CERATIOCARIS M‘COY, 1849 (CRUSTACEA, ARCHAEOSTRACA); PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES. Z.N.(S.) 1489

By W. D. Ian Rolfe (Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.)

The object of the present application is to request that the nominal genus Ceratio caris (Crustacea, Archaeostraca) be placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology, and to insure the suppression of the nominal genus Leptocheles in accordance with the Principle of the First Reviser.

2. The nominal genus Ceratio caris was established by M‘Coy in 1849 (412) for the carapace of two nominal species: C. solenoides and C. ellipticus.

3. Earlier in the same paper (3-4) M‘Coy established a nominal subgenus Leptocheles of the genus Pterygotus Agassiz for what he considered to be the "didactyle pincers" of a separate crustacean.

4. Barrande (1853: 341–342) demonstrated that these "pincers" were only the trid tailpiece of Ceratio caris and that it was therefore legitimate "den Namen Leptocheles als überflüssig ansehen".

5. In accordance with Article 28 and with the Principle of the First Reviser (1953, Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl. : 66–67, Decisions 123–124), therefore, it is clear that Ceratio caris as selected by Barrande stands in preference to Leptocheles which has page precedence.

6. With the few exceptions listed by Van Straelen and Schmitz (1934: 244), Barrande’s selection has led to universal acceptance of the genus Ceratio caris, and it is proposed that this name be placed on the Official List.

7. The family name Ceratio carididae based on Ceratio caris M‘Coy, 1849, was formed incorrectly by Salter (1860: 162) and should be corrected to Ceratio carididae.

8. In view of the above facts, I recommend that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) place the generic name Ceratio caris M‘Coy, 1849 (gender: feminine), type by subsequent designation by Miller, 1889 (537), Ceratio caris solenoides M‘Coy, 1849 (to be given precedence over Leptocheles M‘Coy, 1849, by the action of Barrande, 1853, as First Reviser) on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(2) place the specific name solenoides M‘Coy, 1849, as published in the binomen Ceratio caris solenoides (type-species of Ceratio caris M‘Coy, 1849) (holotype in Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge=b/41) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(3) place the family name Ceratio carididae (correction of Ceratio carididae) Salter, 1860 (type-genus Ceratio caris M‘Coy, 1849) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology;

(4) place the family name Ceratio carididae Salter, 1860 (type-genus Ceratio caris M‘Coy, 1849) (an invalid original spelling for Ceratio carididae) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.
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Comment on the Proposed Validation of Cicadella Latreille, 1817. Z.N.(S.) 457

By W. J. Le Quesne (Chesham, Bucks., England).

The case of Cicadella is complex. A number of taxonomic works have appeared using it in different senses over the past 20 years—here are some examples:—

Cicadella = Tettigella: Ribaut, 1952.

Cicadella = Euplerix: Evans, 1947; Oman, 1949 (Beirne, 1956); Ossiannilsson, 1946; Kloet & Hineks, 1945; China, 1950; Esaki & Ito, 1954; Lindberg, 1947; Medler, 1942; Diabola, 1954.

This selection of general works and check lists which came to hand suggests that Wagner’s publication in Bombus (1950) has been followed by Ribaut, while three other authors in the last decade have kept the name Tettigella (or the derived subfamily name). After reading all the facts of this very confused case and some consideration, I feel that the unfortunate lapse of 11 years between Wagner’s original application and the present have strengthened the case for retaining Cicadella Duméril, 1806, with picta Fabricius, 1794 (=atropunctata Goeze, 1778) as the type-species. This course, I think, will cause the less confusion.

Comment on the Proposed Validation of Anilius Oken, 1815. Z.N.(S.) 1046

By Hobart M. Smith (Professor of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.)

The survey of herpetozoa names in Oken, 1816, is a valuable contribution to taxonomy. Since Anilius has been used almost without exception since Stejneger, 1907, for the snake known previously as Ilyisia, and since the literature using Ilyisia is not of such magnitude or variety as to be confusing, it is clearly in the interest of nomenclatural stability to preserve the name Anilius as applied for the past half century.