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OPINION 305

SUPPRESSION, UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF THE GENERIC NAME “AMMONITES” BRUGUIERE, 1789, AND ADDITION TO THE “OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY” OF THE GENERIC NAME “ARIETITES” WAAGEN, 1869 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

RULING:—(1) Under the Plenary Powers, the generic name Ammonites Bruguière, 1789 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea) is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The under-mentioned generic name is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology as Name No. 749: Arietites Waagen, 1869 (gender: masculine) (type species, by monotypy: Ammonites bucklandi Sowerby (J.), 1816).

(3) The under-mentioned specific name is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology as Name No. 169: bucklandi Sowerby (J.), 1816, as published in the combination Ammonites bucklandi (specific name of type species of Arietites Waagen, 1869).

(4) The under-mentioned generic name is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology as Name No. 157: Ammonites Bruguière, 1789, as suppressed, under the Plenary Powers, under (1) above.
I.—THE STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In June, 1949, Dr. W. J. Arkell (Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge) approached the Secretary to the Commission on the subject of the future status of the generic name *Ammonites* Bruguiere, 1789 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). The position in regard to this generic name was at that time somewhat confused from the point of view of the Commission in view of the fact that in 1946 Dr. L. F. Spath had published a note that he had submitted an application to the Commission that it should designate a type species for the genus *Ammonites* Bruguiere (Spath, 1946, Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. (11) 12 : 490), thus fixing the taxonomic position of this genus. No such application had ever been received in the Office of the Commission, and Mr. Hemming took the view that the correct course in the first instance was to inform Dr. Spath, with reference to his paper of 1946 that, if he still wished to submit an application in regard to the generic name *Ammonites*, immediate arrangements would be made for its publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. When later Mr. Hemming informed Dr. Arkell that it appeared unlikely that Dr. Spath would pursue his original intention of submitting an application to the Commission in regard to the foregoing generic name, Dr. Arkell decided himself to approach the Commission on this subject. In pursuance of this decision, Dr. Arkell accordingly on 3rd January, 1950, submitted an application in which he asked the Commission to suppress the generic name *Ammonites* Bruguiere, 1789, under its Plenary Powers. This application was slightly revised in the course of the year 1950, its terms being finally settled on 23rd August, 1950. The application so submitted was as follows:—

Proposal to suppress the generic name "*Ammonites*" Bruguiere, 1789, under the Plenary Powers and to place the generic name "*Arietites*" Waagen, 1869 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea) on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology"

By W. J. ARKELL, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.
(Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge)

1. The question of the type species of the genus *Ammonites* Bruguiere, 1789, has been discussed at length by Buckman (1923, 1924) and
Spath (1924, 1946) and others. From these discussions the following essential points have emerged (paras. 2, 3, 4).

2. The type species of *Ammonites* Bruguière, 1789, is *A. bisulcatus* Bruguière, 1789, so selected by Meek, 1876.

3. *A. bisulcatus* Bruguière was based on a number of cited figures in 17th and 18th century authors.

4. The lectotype of *A. bisulcatus* Bruguière is the perspective figure in Lister, 1678 (vi, fig. 3), so selected by Buckman, 1923.

5. Buckman identified Lister’s figure as a *Paltopleuroceras* (recte *Pleuroceras*) from the Upper Domerian and thought it came from Northamptonshire (Buckman, 1923 : 56—57, pl. cccxcii, Lister’s figure reproduced).

6. Lister’s text contains nothing to connect particular figures with particular localities, but of the localities mentioned by Lister the two rightly chosen by Buckman as most likely, the banks of Bugthorpe Beck and the hill above Byland Abbey, are both in Yorkshire as stated by Lister. The most likely locality is the banks of Bugthorpe Beck, which Fox-Strangways (1892 : 68) mentions as exposing sections principally in the zones of *A. bucklandi* and *A. angulatus*.

7. The detail of the carina, which is clear in Lister’s engraving, is lost in Buckman’s half-tone reproduction. What Buckman apparently took for a serrated carina is seen in Lister’s engraving to be the rib-endings on the far side, shown (quite correctly) in perspective; the carina is clearly shown in Lister’s engraving as smooth.

