

während *M. dubia* von Bütschli selbst als zweifelhafte und ungenügend beobachtete Art, wie bereits gesagt, bezeichnet.

Geographische Verbreitung der *Monohystera setosa* Bütschli (syn. *M. dubia* Bütschli).

Deutschland: Kieler Bucht und im Brackwasser. Main, an Wasserpflanzen, im Botanischen Garten zu Frankfurt a. M. Bütschli (1; 2). Nordsee: Insel Walcheren, Flessingen De Man (3). Ostsee: Finnischer Meerbusen. G. Schneider (5; 6). Ungarn: Plattensee v. Daday (4). Schweiz: Zürichsee G. Steiner (8). Genfer See (7; 9), Vierwaldstätter See Hofmänner.

Lausanne, 7. Juni 1913.

Literatur.

- 1) Bütschli, O., 1873, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der freilebenden Nematoden. Nova Acta. Leop. Car. Acad. Bd. XXXVI. Taf. V. fig. 26a—b. S. 65.
- 2) —, 1874, Zur Kenntnis der freilebenden Nematoden, insbesondere der des Kieler Hafens. Abhdlg. Senckenberg. Natf. Ges. Bd. IX. S. 29. Taf. II. Fig. 11a. Taf. III. Fig. 11 b.
- 3) De Man, J. G., 1888, Nématodes de la mer du Nord. Mém. Soc. zoologique de France. Tome I. p. 29. Pl. I. fig. 5.
- 4) v. Daday, E., 1897, Die freilebenden Süßwassernematoden Ungarns. Zool. Jahrbücher. Abtg. f. Syst. Bd. X. S. 95. Taf. XI. Fig. 9.
- 5) Schneider, G., 1905, Beitrag zur Kenntnis der im Uferschlamm des finnischen Meerbusens freilebenden Nematoden. Acta Soc. Fauna-Flora fennica. Bd. 27. No. 7. Tafel I.
- 6) —, 1906, Zur Kenntnis der frei im finnischen Meerbusen vorkommenden Nematoden. Zool. Anz. Bd. 29. S. 625.
- 7) Hofmänner, B., 1912, Notes préliminaires sur les Nématodes libres du Léman. Procès verbaux de la Soc. vaud. sc. nat. Séance du 3 VII. 1912.
- 8) Steiner, G., 1913, Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Tierwelt des Züricher Sees. Arch. f. Hydrobiologie u. Planktonkunde. Bd. VIII. Heft 3. 1913. S. 451. Fig. 1—3.
- 9) Hofmänner, B., 1913, Contribution à la connaissance des Nématodes libres du Léman (43 espèces, dont 5 n. sp.). Rev. suisse de zoologie Genève. Ist in Drucklegung begriffen.

II. Mitteilungen aus Museen, Instituten usw.

Report of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

By Dr. C. W. Stiles.

eingeg. 28. Mai 1913.

1)¹ During its 1913 (Monaco) session, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature has held ten executive meetings.

2) The following nine active Commissioners were present: Messrs. Allen, Blanchard, Dautzenberg, Hartert, Hoyle, Jentink, Monticelli, Stejneger, and Stiles. In addition, Messrs. K. Jordan and

¹ For convenience of reference, the paragraphs or subjects of this report are given serial numbers in parentheses, thus: (1).

the Honorable Walter Rothschild, at the invitation of the Commission, attended the meetings in an advisory capacity.

3) The following active and advisory Commissioners were not in attendance: Messrs. Apstein, Dollo, Jordan (D. S.), Ludwig, Mitchell, and F. E. Schulze.

4) Death. — It is with profound regret that the Commission reports the death of one of its members, Professor Dr. F. C. von Maehrenthal who died in 1910, very shortly after the Gratz meeting. Putting entirely aside our feeling of personal loss as insignificant in comparison with the loss that Commissioner von Maehrenthal's death means to the international zoological profession, the Commission feels that it is only just to pause a moment to recall to the members of this Congress the modest character of this man who gave nearly his entire professional career to aiding his colleagues in their more tedious labors and than whom it would be difficult to find, in the entire history of zoology, any man with a keener insight into the intricacies and complications of zoological nomenclature with the possible exception of Linnaeus and Strickland.

5) Resignations. — During the interim since the 1910 session, the Commission has received the following resignations, which are herewith reported to the Congress with the recommendation that they be accepted:

Doctor G. A. Boulenger (London), who declined to serve.

Doctor Louis Dollo (Brussels), who begged to be excused from service, on the ground of poor health.

The resignation of Professor Hubert Ludwig (Bonn) has been received, but as his term of office expires with the present Congress no formal action is necessary.

6) Advisory or temporary Commissioners. — Through the death of Dr. von Maehrenthal and the resignations of Doctors Boulenger, Dollo, and Ludwig, the Commission became reduced from 15 to 11 members. As it seemed very advisable not to permit the organization to decrease in size, and as there was no method of procedure prescribed whereby vacancies were to be filled in the interim between Congresses, the Commission, acting in the interest of the subject, invited certain gentlemen to fill the vacancies until these could be filled by the present Congress. The gentlemen in question are as follows:

Doctor P. Chalmers Mitchell, Secretary of the Zoological Society of London, was invited to serve in place of Dr. Boulenger.

