ARGYRODES SIMON, DIPOLENURA SIMON, ROBERTUS O. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE AND THEONE SIMON (ARACHNIDA, ARANEAE): PROPOSED PRESERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS.

By Herbert W. Levi (Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge 38, Mass., U.S.A.)

The principal purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to permit the accustomed usage of four genera of the spider family THERIDIIDAE: Argyrodes, Dipoenura, Robertus and Theone. A study of theridiid genera (in press) has revealed that usage of these names does not correspond with the strict application of the Rules.

1. Argyrodes Simon (1864, Histoire Naturelle des Araignées, (ed. 1) : 253), with type-species by tautonymy Linyphia argyrodes Walckenaer (1841, Histoire Naturelle des Araignées 2 : 282), from southern Europe and North Africa, is preoccupied by Argyrodes Guenee (1845, Ann. Soc. ent. France (2) 3 : 322) (Lepidoptera) with the type-species by monotypy A. vinetella Fabricius.

Strand (1928, Arch. Naturgesch. 93 : 42) first noted the homonymy and proposed the name Argyrodina for Argyrodes Simon. In the 1940’s Conopistha Karsch (1881, Berliner Ent. Zeitschr. 25 : 39) with the type-species by original designation C. bonadea, from Japan, was recognized as a subjective synonym of Argyrodes Simon. For the last twenty years Conopistha has been generally used as the name for the genus. A revision of the American spiders of the genus (Exline and Levi, 1961, in press) and a study of all theridiid genera (Levi, 1961, in press) place both Ariamnes Thorell (1869, Nova Acta Reg. Soc. Sci. Uppsala (3) 7 : 37, new name for Ariadne Doleschall, 1857, Nat. Tiidschr. Nederland Ind. 13 : 410, preoccupied by two older homonyms) with type-species by monotypy A. flagellum Doleschall, and Rhomphaea L. Koch (1872, Die Arachniden Australiens (1) : 289) with the type-species by monotypy R. cometes L. Koch, 1872, as additional subjective synonyms of Argyrodes, both antedating Conopistha Karsch, 1881.

If we follow the Law of Priority, the genus should be called Ariamnes, a name previously used for a small group of rare tropical spiders. However, those who disagree with the synonymy may still consider Conopistha or Rhomphaea the generic name.

Others, like Bonnet (1955, Bibliographia Araneorum 2(1) : 704) continue to consider Argyrodes the correct name. Besides being the oldest name of this assemblage of species, Argyrodes is the type-genus of a name in the family group. Simon (1892, Histoire Naturelle des Araignées 1 : 496) divided the THERIDIIDAE into groups, one of which he called ARGYRODAE. Later authors (e.g. Petrunkevitch, 1928, Trans. Connecticut Acad. Sci. 29 : 45) have interpreted ARGyroDAE as a subfamily name, and have changed it to ARGyroDINAe. The family name, however, is no longer in use and I therefore do not
ask that it be placed on the Official List. *Argyrodes* contains about 70 American species, and probably 100–200 species in the tropics and subtropics of other parts of the world.

According to Prof. W. T. M. Forbes and Dr. E. G. Munroe, *Argyrodes* Guenée (type-species *vinetella* Fabr.) is a junior objective synonym of *Eucarphia* Huebner (1825, *Verzeichnis bekannter Schemeterlinge* (23) : 364), which contains three species with *vinetella* Fabricius as the type. *Argyrodes* Guenée is thus an objective synonym of *Eucarphia*, so the name is not available for a lepidopteran genus as proposed by Guenée.

The preservation of *Argyrodes* (spiders) through the suppression of *Argyrodes* (Lepidoptera) is thus advisable for 3 reasons:

1. The continued widespread usage of *Argyrodes* in the aranean literature (e.g. Bonnet, 1955), owing to non-acceptance of the earlier senior homonym.
2. The fact that the generic name is the basis of an available and currently used name of the family-group of names.
3. The uncertainty of what replacement name for *Argyrodes* (spiders) to adopt, owing to disagreement among specialists as to the generic relation of the various generic names in the *Argyrodes* group.

All these difficulties would be removed at once if *Argyrodes* (Lepidoptera) were suppressed.

