Reply to comments on the proposed stabilization of usage of the name *Ceratites nodosus* (Mollusca, Ammonoidea)
(Case 2732; see BZN **48**: 31–35, 246; **49**: 145–149, 290; **50**: 54–56, 141–142)

Max Urlichs
Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde Stuttgart, Rosenstein 1, 70191 Stuttgart 1, Germany

1. Tozer (BZN **49**: 145–149) has commented at length on my application (BZN **48**: 31–35). However, he has overlooked some points and misinterpreted others, and therefore it is necessary to discuss some important facts.

2. Tozer (para. 3) correctly stated that the authorship of *Ammonites nodosus* has generally been attributed to Bruguière, whose description was based on Scheuchzer (1718). However, in modern times no workers before Rieber & Tozer (1986), for example Philippi (1901), Spath (1934) and Wenger (1957), had seen any original Scheuchzer specimens: they only had his inadequate figure and Bourguet's (1742) redrawing of it (see para. 1 of my application). Philippi (1901), on whose extensive work the 20th century concept of *Ceratites nodosus* is based, made (p. 410) the following comment on this (my translation): 'Scheuchzer's figure is insufficient. The number and form of the lobes and saddles is properly represented in general, but the saddles seem to be distinctly crenulated. Elongated-oval nodes, which do not seem to have any connection with the round, button-shaped external nodes, surround the umbilicus in such a way that Scheuchzer's ammonite has an appearance like an *Aspidoceras*'.

3. As I previously pointed out (BZN **48**: 32, para. 6), due to the inadequacy of Scheuchzer's figure Philippi (pp. 410, 413) interpreted *Ceratites nodosus* as represented by Schlotheim's illustration (not an original specimen, since none were known) of *Ammonites nodosus* (1823, pl. 31, fig. 1): '*Ceratites nodosus* is typified according to Schlotheim's figure, which is of a specimen without body chamber, large moderately involute forms with widely separated bulging ribs, unforked on the last coil and a broad weakly domed venter' (translation; I quoted the original German in para. 6 of my application).

4. As noted above, Philippi (1901) never saw the actual specimen on which Schlotheim had based his figure of *Ammonites nodosus*, which is a phragmocone rediscovered by Urlichs & Mundlos (1987) in Berlin (Museum für Naturkunde, specimen MB: C.774) and illustrated by them (1987, fig. 10). This specimen proved not to match Philippi's concept of *C. nodosus*, but corresponds to *Ceratites (Acanthoceratites) spinosus spinosus* Philippi, 1901 (p. 404). Therefore, we (Urlichs & Mundlos, 1987, p. 7) proposed another specimen (MB: C.785) from the Schlotheim collection as lectotype of *Ceratites nodosus* Schlotheim; this specimen does accord with Schlotheim's figure, Philippi's usage, and the subsequent 20th century concept of *Ceratites nodosus*. We pointed out that our proposal would require ratification by the Commission's plenary powers, and this is requested in my application.

5. It can be seen that Philippi (1901) regarded *Ceratites nodosus* as characterized by Schlotheim's (1823) figure, and not by Scheuchzer's (1718) illustration or by any physical type specimen known to be extant. Contrary to Tozer (BZN **49**: 147, para. 7) and Silberling (BZN **50**: 141–142), almost all subsequent authors, and not just

Urlichs & Mundlos (1987), have followed Philippi in using *Ceratites nodosus* in the sense of Schlotheim's (1823) pl. 31, fig.1. These authors include Riedel (1916), Spath (1934) and Wenger (1957), and I mentioned 14 other works in para. 10 of my application. The only exceptions are in fact Rieber & Tozer (1986) and Tozer in his comment.

6. Tozer (BZN **49**: 148, para. 8) has commented that 'The taxonomy adopted by Urlichs & Mundlos (1987) for the ceratitids of the Upper Muschelkalk is different from that of Schlotheim, Philippi, Spath and Wenger. It is much more elaborate, with recognition of genera, subgenera, species and subspecies'. Naturally more taxa have been described over the decades, and we (Urlichs & Mundlos) followed the species and subspecies of Wenger (1957) with only three exceptions: we renamed a junior objective synonym and separated two previously named species he had synonymized. In all other ways we followed the taxonomy of the above authors, and here again Tozer's remarks are not in accordance with the facts.

7. Rieber & Tozer (1986) and Tozer (BZN **49**: 148, para. 9) have made the mistake of treating the specimen (PIMUZ L/1651), which they rediscovered in Zurich and which was the basis of Scheuchzer's (1718) illustration, as the lectotype of *C. nodosus*. Like Schlotheim's specimen MB: C.774, the origin of his (1823) figure, Scheuchzer's specimen does not belong to *Ceratites nodosus* as understood by Philippi, Spath, Wenger and subsequent authors. It is true that under Article 74c of the Code a lectotype is an original specimen and not an illustration of it, even if the specimen cannot be traced. In the case of *C. nodosus*, however, the modern (last 92 years) concept has not been based on actual specimens, the Scheuchzer and Schlotheim collections being believed lost, but on Philippi's (1901) interpretation of Schlotheim's figure. This essential point has been overlooked by Tozer.