Professor Kraepelin, of Hamburg, was invited to serve in place of Dr. von Maehrenthal; Dr. Kraepelin served but a short time and Professor Apstein, of Berlin, was invited to fill the vacancy.

7) Upon reaching Monaco, the Commission invited Dr. K. Jordan, Secretary of the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature, and the Honorable Walter Rothschild, to sit with the Commission in an advisory capacity and this has been done.

8) Since not a single majority vote has been determined by the gentlemen in question, and therefore their temporary membership on the Commission has in reality been equivalent to their serving simply in an advisory capacity, the legality of the action taken can not be questioned on the ground that these gentlemen were not formally elected by the Congress. At the same time, as a matter of formality the Commission at present asks that its

action in respect to the vacancies be confirmed by the Congress by the adoption of the following resolution:

9) Resolved, That the informal action taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to filling vacancies be approved and ratified by this Ninth Congress and be made formal.

10) In order to provide for similar contingencies in the future, the Commission recommends to the Congress the adoption of the following resolution:

11) Resolved, That in case of vacancies in the Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by death or resignation during the interim between Congresses, said Commission is empowered to fill said vacancies temporarily, with the understanding that the appointees shall hold office until the vacancies in question are filled by the next succeeding Congress.

12) Expiration of term of service. — The term of service expires at the close of this (1913, Monaco) Congress for the following five members of the class of 1913:

J. A. Allen, of New York; Ph. Dautzenberg, of Paris; Hubert Ludwig, of Bonn; F. C. von Maehrenthal, deceased, of Berlin, succeeded temporarily by K. Apstein, of Berlin; W. E. Hoyle, of Cardiff.

13) Nominations. — In accordance with custom obtaining since the Cambridge (1898) Congress, the Commission, after careful consideration as to details of the work, of countries, languages, specialities, etc., herewith has the honor to submit nominations to fill the seven vacancies that will exist upon adjournment of the present Congress. These nominations are:

Class of 1919: Professor C. Apstein, of Berlin, Germany, (Professor von Maehrenthal's successor in the office of *Das Tierreich*) vice Prof. Louis Dollo, of Brussels, resigned.

Professor Roule (of the Paris Museum) vice G. A. Boulenger, resigned.

Class of 1922: Dr. J. A. Allen, of the American Museum of Natural History, N. Y., vice J. A. Allen, term expired.

Ph. Dautzenberg, of Paris, vice Ph. Dautzenberg, term expired.

Prof. H. J. Kolbe, of the Berlin Museum, vice Prof. Hubert Ludwig, of Bonn, term expired.

Dr. Wm. Evans Hoyle, Director of the National Museum of Wales, at Cardiff, vice W. E. Hoyle, term expired.

Dr. Karl Jordan, Secretary of the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature, vice F. C. von Maehrenthal, deceased and term expired.

14) Proposition to enlarge the Commission. — This Commission originally consisted of five members, elected at the Leyden Congress in 1895. Upon recommendation of the original Commission, the Cambridge (1898) Congress increased the number of commissioners to fifteen. The present Commission is of the opinion that it is now in the interest of the subject to increase the membership from 15 to 18 with the understanding that the three new commissioners shall be so arranged that one joins the Class of 1916, one that of 1919, and one that of 1922. The Commission is led to this recommendation by several reasons, notably by the three following: 1) there exists at present an excellent opportunity to cooperate in work on the nomenclature of Entomology and the situation is such that the Com-

mission desires the services of two additional entomologists in this connection; 2) the work of the Commission has increased to such an extent that it seems in the interest of the subject to have three more men available for service; 3) the Commission feels that it is desirable to return to its former policy of having a paleontologist among its members and in view of the present amount of work before us this will be difficult unless authority is given for the appointment of the additional men requested. If the Congress authorizes the three additional men, the Commission is prepared to make the nominations required, as follows:

Class of 1916: Dr. Henry Skinner of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia.

Class of 1919: Dr. Geza Horváth, of Budapest.

Class of 1922: Dr. F. A. Bather, Assistant Keeper of Geology, British Museum of Natural History, London.

15) Offers of Cooperation. — It is a pleasure to report that two nomenclatorial committees have, since the last Congress, made overtures to the Commission to cooperate in work.

One offer of cooperation has come from the Committee on Nomenclature of the American Paleontological Society and consisting of Wm. H. Dall, F. H. Knowlton, and S. W. Williston (secretary).

Another offer of cooperation has come from the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature.

16) In this connection it may be stated that a working arrangement has been made between the Secretary of the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature and the Secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in accordance with which all questions on Entomological Nomenclature will be referred to the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature for study as to premises and for report before any opinion on them is issued by the International Commission, and attention is invited to the fact that the Secretary of the Committee on Entomological Nomenclature has been nominated for membership in the International Commission. Whether the time will ever come that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature will consist chiefly or exclusively of the secretaries of various international committees representing special groups remains to be seen.

