s's"). The specimen also bears a small, more recent label, "13", referring to the species number in the Twelfth Edition of the Systema Naturae (1 : 659). The "habitat" given by Linnaeus for the species is "Europa australiore", but this is consistent with the fact that both the taxonomic species in question occur in southern Europe. Both, are, in fact, also distributed well outside this region, G. bimaculatus over a very large part of the warmer regions of the Old World as far as Taiwan in the east and South Africa in the south. It is, in fact, interesting to note that Linnaeus (1767, Syst. Nat. (ed. 12) : 695, no. 13) adds the Cape of Good Hope ("Cap. b. spei") to the "habitat" of his G. campestris, and it may well be that his better-preserved female forms the basis for this record. The taxonomic species at present generally known as G. campestris is unknown further south than North Africa.

5. It is thus quite clear that if the true type-specimen associated with the nominal species Gryllus campestris Linnaeus, 1758, remains as the type of the taxonomic species for which this name has been used for the past two hundred years, enormous confusion would result. Apart from anything else this common and familiar insect would be left without a name! Since the literature concerning this species is very voluminous, and that regarding G. bimaculatus is by no means inconsiderable, the obvious solution to the problem is to pass over the true type and to designate as neotype of the taxonomic species, an appropriate modern male from southern Europe. This specimen is in the British Museum (Natural History). It bears the data "FRANCE : Loir-et-Cher, between Vendôme and Blois, 10.vii.1956 (P. M. Stock)" and has the following measurements: length of body (measured to the tip of the abdomen) : 24.6 mm.; maximum width of head : 8.7 mm.; median length of pronotum : 4.6 mm.; median width of pronotum : 8.4 mm.; length of tegmen : 14.3 mm.; length of hind femur : 11.7 mm. I am indebted to Dr. D. R. Ragge for assistance in making this selection. The true type, for the purposes of nomenclature, would thus be regarded as "lost". I can see no real objection to this course of action since long before the time of Linnaeus the true field cricket was well known throughout much of Europe. It is perhaps a little unfortunate that it did not occur in Sweden!

6. I therefore make application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to recognise, under its plenary powers, the above type-designation in the interests of stability in zoological nomenclature. The Commission has already placed Gryllus on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology (Opinion 104 of 1908) with Acheta campestris Fabricius, 1775 [=Gryllus (Acheta) campestris Linnaeus, 1758] as type-species (see also Hemming & Noakes, 1958 : 54, entry 520). The specific name campestris Linnaeus was placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology in Direction 64 (Name No. 1283). Further information on the crickets of the Linnaean Collection are given by Kevan (l.c.).

In support of the above proposal it may be noted that Linnaeus, in his original description of Gryllus campestris, refers to "Frisch. ins. 1. t.1." (1720, Beschr. aller. Ins. Teutschl.) and to "Roes[el].ins.2.gryll.t.13." (1749, Monatl.
herausg. Ins. Belust.), so that it could be argued that Linnaeus' own specimens do not, in fact, represent true types and that the current concept of the species, *campestris*, is in accord with Linnaeus' description.

Acknowledgement is made of financial assistance from the National Research Council of Canada. Thanks are also due to the Linnean Society for facilities to study the collection.
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**COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS FOR BLISSUS BURMEISTER, 1835. Z.N.(S.) 1471**

(see volume 18, pages 346–348)

By Eduard Wagner (Hamburg, Germany)

DASIOPS ALVEOFRONS MOFFITT AND YARUSS, 1961 (INSECTA, DIPTERA); PROPOSED SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS IN FAVOUR OF DASIOPS ALVEOFRONS MCALPINE, 1961.

By J. F. McAlpine (Entomology Research Institute, Canada Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ontario), H. R. Moffitt (University of California, Citrus Experimental Station, Riverside, California) and F. L. Yaruss (Department of Agriculture, San Diego, California).

In this application the Commission is asked to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name alveofrons Moffitt and Yaruss, 1961 (J. econ. Ent. 54(3) : 504–505) for the purposes of priority and homonymy, and to validate the specific name alveofrons McAlpine, 1961 (Canad. Ent. 93(7) : 539–544).

2. Although it was not the intention of Moffitt and Yaruss to propose the name Dasiops alveofrons, their paper, having appeared some 29 days prior to that of McAlpine and containing description of characters intended to be diagnostic, does in fact present the name for the first time and validate it.

3. The intent of both Moffit and Yaruss and McAlpine was that McAlpine’s paper, which described the species and was intended to validate the name, should be published prior to that of Moffitt and Yaruss which deals primarily with the economic importance and bionomics of the species. Because of inadvertent confusion concerning the date of publication of McAlpine’s paper, the chronology of appearance of the two papers was the reverse of that intended.

4. This unfortunate reversal is likely to cause confusion and lack of uniformity in nomenclature, first, because McAlpine cited Dasiops alveofrons as a “new species” while Moffit and Yaruss cited it as “Dasiops alveofrons McAlpine”, whereas in fact the authorship should be attributed under the law of priority to Moffitt and Yaruss, and, secondly, because McAlpine cited a holotype, which, if Moffitt and Yaruss’s publication is accepted, becomes a false type, leaving the species without a holotype or defined syntypes.

5. Since Dasiops alveofrons is an important pest of apricots it is expected that it will be the subject of considerable discussion in subsequent literature. To avoid confusion in its nomenclature it is therefore requested that the International Commission should:

(1) exercise its plenary powers to suppress the specific name alveofrons Moffitt and Yaruss, 1961, as published in the binomen Dasiops alveofrons (J. econ. Ent. 54(3) : 504–505) for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;

(2) place the specific name alveofrons McAlpine, 1961, as published in the binomen Dasiops alveofrons (Canad. Ent. 93(7) : 539–544) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(3) place the specific name suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

ASTERIAS NODOSA LINNAEUS, 1758 (ASTEROIDEA); SELECTION OF A LECTOTYPE AND ADDITION TO THE OFFICIAL LIST.
Z.N.(S.) 1493

By A. M. Clark (British Museum (Natural History), London)

In 1959 Madsen (Vidensk. Medd. naturh. Foren. Kbh. 121: 161-170) published a note on some Linnean and Müllerian types of Echinoderms in the Zoological Museum in Copenhagen. He pointed out that Linnaeus in 1758 (p. 661) used the same diagnosis for his species Asterias nodosa as in 1753 (Museum Tessinianum: 114) he had used for Asterias dorsata. (This is not precisely correct as in 1758 Linnaeus added the word “muricatis” to the diagnosis “A. stellata radiis longitudinaliter elevatis” given in the earlier work).

