

A footnote written by Agassiz to the explanation of pl. 44'' of his German translation (Buckland, 1838) of Buckland's 1836b book establishes the name *Atramentarius* for the ink-sac illustrated in fig. 7, which Engeser & Donovan (1996, p. 255) state is recognizable as *Belemnoteuthis montefiorei* Buckman, 1880. Donovan & Crane (1992, p. 280) pointed out that the correct original spelling of the generic name customarily spelled *Belemnoteuthis* is *Belemnotheutis* Pearce, 1842 (p. 593); I followed the original spelling in my *Fossilium Catalogus* (Riegraf, 1995, p. 27). *Atramentarius* Buckland & Agassiz in Buckland, 1838 is a senior synonym of *Belemnotheutis*, a name which (as *Belemnoteuthis*) is in current usage (references cited by Engeser & Donovan, p. 254). I therefore propose that the Commission be asked to suppress the nominal genus *Atramentarius* in order to conserve *Belemnotheutis* Pearce, 1842 (type species by subsequent monotypy by Pearce (1847, pls. 15–16) *Belemnoteuthis* [sic] *antiquus* Pearce, 1847, pls. 15–16).

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

- (1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the name *Atramentarius* Buckland & Agassiz in Buckland, 1838 for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name *Belemnotheutis* Pearce, 1842 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent monotypy (Pearce, 1847) *Belemnoteuthis antiqua* Pearce, 1847;
- (3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *antiqua* Pearce, 1847, as published in the binomen *Belemnoteuthis antiquus* [recte *antiqua*] (specific name of the type species of *Belemnotheutis* Pearce, 1842);
- (4) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the following names:
 - (a) *Atramentarius* Buckland & Agassiz in Buckland, 1838, as suppressed in (1) above;
 - (b) *Belemnoteuthis* Pearce, 1847 (unavailable as an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Belemnotheutis*).

Additional references

- Buckland, W.** 1838. *Geologie und Mineralogie in Beziehung zur natürlichen Theologie*, vol. 2. 69 pls. with explanations. Leibrock, Neufchâtel.
- Donovan, D.T. & Crane, M.D.** 1992. The type material of the Jurassic cephalopod *Belemnotheutis*. *Palaeontology*, **35**: 273–296.
- Pearce, J.C.** 1842. On the mouths of ammonites, and on fossils contained in laminated beds of the Oxford Clay, discovered in cutting the Great Western Railway, near Christian Malford in Wiltshire. *Proceedings of the Geological Society of London*, **3**: 592–594.
- Pearce, J.C.** 1847. On the fossil Cephalopoda constituting the genus *Belemnoteuthis*, Pearce. *London Geological Journal*, **2**: 75–78, pls. 15–16.

Comments on the proposed designation of *Foenus unguiculatus* Westwood, 1841 as the type species of *Pseudofoenus* Kieffer, 1902 (Insecta, Hymenoptera)

(Case 2950; see BZN 53: 261–263)

- (1) R.W. Crosskey

Department of Entomology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

The applicants have referred to my past work on GASTERUPTERIIDAE and, since I retain an interest in this family, I should like to contribute a comment on this case. In essence I ask the Commission to reject the application in its present form.

I agree that in the unusual situation described by A.D. Austin, J.T. Jennings and M.S. Harvey some Commission action is desirable. However, I do not think they have provided adequate background for a Commission decision, nor do I think that their solution is a wise one; it leaves the identity of *Gasteruption pedunculatum* Schletterer, 1889 unresolved when this is the crux of the matter to be settled. To pick a new type species for *Pseudofoenus* and leave the old one in limbo largely defeats the object.

The first point (nomenclatural) to establish is the status of the surviving specimen (male) of *G. pedunculatum* in the Berlin Museum. Jennings & Austin (1994, pp. 1301–1302) referred to this as the holotype but, as stated in para. 3 of the application, there must have been at least two original specimens because Schletterer wrote: 'Type in königl. naturhistorischen Museum zu Berlin und im naturhistorischen Museum zu Zürich'. The Berlin specimen clearly has syntype status. In a practical sense it is useless as the gaster is missing. The second noteworthy point (taxonomic) is that Schletterer was very doubtful whether his *pedunculatum* was really a new species; he wrote (p. 468) '*F. unguiculatus* Westw. ist sehr wahrscheinlich identisch mit *pedunculatum*' and immediately under the species heading gave the possible synonymy in the form '? *Foenus unguiculatus* Westw., Ann. Nat. Hist., T. VII, p. 537, ♂ ... 1841' (Westwood was in error as to the sex; the original specimen was in fact female).

To circumvent the present major weakness (*G. pedunculatum* still left as a nomen dubium) it seems clear to me that the application should be revised. The Commission should be asked to set aside the useless *pedunculatum* syntype and designate a neotype for this nominal species. As nothing prevents designation of neotypes of opposite sex from that of original types (Article 75d(4) of the Code), the chosen neotype specimen should be a female. Furthermore, it should be a female of *Pseudofoenus unguiculatus* (Westwood), as the female of this species has a known identity from its holotype. This way, four things take place at once: the identity of *G. pedunculatum* is fixed, the synonymy of *pedunculatum* with *unguiculatus* is established, the same taxonomic species is kept as the type of *Pseudofoenus*, and the action is in accord with Schletterer's originally suspected synonymy of the two nominal species. The nominal type species remains unchanged as *G. pedunculatum* although its name is synonymous with the earlier *F. unguiculatus*.

If the holotype of *unguiculatus* is in good enough condition the best course would be for the Commission to designate it as a neotype for *pedunculatum*, thereby establishing objective synonymy. If not, then subjective synonymy by use of a recently collected specimen will suffice.

(2) A.D. Austin & J.T. Jennings

Department of Crop Protection, Waite Campus, The University of Adelaide,
P.O. Glen Osmond, South Australia 5064, Australia

M.S. Harvey

Western Australian Museum, Francis Street, Perth, Western Australia 6000,
Australia



Crosskey, Roger Ward et al. 1997. "On the proposed designation of *Foenus unguiculatus* Westwood, 1841 as the type species of *Pseudofoenus* Kieffer, 1902 (Insecta, Hymenoptera)." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 54, 185–186. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.106>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/45039>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.106>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/106>

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>.