17) By-Laws. — The Commission has made no amendment to its by-laws since 1910, but attention may be invited to the fact that the President is the presiding officer and that the Secretary is the administrative officer. If, therefore, any person desires to submit propositions to the entire Commission, time will be saved if they are sent directly to the Secretary, whose permanent address is: Hygienic Laboratory, U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.

18) In order to avoid misunderstanding in the future, attention may be invited to the fact that the Commission does not feel called upon to consider any communication addressed to it only through the medium of journals or the proceedings of learned societies. To insure consideration of communications the latter may best be sent direct to the Secretary and if their receipt is not acknowledged within a reasonable time the conclusion may safely be drawn that they were never received.

19) Official list of most frequently used zoological names. —

The Gratz Congress adopted a recommendation by the Commission to the effect that an attempt be made to establish, on basis of the International Rules of Nomenclature, an "Official List of Most Frequently Used Zoological Names". In accordance with this vote, the Secretary invited a number of workers to form themselves into special committees and to cooperate in the undertaking, and he submitted to several of these committees lists of names for study.

20) The vigorous protests received from various sources were not foreseen. Some zoologists protested against the proposed list on the ground that this was the beginning of a list of "Nomina conservanda" to which they would not submit; others demanded that the Secretary agree that the list be made without reference to the Law of Priority; some practically challenged the right of the Commission to undertake the work; others flatly refused to cooperate; some agreed to cooperate and did so; others promised aid that has thus far not been forthcoming.

21) In view of the great dissatisfaction with the proposed list, the Secretary finally decided that the wisest plan would be to submit to the Commission only a comparatively small number of names as a sample of what was proposed and to postpone further action on the matter until the Commission might discuss the situation and lay its views before the Congress for further consideration.

22) The Commission submits herewith a sample of what it had in mind in suggesting the Official List. This consists of an accepted list of 40 generic names which appear from our present knowledge to be valid under the Code and a rejected list of names which appear to be unavailable under the Code.

23) The Commission recommends that this be taken as a beginning and that names be very gradually and carefully selected to be added to the list. It will, however, be impossible to build out this nomenclator unless cooperation is had from systematists in the different groups. With proper cooperation, however, the Commission is persuaded that 100 to 500 accepted names and as many or more rejected names might be added to the list every three years and that in this way not only would we obtain a list of established names for the genera most frequently referred to but that many useless names could be definitely eliminated from literature. The Commission does not desire, however, to continue this very time-consuming labor unless there is a very distinct desire on the part of zoologists to have the work done and a willingness to cooperate in the undertaking.

24) The names suggested as samples for adoption are distributed as follows: Trematoda, 11; Cestoda, 5; Nematoda, 7; Gordiacea, 2; Acanthocephala, 1; Arachnoidea, 8; Diptera, 6. Practically all of these come into consideration not only in zoological but also in medical and veterinary literature.

25) Public notice has been given that these names would be called up for vote at this (1913) meeting of the Commission and ample opportunity has been afforded for the presentation of objections. No objection to any name in the list as now submitted has been presented to the Commission.

26) In addition to the list of 40 names submitted for action at the present meeting the Commission submits a list of 169 generic names of birds, with their authorities, references, genotypes, and method of type fixation,

based on the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature and unanimously agreed upon by a special committee of professional ornithologists upon which the following gentlemen served: J. A. Allen (New York), E. Hartert (Tring), C. E. Hellmayr (Munich), H. G. Oberholser (Washington), C. W. Richmond, secretary (Washington), R. Ridgway (Washington), L. Stejneger (Washington), and W. Stone (Philadelphia).

27) It is the intention of the Commission to send this list of names to press in the very near future and to give ample opportunity to the zoological profession to offer objection to any of the names in question. Shortly after January 1, 1914, the Commission contemplates announcing the fact whether or not objection has been raised and will issue an Opinion regarding the adoption of the List. This Opinion would then be laid before the Tenth International Congress for confirmation.

28) A third list, consisting of 430 names "to be rejected", is submitted by the Commission. These names also have been made public with invitation to zoologists to present arguments showing why any of said names should not be rejected. This list is to be interpreted simply as follows: Word has reached the Commission in one form or another that these names are absolute homonyms and therefore (Art. 34) unavailable; under these circumstances the Commission will consider the names in question as still-born unless evidence is presented that the premises now before the Commission are erroneous; further, the Commission suggests to authors that they cooperate in the work by either correcting the premises before the Commission or by discontinuing to use the names. The "To be rejected" list consists thus far of 430 generic names, distributed as follows: Trematoda, 22; Nematoda, 40; Gordiacea, 1; Acanthocephala, 2; Diptera, 92; Mammalia, 273.

29) Many other names, supposedly valid or supposedly unavailable, are still under consideration either by the Commission or by the several special sub-committees, but no further work in this line is contemplated unless the present Congress distinctly expresses its desire to have the labor continued.

30) In the opinion of the Commission, work of this nature is distinctly constructive and promises the ultimate possibility of an international and authoritative list of the names that should be applied to the most commonly cited 5000 to 10000 zoological genera.