2. The problem of *Dipoenura* Simon (1908, *Bull. Sci. France, Belgique* 42 : 95) has been well stated by Bonnet (1956, *Bibliographia Araneorum* 2(2) : 1515):

Simon, en décrivant le genre *Dipoenura* (1908a, *Bull. sci. France, Belgique* 42) p. 95) indique qu’il s’agit de son *Dipoena* Sect. B de 1894a, [Histoire Naturelle des Araignées, vol. 1] p. 568, qui comprenait les espèces *pyramidalis*, *cyclosoides*, etc. . . . ; il indique d’autre part que *pyramidalis* est le type de ce nouveau genre. Or, en 1914, *Les Arachnides de France*, vol. 6] p. 297, Simon, passe l’espèce *pyramidalis* dans le genre *Theridium*, et lui donne le nom de *conigerum*, a cause du *Theridium pyramidalis* de L. Koch (1867).—D’autre part, Petrunkevitch, 1928b, [Trans. Connecticut Acad. Sci., vol. 29] p. 117, n’ayant sans doute pas repéré cette espèce *pyramidalis* (décrite sous le nom d’*Euryopis*) attribue comme type au genre *Dipoenura* la première espèce nouvelle qui est décrite avec le genre, c’est-à-dire *fimbriata*. Je ne changerais pas cette désignation maintenant qu’elle est ainsi faite par Petrunkevitch, mais il eut été plus normal de prendre *cyclosoides* comme type, puisque cette espèce est la deuxième citée par Simon et qu’elle avait une plus grande ancieneté. Enfin, le fait que ce genre *Dipoenura* voit son espèce-type passer dans le genre *Theridium* devrait automatiquement entraîner la synonymie de ces deux genres ; cela n’est pas possible, les deux genres étant différents ; il faudrait alors créer un autre terme, mais il est préférable d’admettre que Simon s’était trompé dans le premier choix de l’espèce-type de *Dipoenura*.

*Dipoenura* species are rare; the name has been little used. Male and female specimens are known of *D. fimbriata* from Tonkin, Southeast Asia. Two other species are known to belong to the genus, *D. cyclosoides* (Simon), from Sierra-Leone, West Africa, known only from females, and *D. quadrifida* Simon also
from Tonkin. No other generic names are available for these species.

*Theridion pyramidale* is known only from juvenile specimens. Their generic affinity is doubtful. It probably belongs to *Achaearanea* Strand, 1929.

If we were to accept the early type designation, *T. pyramidale*, the large genus *Achaearanea* Strand, 1929 (containing about 100 species, many common), would become a junior subjective synonym. In addition, since the type of *T. pyramidale* is only known from juveniles, the synonymy would remain doubtful until additional specimens of the type are found. Also *D. cyclosoides* Simon, *D. fimbriata* Simon and *D. quadrifida* would need a new generic name.

It is therefore requested that the Commission set aside the early type designation and designate *D. fimbriata* Simon as type.


Between 1884 and 1911 *Pedanostethus* was generally used for the genus. From 1907 to the present time *Robertus* has been in use in Europe, until Kaston's 1946 paper in North America.

At present *Robertus* is used by European authors. A. Holm, who has studied the genus, uses *Robertus*. Wiehle, a specialist in the theridiidae published a short discussion on names indicating his preference for *Robertus* (1960, *Zool. Jahrbücher Syst.* 88 : 237). Tullgren (1949, *Ent. Tidskr.* 70 : 60) has used *Robertus* and this name has been used by G. H. Locket and A. F. Millidge (1953, *British Spiders*, Roy. Soc., vol. 2). In the U.S. *Ctenium* has been used in Kaston's revision (cited above) of North American species and in several regional lists.

Universality of use demands that one or the other name be used for the genus. Usage strongly favours *Robertus*. It is requested therefore that the Commission use its plenary powers to suppress *Ctenium*.

4. *Theonoe* Simon, (1881, *Les Arachnides de France* 5 : 130), type-species designated by Simon, 1894 (*Histoire Naturelle des Araignées* 1 : 589), *Theonoe filiola* Simon, 1881 (op. cit., 5 : 131) includes several uncommon species. Although preoccupied by *Theonoe* Philippi, 1864 (Hemiptera) the name *Theonoe* has always been used for the genus except in Levi, 1955 (*Amer. Mus. Novitates*, no. 1718 : 3) where the homonymy was pointed out and the junior objective synonym *Coressa* Simon, 1894 was used.

A letter of inquiry to Dr. W. E. China, a specialist on Hemiptera, was answered as follows:

"*Theonoe spiniger* Philippi, 1865, *Analis de la Universidad de Chile*, Vol. 26, p. 654–5 is a nymph (immature stage) of a species of the genus *Leptoglossus* Guérin, 1830, and is probably *Leptoglossus chilensis* Spinola, Order Hemiptera, Suborder Heteroptera, Family Coreidae."
"Neave was wrong in his Nomenclator to attribute the name to the Coleoptera. The name Theonoe has never been used in either Coleoptera or Hemiptera so that no trouble will be caused by suppressing it in favour of Theonoe Simon, 1881, Arachnida.

