malacologists referring to these taxa have felt obliged to make a decision based on a personal interpretation of the Code, which may have resulted in giving precedence to strict priority or to the need for long term stability. We gave more weight to the latter alternative in our solution to this problem. Rosenberg’s comment serves to emphasise the necessity for the use of the plenary powers. We do not agree that the spelling of this name is unimportant; it has caused confusion for a very long time. We cannot see that making a mistake seven times makes it less of a mistake. The matter of the spelling is not the only consideration, as Rosenberg has noted. It is precisely in cases such as that set out in our submission that a Commission decision is most appropriate. Rosenberg does not argue against the submission as such. We welcome his stated support.

Comment on the proposed precedence of Polygyridae Pilsbry, 1895 over Mesodontidae Tryon, 1866 (Mollusca, Gastropoda)
(Case 2642; see BZN 46: 94–96; 47: 204–205)

David Heppell
Department of Natural History, National Museums of Scotland, Chambers Street, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, U.K.

The applicant correctly states (para. 2) that the family-group name Polygyridae was first introduced by Pilsbry (as Polygyrinae) in the Manual of Conchology (series 2, vol. 9, p. xxxii). Pilsbry stated that he had abstained from assigning subfamily rank to the various ‘natural tribes of Helices’ that he proceeded to define, but that ‘if they be considered subfamilies, they may bear the names I Polygyrinae;...’. A name proposed conditionally in this way is available under Article 15 of the Code. The applicant cites 1894 for the date of the name and notes (para. 6) ‘Polygyrinae, 1895 [sic]’ for Baker’s (1956) citation. In fact, vol. 9 of the Manual of Conchology (= Helicidae vol. 7) was published in five parts (parts 33–36 and 33a) between November 1893 and February 1895 (see Clench & Turner, 1962, p. 173). Pages i–xlviii comprise part 33a, published on 2 February 1895 and, therefore, Polygyridae dates from then.

The applicant (para. 9) requests the addition of Polygyra Say, 1818 to the Official List of Generic Names with the type species P. septemvolva Say, 1818, by subsequent designation by Herrmannsen (1847). Herrmannsen’s designation (vol. 2, p. 317) dates from 7 December 1847. Gray (November 1847, p. 173) designated Polygyra auriculata Say, 1818 as the type species of Polygyra Say, 1818, and this designation was accepted by Rehder (1936, p. 103) as valid. Gray’s prior designation means that the name Polygyra is formally a senior objective synonym of Daedalochila Beck, 1837 (type species Polygyra auriculata Say, 1818, by subsequent designation by Herrmannsen, vol. 1, p. 369. April 1847). The generic name which would replace Polygyra sensu septemvolva is debatable. Pilsbry (1930, p. 312) designated Polygyra septemvolva as the type of Ulostoma Albers, 1850; he also designated (1930, p. 312) the same species as the type of Cyclodoma Swainson, 1840, but this was not in accord with Swainson’s concept of the genus and the validity of Pilsbry’s designation is uncertain (Rehder, 1936, p. 103).

Pilsbry (1938, p. 24) argued that Gray’s designation was invalid because, as well as citing Polygyra auriculata as the type of Polygyra Say, 1818, he also cited Helix septemvolva [sic] as the type of ‘Polygyra sp. Say, Beck’, the latter being listed among the synonyms of Polygyra Say, 1818. Pilsbry regarded this as the simultaneous
designation of two different type species for the same genus, although there seems to be no doubt that Gray was treating the two taxa as distinct (though homonymous). Gray’s method of indicating objective or subjective synonymy of genera was unambiguously stated in the introduction to his list (1847, p. 129): ‘The method I have followed is to observe the first name given to the genus and the type on which it was founded, and then to accumulate the synonyma around the genus. Where a succeeding author has referred to a different species as the type of the genus, I have given the name in a new line, as from some future period that type may be proved really to belong to a different genus; and when any succeeding author has established a genus on any species which appears to belong to the before-established genus, it is in a similar manner placed under the proper head, with the synonyma belonging to that type. The type on which the genus or subgenus, as it may hereafter prove, was founded, is also given, so that if such type at some future period prove to be distinct from the one under which I have placed it, the synonyma of the genus will be at once seen. But the names which occur under each head are, according to my present views, to be regarded as synonyma of the genus under which they are arranged’.

Acceptance of Gray’s (1847) designation of Polygyra auriculata Say, 1818 as the type species of Polygyra Say, 1818 would be contrary to established usage and nomenclatural stability and it is proposed that this designation should be set aside. The family-group name Polygyridae Pilsbry should be placed on the Official List with the date 1895.

In addition to the proposals on BZN 46: 95, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all fixations of type species for the nominal genus Polygyra Say, 1818 prior to the designation by Herrmannsen (1847) of Polygyra septemvolva Say, 1818.

Additional references


Comment on the proposed conservation of Proptera Rafinesque, 1819 (Mollusca, Bivalvia)

(Case 2558; see BZN 47: 19–21, 205–207)

Douglas G. Smith
*Museum of Zoology, University of Massachusetts, 348 Morrill Science Center, Amherst, MA 01003, U.S.A.*

I write in support of the petition requesting the Commission to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names the name Potamilus Rafinesque, 1818, as advocated by M.E. Gordon. The wide use of *Proptera* in the literature on unionid mollusks
https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.698.
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