46) Presumable permanency of the Official List. — That the question as to the presumable permanency of an Official List based upon the Law of Priority may arise in the minds of many zoologists is to be taken as self-understood. This question may be answered as follows:

47) Changes in names dependent upon changes in conceptions of classification can not be foreseen from one generation to the next and any plan for nomenclature that ignores this point makes promises that can not count upon being fulfilled. The following statistics, however, worked out by Lester F. Ward (1895), give an indication of the changes that may reasonably be expected to occur upon nomenclatorial grounds:

48) By taking the first 50 genera given in the American Ornithologists' Union check-list, it is found that in only 5 cases did the generic name remain unchanged from 1859 to 1886. Thus prior to the establishment of the

names on basis of the Law of Priority, 45 of the 50 names (or 90 per cent) changed from 1859 to 1886. From 1886 (when the names were established on basis of the Law of Priority) to 1895, not one of the 50 names was changed. The complete list embraced 322 genera and about 1000 species and subspecies. In the 10 years following the publication of the list (based upon Priority), it was found necessary to change, by action of the Law of Priority, the names of 3 genera, 1 subgenus, 3 species, and 1 subspecies.

49) The Commission invites the serious attention of the Congress to these very remarkable results obtained by the Code of the A. O. U. If our International Code is properly safeguarded against changes taken hastily and without due deliberation as to the many complications involved, it may reasonably be expected that our International Official List will undergo very few changes upon nomenclatorial grounds, but this Commission can not possibly foresee what changes must be adopted during the next 10 to 100 years because of unforeseen changes in conceptions of classification.

50) The Commission has the honor to request definite instructions from the Congress as to whether or not it is the desire to have this list continued.

51) Code of Ethics. — The Commission permits itself to invite attention to the fact that there exists in the zoological profession no recognized and generally adopted Code of Ethics that is comparable to the Code of Ethics existing in the medical profession of certain countries. Without presuming to be the arbiter of points of general ethics, the Commission is persuaded that there is one phase of this subject upon which it is competent to speak and in reference to this point it suggests to the Congress the adoption of the following resolution:

52) Whereas, Experience has shown that authors, not infrequently, inadvertently publish as new designations of genera or species names that are preoccupied, and

Whereas, Experience has also shown that some other authors discovering the homonymy have published new names for the later homonyms in question, be it therefore

Resolved, That when it is noticed by any zoologist that the generic or the specific name published by any living author as new is in reality a homonym and therefore unavailable under Articles 34 and 36 of the Rules on Nomenclature, the proper action, from a standpoint of professional etiquette is for said person to notify said author of the facts of the case and to give said author ample opportunity to propose a substitute name.

53) Date of Author's reprints or separata. — Among the cases recently submitted to the Commission for Opinion is one that involves a somewhat unusual point in respect to reprints. Under the present rules there is no article which permits the Commission to rule that all separata are of the same date as, or of a later date than, the original publication, although such a proposal has now been submitted as an amendment to the rules and will be considered in time for the Tenth Congress. In the meantime, the Commission has instructed the Secretary to report the following resolutions to the Congress:

54) Resolved, That the Commission, under unanimous suspension of the By-Laws, if need be, recommends to the Congress the adoption of the following resolution, namely,

55) Whereas the widespread custom of issuing reprints in advance of the appearance of the original publication gives rise to much unnecessary confusion in nomenclature, be it —

56) Resolved, That the Ninth International Zoological Congress expresses its disapproval of this custom and appeals to editors to discontinue it, and further, be it

57) Resolved, That editors be requested to give on each edition of all publications the exact date (year, month and day) of issue of said edition.

58) Opinions. — At the Boston (1907) Congress, the Commission reported upon Opinions 1 to 5 inclusive; at the Gratz (1910) Congress it reported upon Opinions 6 to 28 inclusive; at the present Congress, it herewith reports the summaries of Opinions 29 to 56 inclusive. The full opinions have been published by the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. as Publications nos. 1938, 1989, 2013, 2060; no. 2169, containing Opinions 52 to 56 inclusive, is now in proof and will soon be issued. Attention is invited to a correction of Opinion 31 published on page 89, Publication no. 2060.

The Commission regrets to hear that some zoologists claim to have been unable to find copies of these Opinions and desires to state that they are sent to 1100 libraries, to the members of the International Congress, and to a limited number of specialists. Only the summaries are issued in the proceedings of the Congress. If any member of the Congress fails to receive the full Opinions, he is invited to notify the Secretary of the Commission.

At its present session the Commission has taken a preliminary or a final vote upon several additional opinions and it now has under consideration about 15 other cases that have been submitted to it for study.

29) *Pachynathus* vs. *Pachygnathus*. — On basis of argument in Opinion 26. and in view of the prior name *Pachygnathus*, 1834. Arach., the Commission is of the opinion that *Pachynathus* Swainson, 1839, should be suppressed.

30) Swainson's Bird Genera of 1827. — Swainson's bird genera in the Philosophical Magazine of 1827 are monotypic, and according to Article 30 (c) the species mentioned are types of their respective genera. Therefore, these types must take precedence over the designated types of Swainson which occurred later, in the Zoological Journal of 1827.

31) *Columbina* vs. *Chaemepelia*. — In 1840 Gray designated as type of *Columbina* Spix, *Columba passerina* Linn. As this species is not one of the original species of *Columbina* Spix, Gray's type designation is not valid and *Columbina*² remains without a designated type. The valid type of *Chaemepelia* Swainson, is *Columba passerina* Linn., designated by Gray, 1841².