2. The specimen from which Linnaeus derived this diagnosis has been lost, but still existed in the University Museum in Copenhagen in 1859, when Lütken examined it and noted (MS.) that it was damaged by humidity and its skeleton so loosely connected that only half of it could be saved for identification.

3. In 1865 (Vidensk. Medd. naturh. Foren. Kbh. 1864: 161) Lütken confirmed that the Asterias dorsata of Linnaeus, 1753, was the same species as that described by Müller & Troschel, 1842 (System der Asteriden, Braunschweig: 49) under the name of Oreaster clavatus, from a specimen in the Vienna Museum of unknown locality. Müller & Troschel referred to pl. 9, fig. 2 of the Museum Tessinianum (the figure of Asterias dorsata) but mistakenly used the name Asterias stellata for it in their synonymy, “stellata” being the first word in Linnaeus’s diagnosis. Lütken accordingly revived the name dorsata, using the combination Oreaster dorsatus, in place of clavatus.

4. Among subsequent authors, Perrier, 1876 (Arch. Zool. exp. gén. 5: 61), Bell, 1884 (Proc. zool. Soc. London: 77) and Koehler, 1914 (Beitr. Meeresfauna Westafri. 1(2): 168) used the specific name dorsatus, but Döderlein, 1916 (Zool. Jahrb., Syst. 40: 418) and 1936 (Siboga-Exped. Monogr. 46c: 321) used clavatus. Döderlein’s usages of the various names in the subfamily OREASTERINAE are currently generally accepted.

5. Madsen pointed out that the correct name for this species (which can be designated A) should be Oreaster nodosus (Linnaeus) (dorsata being invalidated by its introduction prior to 1758) were it not that the name nodosus is in general use for another species of the family OREASTERIDAE (species B), only removed from the genus Oreaster by Döderlein in 1916, when he made it the type-species of his new genus Protoreaster (1916: 420-424).

6. The use of the specific name nodosus for species B has its origin in the variety of figures referred to by Linnaeus in 1758 under the heading of Asterias nodosa and to the locality “India,” given in 1753 for dorsata, modified to “M. Indico” for nodosa in 1758. Species A, commonly known as Oreaster clavatus Müller & Troschel, is restricted to the west coast of Africa, whereas
species B, commonly known as *Protoreaster nodosus* (Linnaeus), ranges through the tropical Indo-West Pacific.

7. The references given by Linnaeus 1758 under the diagnosis of *Asterias nodosa* are to the following figures:
   (1) *Museum Tessinianum*, 1753, p. 114, pl. 8, fig. 3 (this was corrected to fig. 2 in the twelfth edition, 1788, and was clearly a slip since he also quoted fig. 3 for *Asterias laevigata*).
   (3) Linck, 1733, *De Stellis Marinis*, Lipsiae, pi. 3, fig. 3, pi. 7, fig. 8, pl. 26, fig. 41, pl. 25, fig. 40. Stella marina.
   (4) Rumphius, 1705, *D’Amboinischer rariteitkamer*, Amsterdam, p. 39, pl. 15, fig. A. Stella marina quarta.

8. These figures represent what are now considered to be several different species. No. (1) is not very good, but it was supplemented in 1753 by a brief Latin description as well as the diagnosis quoted above. The description was to the following effect: A starfish of diameter a handsbreadth. Radii five, obtuse, dilated towards their bases, the dorsal side very convex, with a sprinkling on all parts of rather obtuse tubercles spaced from each other. The lower side flat, with a sprinkling of prominent tubercles, the margin girt with little thin spines. This description is quite in accord with species A, and it seems that Lütken was perfectly justified in his conclusion that Linnaeus’s specimen was conspecific with *Oreaster clavatus* Müller & Troschel.

9. Of the other figures referred to by Linnaeus, that of Grew (2) is not positively identifiable, but like (1), it differs from species B in having tubercles on the marginal plates. Of Linck’s figures (3), the first, namely pl. 3, fig. 3, is a fine representation of the dorsal side of the species now known as *Protoreaster nodosus* (i.e. species B) (of which the ventral side is depicted in pl. 2, fig. 3). Linck called this *Pentaceros turritus* and gave as localities for it Ceram, Bona and Amboina. The three other figures of Linck quoted, show respectively the species called *Protoreaster lincki* (de Blainville) [pi. 7, fig. 8], *Pentaceraster mammillatus* (Audouin) [pl. 26, fig. 41] and *Pentaceraster horridus* (Gray) [pl. 25, fig. 40], by Döderlein, 1936. As for Rumphius (4), Engel (1959, *Rumphius Memorial Volume*: 219) notes that this figure certainly represents *Protoreaster nodosus* (Linnaeus) [i.e. species B].

10. In order to retain the names *Oreaster clavatus* Müller & Troschel and *Protoreaster nodosus* (Linnaeus) in their accustomed usages, it is necessary to select an appropriate lectotype for *Asteria nodosa* from among the references given by Linnaeus in 1758, which together can be construed as constituting a type-series (see Articles 72b and 73c of the Code). Accordingly, the specimen represented by Linck’s pl. 3, fig. 3 is hereby proposed as the lectotype of *Asterias nodosa* Linnaeus, 1758, the type-species of the genus *Protoreaster* Döderlein, 1916. The type-locality may be restricted to Ambon in the Molucca Islands.

11. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:
   (1) to place the generic name *Protoreaster* Döderlein, 1916 (gender: masculine), type-species, by original designation, *Asterias nodosa*
Linnaeus, 1758, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology; 
(2) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
(a) clavatus Müller & Troschel, 1842, as published in the binomen Oreaster clavatus;
(b) nodosa Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen Asterias nodosa, and restricted in the sense of the lectotype selected in the present application (type-species of Protoreaster Döderlein, 1916).

