

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839 and *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 (Mollusca, Cephalopoda)

(Case 2902; see BZN 51: 219–223)

(1) D.T. Donovan

Department of Geological Sciences, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, U.K.

In my application to the Commission I omitted to mention that d'Orbigny, who is credited with the first available publication of the generic name *Kelaeno* in 1841, himself later abandoned that name in the sense in which he had first used it, and adopted Münster's name *Acanthoteuthis* for the taxon in question. In 1845 (p. 407) he wrote in his systematic text: 'ACANTHOTEUTHIS Wagner / Syn. *Kelaeno* Munster 1846 (non *Kelaeno* Munster 1842)'. Thus it is clear that he adopted these two generic names in the sense used by the German palaeontologists Wagner and Münster.

Additional reference

Orbigny, A.d'. 1845. *Mollusques vivants et fossiles ou description de toutes les espèces de coquilles et de mollusques classées suivant leur distribution géologique et géographique*, vol. 1. 432 pp. Gide, Paris.

(2) W. Riegraf

Brüggefeldweg 31, D-48161 Münster, Germany

Donovan has clearly and correctly presented the facts concerning the state of *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839 and *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842. I fully support and agree with his proposals to the Commission.

I may mention that Münster (1839, p. 681) referred to *Acanthoteuthis* in a second paper, but as a nomen nudum.

Additional reference

Münster, G. Graf zu. 1839. Über einige Versteinerungen in den lithographischen Schiefer von Baiern. *Neues Jahrbuch für Mineralogie, Geognosie, Geologie und Petrefaktenkunde*, 5: 676–682.

(3) Marion Nixon

Department of Geology, Birkbeck College, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HX, U.K.

I support the proposed application to conserve the current usage of the names *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839 and *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 for two genera of Jurassic teuthoid coleid cephalopods.

(4) Theo S. Engeser

Geologisch-Paläontologisches Institut und Museum, Universität Hamburg, Bundesstrasse 55, 20146 Hamburg, Germany

1. I fully agree with Donovan that *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839 is a valid genus with *Acanthoteuthis speciosa* Münster, 1839 as its type species as designated by Bülow-Trummer in 1920.

2. I also agree that *Kelaeno* was not made available in Münster (1839) by the simple mention of the name. It does not appear in any combination with a valid specific name, nor is any indication given.

3. D'Orbigny (1841) published *Kelaeno* with two nominal species, *K. speciosa* (Münster, 1839) and *K. prisca* (Rüppell, 1829). Under Article 12b(5) of the Code this makes *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841 an available name. No type species was designated by d'Orbigny (1841). Later d'Orbigny (1842–1846) figured four specimens under the name *Kelaeno speciosa*; three of them belong to *Acanthoteuthis* and one is the gladius of *Plesiotheuthis prisca* (Rüppell, 1829). D'Orbigny mixed up the two species, which belong to different orders of coleoid cephalopods. In Engeser (1986) I stated that *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841 is an objective synonym of *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839. However, this is not correct since d'Orbigny had mentioned two species in combination with *Kelaeno* and a type species had not then been designated for that genus. In Engeser (1987) I corrected this and designated *Acanthoteuthis speciosa* Münster, 1839 as its type species. Thus *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841 is an objective synonym of *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839.

4. As stated in para. 2 of the application, it is clear that in 1842 Münster used *Kelaeno* in a quite different sense from d'Orbigny the previous year. Münster included two nominal species, *K. scutellaris* and *K. arquata*, and Bülow-Trummer (1920) later selected *K. arquata* as type species (para. 5 of the application). However, *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 is a homonym of *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841. *Celaeno* Owen, 1844 is only an incorrect subsequent spelling and not available, but Wagner (1860) explicitly 'corrected' the latinization of *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 to *Celaeno* and this, although an unjustified emendation, is an available name. *Celaeno* Wagner, 1860 is a junior objective synonym of *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842.

5. Schevill (1950) wrongly interpreted *Kelaeno* Münster, 1839 as an available name and *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 as a junior homonym of it. He proposed the replacement name *Münsterella*, but his designation of *K. scutellaris* as type species is invalid since *K. arquata* is automatically the type under Article 67h of the Code. Roger (1952) and Krimholz (1958) followed the argument of Schevill (1950). I (Engeser, 1988) rejected Schevill's (1950) argument and pointed out the homonymy between *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841 and *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842. Two junior synonyms were available as a replacement name — *Celaeno* Wagner, 1860 and *Münsterella* Schevill, 1850. Since *Celaeno* Wagner, 1860 is preoccupied (see para. 3 of the application), I adopted *Münsterella* (now spelled *Muensterella*) Schevill, 1950 instead of *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842. I see no reason to change my view and therefore do not support Donovan's proposal.