8. These morphological data, combined with the probable locality, make it highly probable that the type specimen of Lister’s pl. vi, fig. 3, is an Arietid (*sensu lato*) from the Sinemurian of Yorkshire, and it is possible that topotypes may one day be found sufficiently like Lister’s figures to enable the genus to be interpreted.

9. Meanwhile a search of the Leckenby collection of Yorkshire ammonites and other rich Lias material in the Sedgwick Museum has failed to reveal to me anything identifiable beyond doubt as the genus figured by Lister. Spath (1946) has declared Lister’s figure to be generically indeterminable, and Mr. D. T. Donovan, who has been specialising on Lias ammonites, agrees (in litt.).

10. The present position in accordance with the Rules, therefore, is that the genus *Ammonites* Bruguière, 1789, the family *AMMONITIDAE*
Owen, 1836, and the superfamily Ammonitacea Buckman, 1905, and ultimately the order Ammonoidea de Haan, 1825, rest upon a species of which the type specimen ("ultimate standard of reference") is unidentifiable generically, although probably one of the Sinemurian family Arietitidae Hyatt, 1874.

11. If the position were left thus, a large part of the classification of Ammonoidea would be liable to be overturned at any time by authors who might claim to be able to identify the genus Ammonites from Lister's figure, and their nomenclature would be different from those who were unable to recognise that figure, and from those again who might interpret it differently.

12. Accordingly it is desirable that the International Commission should take action under their Plenary Powers at the earliest opportunity to stabilise the matter.

13. Two proposals have already been published: (A) Spath (1924 and 1946) has argued that a much later figure by some more modern author should be designated as the neotype of A. bisulcatus Bruguière, and the figure which he has proposed should be so selected is that by d'Orbigny (1843), which he considers represents what Meek (1876) had in mind when he designated A. bisulcatus lectotype of Ammonites. (B) Roman (1938) and Arkell (1940) have expressed the opinion that the genus Ammonites ought never to have been revived and should be abolished like many other ancient names long fallen into desuetude (e.g., Ostracites, Pectinites, etc.).

14. The disadvantages of the course in Para. 13(A) are (1) that as pointed out by Buckman (1924) such action is arbitrary in the extreme: if the genus Ammonites Bruguière, 1789, is to be revived, it should stand or fall by its legitimate type species, not have made for it a type species which was not known to exist until more than 50 years later; (2) that d'Orbigny's drawings are notoriously inaccurate and often synthetographs, and pl. 43 is apparently not based on a type specimen; (3) that the group to which d'Orbigny's pl. 43 belongs has for 80 years had a familiar and widely-used generic name, Arietites Waagen, 1869 (type species by monotypy Ammonites bucklandi J. Sowerby, 1816, Sinemurian zonal index fossil), which is in turn type genus of the widely-used family Arietitidae Hyatt, 1874. Apart from the little-known paper by Meek, 1876 (unknown even to Buckman), the genus Arietites and the family Arietitidae (or Arietidae) had been used for half a century in all world literature on Liassic ammonites and in text-books. One of the classics of ammonites is Hyatt's book "Genesis of the Arietidae" (1889), and the leading palaeontological text-book to this day, Eastman's translation of Zittel (1913 : 655) has a figure "Arietites bisulcatus Bruguière" to illustrate the family Arietinae,
and the figure is d'Orbigny's pl. 43; and the same figure and the same name are repeated in the latest (German) edition of the same book (1924: 571).

15. The facts adduced in paragraph 14 above, emphasise that Ammonites as used by Buckman and Spath since 1923 was a revival not a survival, and paragraphs 5 to 13 indicate that it was a revival on the flimsiest foundations. Roman (1938) in his comprehensive work on the Jurassic and Cretaceous ammonites rightly refused to displace Arietites and Arietitidae by Ammonites and ammonitidae.