The present application was compiled following collaboration and consultation with Dr. F. Jensenius Madsen, Copenhagen, and Prof. E. Tortonese, Genoa.
PISIDIA LEACH, 1820, PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES; AND CANCER ISTRIANUS SCOPOLI, 1763, (CRUSTACEA DECAPODA), PROPOSED SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS Z.N.(S.) 1496

By L. B. Holthuis (Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands)

The generic name Porcellana Lamarck, 1801, is universally used for a well-known and widely distributed genus of Porcelain Crabs (or Rock-sliders), belonging to the Anomuran Decapod Crustacea. The genus is the type of the family Porcellanidae which embraces all known Porcelain Crabs. The name Porcellana has been consistently used since its introduction and its rejection would cause a highly undesirable confusion in carcinological literature.

2. Various nomenclators give the impression that Porcellana Lamarck, 1801, is an invalid name by listing several older homonyms of it. Two of these, Porcellana Klein, 1753, and Porcellana Adanson, 1757, are prelinnean and need not further be considered here. The other four senior homonyms of Porcellana Lamarck, which I found in nomenclators, are the following (all four pertain to a genus of Mollusea of the family Cypriidae):

- Porcellana P. L. Statius Müller, 1766, Deliciae Naturae 1: 129.
- Porcellana Linck, 1783, Index Mus. Linck. 1: 140.
- Porcellana Meuschen, 1787, Mus. Geversianum: 398.

3. Statius Müller (1766) and Linck (1783) do not consistently apply the binomial nomenclature in their above cited works. They often used Linnean names, which of course are binominal, but also accepted uni- or polynominal names from other authors like, e.g., Rumphius, Martini, etc. Therefore these books are not available nomenclaturally and the names in them have no standing (cf. Art. 11(c) of the Code).

4. Meuschen’s (1787) book seems to be consistently binominal and is accepted as such by Sherborn (1902, Index Anim. 1: xxxix). In it, however, the generic name Porcellana is only given in the plural form by Meuschen: "Genvs XXVII. Porcellanae". Nowhere in the book is the word Porcellana found in the singular; in the text the generic name is always indicated with the abbreviation P. As according to Article 11 par. g of the Code a genus-group name must be a noun in the nominative singular or be treated as such, the name Porcellanae Meuschen 1787 is not available nomenclaturally, even if Meuschen’s book be considered an available publication.

5. Bruguière (1792: 545) mentioned the name Porcellana in a discussion of Adanson’s (1757) Histoire naturelle du Sénégal and only cited Adanson, without accepting his names; furthermore no description of Porcellana is given by Bruguière. Porcellana Bruguière, 1792, therefore is not an available name either.

6. Porcellana Lamarck, 1801, thus fortunately has no older available
homonyms and can be used for the genus of Porcelain Crabs under discussion. The Commission is now requested to place this name on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology and to insert its unavailable senior homonyms in the appropriate Index.

7. Recently Haig (1960, Allan Hancock Pacif. Exped. Exp. 24 : 196, 207) showed that the genus Porcellana as usually understood by authors should be split into two genera: Porcellana Lamarck, 1801, and Pisidia Leach, 1820. As Haig (1960 : 207) was of the opinion that no type had ever been selected for the genus Pisidia, she selected as such Pisidia linnaeana Leach, 1820. However, there proves to be an older type selection for the genus, as in 1912 Fowler (Ann. Rep. New Jersey State Mus. 1911 : 577) in an obscure place had already made Pisidia viridis Leach (1820, Dict. Sci. Nat. 18 : 53) the type of Pisidia Leach; this, to my knowledge, is the oldest type selection for the genus. Pisidia viridis Leach is a nomen dubium, which at present is not used, and has hardly at all been mentioned in the literature. Leach’s description of that species is extremely short, but as Miss Haig, who is one of the foremost authorities in the field of Porcellanidae, informed me (in litt.) “Pisidia viridis sounds to me more like a Petrolisthes than anything else”. This was recently confirmed by Dr. Isabella Gordon, who at the request of Miss Haig examined the type-specimen of Pisidia viridis Leach, which is preserved in the collection of the British Museum, and found it a true Petrolisthes. Though the specific identity of the type is not yet definitely ascertained, it seems possible that it is identical with Petrolisthes galathinus (Bosc, 1801–1802). Fowler’s type selection is most unfortunate as not only would it make the generic name Pisidia the incorrect name for the genus to which Haig (1960) assigned it in her monograph of the West American Porcellanidae, but this name would at the same time have to replace the widely used name Petrolisthes Stimpson, 1858, for a genus that is represented by numerous species in all the tropical and subtropical seas of the world. All this confusion can be avoided if Fowler’s type designation for Pisidia is suppressed and that by Miss Haig is validated. Therefore I now suggest that the plenary powers be used to that end. Together with the name Pisidia Leach, 1820, also the name Petrolisthes Stimpson, 1858, should be entered in the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

8. In his description of Pisidia linnaeana Leach (1820, Dict. Sci. nat. 18 : 54) stated that his species was identical with Cancer hexapus Linnaeus (1767, Syst. Nat. (ed. 12) 1 : 1039). Linnaeus’s Cancer hexapus is based on Baster’s (1762, Opusc. Subsec. 2(1) : 26, pl. 4, fig. 3) description and figure of “Cancer thorace levi, orbiculato, subdepresso, chelis validioribus, antennis longissimis, pedibus posticis minutiioribus”, which distinctly shows it to belong to the species which in modern literature is indicated by the name Pisidia (or Porcellana) longicornis (L.). As the lectotype of both Cancer hexapus Linnaeus, 1767, and of Pisidia linnaeana Leach, 1820, I now select the specimen figured by Baster (1762) on his pl. 4, fig. 3. Baster’s fig. 3a and 3A are made from the same specimen, 3a showing it in natural size, while 3A is an enlarged figure. A few pages after the description of his Cancer hexapus, Linnaeus (1767, Syst. Nat. (ed. 12) 1 : 1040) published the description of his new species.
Cancer longicornis, which, like C. hexapus, is based on the specimen figured by Baster on his pl. 4, fig. 3. Under C. longicornis, namely, Linnaeus referred to this figure by Baster; furthermore Linnaeus gave references to Gronovius and Seba, which also concern Pisidia longicornis. The lectotype of Cancer hexapus is now also selected to be the lectotype of Cancer longicornis Linnaeus (1767). In this way Cancer hexapus Linnaeus, 1767, Cancer longicornis Linnaeus, 1767, and Pisidia linnaeana Leach, 1820, become objectively synonymous. As Cancer hexapus L. and C. longicornis L. have been published simultaneously, their relative priority is to be determined by the action of the first reviser (cf. Article 24(a) of the Code). The first reviser in this case is H. Milne Edwards (1837, Hist. nat. Crust. 2 : 257) who in discussing the synonymy of the species to which he assigned the name Porcellana longicornis remarked: "Nous ne voyons aucune raison suffisante pour séparer de cette espèce le Cancer hexapus de Herbst"; Cancer hexapus Herbst is not a new name, but just a later usage by Herbst (1783, Vers. Naturgesch. Krabben Krebse 1(2-5) : 98) of Cancer hexapus L. Through H. Milne Edwards's action the name Cancer longicornis acquires priority over Cancer hexapus. The valid name for the type-species of the genus Pisidia thus is Pisidia longicornis (Linnaeus, 1767).