"It will be quite in order for you to make an application to the Commission through me, explaining the position and requesting the suppression of Theonoe Philippi, 1865. Philippi himself states that it is probably a nymph and his name Theonoe, according to a footnote on p. 654, means a nymph. He likens his new species T. spiniger, which is type-species by monotypy of Theonoe Philippi, to Anisoscelis chilensis Spinola, but the species actually belongs to the allied genus Leptoglossus Guérin, 1830, not to Anisoscelis. The specific name spiniger Philippi, 1865 (page 655) as published in the binomen Theonoe spiniger is, and should be declared, a junior synonym of Leptoglossus chilensis Spinola.

"Until Theonoe Philippi, 1865 is suppressed it should be regarded as a junior subjective synonym of Leptoglossus Guérin."

The Commission is herewith requested by exercise of its plenary powers to place the name Theonoe Philippi, 1865 (Hemiptera) on the Index of Rejected Generic Names and to place the name Theonoe Simon, 1881 (Araneae) on the Official List of Generic Names.

5. The International Commission is therefore asked:
(1) to use its plenary powers:
   (a) to suppress the generic names Argyrodes Guenée, 1845, and Theonoe Philippi, 1865, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;
   (b) to suppress the generic name Ctenium Menge, 1871, for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
   (c) to set aside all designations of type-species for the genus Dipoenura Simon, 1908, made prior to the Ruling now requested and, having done so, to designate Dipoenura fimbriata Simon, 1908, to be the type of that genus.

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) Argyrodes Simon, 1864, type-species, by tautonymy, Linyphia argyrodes Walckenaer, 1841;
   (b) Dipoenura Simon, 1908, type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(c) above, Dipoenura fimbriata Simon, 1908;
   (c) Robertus O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879, type-species, by monotypy, Robertus astutus Pickard-Cambridge, 1879;
   (d) Theonoe Simon, 1881, type-species, by designation by Simon, 1894, Theonoe filiola Simon, 1881;
   (e) Eucarphia Hübner, [1825], type-species, by designation by Ragonot, 1855, Tinea vinetella Fabricius, 1787 (Lepidoptera).

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
(a) *argyrodes* Walckenaer, 1841, as published in the binomen *Linyphia argyrodes* (type-species of *Argyrodes* Simon, 1864);
(b) *fimbriata* Simon, 1908, as published in the binomen *Dipoenura fimbriata* (type-species of *Dipoenura* Simon, 1908);
(c) *neglectus* Pickard-Cambridge, 1871, as published in the binomen *Neriene neglectus*;
(d) *filiola* Simon, 1881, as published in the binomen *Theonoe filiola* (type-species of *Theonoe* Simon, 1881);
(e) *vinetella* Fabricius, 1787, as published in the binomen *Tinea vinetella* (type-species of *Eucarphia* Hübner, [1825]) (Lepidoptera).

(4) to place the following generic names as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:
(a) *Argyrodes* Guenée, 1845;
(b) *Ctenium* Menge, 1871;
(c) *Theonoe* Philippi, 1865.

APHIS LINNAEUS, 1758; ITS TYPE-SPECIES AND THE FAMILY-GROUP NAME DERIVED FROM IT. Z.N.(S.) 881

(see volume 18, pages 177–180)

It is regretted that in the article published under the above title in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, quotations are given from a preliminary draft application to the Commission prepared by Mr. H. L. G. Stroyan, and largely based on notes supplied by Dr. Hille Ris Lambers, overlooking the fact that these authors had intended to submit a definitive joint application at a later date. N. D. RILEY

COMMENT

By Miriam A. Palmer (Colorado State University, Department of Entomology, Fort Collins, Colorado, U.S.A.)

As to the proposals in items (1), (2) and (3) in paragraph 11 on page 180 concerning the type-species of the genus *Aphis* and placing the same on the Official List I fully approve.

Proposal in (4): If usage is to be the major consideration and if Linnaeus’ apparent error can be followed then obviously Aphididae should stand. I think usage is a serious consideration where a radical change is involved which causes confusion and frustration. The change here discussed seems hardly that radical and Aphidae is simpler and apparently just as accurately fulfills the linguistic requirements as does Aphididae. With Grensted I prefer Aphidae.

I shall be glad to see this question settled whether it is decided my way or not.
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