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, 229–231)

(1) Ulrich Lehmann
Geologisch-Paläontologisches Institut und Museum, Universität Hamburg, Bundesstrasse 55, D-20146 Hamburg, Germany

The attribution of the name *Ceratites nodosus* to Schlotheim, as proposed in the application by Urlichs, seems to me to be desirable. The following points should be borne in mind.

1. Original specimens of '*Ammonites nodosa* Bruguière' were not examined by (at least) the majority of authors; that nominal species was based on the rather poor illustration referred to by Bruguière, and not a specimen. When original material was rediscovered it turned out not to belong to *Ceratites nodosus* as long understood.

2. Tozer (BZN **49**: 145–149) underestimates the extent to which *Ceratites nodosus* in the sense (based on a Schlotheim figure) which Urlichs seeks to conserve is established in the literature and in practical field-work, and has been at least since the time of Philippi (1901). Tozer's assertion (his para. 8) that the taxonomy adopted by Urlichs & Mundlos (1987) is 'unarguably subjective' and not current usage is not justified. Their taxonomy is more elaborate than that of Schlotheim, Philippi, Spath and Wenger, but it is based on them and is the actual 'current usage', and that in the very 'homeland' of *Ceratites*. Every taxonomy is subjective to some extent: there is nothing wrong about that. The consequences for stratigraphy and taxonomy of abandoning this usage should be taken very seriously, as pointed out by Urlichs (see also Abb. 16 of Urlichs & Mundlos (1987)). The danger of confusion and misunderstandings is immense.

To sum up: in my opinion 'strict adherence to rules', as proposed by Tozer, would in this case have disadvantages for practical taxonomy and stratigraphy which far outweigh any advantages there might be. I support the application by Urlichs.

(2) Max Urlichs
Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde Stuttgart, Rosenstein 1, D-70191 Stuttgart, Germany

1. I should like to reply to the comments by the late R.V. Melville (BZN **50**: 55–56).

2. Melville was indeed correct in stating (his para. 6) that 'Schlotheim's figure would have been of primary importance' to our (Urlichs & Mundlos, 1987) predecessors, but he was mistaken in saying (para. 2) that Scheuchzer's specimen in Zurich designated by Rieber & Tozer as lectotype agrees with the usage established by Philippi and subsequent workers. It does not so so (BZN **48**: 33, para. 9); if it did I would not have submitted my application. The adoption of this specimen as type would immediately alter the established meaning of *Ceratites nodosus*.

3. The Schlotheim specimen designated as lectotype by Urlichs & Mundlos (1987, p. 7) is not completely decorticated (cf. para. 2 of Melville's comment). Only one whorl side of the body chamber is corroded. On the other side the ribs are visible. The

umbilical width and the cross section are measurable on the phragmocone, and the suture is uncorroded. Therefore, the characters of taxonomic importance are clearly visible. There is no doubt about its identity with what we now call *Ceratites nodosus*.

4. Of course, no information was published about the exact level from which the lectotypes proposed by Rieber & Tozer (1986) and Urlichs & Mundlos (1987) originated (see para. 4 of Melville's comment). However, the species of *Ceratites* are very characteristic, and their stratigraphic range within the Upper Muschelkalk (which reaches a thickness of 70–90m) is well known since Riedel (1916), who subdivided the Upper Muschelkalk into 10 *Ceratites* Zones. This subdivision has often been confirmed and completed by different authors, e.g. Wenger (1957), Hagdorn & Simon (1985) and Urlichs (1993). Specimens comparable to the lectotype of *Ceratites nodosus* proposed by Rieber & Tozer (1986) occur in SW-Germany 20–23m above the base of the Upper Muschelkalk; those specimens comparable to the Schlotheim lectotype proposed by Urlichs & Mundlos (1987) are found at 60–65m. The lower level corresponds to the Upper Anisian and the upper to the Lower Ladinian. The phylogeny of *Ceratites* has been established from the stratigraphic ranges of the different species (Riedel, 1916; Wenger, 1957); it is one of the best known examples.

Additional reference

Urlichs, M. 1993. Zur Gliederung des Oberen Muschelkalks in Baden-Württemberg mit Ceratiten. Pp. 153–156 *in* Hagdorn, H. & Seilacher, A. (Eds.), *Muschelkalk, Schöntaler Symposium 1991*. Sonderbände der Gesellschaft für Naturkunde in Württemberg, vol. 2. Korb (Goldschneck).

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Clavella* Oken, 1815 and *Pennella* Oken, 1815 (Crustacea, Copepoda)

(Case 836; see BZN **50**: 273–276)

G.A. Boxshall
The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

Clavella and *Pennella* are widely used in the taxonomic literature on parasitic copepods (Kabata, 1979, 1992; Hogans, 1988). Both genera have been redefined and modern redescriptions are available of their type species, *Lernaea uncinata* Müller, 1776 (now *Clavella adunca*) (in Kabata, 1979) and *Pennella diodontis* Oken, 1815 (in Hogans, 1988). There is no taxonomic confusion surrounding either genus. These generic names are also mentioned frequently in non-taxonomic, parasitological literature (e.g. Dogiel et al., 1958; Kabata, 1970; Sniesko, 1970; Möller & Anders, 1983). I am in favour of the conservation of both generic names and of the binomen *Pennella diodontis* because of their wide use in taxonomic and general parasitological literature.

Additional references

Dogiel, V.A., Petrushevskii, G.K. & Polyanski, Yu.I. 1958. *Parasitology of fishes*. Leningrad University Press, Leningrad. [English edition 1961, translated by Z. Kabata. 384 pp. Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh.]