OPINION 1133
SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF NAMES FOR GENERA AND SPECIES OF AMPHIPODA PROPOSED BY RAFINESQUE BETWEEN 1814 AND 1820

RULING – (1) Under the plenary powers
(a) the following generic names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:
   (i) *Psammylla* Rafinesque, 1817;
   (ii) *Sperchius* Rafinesque, 1820;
(b) the following specific names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:
   (i) *bispinosa* Rafinesque, 1814, as published in the binomen *Pisitoe bispinosa*;
   (ii) *littoralis* Rafinesque, 1817, as published in the binomen *Psammylla littoralis*;
   (iii) *lucidus* Rafinesque, 1820, as published in the binomen *Sperchius lucidus*;
   (iv) *potamogeti* Rafinesque, 1817, as published in the binomen *Pepredo potamogeti*;
(c) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Talitrus* Bosc, [1802] are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Cancer (Gammarellus) saltator* Montagu, 1808, is hereby designated as type species of that genus;
(d) the family name TALITRIDAE Rafinesque, 1815 (type genus *Talitrus* Bosc, [1802]) is hereby given nomenclatural precedence over the family name ORCHESTII-DAE Leach, 1814 (type genus *Orchestia* Leach, 1814) whenever the two names are regarded as synonyms;
(e) it is hereby directed that the following nominal species are to be interpreted by the neotypes designated by Holthuis, 1969, *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 26: 106, paragraph 3a and: 107, paragraph 3c respectively:
   (i) *Lepleuris rivularis* Rafinesque, 1820;
   (ii) *Pisitoe levifrons* Rafinesque, 1814.
(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
(a) *Crangonyx* Bate, 1859 (gender: masculine), type species,
by monotypy, *Crangonyx subterraneus* Bate, 1859 (Name Number 2079);

(b) *Orchestia* Leach, 1814 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Cancer (Gammarrus) littoreus* Montagu, 1808 (Name Number 2080);

(c) *Phronima* Latreille, [1802] (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Cancer sedentarius* Forsskål, 1775 (Name Number 2081);

(d) *Phrosina* Risso, 1822 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Stebbing, 1888, *Phrosina semilunata* Risso, 1822 (Name Number 2082);

(e) *Synurella* Wrzesniowski, 1877 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Synurella polonica* Wrzesniowski, 1877 (Name Number 2083);

(f) *Talitrus* Bosc, [1802] (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) (c) above, *Cancer (Gammarellus) saltator* Montagu, 1808 (Name Number 2084);

(g) *Talorchestia* Dana, 1852 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent monotypy (Dana, 1853), *Talitrus gracilis* Dana, 1852 (Name Number 2085).

3. The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *fasciatus* Say, 1818, as published in the binomen *Gammarrus fasciatus* (Name Number 2671);

(b) *gammarellus* Pallas, 1766, as published in the binomen *Oniscus gammarellus* (Name Number 2672);

(c) *gracilis* Dana, 1852, as published in the binomen *Talitrus gracilis* (specific name of type species of *Talorchestia* Dana, 1852) (Name Number 2673);

(d) *locusta* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Cancer locusta* (Name Number 2674);

(e) *longicornis* Say, 1818, as published in the binomen *Talitrus longicornis* (Name Number 2675);

(f) *minus* Say, 1818, as published in the binomen *Gammarrus minus* (Name Number 2676);

(g) *platensis* Krøyer, 1844, as published in the binomen *Orchestia platensis* (Name Number 2677);

(h) *polonica* Wrzesniowski, 1877, as published in the binomen *Synurella polonica* (specific name of type species of *Synurella* Wrzesniowski, 1877) (Name Number 2678);

(i) *saltator* Montagu, 1808, as published in the combination *Cancer (Gammarellus) saltator* (specific name of type
species of *Talitrus* Bosc, [1802]) (Name Number 2679);

(j) *sedentarius* Forsskål, 1775, as published in the binomen *Cancer sedentarius* (specific name of type species of *Phronima* Latreille, [1802]) (Name Number 2680);

(k) *semilunata* Risso, 1822, as published in the binomen *Phrosina semilunata* (specific name of type species of *Phrosina* Risso, 1822) (Name Number 2681);

(l) *subterraneus* Bate, 1859, as published in the binomen *Crangonyx subterraneus* (specific name of type species of *Crangonyx* Bate, 1859) (Name Number 2682).

