OPINION 703

PTEROPHORUS SCHÄFFER, 1766 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA):
ADDITION TO THE OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES

RULING.—(1) The generic name Pterophorus Schäffer, 1766 (gender: masculine), type-species, by designation by Whalley, 1961, Phalaena pentadactyla Linnaeus, 1758, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1591.

(2) The specific name pentadactyla Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen Phalaena pentadactyla (type-species of Pterophorus Schäffer, 1766) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1777.

(3) The family-group name PTEROPHORIDAE Zeller, 1841 (type-genus Pterophorus Schäffer, 1766) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 365.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1463)
The present application was submitted to the office of the Commission by Mr. P. E. S. Whalley in July 1960. An amended version of Mr. Whalley’s application was sent to the printer on 22 September 1960 and was published on 14 April 1961 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 18: 159–160. Mr. Whalley’s proposals were supported by Dr. L. Bigot (Bull zool. Nomencl. 19: 141) and opposed by Prof. E. M. Hering (Bull zool. Nomencl. 18: 333). The applicant’s reply to Prof. Hering’s objections was published in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 19: 69.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION
On 25 July 1962 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (62/25) either for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 18: 160. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 25 October 1962 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—nineteen (19), received in the following order: China, Holthuis, Riley, Obruchev, Evans, Uchida, Binder, do Amaral, Miller, Boschma, Lemche, Vokes, Tortonese, Stoll, Borchsenius, Mertens, Poll, Alvarado, Bonnet.

Negative votes—six (6): Mayr, Key, Jaczewski, Hering, Brinck, Kühnelt.

On Leave of Absence—three (3): Bradley, Munroe, Prantl.

Voting Papers not returned—one (1): Hemming.

The following comments were made by Commissioners in returning their votes:

Prof. Ernst Mayr (17.viii.62). “It does not seem to me that the conflicting statements have been sufficiently investigated. This is a very recent application, as evident from its serial number, and it would have seemed to me that Hering and Whalley should have been requested to present more detailed data on usage. It is difficult for a Commissioner to arrive at a reasoned judgment on the basis

of the scanty and contradictory evidence so far available. This is particularly regrettable in the case of such an important genus as *Pterophorus*.

Dr. K. H. L. Key (24.vii.62). "I am voting against the application relating to *Pterophorus*, because there seems to be a great deal of unresolved confusion on several points at issue. Not only is there disagreement among the three specialists who have written to the Commission, but there is much internal inconsistency in the two statements by Whalley.

"The case has two aspects: (1) What would be the valid type-species of *Pterophorus* Geoffroy, if that genus were not unavailable as from Geoffroy? This is not strictly relevant, but it would provide a suitable species to designate as type-species of *Pterophorus* Schäffer provided that usage were not against such choice. In any case, one would like to feel that investigations on this point had led to a definite conclusion. (2) What choice of type-species would be indicated by usage?

"(1) In the original application it is stated that *pentadactylus* is the type-species of *Pterophorus* Geoffroy by designation by Curtis (1827). However, in *Bull.* 19: 69 we read that Leach (1815) designated the same type-species earlier, while Latreille (1802-3) cited *didactylus* as type-species. Moreover, Cuvier (1798) cited ‘a type’ for the ‘complex’ of *Alucita* L. and *Pterophorus* Geoff. and ‘put pentadactyla in this group’. Whether this should be read to mean that *pentadactyla* was cited as the type is not clear to me, nor for which of the two nominal genera the type must be considered to have been formally selected. On page 69, also, it is stated that *didactylus* was subsequently cited as type-species of *Geina* Tutt, but lower down we read that *monodactylus* ‘should be left as the type-species of *Geina* Tutt’. Wallengren is said to have given *monodactylus* as a synonym of *pterodactylus* L., a name not otherwise referred to (and possibly a misprint). Contrary to Whalley, Bigot (although writing in support of him) states that most authors currently put *monodactylus* in the genus *Emmelina* (not *Geina*).

"(2) As regards usage, the views of Whalley and Bigot favouring *pentadactylus*, are diametrically opposed to those of Hering, favouring *monodactylus*.

"I do not see how the ordinary Commissioner can come to any conclusion on such conflicting submissions."

Dr. T. Jaczewski (24.ix.62). "I agree with the objection raised by Prof. E. M. Hering and I am of the opinion that the case requires careful reconsideration. I am supported here in this opinion by Prof. S. Adamczewski."

Prof. W. Kühnelt (23.x.62). "I should like to support the proposal of E. M. Hering to designate *monodactyla* Linnaeus as the type-species of *Pterophorus* Schäffer instead of *pentadactyla* Linnaeus."

In spite of the serious objections raised by Commissioners Mayr, Key, Jaczewski and Hering, it has been decided to accept the majority vote of the Commission, because the Secretary sees no other way of solving this rather urgent problem, where there has obviously been divergent use of a generic name among lepidopterists of different countries.

---

1 None of these earlier "designations" is in fact valid under the Code.
2 This was a lapsus calami on the part of Mr. Whalley, *monodactylus* is type of *Emmelina*. 
**ORIGINAL REFERENCES**

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

- *Pterophorus Schäffer, 1766, Elementa Entomologica*: Tab. 104, figs. 2, 3

The following is the original reference for the designation of a type-species for the genus concerned in the present Ruling:


**CERTIFICATE**

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (62)25 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 703.

W. E. CHINA

*Acting Secretary*

*International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

*London*

18 October 1963
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