

6. Notes on Rotatorian Nomenclature.

By H. K. HARRING, Washington.

eingeg. 5. April 1914.

In a recent paper¹ de Beauchamp devotes a considerable amount of space to a rather severe criticism of my "Synopsis of the Rotatoria". While public discussion of questions pertaining to zoological nomenclature is as a rule unprofitable, I feel that a reply is necessary in this case, as all of the arguments advanced by de Beauchamp are founded on erroneous interpretations of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature and, if allowed to pass unchallenged, may mislead others unfamiliar with the subject and the facts.

From what is said (p. 293) concerning *Furcularia* Lamarck it appears that de Beauchamp considers the type-designations still open to argument. This is in opposition to Art. 30 of the Code (as amended at the 7th Int. Congr. Zool., Boston 1907), sect. II g: "If an author, in publishing a genus with more than one valid species, fails to designate (see *a*) or indicate (see *b*) its type, any subsequent author may select the type, and such designation is not subject to change (Type by subsequent designation)".

In regard to synonymic citations, de Beauchamp seems not to know the universally accepted rule: When an author claims to have recognized an earlier species, by citing it as a synonym, this assertion is to be accepted as correct, unless the earlier species can be shown to be a different and valid species. Thus, in the case of *Cercaria forcipata* and *Cercaria catellina*, it is absolutely immaterial whether de Beauchamp can recognize these species or not; all the "recognition" needed was given by Ehrenberg, when he cited Müller's names as synonyms. Consequently, whether an author carries the synonymy of *Diglena forcipata* back to Ehrenberg or to Müller, the correct name of the species is in any case *Diglena forcipata* (Müller). If de Beauchamp can establish *Cercaria forcipata* and *C. catellina* as valid species, he may give new specific names to Ehrenberg's forms, but not till then.

A little reflection should convince any unbiased person that without this rule, which was accepted long before there was any thought of a formal code, any stability in nomenclature would be impossible. If any author had the privilege of accepting or rejecting as much of the

¹ Beauchamp, P. de, Documents sur les Notommatidés à mastax forcé avec quelques remarques sur la nomenclature des Rotifères. Bull. Soc. Zool. France, vol. 38. p. 291—301, 326—335. 1914.

synonymy of a certain species as suited him, by the subterfuge of "declaring it unrecognizable", priority would be a mockery.

The treatment of the genus *Diglena* Ehrenberg, 1830, proposed by de Beauchamp is not justified by the Code. As he states, *Diglena* was established for *Diglena catellina* = *Cercaria catellina* Müller and *Diglena aurita* n. sp. As the latter is an absolute nomen nudum, the genus is monotypic with *Diglena catellina* (Müller) as type. Regardless of the validity of the type species, the genus still dates from 1830; the proposal to select the type from species not included until 1832 is prohibited by Art. 30 (as amended at the Boston Congress), sect. II e: "The following species are excluded from consideration in selecting types of genera: (a) Species which were not included under the generic name at the time of its original publication".

The genus *Encentrum* Ehrenberg is rejected by de Beauchamp, apparently because he considers it tied to *Distemma* on account of being originally published as a subgenus of the latter. According to Art. 6 of the Code generic and subgeneric names are of equal value, so that, regardless of the final disposition of *Distemma*, *Encentrum* must stand on its own merits. Applying Opinion 46, Int. Comm. Zool. Nomenclature (Status of genera for which no species was distinctly named in the original publication), this genus is one of the "... instances in which an author has described a genus, clearly giving generic characters, but failing to give either a separate description or figure (illustration) of the species he studied, and from the original publication it is not clear how many species (none of which he mentioned by name) were included in the genus". The decision of the Commission is: "... if it is not evident from the original publication of the genus how many or what species are involved, the genus contains all 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 becomes ipso facto the type". From this it is evident that, no matter how vague and all-embracing the original definition of the genus, when a valid species, which can not be shown to be excluded by such definition, is cited with the generic name *Encentrum*, this becomes valid. As no species has ever been published in connection with the genus until the type designation in the Synopsis, it will be seen that the name *Encentrum* Ehrenberg is valid for species congeneric with *Encentrum marinum* (Dujardin). Whether this genus should include all the species tentatively listed (the majority on de Beauchamp's original suggestion) is obviously a purely zoological question.

De Beauchamp recommends the application of "a little tact" in deciding nomenclatural questions. And yet it was precisely to banish

“tact”, i. e. personal preferences, that the Code was adopted. To quote Stiles²: “The purpose of the International Code of Nomenclature is, therefore, to remove zoological nomenclature from subjective influences . . .”.

That the Synopsis has not the force of law is self-evident; nevertheless, if in agreement with the International Code, it has the force of the Code itself and de Beauchamp has not established any contradictions, but rather that his understanding of the Code is incorrect. Whether he wishes to apply the nomenclature of the Synopsis now, at some future time, or not at all, is of course for him to decide; there is not, and can not be, any compulsion in matters of this kind.

I regret being forced into print in this way, as I think all the questions at issue could, and properly should, have been settled by correspondence.

7. Warum besitzen die Spinnentiere keine beweglichen Stielaugen wie die höheren Krebse?

Von Prof. Dr. Fr. Dahl, Berlin-Steglitz.

eingeg. 8. April 1914.

Die obige Frage mag manchem Morphologen etwas unmotiviert erscheinen. Da bewegliche Stielaugen im Tierreich weit seltener vorkommen als sessile Augen, würde man eher für das Vorkommen von Stielaugen nach Gründen fragen. Wenn ich trotzdem die Frage in obiger Form stelle, so leitet mich die Besprechung einer Arbeit von mir in der Zeitschrift »Nature«¹. Da ich die Frage in dem dortigen Zusammenhang nicht für unberechtigt halten kann, möchte ich hier kurz auf dieselbe eingehen.

Ich hatte in meiner Schrift über die Physiologie der Spinnentiere² auf die physiologische Parallele im äußeren Bau der höheren Krebse und der Spinnentiere hingewiesen, eine Parallele, die trotz des morphologischen Gegensatzes unverkennbar zutage tritt: — »Der Kopf ist bei den Spinnentieren mit dem Thorax, wenigstens mit dem ersten, das erste Beinpaar tragenden Thoracalsegment (Solifugen) stets völlig unbeweglich verwachsen. Diese Verwachsung schließt physiologisch einen Nachteil und einen Vorteil ein. Ein Nachteil besteht darin, daß der Gebrauch der Augen und der Mundwerkzeuge in bestimmter Weise eingeschränkt

² Stiles, Ch. Wardell, The International Code of Zoological Nomenclature as applied to Medicine. Bull. 24 Hyg. Lab. U. S. Publ. Health & Mar. Hosp. Serv., Washington. 50 p. 1905.

¹ Nature No. 221. Jan. 29. 1914.

² Vergleichende Physiologie und Morphologie der Spinnentiere. S. 42.

ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Zoologischer Anzeiger](#)

Jahr/Year: 1914

Band/Volume: [44](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Harring H.K.

Artikel/Article: [Notes on Rotatorian Nomenclature. 500-502](#)