The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:

(a) *ORCHESTIIDAE* (correction of *ORCHESTIDAE*) Leach, 1814 (type genus *Orchestia* Leach, 1814), with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *TALITRIDAE* Rafinesque, 1815 by anybody who believes that *Orchestia* Leach and *Talitrus* Bosc belong to the same family-group taxon (Name Number 496);

(b) *PHRONIMIDAE* (correction of *PHRONIMIA*) Rafinesque, 1815 (type genus *Phrosina* Risso, 1822) (Name Number 497);

(c) *PHROSININAE* Dana, 1852 (type genus *Phrosina* Risso, 1822) (Name Number 498);

(d) *TALITRIDAE* (correction of *TALITRIDIA*) Rafinesque, 1815 (type genus *Talitrus* Bosc, [1802]) with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *ORCHESTIIDAE* Leach, 1814 by anybody who believes that *Talitrus* Bosc and *Orchestia* Leach belong to the same family-group taxon (Name Number 499).

The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Dactylocera* Latreille, 1829, a junior objective synonym of *Phrosina* Risso, 1822 (Name Number 2105);

(b) *Pisitoe* Rafinesque, 1814, a junior objective synonym of *Phronima* Latreille, [1802] (Name Number 2106);

(c) *Psammylla* Rafinesque, 1814, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) (i) above (Name Number 2107);

(d) *Sperchius* Rafinesque, 1820, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) (ii) above (Name Number 2108).

The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology, with the
Name Numbers specified:

(a) *bispinosa* Rafinesque, 1814, as published in the binomen *Pisitoe bispinosa*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) (i) above (Name Number 1052);

(b) *levifrons* Rafinesque, 1814, as published in the binomen *Pisitoe levifrons*, a junior objective synonym of *Cancer sedentarius* Forsskål, 1775 through the neotype designation made under the plenary powers in (1) (e) (ii) above (Name Number 1053);

(c) *littoralis* Rafinesque, 1817, as published in the binomen *Psammylla littoralis*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) (ii) above (Name Number 1054);

(d) *lucidus* Rafinesque, 1820, as published in the binomen *Sperchius lucidus*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) (iii) above (Name Number 1055);

(e) *potamogeti* Rafinesque, 1817, as published in the binomen *Pephredo potamogeti*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) (iv) above (Name Number 1056);

(f) *rivularis* Rafinesque, 1820, as published in the binomen *Lepleurus rivularis*, a junior objective synonym of *Gammarus minus* Say, 1818 through the neotype designation made under the plenary powers in (1) (e) (i) above (Name Number 1057).

**NOTE ON THE DATES ASSIGNED TO CERTAIN NAMES IN THE PRESENT RULING**

In his original application (see the History of the Case), Dr Holthuis cited the date of *Phronima* Latreille as “[1802–1803]” and that of Bosc as “[1801–1802]”, and those were the correct bibliographic dates for the works containing those names, according to the evidence then available to him, namely that published by Griffin, 1938, *J. Soc. Bibliogr. nat. Hist.*, vol. 1: 157. In the light of Griffin’s assumptions, the correct nomenclatural date for Latreille’s *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.*, vol. 3, would have been the last day of “An XI” corrected to the Gregorian calendar, i.e. [23 September 1803] under Article 21b(ii) of the present Code.