16. If the generic name Ammonites were to be revived, it would become automatically the type genus of the family ammonitidae, which for reasons of priority is attributed (as by Meek) to Owen, with the date 1836. This is misleading, for ammonitidae Owen 1836 was a vastly wider and altogether different concept. Most families as now used have been emended (which usually means restricted) to some extent, but none to such a degree as this. ammonitidae Owen, 1836, was in fact almost the same as the order ammonioidea, and as de Hann's "family ammonitae", 1825. Consequently, the revival of Ammonites as a generic name would involve either its attribution to the family "ammonitidae Owen" which is really something totally different, or the establishment of a new family ammonitidae dating from some later author such as Meek or Spath, arbitrarily chosen (Meek, however, still included Cretaceous genera in ammonitidae); but this would be a homonym of ammonitidae Owen and invalid.

17. Dr. Spath in his paper of 1946 stated that he proposed to submit an application concerning the type of Ammonites to the International Commission, but I learn from the Secretary that no such application has yet been received by the Commission (January, 1950). Since a decision on this important matter is urgently needed, I hereby make the following applications (paragraphs 18, 19).

18. That the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should use their Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name Ammonites Bruguière, 1789, for the purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 34 (thereby continuing to render invalid as a homonym any later use of the word Ammonites as a generic name) and should place this name on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

19. That the Commission should place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the generic name Arietites Waagen, 1869 (gender of generic name: masculine) (type species, by monotypy: Ammonites bucklandi Sowerby (J.), 1816) and on the Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology the trivial name bucklandi Sowerby (J.), 1816, as published in the binominal combination Ammonites bucklandi.
20. In making this application I assume that when (if ever) the Commission draws up Rules governing the names of taxonomic categories higher than families, it will, if necessary, make provision for retention of the order name AMMONOIDEA, so that it shall not require to be replaced because of the abolition of the generic name Ammonites and family name AMMONITIDAE.
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II.—THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CASE

2. Registration of the present application: On the receipt of Dr. Arkell's preliminary communication of 25th June 1949, the question of the future status of the generic name *Ammonites* Bruguière, 1789, was allotted the Registered Number Z.N.(S.) 425.

3. Publication of the present application: As soon as practicable after the present application had been finally settled in August 1950, it was sent to the printer and it was published on 4th May 1951 in Triple-Part 6/8 of volume 2 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Arkell, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2: 200—203).

4. Issue of Public Notices: Under the revised arrangements approved by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 51—56), Public Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in the present case was given on 4th May 1951, both in Triple-Part 6/8 of volume 2 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, the Part in which Dr. Arkell's application was published, and also to the other prescribed serial publications. In addition, Public Notice was given to certain palaeontological serial publications in Europe and America. The publication of these Notices elicited no objection to the action proposed.
5. Support received for the present application: Support for the present application was received from the following specialists:—
(a) Dr. D. T. Donovan (University of Bristol, Department of Geology, Bristol); (b) Dr. R. Ph. Dollfus (Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris); (c) Mr. C. W. Wright (London); (d) Mr. R. Casey (Geological Survey and Museum, London); (e) Dr. Helmut Hölder (Geologisch-Paläontologisches Institut der Universität Tübingen, Germany); (f) The Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America. The communications so received are given in the immediately following paragraphs.

6. Support received from Dr. D. T. Donovan (University of Bristol, Department of Geology, Bristol): On 28th May 1951, Dr. D. T. Donovan (University of Bristol, Department of Geology, Bristol) addressed a letter to the Commission commenting upon a number of applications, including the present one. The following is an extract from the foregoing letter of the passage in which Dr. Donovan indicated his support for the present application (Donovan, 1951, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 2: 335—336):—

I agree with Dr. Arkell that it is undesirable for this name to remain, as at present, based on an eighteenth-century figure of uncertain identity, owing to the possibility of different interpretations, as pointed out in paragraph 11 of the proposal. The alternative procedure, namely the definition of the type species by reference to a later figure is liable to displace other current names; as regards the particular proposal mentioned by Dr. Arkell (paragraph 13(A)) that d'Orbigny's 1843 plate 43 should be selected as "neotype" of Ammonites bisulcatus, Bruguière, I have personally examined d'Orbigny's collection in Paris and have satisfied myself that his plate 43 does not represent any now existing specimen; it may be a figure of a lost specimen but is more likely to be an idealised drawing. It is therefore undesirable that the interpretation of any genus should depend on this figure. In my own work I have not used the genus, since it cannot be defined to the agreement of all, and I feel that Dr. Arkell's proposal for suppression would be an acceptable solution.

