VOLUTA PERTUSA LINNAEUS, 1758, VOLUTA MORIO LINNAEUS, 1767, VOLUTA RUFFINA LINNAEUS, 1767, AND BULLA CONOIDEA LINNAEUS, 1767: SUPPRESSED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers the following specific names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

(a) pertusa Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen Voluta pertusa;
(b) morio Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen Voluta morio;
(c) ruffina Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen Voluta ruffina;
(d) conoidea Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen Bulla conoidea.

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) pertusa Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen Voluta pertusa (Name No. 885);
(b) morio Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen Voluta morio (Name No. 886);
(c) ruffina Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen Voluta ruffina (Name No. 887);
(d) conoidea Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen Bulla conoidea (Name No. 888).

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1700)

The present case was submitted to the office of the Commission by Mr. Walter O. Cernohorsky in May 1965. Mr. Cernohorsky’s application was sent to the printer on 20 May 1965 and was published on 13 August 1965 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 22 : 198–203. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the Bulletin as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Constitution Art. 12b; Bull zool. Nomencl. 21 : 184) and to two specialist serials. The proposals were supported by Dr. Jean M. Cate.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 20 July 1967 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (67)35 either for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 22 : 202–203. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 20 October 1967 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—eighteen (18), received in the following order: Holthuis, Vokes, Lemche, Evans, Obruchev, Boschma, Mayr, Brinck, Simpson, Tortonese, Munroe, do Amaral, Uchida, Jaczewski, Mertens, Binder, Alvarado, Forest.
Negative votes—four (4): China, Sabrosky, Kraus, Ride.
Voting Papers not returned—one (1): Hubbs.
Commissioner Bonnet returned a late affirmative vote.
The following comments were made by Commissioners in returning their votes:

Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (2.viii.67): "I am opposed to Commission action on cases of *nomina dubia*. Should not these cases be delayed until the Commission can rule on my application regarding *nomina dubia* in general?"

Dr. Henning Lemche (3.viii.67): "I favour the suppression because of the many serious but unsuccessful attempts that have been made to identify these species."

Prof. P. Brinck (18.viii.67): "I vote for the proposal with some doubt, as the applicant has not consulted nor refers to the Upsala collection of Linnaean material. It is rich in molluscs and has been listed by Dr. Alec Holm. Microfilms of the material have been distributed to various institutions. A copy is with the Linnean Society in London. The Upsala collection contains i.a. the material from the Museum Lud. Ulricae."

Prof. G. G. Simpson (25.viii.67): "This action is doubtless within the powers of the Commission. If one wanted to be legalistic, however, one could object to the proposal of suppression on grounds that these are *nomina dubia*. There is no rule or ruling that *nomina dubia* are to be suppressed *ipso facto*, and the implication that this is so is virtually a clandestine amendment of the Code (see also Bull. zool. Nomencl. 22 : 273)."

Dr. Otto Kraus (16.x.67): "As the applicant explains there seems to be no doubt that all four names should be regarded as *nomina dubia*. There is not even one case in which they threaten stability at present, so I do not understand the necessity of action by the Commission."

Dr. W. D. L. Ride (19.x.67): "In my opinion, the plenary powers should not be used to suppress a *nomen dubium* merely because it cannot be fixed to a taxon because there is no type specimen. Neotype selection provides for this situation within the normal provisions of the Code and it should be used unless all possible action of this nature will result in confusion. The author has not demonstrated that confusion will result in these cases although it does appear implicit in two of them. If he can demonstrate such confusion, he should reapply. Certainly, the case of *V. morio* can be settled without confusion by the selection of an undoubted specimen of *V. caffra*; and that of *B. conoidea* by a specimen of *V. dactylus* (with appropriate action by a first reviser to settle priority)."

**Original References**

The following are the original references for names placed on the Official Index by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (67)35 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion.

W. E. CHINA
Acting Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
3 November 1967
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