Professor Dupuis, however, has shown (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 32: 4) that the publication of vols. 3 and 4 of Latreille’s work was announced in the *Journal typographique et bibliographique*, 6e année, No. VI: 42, 15 brumaire, An XI, which corresponds to [6 November 1802] in the Gregorian calendar. Vol. 3 must have been published at some date between April 1802 (cited on: 369 of the
Since Professor Dupuis showed at the same time that Bosc's *Hist. nat. Crust.*, vol. 2 must have been published before 20 January 1802, the relative priority of the two works is not in question. It is beyond the terms of the present Opinion to research further into the exact date of publication of Latreille's vol. 3.

**HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.) 1879**

An application by Dr E.L. Bousfield (*National Museum of Natural Sciences, Ottawa, Canada*) and Professor Holthuis for the suppression of names proposed for Amphipod genera and species by Rafinesque was first received on 3 February 1969. It was sent to the printer on 15 February 1969 and published on 8 August 1969 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 26: 105–112. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and to a Crustacean serial. Dr Sabrosky wrote in February 1970 to protest against the proposed use of the Commission's plenary powers to suppress *nomina dubia*, drawing attention to his own earlier application on this subject (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 22: 265–266). Professor Holthuis replied that "whatever the identity of Rafinesque’s species and genera is, their names, if revived, will preoccupy well-established and widely adopted Amphipod names. To me the most logical solution to this problem is to eliminate these threats. To leave them dangling in the air forever like so many swords of Damocles does not seem to have any advantage".

**FIRST VOTE BY THE COMMISSION**

On 28 November 1973 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1973)14 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 26: 109–112. At the close of the voting period on 28 February 1974 there were 14 affirmative votes, four negative votes and two abstentions (two late positive votes and one late negative vote were also eventually returned). The following comments were submitted by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

*Tortonesi:* "I vote 'for' because too often the revival of old and unwanted names threatens the stability of nomenclature. I agree with Dr Holthuis that such a danger is better avoided by suppressing the names."

*Willink:* "I fully agree with Dr Holthuis."

*Dupuis:* "Je déclare m’abstenir car il n’y a pas une seule proposition, mais plusieurs. Pour la suppression de *nomina dubia* je
partage l'avis de Sabrosky. Pour la désignation de néotypes je suis toujours très réticent.”

Sabrosky: “Holthuis’s riposte is clever and appealing, but misses the main point of my statement in Bull. vol. 22: 265–266. At this late date, the chances of such old nomina dubia rising from the dead must surely be exceedingly remote. This case should not even be considered until the arguments in my application have been evaluated and voted upon.

“One exception: I will support the requested action for Talitrus, but with the comment that an application for action on a misidentified type species should have been a separate case and not mixed up with Rafinesque’s nomina dubia. A zoologist interested in Talitrus and TALITRIDAE, and who depends on published lists of cases before the Commission would not have been alerted by the title of this application to the fact that the case proposed important action on the type species of Talitrus Bosc.”

Melville: “No vote. Dr Sabrosky’s comment has not yet been fully dealt with.”

Rohdendorf: “I vote against because I am almost convinced of the prematurity of many proposed suppressions of Rafinesque’s nomina dubia.”

Heppell: “The case should be treated, as suggested by Dr Sabrosky, under the provisions for nomina dubia. If the identity of Rafinesque’s names are eventually decided, the names can then be dealt with under the provisions for unused names.”

Bernardi: “Je pense, comme le Dr Sabrosky, que les nomina dubia doivent être abordés uniquement d’un point de vue taxonomique et n’exigent donc pas l’intervention de la Commission.”