7. Support received from Dr. R. Ph. Dollfus (Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris): On 25th June 1951 Dr. R. Ph. Dollfus (Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris) furnished a statement dealing with a number of cases previously published in the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature. The following is an
extract from the foregoing statement of the passage in which Dr. Dollfus indicated his support for the proposals submitted in the present case (Dollfus, 1952, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 6 : 212):—

Je suis pour la suppression d'Ammonites Bruguière, 1789, et pour l'adoption d'Arietites Waagen, 1869.

8. Support received from Mr. C. W. Wright (London): On 17th July 1951 Mr. C. W. Wright (London) addressed to the Commission the following letter of support for the present application (Wright, 1951, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 2: 336):—

I should like to support Dr. W. J. Arkell’s application (1951, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 2 : 200—203) for the suppression of the generic name Ammonites Bruguière, 1789. Although it might be argued that this name is comparable in its double connotation, as the name of a genus and, almost in the vernacular, as the name of an Order or Sub-Order, to such names as Nautilus, the scale of the vernacular use of Ammonites is so vast that its use as the name of a nominal genus would be bound to be confusing and misleading, quite apart from the arguments adduced by Dr. Arkell.

9. Support received from Mr. R. Casey (Geological Survey and Museum, London): On 5th October 1951 Mr. R. Casey (Geological Survey and Museum, London) addressed a letter to the Commission, commenting upon a number of applications previously published in the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature, including that relating to the name Ammonites Bruguière. The following is an extract from the foregoing letter of the passage in which Mr. Casey indicated his support for the present application (Casey, 1952, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 6: 213):—

In view of the additional evidence advanced by Dr. Donovan in the case of the nominal genus Ammonites Bruguière, 1789 (Donovan, D.T., 1951, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 2(11) : 335) I wish to be associated with those workers who have given their support to Dr. Arkell’s application for the suppression of the generic name Ammonites Bruguière, 1789.

10. Support received from Dr. Helmut Hölder (Geologisch-Paläontologisches Institut der Universität Tübingen, Germany): On 6th October 1951 Dr. Helmut Hölder (Geologisch-Paläontologisches Institut der Universität Tübingen) submitted a statement
setting out his views on the applications relating to the names of ammonites submitted by Dr. Arkell which had been published in Triple Part 6/8 of Volume 2 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. The following is an extract from Dr. Hölder's communication of the passage in which he indicated his support for the proposal for the grant of protection to the name *Arietites* Waagen, 1869, as against the name *Ammonites* Bruguière:—

Stellungnahme zu Arkell's Anträgen zur Nomenklatur jurassischer Ammoniten in "Bull. zool. Nomencl.", 2, 1951


11. Support received from the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America: On 9th April 1952 there was received a large number of letters commenting on various applications previously published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* from Professor G. Winston Sinclair (then of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.) Chairman of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America. Included among these was a letter, reporting that the members of the Joint Committee supported the present application by eight votes to three. The foregoing letter was dated 18th February 1952, and its late receipt was apparently due to a decision to defer the despatch to the Commission of the letters containing comments by members of the Joint Committee until all the letters in question had been prepared. By the date on which this letter was received, the Prescribed Period of Public Notice had expired and the Voting Paper (V.P.(52)23) relating to this case had been prepared. It was therefore impossible to include in that Voting Paper a reference to Professor Sinclair's letter, but, when the Voting Paper was despatched (on 24th April), a supplementary sheet containing the particulars furnished by Professor Sinclair was issued to the Members of the Commission, who were thus placed in possession of the views of the members of the Joint Committee.
at the same time that they received the Voting Paper relating to the present case. The following is the text of Professor Sinclair’s letter:—

The Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America has considered this subject, and I wish to inform you that, being polled, they voted: To support the petition (eight): (1) J. M. Weller; (2) Don L. Frizzell; (3) Bryan Patterson; (4) Katherine V. W. Palmer; (5) Bobb Schaeffer; (6) John B. Reeside, Jr.; (7) R. C. Moore; (8) G. Winston Sinclair. To oppose the petition (three): (1) A. Myra Keen; (2) S. W. Muller; (3) J. W. Wells.

III.—THE DECISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

12. Issue of Voting Paper V.P.(52)23: On 24th April 1952 a Voting Paper (V.P.(52)23) was issued in which the Members of the Commission were invited to vote either for, or against, the proposal “relating to the names Ammonites Bruguière and Arietites Waagen specified in paragraphs 18 and 19 on page 202 of volume 2 of the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature” [i.e., in the application reproduced in the first paragraph of the present Opinion].

13. The Prescribed Voting Period: As the foregoing Voting Paper was issued under the Three-Month Rule, the Prescribed Voting Period closed on 24th July 1952.

14. Particulars of the Voting on Voting Paper V.P.(52)23: The state of the voting on Voting Paper V.P.(52)23 at the close of the Prescribed Voting Period was as follows:—

(a) Affirmative Votes had been given by the following seventeen (17) Commissioners (arranged in the order in which Votes were received):

Calman; Hering; Dymond; Esaki; do Amaral; Hankó; Bonnet; Lemche; Vokes; Cabrera; Pearson; Bradley; Boschma; Stoll; Mertens; Hemming; Riley;
(b) Negative Votes:  
None;

(c) Voting Paper not returned, one (1):  
Jaczewski.

15. Declaration of Result of Vote: On 25th July 1952, Mr. Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission, acting as Returning Officer for the Vote taken on Voting Paper V.P.(52)23, signed a Certificate that the Votes cast were as set out in paragraph 14 above and declaring that the proposal submitted in the foregoing Voting Paper had been duly adopted and that the decision so taken was the decision of the International Commission in the matter aforesaid.

16. On 20th March 1954 Mr. Hemming prepared the Ruling given in the present Opinion and at the same time signed a Certificate that the terms of that Ruling were in complete accord with those of the proposal approved by the International Commission in its Vote on Voting Paper V.P.(52)23.

17. The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:—

Ammonites Bruguière, 1789, Ency. méth., Vers 1 (1) : xvi, 28
Arietites Waagen, 1869, Geogn.-pal. Beitr. 2 (Heft 2) : 247
bucklandi, Ammonites, Sowerby (J.), 1816, Min. Conch. 2 : 69

18. At the time of the adoption of the Ruling given in the present Opinion, the expression prescribed for the second portion of the binomen which constitutes the scientific name of a species was the expression “trivial name” and the Official List reserved for recording such names was styled the Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology, the word “trivial” appearing also in the title of the Official Index reserved for recording rejected and
invalid names of this category. Under a decision taken by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, the expression “specific name” was substituted for the expression “trivial name” and corresponding changes were made in the titles of the Official List and Official Index of such names (1953, Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl. : 21). The changes in terminology so adopted have been incorporated in the Ruling given in the present Opinion.

19. The prescribed procedures were duly complied with by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in dealing with the present case, and the present Opinion is accordingly hereby rendered in the name of the said International Commission by the under-signed Francis Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in virtue of all and every the powers conferred upon him in that behalf.

20. The present Opinion shall be known as Opinion Three Hundred and Five (305) of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

DONE in London, this Twentieth day of March, Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-Four.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

FRANCIS HEMMING
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. 1954. "Opinion 305 Suppression, under the Plenary Powers, of the generic name ammonites Bruguiere, 1789, and addition to the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology of the generic name Arietites Waagen, 1869 (class Cephalopoda, order Ammonoidea)." Opinions and declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 8, 297–312.
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