OPINION 1183

TEREBRATULA LINEATA YOUNG & BIRD, 1828, AND
RHYNCHONELLA SUBCONCINNA DAVIDSON, 1852
(BRACHIOPODA): DESIGNATION OF NEOTYPES

RULING.- (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the following names are to be applied in accordance with the neotypes specified:

(a) Terebratula lineata Young & Bird, 1828 by specimen number BB 14882 in the Palaeontology Department of the British Museum (Natural History), London;

(b) Rhynchonella subconcinna Davidson, 1852 by specimen number B 33239 in the Palaeontology Department of the British Museum (Natural History), London.

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

(a) lineata, Terebratula, Young & Bird, 1828, as published in the binomen Terebratula lineata, and as interpreted by reference to the neotype designated under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above (Name Number 2749);

(b) subconcinna Davidson, 1852, as published in the binomen Rhynchonella subconcinna, and as interpreted by reference to the neotype designated under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above (Name Number 2750).

HISTORY OF THE CASES Z.N.(S.)1217, 1218

Applications for the designation of neotypes by the use of the plenary powers for the two nominal species Terebratula lineata Young & Bird, 1828, and Rhynchonella subconcinna Davidson, 1852, were first received from Dr D.V. Ager (then of Imperial College of Science, London S.W.7) on 25 April 1957. They were sent to the printer on 12 June 1957 and published on 26 August 1957 in Bull. zool. Nom. vol. 13, pp. 251–253, 254–256 respectively. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in three palaeontological serials.

The application was supported by R.V. Melville (then of Geological Survey & Museum, London S.W.7). Professor J. Chester Bradley objected to the use of the plenary powers in the case; he thought that it should be dealt with under the notification-
and-challenge' procedure proposed at the Copenhagen (1953) Congress (see *Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature*, paragraph 39, p. 30) but never formally adopted in the Code (*ibid.*, paragraph 196, p. 103). Dr Ager, supported by Mr Melville, maintained his original request, which aimed at stabilising these disputed names in the sense that he had given them in a recent monograph. Furthermore, the species are of stratigraphical importance. There can be no doubt that the Commission was, at that time, entitled to use its plenary powers in the manner requested. The fact that the use of those powers is not necessary under the 1961 Code was not then relevant.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

On 17 March 1958 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Papers (1958)7 and 8 on the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 13, pp. 253, 256. At the close of the voting period on 17 June 1958, the state of the voting was as follows:

**Affirmative Votes** — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Holthuis, Hering, Vokes, Prantl, Hankó, Dymond, Riley, Bonnet, Bodenheimer, Boschma, Jaczewski, do Amaral, Cabrera, Hemming, Kühnelt, Tortonese

**Negative Votes** — seven (7) received in the following order: Lemche, Mayr, Key, Mertens, Sylvester-Bradley, J.C. Bradley, Stoll

The votes were cast identically on both voting papers. The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their votes on V.P.(58)7:

**Lemche:** ‘The problem is not a nomenclatural one. The applicant should not be able to make the Commission responsible for the taxonomic view that lineata = bidens = triplicata, which is the sole purpose of this application.’

**Mayr:** ‘Even before reading Commissioner Bradley’s comments I had marked in my copy of the Bulletin that this is one of the superfluous neotype designations that we had tried to discourage at Copenhagen. If we set this precedent we may get flooded by applications. Regardless of whether the majority comes out “for” or “against”, the reasons for the “against” votes should be recorded in the Opinion in detail.’

**Key:** ‘I see no occasion to go beyond the notification and challenge procedure. The applicant admits that the original figure and description are enough to define the species and he supplies no evidence of rival interpretations of the name. I would be prepared to vote only for the addition of lineata to the Official List (without reference to the neotype).’
J.C. Bradley: ‘The plenary powers are to suspend the rules. I object to misusing them by invoking them to hasten the application of a rule in connection with which a satisfactory procedure is already provided.’

The following comments were returned with V.P.(58)8:

Lemche: ‘The problem is not a nomenclatural one. The applicant should not be able to make the Commission responsible for the taxonomic view that subconcinna = fodinalis, which is the sole purpose of this application.’

Mayr: ‘As correctly stated by Commissioner Bradley, since this name has enjoyed uninterrupted usage, is not now challenged, and is unequivocally represented by the figure of the holotype, the application for a neotype does not meet the requirements adopted at Copenhagen. Mere loss of the holotype is not enough. The applicant has provided no real evidence of confusion.’

Key: ‘The applicant has given no reasons why the notification and challenge procedure is inadequate to deal with the situation he describes.’

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

*lineata*, Terebratula, Young & Bird, 1828, *Geological survey of the Yorkshire coast*, 2nd edit., p. 232, pl. 7, fig. 10


The following are the original references to neotype designations accepted in the present Opinion: Ager, 1956, *Monograph brit. Liassic Rhynchonellidae (Palaeontogr. Soc.)* (1), pp. 40–43, pl. 3, figs. 6a–c (for *Terebratula lineata*), p. 10, pl. 1, figs. 5a-c (for *Rhynchonella subconcinna*).

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on voting papers (58)7 and 8 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in those voting papers have 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. 1183.

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
31 December 1980
POSTSCRIPT BY THE SECRETARY

Before writing the above Opinion, I asked Professor Ager (now of University College, Swansea, U.K.) whether usage of the names involved was the same today as when his application was submitted over 20 years ago. He assured me that it was. Since his application for the use of the plenary powers had been approved by the necessary two-thirds majority, I drafted the Opinion accordingly.

R.V.M.
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