9. The genus Pisidia is represented in the Mediterranean by three species : P. longicornis (L., 1767), P. longimana (Risso, 1816), and P. bluteli (Risso, 1816). In 1763, Scopoli (Entomol. Carniol. : 409) described a species Cancer istorianus, which judging by the description might be a species of Pisidia, though it does not fit in all points (e.g., Scopoli's description states that the abdomen is short and conical, a character not shown by any Porcellanid). It is impossible to assign Cancer istorianus with certainty to any of the three just mentioned species of Pisidia, and therefore it must be considered a nomen dubium. The name istorianus was misspelled histriae by Herbst (1783, Vers. Naturgesch. Krabben Krebse 1(2-5) : 97) and histrio by that same author (Herbst, 1796, Vers. Naturgesch. Krabben Krebse 2 (6 et seqq.) : 222). Nardo (1869, Mem. Ist. Veneto Sci. Lett. Arti 14 : 14) remarked that the identity of Scopoli's species (the name of which was misspelled histrianus by Nardo) is uncertain but that it might belong to the genus Porcellana, while he furthermore quoted Von Martens (1824, Reise nach Venedig : 494) as supposing that Scopoli's species might be the same as Porcellana bluteli Risso. Neither the name istorianus Scopoli nor any of its subsequent spellings has ever been accepted by later authors and at present it is a completely forgotten name. However, as this name is older than either Porcellana bluteli Risso, 1816, or P. longimana Risso, 1816, it forms a danger to both of these names. Therefore I now suggest that the name Cancer istorianus be suppressed under the plenary powers of the Commission.

10. The concrete proposals which I now submit to the Commission are that they should:

(1) make use of their plenary powers to:

(a) set aside all type designations and selections for the genus Pisidia

Leach, 1820, made prior to the Ruling now asked for; and having done so to
(b) designate as the type-species of that genus the species *Cancer longicornis* Linnaeus, 1767, as defined by the lectotype selection made in the present proposal;

(c) suppress for the purpose of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy the specific name *istroianus* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the combination *Cancer istrianus*;

(2) place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the following names:—


(3) place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the following names:—

(a) *longicornis* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the combination *Cancer longicornis* (the name of the species designated under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above to be the type-species of the genus *Pisidia* Leach, 1820);

(b) *platycheles* Pennant, 1777, as published in the combination *Cancer platycheles* (the name of the type-species of the genus *Porcellana* Lamarck, 1801);

(c) *violacea* Guérin, 1829, as published in the combination *Porcellana violacea* (the name of the type-species of the genus *Petrolisthes* Stimpson, 1858);


(5) place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the names:—

(a) *Porcellana* Statius Müller, 1766, *Deliciae Naturae* 1: 129 (a name published in a non-binominal publication);

(b) *Porcellana* Linck, 1783, *Index Mus. Linck.* 1: 140 (a name published in a non-binominal publication);

(c) *Porcellana* Meuschen, 1787, *Mus. Geversianum* : 398 (a generic name not published in the nominative singular);

(d) *Porcellana* Bruguière, 1792, *Encycl. méthod. Hist. nat. Vers* 1(2) : 545 (a nomen nudum not published for use in zoological nomenclature);

(6) place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the names:—

(a) *hexapus* Linnaeus, 1767, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) 1: 1039, as published
in the combination Cancer hexapus (a junior objective synonym of the name longicornis Linnaeus, 1767, placed on the Official List in (3)(a) above);

(b) histriae Herbst, 1783, Vers. Naturgesch. Krabben Krebse 1(2-5) : 97, as published in the combination Cancer histriae (an erroneous spelling of the name istrianus Scopoli, 1763, suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(c) above);

(c) histrianus Nardo, 1869, Mem. Ist. Veneto Sci. Lett. Arti 14 : 14, as published in the combination Cancer histrianus (an erroneous spelling of the name istrianus Scopoli, 1763, suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(c) above);

(d) histrio Herbst, 1796, Vers. Naturgesch. Krabben Krebse 2 : 222, (an erroneous spelling of the name istrianus Scopoli, 1763, suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(c) above);

(e) istrianus Scopoli, 1763, Entomol. Carniol. : 409, as published in the combination Cancer istrianus (a name suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(c) above);

(f) linnaeana Leach, 1820, Dict. Sci. nat. 18 : 54, as published in the combination Pisidia linnaeana (an objective junior synonym of longicornis Linnaeus, 1767, placed on the Official List in (3)(a) above);

(7) place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoology the following publications :

(a) Linck, J. H., 1783–1787. Index Musaei Linckiani, oder kurzes systematisches Verzeichnis der vornehmsten Stucke der Linckischen Naturaliensammlung zu Leipzig, 3 vols. (vol. 1, 1783 ; vol. 2, 1786 ; vol. 3, 1787);

(b) Statius Müller, P. L., 1766. Deliciae Naturae selectae; oder auserlesenes Naturalien-Cabinet, welches aus den drey Reichen der Natur zeigt, was von curiosen Liebhabern aufbehalten und gesammelt zu werden verdient. Ehemals herausgegeben von Georg Wolfgang Knorr; fortgesetzt von dessen Erben. 3 vols. (ed. 1 in 1766 ; ed. 2 in 1778 ; a Dutch translation in 1771).
STEBEOMASTIS BATE, 1888 (CRUSTACEA DECAPODA), PROPOSED VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 1497

By L. B. Holthuis (Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands)

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is invited to make use of its plenary powers to save the name Stereomastis Bate, 1888, for a genus of deep-sea lobsters belonging to the family POLYCHELIDAE. This name is threatened by its older subjective synonym Eryoneicus Bate, 1882, which so far, however, has only been used to indicate the larval stages of this genus and the related genus Polycheles Heller, 1862.