32) The Type of the Genus *Sphex*. — On basis of the premises submitted, *sabulosa* is the type of *Sphex* Linnaeus, 1758.

² Foot-note by Stejneger. — At the time of Opinion 31, the second edition of Gray's List of the Genera of Birds, published 1841, had not been seen by the writer, nor was the point brought out clearly in the documents submitted, and hence escaped notice, that *Columbina strepitans* Spix was designated by Gray, 1841, p. 75, as the type of *Columbina*. This action of Gray is undoubtedly valid and the type of *Columbina* is therefore *C. strepitans* Spix. In view of this fact, brought to the attention of the Commission by Mr. W. E. Clyde Todd, Opinion 31 is hereby changed accordingly, and will be submitted to the members of the Commission for approval.

33) The Type of the Genus *Rutilus* Rafinesque, 1820. — *Cyprinus rutilus* is the type of *Rutilus* Rafinesque, 1820. *Rutilus plargyrus* is the type of *Plargyrus* Rafinesque 1820.

34) *Aeshna* vs. *Aeschna*. — Since evidence of the derivation of the word is not contained in the original publication, the original spelling of *Aeshna* should be preserved.

35) Types of Genera of Binary but not Binominal Authors. — In determining the type of a genus, the selection must be confined to species included under the generic name in question at the time of its original publication, regardless of the fact whether they were named binominally or not. If, however, a generic name is distinctly proposed as a substitute for an earlier generic name, the species of the latter are to be taken into consideration.

36) Emendation of *Trioxocera*, *Dioxocera* and *Pentoxocera*. — The Commission is of the opinion that the original publication of *Trioxocera*, *Dioxocera* and *Pentoxocera* make it evident that an error of transcription (seu transliteration) is present, and that these names should be emended to read *Trioxocera*, *Dioxocera* and *Pentoxocera*.

37) Shall the Genera of Brisson's »Ornithologia«, 1760, be accepted? — Brisson's (1760) generic names of birds are available under the Code.

38) On the Status of the Latin Names in Tunstall, 1771. — The Latin names in Tunstall's *Ornithologia Britannica*, 1771, are available in so far as they are identifiable through the bibliographic, page, and illustration references given, or through the English names quoted from Pennant, 1768, or through the French names quoted from Brisson, 1760.

39) On the Status of the Latin Names in Cuvier, 1800. — The Latin names in the systematic tables given in Cuvier, 1800 (*Leçons d'anatomie comparée*), are available in so far as they are identifiable through the bibliographic references given on page xix of the introduction.

40) *Salmo eriox* vs. *S. trutta* and *S. fario*; *Heniochus acuminatus* vs. *H. macrolepidotus*. — On basis of the premises submitted, it is not necessary to substitute *eriox* in place of *fario* or *trutta*; Cuvier's (1817) selection of *macrolepidotus* has precedence over the selection of *acuminatus* by Jordan & Seale, 1908.

41) *Athlennes* vs. *Ablennes*. — As the original publication shows an evident lapsus calami, the name *Athlennes* should be emended to read *Ablennes*.

42) The type of *Carapus* Rafinesque, 1810. — *Carapus* Rafinesque, 1810, is monotypic, type *Gymnotus acus* Linnaeus.

43) On the Status of Genera the Type Species of Which are cited without Additional Description. — The characters given for *Telecognus*, *Isoplatia*, *Alloderma* and *Aphobetoideus* cover the genera and the type species, and the generic and specific names are published in the sense of the Code.

44) *Leptocephalus* vs. *Conger*. — *Leptocephalus* Gronovius, 1763 and Gmelin 1789, type *morrisii*, takes precedence over any later generic name for which the adult stage of this animal has been designated as type.

45) The Type of *Syngnathus* Linnaeus, 1758. — So far as one can judge from the premises submitted, the type of *Syngnathus* Linnaeus, 1758, has never been definitely designated, and there is no objection to designating, as such, the species *acus* Linnaeus to accord with general custom and convenience.

46) Status of Genera for which no species was Distinctly Named in the Original Publication. — In genera published without mention, by name, of any species, no species is available as genotype unless it can be recognized from the original generic publication; if only one species is involved, the generic description is equivalent to the publication »*Xus albus*, n. g., n. sp.«; if several species are referred to but not mentioned by name, one of these species must be taken as type; if (as in *Aclastus* Foerster (1868) it is not evident from the original publication of the genus how many or what species are involved, the genus contains all of the species of the world which

would come under the generic description as originally published, and the first species published in connection with the genus (as *Aclastus rufipes* Ashmead, 1902) becomes ipso facto the type.

47) *Carcharias*, *Carcharhinus* and *Carcharodon*. — *Carcharias* Rafinesque, 1810, is monotypic, type *Carcharias taurus* Rafinesque.

48) The Status of Certain Generic Names of Birds Published by Brehm in Isis, 1828 and 1830. — In so far as the names in question are dependent solely upon a vernacular name, the generic names of Brehm, 1828 and 1830, are nomina nuda, and are not entitled to citation from the dates in question.