Professor Dupuis was invited to explain more fully the reasons for his abstention. His explanation, and Professor Holthuis’s reply, were published in Bull. zool. Nom. vol. 32: 3–8. No other comment was received.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

A second voting paper – Voting Paper (1978)14 – was circulated to the members of the Commission under the Three-Month Rule on 5 September 1978. At the close of the voting period on 5 December 1978 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes – fourteen (14) received in the following order: Holthuis, Melville, Alvarado, Eisenmann, Vokes, Brinck, Willink, Tortonese, Binder, Bayer, Corliss, Habe, Nye, Welch


Cogger abstained from voting; Ride was on leave of absence. Sabrosky sent in a late abstention. No voting papers were returned.
by Heppell, Kraus and Starobogatov.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Cogger: “Despite Holthuis’s reply to Dupuis, the latter’s case is convincing – the more so because of the errors discovered in the original proposal. Although such errors are fairly trivial and do not alter the basic case, they point up the problems inherent in dealing with a multiplicity of nomenclatural decisions in one vote. I strongly endorse many of the views held by Dupuis, but as my views are based largely on principles rather than on specifics, it seems appropriate to abstain from voting in this case.”

Dupuis: “Je vote contre un trop grand nombre de mesures proposées simultanément (‘plus le nombre de mesures augmente, plus il y a de chances de commettre des erreurs’, Dupuis, Bull. vol. 32: 4).

“Si la Commission dans sa majorité votait pour, il conviendrait que le Secrétaire tienne compte que l’auteur de certains noms est bien Latreille in Bosc (conformément à Dupuis l.c.: 4) et non pas Bosc (Holthuis, Bull. vol. 32: 6).


“Latreille a confirmé tout cela (Hist. nat. gén. partic., vol. 5: 172–173): ‘L’ouvrage de Bosc présente ... plusieurs observations sur les Crustacés, que ce naturaliste a recueillies en Caroline .... Je lui ai communiqué mon nouveau travail dans cette partie des animaux sans vertèbres. L’expression de sa gratitude à mon égard a été celle d’un homme qui sait apprécier les recherches des autres; qui ne s’en sert jamais sans rendre hommage à leur auteur, et dont le coeur est doué d’une sensibilité exquise.’ Italiques de C. Dupuis.”

Bernardi: “Bien que prenant en considération la réponse de Holthuis, je considère que cette application a un caractère trop global.”
Professor Holthuis was invited to comment on Professor Dupuis' observations and did so in two letters dated 6 December 1978 and 15 January 1979 (the second in reply to a request from the Secretary for further information). The first letter read:

"In my opinion Bosc nowhere says that the descriptions of Pinnotheres, Talitrus, etc., are cited from Latreille or written by Latreille. The fact that he made use of Latreille's manuscript does not imply that he copied the descriptions. The crucial sentence in Bosc's book is the one on: 48: 'mais on donnera en entier celui qu'il a rédigé pour une nouvelle édition'. I interpreted this as 'I give here all the work [celui agreeing with travail] that he has prepared for a new edition', but that does not mean that Bosc copied the manuscript verbatim. When we compare Bosc's definition of Talitrus (1801, vol. 1: 78) with Latreille's (1802, vol. 3: 38, 39), we see that Bosc used his own words: 'Quatre antennes simples; les intermédiaires, supérieures, et plus courtes que le pédoncule des latérales et inférieures; dix à quatorze pattes'. Latreille used a similar but slightly different definition: 'Antennes simples: les intermédiaires supérieures et plus courtes que les latérales et inférieures. (Dix à quatorze pattes). Une queue; des pièces articulées au bout'. In their more extensive accounts of the genus (Bosc, vol. 2: 148—152; Latreille, vol. 6: 294—302) the differences are much more striking. Bosc (vol. 2: 152) even includes a new species (collected by himself) in the genus, which Latreille (vol. 6: 300) accepts and refers to Bosc.

"My impression is that Bosc consulted Latreille's manuscript, but did not copy it literally. He used his own wording and made important changes and additions. I do not think that in these cases Latreille 'is alone responsible both for the name and for the conditions that make it available'.

The second letter read:

"Article 50 of the Code says that the author of a scientific name is the person who first publishes it (here Bosc), unless it is clear from the contents of the publication that another person (here supposedly Latreille) is alone responsible both for the name and the conditions that make it available. I have always interpreted this rule to mean that there must be a definite statement in the original publication that someone other than the author of the publication is responsible for the names and the descriptions of all or some specifically mentioned taxa. I do not believe that Bosc makes this clear in his book.