2. The family POLYCHELIDAE contains three recent genera: Polycheles Heller, 1862, Willemoesia Grote, 1873, and Stereomastis Bate, 1888. The first two of these genera have been placed on the Official List in Opinion 519 (1958, Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl. 19(6): 137, 138). It is now requested to have also the third name, Stereomastis, placed on the List, but to this end recourse to the plenary powers is necessary.

3. The larval stages of the family POLYCHELIDAE differ so strongly from the adults that at first they were considered to represent a distinct genus, which received the name Eryoneicus from Bate (1882, Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. (5) 10 : 456). Sund (1915, Nature, Lond. 95 : 372) was the first who came with strong arguments to show that Eryoneicus is not a distinct genus, and that its “species” are larval stages of the genera Polycheles and Stereomastis. The publication of Balss’s account (1925, Wiss. Ergebn. Tiefsee-Exped. Valdivia 20(4) : 189–203) of the POLYCHELIDAE collected by the German “Valdivia” Expedition removed the last doubts as to the larval nature of Eryoneicus.

At that time many “species” of Eryoneicus had been described and in many instances it was impossible to know which adult and larval species belonged together. For convenience’s sake therefore the generic name Eryoneicus was continued to be employed for the larvae and even as recently as 1953 Bernard (Dana Rep. 37 : 1–93) gave a revision of the “genus” Eryoneicus of which he described 14 new species.

4. The nomenclature of the larvae and that of the adults thus are still quite independent of one another and even the larvae of which the adults are known are often still indicated with the larval name, as Eryoneicus coecus Bate for the larvae of Stereomastis sculpta (Smith). Though the generic name Eryoneicus is employed for the larvae of both of the genera Polycheles and Stereomastis, nomenclaturally it is a senior subjective synonym of Stereomastis since the type-species of Eryoneicus, E. coecus Bate, proves to be the larva of Stereomastis sculpta (Smith).

5. A strict application of the Code necessitates the replacement of the name Stereomastis Bate, 1888, by Eryoneicus Bate, 1882. This would certainly lead to a great confusion since the name Eryoneicus, which has never been used for any adult Polychelid, to every carcinologist denotes the Polychelid

larval stages. It would therefore be most awkward if the generic name *Stereomastis* had to be replaced by *Eryoneicus*.

6. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked to suppress under its plenary powers the generic name *Eryoneicus*, with the understanding that this name may still be used as a term to indicate larval stages, but apart from that has no standing under the Law of Priority.

7. Faxon (1893, Bull. Mus. comp. Zool. Harvard Coll. 24 : 197, 198) used the spelling *Eryonicus* for *Eryoneicus*. As he gave no reasons for so doing this spelling must be considered an erroneous spelling and should be placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology. Some years later, however, Faxon (1895, Mem. Mus. comp. Zool. Harvard Coll. 18 : 108) made it clear that his change of *Eryoneicus* to *Eryonicus* was intentional. *Eryonicus* Faxon (1895) therefore is an (invalid) emendation and as such is an available name. As this name is a junior synonym of *Stereomastis* Bate, 1888, there is no need to ask for its suppression.

8. Neither *Stereomastis* nor *Eryoneicus* have ever been made the type of a taxon of the family group.

9. The concrete proposals which I now submit to the International Commission are that they should:

(1) make use of their plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy the generic name *Eryoneicus* Bate, 1882;


(3) place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the following names:


(b) *suhmi* Bate, 1878, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (5) 2 : 278, as published in the combination *Pentacheles suhmi* (the name of the type-species of the genus *Stereomastis* Bate, 1888);

(4) place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the following names:


ARCTOPSIS LAMARCK, 1801 (CRUSTACEA, DECAPODA); PROPOSED SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS, AND RELATED MATTERS. Z.N.(S.) 1498

By L. B. Holthuis (Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands)

In 1801, Lamarck (Syst. Anim. s. Vert. : 155) erected a new genus Arctopsis, his total account of which runs as follows:


This description is practically useless: no crab has six antennae, so that the first sentence must be erroneous, while the next two lines are so general as to fit the majority of oxyrhynchs and a few other crabs as well.

2. Desmarest (1823, Dict. Sci. nat. 28 : 260) placed Arctopsis in the synonymy of Pisa Leach, 1814, while Latreille (1825, Encycl. méthod. Hist. nat. Entomol. 10 : 139) identified Lamarck's species with Pisa armata (Latreille, [1802–1803]). Latreille explained the first faulty sentence of Lamarck's description as follows: "Quelquefois aussi des corps étrangers s'attachent au museau, et c'est sur un individu de la Pise armée étant dans cet état, que M. de Lamarck avait établi le genre Arctopsis". H. Milne Edwards (1834, Hist. nat. Crust. 1 : 308) was of the same opinion, though he did not express himself so positively as Latreille. The possibility that Latreille actually did examine Lamarck's specimen is not imaginary. As far as is known to me, the only author actually adopting the Lamarckian names in question was A. White (1847, List Crust. Brit. Mus. : 5 ; 1850, List Spec. Brit. Anim. Brit. Mus. 4 : 5, 6 ; 1857, Pop. Hist. Brit. Crust. : 13, 20, 21), who substituted Arctopsis for Pisa ; however, most other authors, including even Lamarck himself (1818, Hist. nat. Anim. s. Vert. 5) totally disregarded both names. Miers (1886, Rep. Voy. Challenger, Zool. 17 : x, xvii, xviii, xxxviii, xliv, 53–55) also doubtfully identified Arctopsis with Pisa. He stated: "Arctopsis lanata of Lamarck has been referred to this form [=Pisa tribulus] by A. White, and Lamarck's generic name has priority over the almost universally used Pisa of Leach, but Lamarck's description is so brief, vague, and obviously incorrect, that I do not think myself justified in using his name in preference to one about which there is no uncertainty, and which has been generally adopted " (: 55). Miers then proposed to use Arctopsis as a possible subgeneric designation. Stebbing (1893, Hist. Crust. : 116) stated that " Pisa Leach, 1813, is open to the suspicion of being a synonym of Arctopsis, Lamarck, 1801 ", but continued to use the name Pisa. Since then Pisa has been practically unanimously used for the genus.

