referred this case to the Commission (inasmuch as *C. incisus* was misidentified); their request for suppression is one of two possible actions. At first glance, usual taxonomic practice involving priority seems warranted; PALAEORYCTIDAE has been in use only 48 years and CIMOLESTIDAE has lain in disuse only 35 years. Neither is a nomen oblitum. Furthermore, not many persons have studied fossil mammals of the aforementioned taxa, and the literature is not burdened by their names.

3. If PALAEORYCTIDAE were supplanted by the older name CIMOLESTIDAE, the latter taxon no longer would include marsupials, as it did previously, but would instead include numerous insectivores formerly known as palaeoryctids. Furthermore, most palaeoryctids after 1958 are those insectivores which before that date and since 1926 comprised the DELTATHERIDIIDAE Gregory and Simpson. This confusing revolution of names resulting from usual practice alternative to suppression is complicated by consideration of animals in time as well as space. Suppression of the name CIMOLESTIDAE seems to me to best maintain stability of the names concerned, permitting more effort and print to be devoted toward study of the fossils themselves instead of toward determining and explaining names and time-ranges.

4. Including *C. incisus* with the other palaeoryctids hardly alters the concept of this family, as pointed out by the authors. One point in favor of following rules of priority, no matter what, is the preservation of the concepts of early workers as well as those of recent workers. In this case the early concept of *C. incisus* and its relationships is of little worth.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE APPLICATION CONCERNING THE VALIDATION OF *AMAUROBIUS* C. L. KOCH AND *COELOTES* BLACKWALL.

Z.N.(S.) 1625

(see volume 21, pages 150–153)

By Herbert W. Levi (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*) and Otto Kraus (*Natur-Museum und Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M., Germany*)

(1) The main purpose of the original proposal is the stabilisation of accustomed usage of the generic names *Amaurobius* C. L. Koch, 1837, and *Coelotes* Blackwall, 1841. But we find now that the application needs to settle also the interpretation of the type-species of *Coelotes*. The problem is set out below.

(2) At the time when the generic name *Coelotes* was established by Blackwall (1841), only one included species was mentioned: *Clubiona saxatilis* Blackwall, 1833, which consequently is the type-species (by monotypy). It was generally accepted by arachnologists that *saxatilis* would be a junior subjective synonym of *Drassus atropos* Walckenaer 1830. These are the reasons why Levi and Kraus in their original application correctly cited *saxatilis* as type-species of the genus, but asked to place the " valid " name *atropos* on the Official List.

(3) P. Chrysanthus now points out[1] that in this current sense *atropos* is to be regarded a misidentified species: in contradiction to *atropos* autt., *atropos* Walckenaer 1830 with high probability seems to be a senior subjective synonym of *Aranea terrestris* Wider 1834 [= *Coelotes*], a closely related species, and thus the species currently known as *C. atropos* would loose its name, and should be called *saxatilis* Blackwall 1833. On the other hand, *atropos* would replace the well-known name *terrestris*. This is more than a case of simple name changing, for the transfer of the name *atropos* from one species to another within the same genus would lead to hopeless confusion.

Coelotes atropos and *terrestris* are very important specific names in spiders. They refer to two of the most common European species, and they are almost continuously cited now in connection not only with taxonomic but also faunistic, ecological, and

[1] We wish to express our sincere thanks to Father Chrysanthus who informed us (in litt.) of his conclusions.

ethological studies (Tretzel, 1961). Up to 1939, *atropos* has been used more than 200, *terrestris* more than 100 times (fide Bonnet, 1956).

(4) Under these circumstances it seems justified to ask the Commission to stabilize extensive current usage (as established especially by O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879, Simon, 1937, Locket and Millidge, 1953, and Wiehle, 1963).

There is no type-material of *Drassus atropos* Walckenaer, 1830, in existence; so the best solution of the case seems to be the interpretation of the nominal species in question by designating a neotype being in conformity with usage.

We propose to regard a male specimen, on which Wiehle (1963 : 289–296) based his profound taxonomic treatment of the species, the neotype of *atropos*. It is transferred from the collections of the Senckenberg-Museum, Frankfurt a.M. (SMF 12156) to those of the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, for *atropos* was originally described from France by a French author. The label reads as follows: " *Amaurobius atropos* (Walckenaer), Neotype of *Drassus atropos* Walckenaer 1830. —— Locality: Harz, Stolberg, Mischwald, unter Steinen. H. Wiehle leg IX.1934, det. 1962 ".

Since the fixation of this neotype is not in strict conformity with the provisions of article 74c (4; 5) of the Code, it will be necessary for the Commission to use its plenary powers when adopting this solution of the case.

We propose to amend para. 13 (4, b) of our original application (*Bull. Zool. Nomencl.*: **21** (2) : 152) as follows:

(b) *atropos*, *Drassus*, Walckenaer, 1830, *Faune française*, Aranéides, 27 : 171, as interpreted by the neotype designated by Levi and Kraus.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT ON THE PROPOSED REJECTION OF *ASCOLI*. Z.N.(S.) 1176*

(see volume 20, pages 294–295)

By C. Jacot-Guillarmod, J. Chester Bradley and J. G. Betrem

Dr. Karl V. Krombein has kindly called our attention to the fact that in 1951 he designated *Scolia flavifrons* Fabricius to be the type-species of *Ascoli* Saussure and Sichel, 1864, (Krombein, 1951, p. 775). This he did on the assumption that Saussure and Sichel, by merely citing the unavailable name " *Ascoli* " Guerin as a synonym of the subgenus *Triscolia* Saussure and Sichel thereby validated it as a new nominal taxon dating from 1864, with themselves as authors.

Dr. Krombein mentions in a letter to Dr. Betrem that he has discussed this situation with Mr. Sabrosky, who is of the opinion that Krombein's treatment of *Ascoli* was the proper one under the old code, " That is that *Ascoli* was validated in synonymy, that it should be credited to Saussure and Sichel, 1864, not to Guérin, 1839 " and further that Krombein's designation of *Sc. flavifrons* to be the type-species was valid.

Krombein wrote to Dr. Betrem further: " Sabrosky points out that in the 1961 publication of the new code, Art. 11 (d) would have made unavailable a name first published in synonymy. However, in the revised edition of the new code as amended at Washington, in 1963, a saving clause was added to Art. 11 (d) so that such names recognized prior to 1961 (as in my treatment of *Ascoli*) are available."

With all of this we agree, except as modified by the following facts:

(1) The taxon *Triscolia* was established not by Saussure and Sichel, 1864, but by Saussure, 1863, p. 17 (*cf.* Betrem *in* Betrem and Bradley, 1964, p. 433).

(2) The type of the taxon *Triscolia* Saussure, 1863, was the Mexican species *Scolia* (*Triscolia*) *badia* Saussure, 1863, and this was type by monotypy.

(3) *Triscolia* as used by Saussure and Sichel, 1864, was not as a new taxon, homonym of *Triscolia* Saussure, 1863†, but was an extension of the latter, consisting of the type-species with twenty-four others.

*This statement has been prepared with the aid of a grant from the National Science Foundation of the United States of America.

†Saussure and Sichel, p. 54, give this date as 1862, because Saussure's paper was read December 29, 1962. It, however, could not have been published in that year.