"In the introduction to his Histoire naturelle des Crustacés (1802, vol. 1: 1—48) Bosc deals extensively with the various classifications of the Crustacea by previous authors (Fabricius, Herbst, Müller, Cuvier, Lamarck) and then speaks of Latreille's then un-
published work (Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.). After barely mentioning Latreille’s first work, his 1796 Précis caract. génériques Ins. (‘On ne parlera pas de son premier travail’), Bosc continues that a new edition has been prepared by Latreille and that ‘on donnera en entier celui qu’il a rédigé pour une nouvelle édition, et dont il a permis de faire usage ici’. The next 43 pages of Bosc’s Introduction (49–91) then give a classification of the Crustacea down to the genera. This classification, although it may have been inspired by Latreille’s unpublished research, is certainly not a verbatim citation of Latreille’s text. The order in which the genera are treated is totally different from that published by Latreille (Hist. nat. gén. partic., vol. 3: 13–43). Thus, for instance, Bopyrus, which Bosc places among the ‘Crustacés improprement dits’ (which form the ‘Section seconde’ of the Crustacea) was placed by Latreille (vol. 3: 43) with the other Isopoda in the ‘Sous-classe première. Tétracères; tetracera’ of the Class Insecta and was thus excluded from the Crustacea.

“That Bosc’s classification is not a citation of Latreille’s is also shown by the different wording of the diagnoses of the genera. It is clear that Bosc used Latreille’s results and accepted several of his genera, but the descriptions are at least partly in his own words, while he added characters, remarks, etc. Latreille is thus certainly not ‘alone responsible both for the name and the conditions that make it available’.

“A comparison of the works of the two authors shows that each gave first a brief review of the genera with diagnosis of each (Bosc, vol. 1: 49–91; Latreille, vol. 3: 13–40 (Crustacea), 40–42 (Insecta Tetracera) and later treated the genera and species more extensively (Bosc, vol. 1: 161–258, vol. 2; Latreille, vol. 5: 346–395, vol. 6: 1–338 for the Crustacea, 339–376, vol. 7: 1–55 for the Insecta Tetracera). The diagnoses of Bopyrus, Talitrus and Pinnotheres are similar in the characters used but differ in the wording. In my opinion, Bosc gave the diagnoses in his own words as far as he possibly could. The extended accounts of the three genera are so different that there cannot be any doubt that both are original, even if each was influenced by the other.

“Bosc described a new species, Talitrus grillus, that he had himself collected in North America, and this was accepted by Latreille and attributed to Bosc. Latreille further says (vol. 6: 294): ‘Bosc a bien développé les caractères génériques des talitres. Ils ont, dit-il, généralement le corps plus épais ...’. He would scarcely have said this if Bosc had merely copied his (Latreille’s) description.

“Thus, although Latreille may have been the spiritual father of Bopyrus, Talitrus and Pinnotheres, nomenclaturally it is Bosc who is to be cited as their author, for he first published Latreille’s
manuscript names with his own descriptions and observations. Why did these early authors with all their good intentions (both Bosc and Latreille behaved as perfect gentlemen here) make our nomenclatural life so difficult?"

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

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

*bispinosa*, *Pisitoe*, Rafinesque, 1814, *Précis Découv. somiol.*: 25


*Dactylocera* Latreille, 1829, in Cuvier, *Règne Animal* (ed. 2), vol. 4: 117


*phronima*, *Latreille*, [1802], *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.*, vol. 3: 38


*Pisitoe* Rafinesque, 1814, *Précis Découv. somiol.*: 25


sedentarius, Cancer, Forsskål, 1775, *Descri. Anim.*: 95
*Talitrus* Bosc, [1802], *Hist. nat. Crust.*, vol. 2: 148
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I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (78)14 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 on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1133.

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
16 February 1979
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