3. Miers's (1886) above-cited observation excellently characterizes the
situation as it still is at present. *Arctopsis* might well be considered a forgotten name. It is clear therefore that the suppression of this forgotten name for a genus which is insuffficiently described but which may be identical with the well-known genus currently and uniformly indicated with the name *Pisa* Leach, 1814, can only be in the interest of the stability and uniformity of nomenclature.

4. Another name which has been suggested as having priority over *Pisa* Leach, 1814, is the name *Blastus* Leach, 1814 (Brewster's Edinb. Encycl. 7: 431; type-species by monotypy: *Cancer tetraodon* Pennant, 1777, Brit. Zool. (ed. 4) 4: 7). *Blastus* and *Pisa* were published by Leach on the same page of his 1814 paper, *Blastus* being mentioned before *Pisa*. In 1815 Leach (*Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond.* 11: 327) synonymised *Blastus* and *Pisa*, adopting the name *Pisa* for the genus. Leach's 1815 choice, being that of the first reviser has to be respected, and *Pisa* thus has priority over *Blastus*. However, Stebbing (1904, *Mar. Invest. S. Afr.* 2: 2), evidently basing himself on the principle of line priority remarked: "Since *Pisa*, Leach, is a synonym of the same author's *Blastus*, Pisinae, if upheld, would become Blastinae, or as a family, Blastidae." So far as I know the name *Blastus* (or actually the name *Blastidae*, as the generic name *Blastus* is not mentioned in his paper) is adopted by only one other author, viz., Barnard (1950, *Ann. S. Afr. Mus.* 38: 10, 48). All other modern authors use the names *Pisa* and *Pisinae*. No action by the Commission is thus necessary here. The name *Blastus*, being a subjective synonym of *Pisa* is still available for those authors, who may consider *Cancer biaculeatus* Montagu and *Cancer tetraodon* Pennant as belonging to two different genera or subgenera. Since *Blastus* is not currently distinguished from *Pisa*, there is no need to have it placed on the Official List.

5. To find the valid name for the type-species of the genus *Pisa* provides another complicated problem. Until 1913 this type-species and a related form have been continuously confused with one another and it has been the great merit of Pesta (1913, *S. B. Akad. Wiss. Wien (mathem.-naturwiss. Kl.*) 122(1) : 1213–1223) to have solved this problem in his paper "Kritik adriatischer Pisa-Arten aus dem Formenkreis armata-gibbsi-nodipes". The names that have been used for the two species (which for reasons of convenience are indicated here as Species A and Species B, as has also been done by Pesta) are the following:

*Pisa nodipes* Leach, 1815, *Zool. Miscell.* 2: 50

6. Carcinologists at present are unanimous in assigning the names *Cancer biaculeatus* and *Pisa gibbsii* to Species A, and the names *Pisa nodipes* and *Inachus musivus* to Species B. *Pisa gibbsii* even is objectively synonymous with *Cancer biaculeatus*, being a substitute name for the latter.

7. As far as *Cancer tribulus* L. is concerned, Miers (1886) was, as far as is
known to me, the first author to identify that species with a species of *Pisa.* Linnaeus’s description, however, is such that there exists a grave doubt as to the correctness of Miers’s identification. Neither the arrangement of the spines on the carapace described by Linnaeus, nor the character of the long filiform legs agree with any *Pisa.* Personally, I believe it far more probable that *Cancer tribulus* L. is a species of the genus *Inachus* Weber, 1795. However this may be, the name *tribulus* has been ignored by subsequent authors and in modern carcinological literature is used neither for a species of *Pisa* nor for one of *Inachus.* As it seems unlikely that the species *Cancer tribulus* L. will ever be satisfactorily identified and as it, as a nomen dubium, will form a continuous threat to the stability of junior names, it is now requested that the name be suppressed under the plenary powers of the Commission.

8. The same holds true for the specific name *Arctopsis lanata* Lamarck. As has been shown above, this name is a nomen dubium like the generic name *Arctopsis* and its suppression is likewise requested here.

9. The specific name *armata* was introduced by Latreille (1802-1803) who gave a short diagnosis of his *Maja armata* and referred under it to “Herbst, Canc. tab. 15, fig. 92.—Planc. tab. 4, B.” From Latreille’s description it is clear that a species of *Pisa* is meant, and Herbst’s and Plancus’s figures fully confirm this. Both figures represent species A; especially Plancus’s figure being excellent. In order to settle the question of the identity of *Maja armata* Latreille (1802-1803), *Hist. nat. Crust. Ins.* 6 : 98 once and for all I now select as its lectotype the specimen figured by Plancus (1760, *De Conchis minus notis* : app. pl. 4 fig. B) under the name ( : 107) “Cancer Cordatvs, sev Sagittatvs totvs hirshtvs”. The correct name for Species A is thus *Pisa armata* (Latreille, [1802-1803]) and for Species B *Pisa nodipes* Leach, 1815. Pesta in his excellent 1913 revision came to this same conclusion. After the publication of Pesta’s paper the name *nodipes* has been adopted by the majority of authors for Species B and this name is found in most of the modern publications dealing with the Mediterranean fauna. Its nomenclature therefore forms no problem. Strangely enough, several authors did not follow Pesta in the use of the name *Pisa armata* for Species A, notably Bouvier (1940, *Faune de France,* 37 : 331) and Monod (1956, *Mém. Inst. Franz. Afr. Noire* 45 : 486), who both adopted for that species the name *Pisa gibbsii* Leach, 1815. Bouvier (1940) justified this action by saying: “rien ne prouve que le *Maia armata* Latreille 1805, 98, appartienne à cette espèce [= *Pisa gibbsii*] plutôt qu’à la précédente [= *P. nodipes*]” (: 331), and “Au surplus . . . il y a tout avantage à supprimer le nom d’*armata* qui prête aux confusions, attendu que la plupart des auteurs ne l’appliquaient point à *Gibbsii*” (: 328). I cannot agree at all with Bouvier. Firstly there is not the slightest doubt that *Maja armata* Latreille was based on Species A; it is possible that Latreille assigned a mixture of species to his *Maja armata,* but though we can prove that his new species included Species A, we cannot prove that Latreille placed also other species in it. The lectotype selection for *Maja armata* made in the present paper removes the last doubt as to its identity with Species A.