49) *Siphonophora asclepiadifolii* vs. *Nectarophora asclepiadis*. — On basis of the data submitted, *asclepiadifolii* Thomas, 1879, stands in preference to *asclepiadis* Cowen, 1895.

50) *Aphis aquilegiae flava* vs. *Aphis trirhoda*. — Since the name *Aphis aquilegiae flava* Kittel, 1827, is polynominal and is not available under the Code, *Aphis trirhoda* Walker, 1849, is the correct name for this species.

51) Shall the names of Museum Calonnianum, 1797, be accepted? — The Museum Calonnianum, 1797, is not to be accepted as basis for any nomenclatorial work.

52) *Scnotilus corporalis* vs. *Scnotilus bullaris*. — On the premises submitted, *corporalis* has priority over *bullaris*. It is not feasible for the Commission to issue an opinion upon the question: What constitutes an adequate description? The citation of the type locality of a species is not sufficient to establish a name under Art. 25a of the Code. If specific characters are given in addition to the type locality, the type locality becomes a part of the description and is to be considered as an important element in determining the identity of species.

53) *Halicampus koilomatodon* vs. *Halicampus grayi*. — The specific name *grayi* Kaup, 1856, takes priority over *koilomatodon* Bleeker, »about 1865«.

54) *Phoxinus* Rafinesque vs. *Phoxinus* Agassiz. — The genera *Dobula*, *Phoxinus*, and *Alburnus* date from Rafinesque, 1820. The claim is made by Jordan & Evermann, 1896, that *Phoxinus* Agassiz, 1835, is identical with *Phoxinus* Rafinesque, 1820, therefore they claim to have recognized *Phoxinus*, 1820. This claim is to be considered correct until proved to be incorrect, and *Cyprinus phoxinus* is the type both of *Phoxinus*, 1820, and of *Phoxinus*, 1835. If it is claimed that *Alburnus*, 1820, is identical with *Alburnus*, 1840, *Cyprinus alburnus* becomes the type of *Alburnus* 1820.

55) The type of the genus *Ondatra* Link. — On basis of the premises submitted, *zibethicus* is the type of *Ondatra* Link.

56) The type of *Filaria* Müller, 1787. — Müller (1787, pp. 64 and 70) cites, clearly through error, the same figure (plate 9, fig. 1) of Redi for *Ascaris renalis* Gmel. and *Filaria martis* Gmel. Gmelin (1790 a, 3032 and 3040) continued this lapsus. Rudolphi (1809a, 69) recognized and corrected the error since his time *Filaria martis* has been consistently distinguished from *Ascaris renalis*, and no ground is now present for not recognizing Rudolphi's correction of Müller's lapsus. Accordingly, *F. martis* stands as type of *Filaria*, and *Filaria* is not to be substituted for *Diocetophyunc*, *Diocetophyma*, or *Eustrongylus*.

59) The Opinions have now been a policy for six years. They have been received by various Zoologists in different ways. Some of our colleagues in the profession are urging us to continue this policy, on the ground that it is the logical method of settling difficult questions. Others are opposed to the policy and one man has even practically challenged our right to issue the series.

60) This Commission is well aware of the fact that in issuing 56 opinions we have not been able to decide on both sides of every question and thus to please every person.

61) It may not be out of place to remark that these Opinions have

recently probably been the greatest factor in pressing to the fore the Law of Priority and in producing discontent. Formerly, so long as two authors could not agree upon a given point of nomenclature, each followed his own interpretation. If one of these authors now submits the case to the Commission, an Opinion is rendered which, of course, has not the force of law, but which nevertheless is a strong moral support to one side of the controversy in question. Experience has however shown that instances are not lacking when the Commission by giving its opinion has drawn upon itself the fire which in earlier days would have been directed to the individual worker in whose favor the opinion happens to be given. And it has come about that the Commission has not been permitted to remain ignorant of the fact that it has perhaps made fewer friends than enemies in its endeavor to conform to the wishes of our colleagues to settle cases for them.

62) The Commission does not consider that in rendering these Opinions it is placing itself under any obligations whatever to zoologists for the privilege of doing so much work for other people, and is perfectly willing to discontinue the series. In continuing to give Opinions, however, the Commission can not be expected to depart from the Code and to make exceptions in order to please individual workers. If the Congress is not satisfied with the results, it will be an easy matter for the Congress to say so.

63) The Commission as at present constituted feels it proper, however, to remind zoologists that in the performance of our duties we are not supposed to take into consideration any personal preferences or any local, factional, or personal quarrels — such as have actually been presented to us as if they were valid nomenclatorial argument.

64) Increasing Interest in Nomenclature. — Probably at no time in the history of Zoology has there been a more wide-spread interest in the subject of nomenclature than exists at present. This interest is probably due to several factors, one of which is the increased sense of necessity or at least desirability for international uniformity in use of technical names. As authors increase in number and attempt to monograph various groups the lack of uniformity in the use of names is brought home to them, and no matter what policy they may try to follow they usually find it necessary to change some of the names more or less current in their group. Under existing rules and under all standard codes since 1845, and in spirit at least since the Linnaean Code of 1751, the Law of Priority has in general been taken as fundamental criterion in deciding certain classes of the changes, and in fact so many points have been made upon basis of this Law that it has aroused opposition from certain quarters.