6. I also have a different view of the 'generally accepted usage' of Münster's *Kelaeno*. My synonymy list (Engeser, 1988) shows that in the past 150 years about ten authors have used the spelling *Kelaeno* (including the incorrect subsequent spellings *Kalaeno* Krimholz, 1958 and *Kelaena* Walther, 1904), about five authors have used *Celaeno* and four have used *Münsterella* (or its corrected form *Muensterella*). Kretzoi (1942) figured the genus in question under the generic name *Listroteuthis* Naef, 1922, but this was probably a lapsus calami for *Celaeno* since *Listroteuthis* was called

Celaeno. Bandel & Boletzky (1988) called the genus *Celaenoteuthis* for unknown reasons. Since 1950, four authors have used *Kelaeno* (and variants, including *Celaeno*) and four authors *Muensterella* (including *Münsterella*). It follows that there is no consistent use of the generic name *Kelaeno* (including *Celaeno*) for the genus of coleoid cephalopods proposed by Münster in 1842.

7. Since there is confusion in the meaning of *Kelaeno* and also in its spelling, it would be best to reject *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 as a junior homonym of *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841, and to use the unambiguous replacement name *Muensterella* Schéwill, 1950 (with *Kelaeno arquata* Münster, 1842 as the type species).

8. The family name KELAENIDAE (or CELAENIDAE) based on *Kelaeno* (or *Celaeno*) has a similar inconsistent use in the literature. It would be preferable to replace it by MÜNSTERELLIDAE Roger, 1952 in its corrected form MUENSTERELLIDAE.

9. For the reasons given above, I support Donovan's proposals regarding *Acanthoteuthis* but oppose the conservation of *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842. *Muensterella* Schéwill, 1850 should be used rather than *Kelaeno*.

Additional references

- Bandel, K. & Boletzky, S. von. 1988. Features of development and functional morphology required in the reconstruction of early coleoid cephalopods. Pp. 229–246 in: Wiedman, J. & Kullmann, J. (Eds.). *Cephalopods — present and past*. Schweizerbart'sche, Stuttgart.
- Engeser, T. 1986. Beschreibung einer wenig bekannten und einer neuen Coleoiden-Art (Vampyromorphoidea, Cephalopoda) aus dem Untertithonium von Solnhofen und Eichstätt (Bayern). *Archaeopteryx*, 4: 27–35.
- Engeser, T. 1987. Nachtrag zur Nomenklatur der coleoiden Cephalopoden des 'Solnhofener Plattenkalks' (Untertithonium). *Archaeopteryx*, 5: 65–67.
- Kretzoi, M. 1942. *Necroteuthis* n. gen. (Ceph. Dibr., Necroteuthidae n.f.) aus dem Oligozän von Budapest und das System der Dibranchiata. *Földtani Közlöny*, 72: 124–138.
- Orbigny, A.d'. 1842–1846. *Paléontologie Française. Terrain Jurassique*, vol. 1. Masson, Paris.
- Walther, J. 1904. Die Fauna der Solnhofener Plattenkalke. Bionomisch betrachtet. *Jenaer Denkschriften*, 9: 135–214.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Lironeca* Leach, 1818 (Crustacea, Isopoda) as the correct original spelling

(Case 2915; see BZN 51: 224–226)

(1) L.B. Holthuis

Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

A few remarks in defence of the name *Livoneca* Leach, 1818 and in opposition to the application seem to be called for.

As Drs Williams and Bowman have pointed out, in Leach's original publication (1818) the spelling *Livoneca* and its French equivalent *Livonèce* appeared consistently (4 and 5 times respectively). No explanation was given for this name nor for the others in the group, among which are *Nelocira*, *Cirolana*, *Conilera*, *Rocinela*, *Canolira*, *Anilocra*, *Olencira* and *Nerocila*. It was only much later that White (1857, p. 250) pointed out the connection with the name Carolina in the cases of *Cirolana*,



Donovan, D. T. et al. 1995. "Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839 and Kelaeno Münster, 1842 (Mollusca, Cephalopoda)." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 52, 65–67.
<https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.6730>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44798>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.6730>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/6730>

Holding Institution

Natural History Museum Library, London

Sponsored by

Natural History Museum Library, London

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.