10. Also Bouvier’s conclusion, that the name *gibbsii* is to be preferred to *armata* because the latter name has often been used for species different from
Species A, is misleading. The early authors like Latreille and Risso did not distinguish between Species A and B and used the name *armata* for both. Roux (1830, *Crust. Médit.* (4–9) : pls. 33, 34) it is true, gave the name *P. gibbsii* to Species A and that of *P. armata* to Species B. H. Milne Edwards (1834, *Hist. nat. Crust.* 1 : 307, 308) on the other hand used the name *P. gibbsii* for Species B and *P. armata* for Species A, as may be seen from his descriptions; unfortunately he cited *Inachus musivus* Otto in the synonymy of *P. armata*. Heller (1863, *Crust. süidl. Europas* : 41–43) used the same nomenclature as did H. Milne Edwards. The main character that these two authors used to distinguish between Species A and B is that in Species A the intestinal spine of the carapace is sharply pointed, while in Species B it is a blunt tubercle. This character is still considered to be of great importance; the only disadvantage of it is that it can only be seen in the denuded carapace. The velvety hair cover of the carapace, namely, obscures the outline of the spine and therefore the pubescence may give the impression that also in Species A the spine is blunt; as soon as the hairs are removed the feature shows very clearly. Any species described in the literature as being either species A or B and having the intestinal spine sharp is without any doubt Species A. But if the intestinal spine is said to be blunt, the species may be either A or B. We may be confident therefore that H. Milne Edwards's and Heller's *Pisa armata*, which was described as having the intestinal spine sharp is Species A, while their *P. gibbsii* may have been a mixture. The publications of H. Milne Edwards and Heller were fundamental and formed the base for practically all later research, so that their interpretation of *Pisa armata* and *P. gibbsii* has been adopted by the majority of later workers. Bouvier's (1940) argument for using the name *gibbsii* for Species A and rejecting *armata* because the latter had been often used for Species B, does not hold good at all, since the name *gibbsii* in this respect is far worse compromised than *armata* is. Furthermore the name *gibbsii* is invalid as it is an objective junior synonym of the available name *biaculeatus* Montagu.

11. After 1913, the year that saw the publication of Pesta's revision, both the names *armata* and *gibbsii* have been used for Species A. In very few instances (e.g., Nobre, 1931, *Crust. Decap. Stomatop. Portugal* : 154, 155 ; 1936, *Fauna marinha Portugal* 4 : 95, 96) the name *armata* was used for Species A and the name *gibbsii* for Species B.

12. Considering all sides of the question I do not see any justification for not adhering strictly to the Law of Priority, and I suggest therefore that the name *armata* be adopted as the valid name for Species A. There would be little sense in validating the name *gibbsii*, as to achieve that end not only the name *armata*, but also the name *biaculeata* should have to be suppressed under the plenary powers of the Commission.

13. The genus *Pisa* is currently considered to be the type of the subfamily *Pisinae*, and it is now requested that that name be entered in the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.

14. The concrete proposals that I lay before the Commission are that they should:

(1) make use of their plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of the
Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy the following names, all three of which are nomina dubia:

(a) the generic name *Arctopsis* Lamarck, 1801;
(b) the following specific names:
   (i) *lanata* Lamarck, 1801, as published in the combination *Arctopsis lanata*;
   (ii) *tribulus* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the combination *Cancer tribulus*;
(3) place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the following names:
   (a) *armata* Latreille ([1802–1803], *Hist. nat. Crust. Ins.* 6: 98) as published in the combination *Maja armata* (the oldest available name for the type-species of the genus *Pisa* [Leach, 1814]);
   (b) *nodipes* Leach (1815, *Zool. Miscell.* 2: 50) as published in the combination *Pisa nodipes*;
(6) place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the following names:
   (a) *lanata* Lamarck (1801, *Syst. Anim. s. Vert.* : 155) as published in the combination *Arctopsis lanata* (a name suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(b)(i) above);
   (b) *tribulus* Linnaeus (1767, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) 1: 1045) as published in the combination *Cancer tribulus* (a name suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(b)(ii) above).
DENDRASPIS FITZINGER, 1843 (REPTILIA, SERPENTES); PROPOSED SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 1500

By Robert Mertens (Natur-Museum und Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt am Main, Germany)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name Dendraspis Fitzinger, 1843 (Syst. Rept. : 28), which according to the Law of Priority would be the correct generic name for the Indian King Cobra, Ophiophagus hannah (Cantor, 1836).

2. The generic name for the four species of “Mambas”, well-known venomous snakes of Africa, has been cited in the earlier literature as Dendraspis, attributed to Schlegel, 1848 (Schlegel, Over Elaps jamesonii Traill etc., Natura Artis Magistra 1848 : 5) and with Elaps jamesonii Traill, 1843 (Edinb. New Phil. J. 34(66) : 54) as type-species (designation by monotypy). In 1936 Brongersma (Zool. Mededeel. 19 : 136) pointed out that the generic name introduced by Schlegel was not Dendraspis but Dendroaspis, Dendraspis being no more than an invalid subsequent spelling first introduced by Duménil, 1856 (Rev. Mag. Zool. (2) 8 : 558). Since that time the correct use of this spelling is to be found more frequently in scientific publications.