65) In this connection it is interesting to note that if an author changes from *Amoeba* to *Ameba*, or from *Amoeba vulgaris* to *A. princeps*, or if he makes a change of name and gives as his reason the fact that the rejected name does not please him, or even if he divides an old collective genus into 40 or 50 new genera, introducing 39 or 49 new names and retains the old collective generic name for the indefinite residuum, his action is not very likely to produce any particular indignation, but if any author consistently applies the Law of Priority, thus attempting to settle all cases objectively, he becomes what one author is pleased to call a »fanatic priority ruler«.

66) As authors are increasing in number and as publications become

so numerous, both the application of the Law of Priority and the protests against the Law increase.

67) The Commission is distinctly gratified if its efforts have contributed in even a small degree to the present increased interest in the subject. It may, however, be permitted to invite attention to three phases of the present status of the subject which are somewhat disquieting.

68) 1. Intemperate language. — Whether or not it be an actual fact, appearances to that effect exist that if one author changes or corrects the names used by another writer, the latter seems inclined to take the change as a personal offense. The explanation of this fact (or appearance, as the case may be) is not entirely clear. If one person corrects the grammar of another, this action seems to be interpreted as a criticism upon the good breeding or education of the latter person. Nomenclature has been called 'the grammar of science', and possibly there is some in-born feeling that changes in nomenclature involve a reflection upon one's education, culture, and breeding. Too frequently there follows a discussion in which one or the other author so far departs from the paths of diplomatic discussion, that he seems to give more or less foundation to the view that there is something in his culture subject to criticism. It is with distinct regret that the Commission notices the tendency to sarcasm and intemperate language so noticeable in discussions which should be not only of the most friendly nature, especially since a thorough mutual understanding is so valuable to an agreement, but which are complicated and rendered more difficult of results by every little departure from those methods adopted by professional gentlemen.

69) In the opinion of the Commission the tendency to enter into public polemics over matters which educated and refined professional gentlemen might so easily settle in friendly and diplomatic correspondence is distinctly unfavorable to a settlement of the nomenclatorial cases for which a solution is sought. It may be assumed that the vast majority of zoologists agree with the Commission in desiring results rather than polemics, and the Commission ventures to suggest that results may be obtained more easily by the utmost consideration for the usual rules of courtesy when discussing the views of others.

70) 2. Education in Nomenclature. — It may safely be asserted that comparatively few zoologists upon beginning their independent professional career have even a general idea of the subject of nomenclature, for the reason that zoological grammar (namely, zoological nomenclature) is not usually taught in courses leading to the bachelor's, the master's, or the doctor's degree. Without wishing to emphasize the point unduly, the Commission ventures to suggest that it would be in the interest of harmony if at least the elementary rudiments of the subject were taught more generally to students preparing themselves for a career as professional zoologists.

71) 3. The immensity of the task before us. — Despite the quite generally increased interest shown in the subject of nomenclature, there are some grounds for disquiet in the fact that relatively so few workers seem to grasp the immensity of the task involved in introducing harmony of system among so many different groups and in bringing about satisfactory conditions among so many hundreds of thousands of technical names scattered over so many different publications written or edited in so many instances by workers who, despite their erudition in respect to their subject,

were so to speak not exactly grammatical — or at least rhetorical — when it came to their technical names.

72) That present conditions are to be settled in a day or in a few years is not to be expected. The transitional period between the lack of uniformity in the past and the hoped for uniformity of the future will last at least one entire generation, and to our generation falls the pleasure or the misfortune (according to one's point of view) of undertaking the extensive and distinctly altruistic duty of saving future generations of scientific workers from the dangerous inheritance of chaotic nomenclature that threatens them.

73) Stability in all zoological names during our generation is not in the dreams of the members of this Commission, which at your request undertook 18 years ago a most trying, most thankless, and very extensive task, for which the only reward in its successful accomplishment exists in the thought that our work is sacrifice.

74) That many of our colleagues should differ with us in point of view, does not disquiet us, but it is a matter of some misgiving to us that some of our colleagues are (or at least seemingly are) of the opinion that the difficulties at hand are to be settled so easily and in a few years.

75) The transitional period will be mentioned again in connection with the reference to the Law of Priority.

76) Whatever the outcome of the present situation, the Commission desires to express its gratification of the fact that, judged from the various postal card votes that have recently been taken, many persons are today are hearing of the rules of nomenclature who probably rarely if ever heard of them before and many others are taking an active interest who formerly ignored the subject. At the same time the feeling that has been exhibited in some instances leads the Commission to the view that the present occasion is one that calls for cool and calm deliberation rather than for attempts to obtain majorities in postal card votes, for surely the quiet deliberations of a few representatives selected because of their long experience in the intricacies of a very intricate subject are more likely to reduce confusion than is the conclusion of a large number of persons, voting upon a subject perhaps by mail and assuredly with less careful deliberation.

