OPINION 595
INTERPRETATION OF THE NOMINAL SPECIES UNIO PHILLIPSII
WILLIAMSON, 1836 (PELECYPODA)

RULING.—(1) It is hereby directed that the nominal species Unio phillipsii
Williamson, 1836, is to be interpreted by reference to specimen No. L10106
(2) The generic name Anthroconauta Pruvost, 1930 (gender : masculine),
type-species by original designation, Unio phillipsii Williamson, 1836, is hereby
placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1410.
(3) The specific name phillipsii Williamson, 1836, as published in the
binomen Unio phillipsii, and interpreted by reference to specimen L10106
in the Geological Department of the Manchester Museum, England (type-
species of Anthroconauta Pruvost, 1930) is hereby placed on the Official List
of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1722.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1398)
The present case arose from a letter dated 12 January 1959, from D. J. Weir
to the office of the Commission concerned with the status of the specific name
Unio phillipsii. An application to the Commission was prepared and was
sent to the printer on 27 February 1959 and was published on 1 October 1959
Dr. Weir’s proposals were supported by Dr. R. M. C. Eagar (Bull. zool.
Nomencl. 17 : 64) ; Dr. M. A. Calver (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17 : 75) ; Dr. L. R.
Cox (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17 : 162) ; Prof. P. Pruvost, Dr. A. Pastiels,
Dr. E. Paproth, Dr. T. N. George (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17 : 188). No
adverse comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION
On 31 May 1960 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under
the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (60)13 either for or against the proposals
published in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17 : 64. At the end of the prescribed Voting
Period on 31 August 1960 the state of the voting was as follows :
Affirmative Votes—twenty-one (21), received in the following order :
Holthuis, Prantl, Mayr, Uchida, Brinck, Dymond, Hering, Riley, Obruchev,
Jaczewski, Lemche, Miller, Kühnelt, Bonnet, Vokes, Stoll, Tortoneese, do
Amaral, Key, Mertens, Poll.
Negative Votes—none (0).
Leave of Absence—one (1) : Bradley.
Votes not returned—two (2) : Boschma, Cabrera.
A late affirmative vote was returned by Commissioner Hemming.
The following comments were sent by Commissioners with their votes :
Dr. Per Brinck (16.vi.60). “I am voting for the proposal with some
doubt, since I think the wording ‘ the . . . species . . . is to be interpreted by
reference to specimen No. L10106 ’ means a type-selection de facto though
not de jure and this is an unfortunate solution of the problem. The inter-
pretation (by Mr. Weir) is certainly fully justified.”
Dr. K. H. L. Key (9.viii.60). "I consider that the ruling to be given in response to Dr. Weir's request should be a ruling 'that the specimen No. L10106 in the Geological Department of the Manchester Museum, England, is to be deemed a syntype of the nominal species Unio philipsii Williamson, 1836, and is hereby selected as the lectotype of that nominal species'.

"The difficulty arises only through the uncertainty as to whether the specimen generally treated as the single type can be accepted as a member of the type-series, and it is an affirmative ruling on that point that is primarily required. If the action of any earlier author can be held to qualify as a valid lectotype selection once the specimen L10106 has been ruled to be a syntype, then the selection of a lectotype by the Commission may not be necessary. Similarly, it would be possible to leave the lectotype selection to Dr. Weir once the Commission had ruled on the syntype situation. However, the problem would perhaps be most simply and directly resolved by a ruling on both points, as suggested above."

Original references

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


philipsii, Unio, Williamson, 1836, Phil. Mag. (3)9 : 350–351

Certificate

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (60)13 were cast as set out above, that the proposal set out 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. 595.

N. D. Riley
Secretary

W. E. China
Assistant Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London
21 September 1960

1 It seems to me desirable here to put on record my reason for not inviting Commissioners to take action along the lines suggested by Dr. Per Brink or Dr. Key. Clearly the Commission has the power to take such action. It is my belief, however, that it would prefer to leave the task of selecting lectotypes or neotypes in any group to specialists in that group, rather than to usurp a competence which I feel sure it would not wish to claim. N. D. Riley.
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