3. The binomen Naja hannah Cantor, 1836 (Asiat. Research 19(1) : 187) has frequently been used as the scientific name for the Indian King-Cobra, the well-known largest species of poisonous snakes. In recent literature however we find the opinion that this species represents a separate monotypical genus, for which Ophiophagus Günther, 1864 (Rept. Brit. Ind. : 340), with Hamadryas elaps Günther, 1858 (=hannah Cantor, 1836) as type-species was consistently regarded as the valid name. In the synonymy of Hamadryas elaps, Günther (1858) quotes Naja elaps Schlegel, 1837, having misidentified the latter, which is in fact a synonym of Micropechis ikaheka (Lesson, 1830). It had been overlooked that Fitzinger, 1843 (Syst. Rept. : 28) designated Naja bungarus Schlegel, 1837 (=hannah Cantor, 1836) as type-species of the genus Dendraspis Fitzinger, 1843, so that according to the Law of Priority the correct name for the King-Cobra must be Dendraspis hannah (Cantor, 1836).

4. In contrast to the opinion of Brongersma, 1936, who states that the name Dendroaspis is to be rejected as the generic name for the ethiopian Mambas (Zool. Mededeel. 19 : 136) we conclude following the Code that Dendraspis Fitzinger, 1843, and Dendroaspis Schlegel, 1848, are not homonyms. But it seems inadvisable to replace the name Ophiophagus, a name often used in the meantime for the genus, by Dendraspis Fitzinger; the result would be permanent confusion with Dendroaspis (or its invalid emendation Dendraspis Duméril, 1856, in the old sense) not only in zoological but also in applied medical literature. Both the genera concerned even belong to the same family of elapids. Therefore it is proposed to suppress the generic name Dendraspis Fitzinger, 1843,
by use of the Commission's plenary powers in order to validate *Ophiophagus* Günther, 1864.

5. I therefore ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Dendroaspis* Fitzinger, 1843, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Dendroaspis* Schlegel, 1848 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, *Elaps jamesonii* Traill, 1843. (The date of publication (cf. Brongersma l.c.) is herewith fixed as 1848);

(b) *Ophiophagus* Günther, 1864 (gender: masculine), type-species by monotypy, *Hamadryas elaps* Günther, 1858.

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *jamesonii* Traill, 1843, as published in the binomen *Elaps jamesonii* (type-species of *Dendroaspis* Schlegel, 1848);

(b) *hannah* Cantor, 1836, as published in the binomen *Naja hannah*.

(4) to place the generic name *Dendroaspis* Fitzinger, 1843, suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.
CHILODUS MÜLLER & TROSCHEL, 1844, AND CAENOTROPUS GÜNther, 1864 (PISCES) ; PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES. Z.N.(S.) 1502

By J. R. Gery (Strasbourg, France) and J. J. Hoedeman (Zoological Museum, Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

The object of the present application is to ask the Commission to give a Ruling confirming the validity of type-designations for the genera Chilodus Müller & Troschel, 1844, and Caenotropus Günther, 1864.

1. The genus Chilodus was established in 1844 by Müller & Troschel (Synopsis generum et specierum familie Characinorum. Arch. Naturgesch. 10(1) : 85) for a South-American fish of the family Characidae s. lat. (Cypriniformes = Ostariophysli auct.). The only species included at the time of the original publication was Chilodus punctatus Müller & Troschel, 1844 (loc. cit. : 85-86).

2. The generic name Microdus was applied by Kner, 1859 (Zur Familie der Charaeinen. III. Folge der Ichthyologischen Beiträge. Erste Abtheilung. Denkschr. Akad. Wiss. Wien (Math.-natur. Kl.) 17 : 149) for a new genus of South-American fishes of the same family, to include the single species Microdus labyrinthicus Kner, 1859 (loc. cit. : 149-151).

3. According to the Rules, the action of Müller & Troschel is correct, and the generic name Chilodus is valid, taking as type-species by monotypy the species Chilodus punctatus, whereas Kner’s generic name Microdus was preoccupied by Microdus Emmons, 1857, an Elasmobranchiomorph genus.

4. Günther 1864 (Catalogue of the Fishes in the British Museum, Volume 5, Catalogue of the Physostomi : 297) established the generic name Caenotropus for a specimen from the River Capin, Amazon, identified by him as the species labyrinthicus of Kner, 1859. He also stated (in footnote) that both the genera (generic names) Chilodus and Microdus are preoccupied, thus ranging both in the synonymy of Caenotropus. Since Chilodus is mentioned first in the synonymy, and whereas Chilodus is a perfectly valid generic name, this would either (a) render Caenotropus a synonym of Chilodus ; or, preferably (b) require that the replacement of Microdus (which was indeed preoccupied) by Caenotropus be given proper status. In the latter case Caenotropus would take automatically the type-species of Microdus Kner (Microdus labyrinthicus) as its type-species.

5. The action of Günther (1864) remained without comments (to our knowledge) until Eigenmann, 1910 (Reports of the Princeton University Expeditions to Patagonia, 1896–1899, 3(4), Catalogue of the Fresh-water Fishes of Tropical and South Temperate America : 424) recognised Caenotropus Günther with type-species Microdus labyrinthicus Kner, and Chilodus Müller & Troschel with type-species Chilodus punctatus Müller & Troschel.

6. Finally the action of Travassos, 1951 (Catalogo dos generos e Subgeneros da subordem Characoides (Actinopterygii-Cypriniformes), Dusenia 2(4), 31 de julho : 279–280 (separate : 27–28)) to make Chilodus punctatus Müller & Troschel 1844, type-species of Caenotropus seems to be incorrect.

7. The International Commission is therefore asked:
(1) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Chilodus* Müller & Troschel, 1844 (gender: masculine), type-species, by monotypy, *Chilodus punctatus* Müller & Troschel, 1844;
   (b) *Caenotropus* Günther, 1864 (gender: masculine), type-species, by monotypy, through *Microdus* Kner, 1859, *Microdus labyrinthicus* Kner, 1859;
(2) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *punctatus* Müller & Troschel, 1844, as published in the binomen *Chilodus punctatus* (type-species of *Chilodus* Müller & Troschel, 1844);
   (b) *labyrinthicus* Kner, 1859, as published in the binomen *Microdus labyrinthicus* (type-species of *Caenotropus* Günther, 1864);
(3) to place the generic name *Microdus* Kner, 1859 (a junior homonym of *Microdus* Emmons, 1857) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.
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