77) This latter point was clearly recognized in the Cambridge (England) meeting when the Commission was not, because of a lack of unanimity in its report, even accorded a place on the program to present the rules, and again in the Berlin Congress when the Commission was urged to keep the subject of nomenclature out of the general meetings by reporting only upon propositions agreed upon by unanimous vote in commission.

78) The Relations of the Commission to the Congress. — Certain letters and certain published criticisms seem to indicate more or less clearly that there is considerable misunderstanding in regard to the relationship of the Commission to the Congress. In the hope of clearing up certain points and thus in the hope of a better understanding, the Commission ventures to give a brief statement bearing on this subject.

79) In 1889 and 1892, at the Paris and the Moscow Congresses, a Code of Zoological Nomenclature was discussed and adopted.

80) In 1895, at the Leyden Congress, a desire was expressed by one of the German delegates to have all codes submitted to a comparative study and to have the results presented to the next Congress. As a result, a

Commission of five members was appointed to carry out this task. This Commission worked for three years and was prepared to present its report to the Cambridge Congress of 1898, but because of the fact that this report was not unanimous on all points, the Commission was refused a place on the program for the presentation of its conclusions as to the rules. The Commission was, however, increased to 15 members in the hope of reaching more satisfactory results in its vote, and upon motion the general session voted that all propositions that were to be reported upon at any given Congress were to be in the hands of the Commission at least one year prior to the meeting of the Congress.

81) After another period of 3 years work, during which the enlarged commission had to restudy the entire report of the original commission, the former met at Berlin in 1901. Before its report was completed conferences were held with quite a number of the more prominent members of the Congress. During these conferences the Commission was given very distinctly to understand that the Congress would not receive any report unless it was unanimous. As one prominent German member of the Congress stated in effect: 'It is the duty of the Commission to become unanimous in its vote: give us a definite set of rules, good, bad, or indifferent, but be unanimous in your report, and after you give us the rules, see that they are carried out.' The words of the prominent German savant were a fair reflection of the feeling we found at the Berlin meeting, so far as the Secretary of the Commission could discover.

82) Unfortunately the Commission could not agree upon all points, and after many conferences, it finally suggested to the Congress the proposition that those portions of the rules upon which the Commission was unanimous should be accepted, and that all other portions be referred back to the Commission. This motion, suggested in the general session, prevailed.

83) After its experience at Cambridge and Berlin the Commission was indeed not inclined again to repeat its action of preparing for the Congress (as it did at Cambridge) any proposition unless all of its members present at the Congress were unanimously agreed upon it. In order to make this point certain the Commission adopted at the Berne Congress the principle of reporting recommendations in regard to changes in the rules, only when the vote upon them was unanimously in the affirmative. Since the Berne Congress this plan has, in the interest of conservation, been strictly adhered to. From the Berlin Congress in 1901 until the present Congress, no section on nomenclature has been provided by the Program Committee and the Commission has endeavored to meet this situation by holding an open meeting of the Commission which all persons interested in nomenclature were invited to attend.

84) The history of the Commission has clearly demonstrated that the Congress has thus far desired not to have its general meetings turned into open discussions on questions of nomenclature, but rather to have nomenclatorial discussions confined to sections and commissions and nomenclatorial questions decided in committee.

85) If at present there is a change of desire on the part of the Congress and if the Congress wishes these very technical and complex matters discussed in the General Sessions, the Commission would rejoice at the more general interest in nomenclature as evidenced by such a desire, but at the

same time it is constrained to state that nomenclature is a subject that requires quiet deliberation rather than formal debate, and, further that to throw open the general meetings of this Congress as a forum for this exceedingly dry and complicated subject will be not only to jeopardize the success of future congresses, but, since this plan is not in accord with the plan under which many zoologists elected to follow the international rules a grave question arises as to following such a policy.

86. Amendments to the »Règles internationales de la nomenclature zoologique«. — There have been fifteen series of amendments submitted to the Commission which has been in session since Friday, March 22, studying the various suggestions, giving hearings, etc. For instance, a special hearing was given both to Professor Brauer and to Doctor Poche for presentation of any arguments or points of view they might desire to submit in connection with the proposed amendments in which they were especially interested.

87. A somewhat embarrassing situation presented itself because of the unusually early date of the Congress, but a valid parliamentary method was suggested under which it became possible to consider all of the propositions submitted.

88. Departing from the usual custom, the Secretary had published in the 'Zoologischer Anzeiger', Nov. 26, 1912, and March 11, 1913, all propositions that had reached him and in addition several propositions that were known to him by fact of their publication.

89. Under the By-Laws adopted by the Commission, and published for general information in the last report, the Commission proceeds as follows: Under Art. IV, Section 1 (a) the Commission reports to the Congress 'Recommendations involving any alteration of the Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique, but no such recommendation is to be reported unless it has first received a majority (8) vote of the Commission and the unanimous vote of all Commissioners present at the meeting'.

(Schluß folgt.)

III. Personal-Notizen.

Münster.

Für das Fach der Zoologie habilitierte sich in Münster Dr. Hubert Erhard.



ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Zoologischer Anzeiger](#)

Jahr/Year: 1913

Band/Volume: [42](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Stiles Charles Wardell

Artikel/Article: [Mitteilungen aus Museen, Instituten usw. 418-432](#)