8. '*Ceratites nodosus*' as defined by Tozer would occur in southern Germany in the 'Trochitenkalk' representing the lower part of the Upper Muschelkalk, and not in the overlying 'Nodosus Schichten' for which it is the name-bearing species. Tozer's statement (BZN **49**: 148, para. 9) 'Acceptance of my [Tozer's] proposal [i.e. the Zurich specimen as lectotype] would make it unnecessary to revise the definition of *Ceratites (Ceratites)*' is emphatically not correct. It would necessitate taxonomic revision and renaming of several subgenera and species of the genus *Ceratites* (see BZN **48**: 33 and Urlichs & Mundlos, 1987, p. 33).

9. Neither of the recently rediscovered specimens poorly illustrated by Scheuchzer (1718) and Schlotheim (1823) belongs to *Ceratites (Ceratites) nodosus* as interpreted by Philippi (1901) and subsequently; they are referrable to *Ceratites (Doloceratites)* and *Ceratites (Acanthoceratites)* respectively (see paras. 9 and 6 of my application). In the interest of stability it follows that neither of them should be taken as the name-bearing type of *C. nodosus*, and this is the reason for my application. On the other hand, and contrary to the remarks by Tozer in paras. 7 and 8 of his comment, the Schlotheim specimen (MB: C.785 in the Museum für Naturkunde, Humboldt Universität, Berlin) proposed as lectotype by Urlichs & Mundlos (1987) and in my application does stabilize the 20th century usage of *Ceratites nodosus* in both its taxonomic and stratigraphic aspects (this usage also corresponds to the description of *C. nodosus* by de Haan (1825) when he established the genus *Ceratites*, as I pointed out in para. 5 of the application). I have given the Commission Secretariat a list of 86 works published since 1970 which use the name *Ceratites nodosus* in this

taxonomic sense. Accordingly I reiterate the proposals in my para. 11 (BZN **48**: 33–34); they have been supported by Hahn (BZN **48**: 246), Tichy (BZN **49**: 290) and by Horn and by Strauch & Bertling on BZN **50**: 54.

10. I have seen the comments (BZN **50**: 55–56) on this case by the late R.V. Melville, and shall deal with them separately.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Styloptocuma* Băcescu & Muradian, 1974 (Crustacea, Cumacea) with designation of *S. antipai* Băcescu & Muradian, 1974 as the type species
(Case 2787; see BZN **49**: 264–265)

Les Watling
Darling Marine Center, University of Maine, Walpole, Maine 04573, U.S.A.

It is unfortunate that Băcescu & Muradian did not specifically designate the one new species in their new genus *Styloptocuma* as the type species. Since they indicated the name of the new species as *Styloptocuma antipai* n.g. n.sp., it seems reasonable to assume that this species was intended to be the type for the new genus. In my recent paper (Watling, 1991), I treated *S. antipai* as the type species, not realizing that a violation of the Code had occurred. The attribution of authorship of this genus to the 40 compilers of the *Zoological Record* would be unreasonable. Therefore, I support the requests made in this case.

Additional reference

Watling, L. 1991. Rediagnosis and revision of some Nannastacidae (Crustacea: Cumacea). *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*, **104**: 751–757.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Buprestis* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Chrysobothris* Eschscholtz, 1829 (Insecta, Coleoptera) by the designation of *B. octoguttata* Linnaeus, 1758 as the type species of *Buprestis*
(Case 2758; see BZN **50**: 23–26; see also Case 2772, BZN **49**: 120–121)

Richard L. Westcott
Oregon Department of Agriculture, 635 Capitol Street NE, Salem, Oregon 97310–0110, U.S.A.

Nelson & Barr have clearly and thoroughly stated the case to conserve the name *Buprestis* Linnaeus, 1758 with the type species *B. octoguttata* Linnaeus, 1758. This is necessary to conserve the current and ubiquitous concepts of the genera *Buprestis* and *Chrysobothris* Eschscholtz, 1829.

There is little I can add to the authors' overwhelming logic to retain the names. The beetles are well known, especially popular with collectors and contain several major (and many more minor) pests of agriculture, horticulture and forestry. There is a wealth of literature pertaining to them. To change either name, particularly for the huge genus *Chrysobothris*, would seriously upset nomenclatural stability.

As a collector and researcher of the BUPRESTIDAE for 35 years I lend my wholehearted support to the proposals.