

- . 1870b. The parasites of domestic animals. 342 pp., 84 figs.
- . 1870c. Description of *Sclerostoma pingvicola*, a new species of Entozoa from the hog. *Amer. J. Sci. Arts*, **100** [s. 2, **50**] (no. 149): 223–224, 1 fig.
- White, J. C., 1859. Specimens and figures of *Stephanurus dentatus*, Diesing, *Sclerostoma dentatum* ? Rudolphi. *Proc. Boston Soc. nat. Hist.* **6**: 428.

ON THE QUESTION OF THE DESIRABILITY OF RETAINING THE TRIVIAL NAME "DENTATUS" DIESING, 1839 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "STEPHANURUS DENTATUS") AS THE TRIVIAL NAME OF THE KIDNEY WORM OF SWINE (CLASS NEMATODA, ORDER RHABDITIDA): AN APPEAL TO PARASITOLOGISTS FOR VIEWS ON THE QUESTION RAISED BY DR. ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.,

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)188)

1. In his application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the subject of the trivial name properly applicable to the kidney worm of swine (the type species of the genus *Stephanurus* Diesing), Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty discusses two separate questions: first, the question whether the trivial name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839 (as published in the binominal combination *Stephanurus dentatus*), the first trivial name published for that species, should be regarded as an invalid name on the ground that it is a junior secondary homonym of the trivial name *dentatus* Rudolphi, 1803 (as published in the binominal combination *Strongylus dentatus*), the two species having at different times been placed by different authors in the same genus; second, the question whether, if *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, is, under the *Règles*, a name which must be rejected as a secondary homonym of *dentatus* Rudolphi, 1803, it is desirable that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should use its plenary powers for the purpose of validating the name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, as the name of the kidney worm of swine.

2. On the first of these questions, Dr. Dougherty points out that Magalhães (1894), Railliet (1896) and Taylor (1900) each "definitely recognized, in their estimation, *dentatus* of Diesing, 1839, to be a secondary homonym of *dentatus* of Rudolphi, 1803" and "accordingly rejected the former". Dr. Dougherty then refers to the decisions on the question of the rules governing specific homonymy taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in Paris in 1948 and reaches the conclusion that, under the rules so revised, the trivial name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, must be regarded as having been rendered permanently invalid by reason of the action taken by the authors cited above; at the same time however, Dr. Dougherty recalls that in the past it has been argued that, in order to establish that a state of secondary homonymy exists, it is necessary not only for an author definitely to reject as a secondary homonym, the later published of any pair of homonyms but also to cite both species under the same combination of generic name and specific trivial name. In this connection, it is useful to recall that considerable discussion took place at the Sixth (Public) Meeting of the International Commission at its Paris Session regarding the criteria to be adopted in determining whether a given pair of names were to be regarded as secondary homonyms of one another; the object of this discussion was to devise criteria which would be clear and unambiguous, depending upon objective data and would at the same time be suitable for application not only to cases arising after the introduction of the new system but also to cases which had arisen prior to that date and to which the new system would need to be applied retrospectively. This discussion is recorded in considerable detail in the *Official Record of Proceedings* under heading (F) on pp. 112-115 of volume 4 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. The formal record of the recommendation on this subject submitted by the Commission to, and later approved by, the Congress will be found embodied in points (8) and (9) of the Conclusion reached (see page 121 of the volume referred to above). At no time during these discussions was it suggested that the new provision to be adopted should require that, before two names could be regarded as being secondary homonyms of one another, each must be cited simultaneously by the same author under the same specific name (combination of generic name and specific trivial name), although (as stated by Dr. Dougherty) this argument had sometimes been advanced in the past by authors seeking to interpret the ambiguous provisions of the then-existing Article 35 (usually in relation to particular cases where the authors concerned were anxious to find reasons justifying the retention of a name which had been rejected by a former author as a secondary homonym but which was no longer considered non-generic with the other species bearing the same trivial name). Not only was no such argument advanced but, on the contrary, the view was strongly expressed that great care must be taken in the revision of Article 35 to avoid the inclusion of formal provisions of a "ritualistic" character of the kind which (as had previously been rightly pointed out by Dr. J. Brookes Knight (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) had marred the amendment to Article 25 made by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at Budapest in 1926). For this reason therefore it was expressly agreed that no definition of the procedure to be adopted by an author in rejecting one name as a secondary homonym of another should be inserted in the new rule and that, as regards rejections effected prior to 1st January 1951, the test to be applied should be simply

whether or not the later author rejected the one name as a secondary homonym of the other. The "rejections" discussed by Dr. Dougherty in relation to the name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, were all effected long before the Paris Congress and fall therefore to be judged by the above simple test. The evidence brought forward by Dr. Dougherty in regard to the action taken by de Magalhães, Railliet and Taylor in the last decade of the XIXth century clearly shows that those authors duly "rejected" the name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, within the meaning of that term as used in Point (8) of the decision of the Paris Congress on this subject.

3. Appeal to parasitologists : The position which has now to be considered is therefore (as Dr. Dougherty points out) (1) whether or not confusion would result from the dropping (as an invalid homonym) of the name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, as the trivial name of the Kidney Worm of Swine, that name being replaced by the name *pinguicola* Verrill, 1870, and (2) if the answer to the foregoing question is in the affirmative, whether the International Commission should prevent that confusion from arising by using its plenary powers to validate the name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839 for the Kidney Worm, that course being possible because the nodular worm to which the same trivial name had been given by Rudolphi in 1803 (in the combination *Strongylus dentatus*) is not considered congeneric with the Kidney Worm and in consequence, according to current taxonomic ideas, there would be no question of homonymy if the name *dentatus* Diesing were to be used for the Kidney Worm in the genus *Stephanurus* Diesing.

4. The foregoing is a matter on which the International Commission must naturally rely upon the views of parasitologists concerned with this group, who alone can advise on the relative merits of the question at issue (namely whether it is desirable that the name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, or the name *pinguicola* Verrill, 1870, should be the valid name for the Kidney Worm of Swine).

5. Accordingly, it is particularly hoped that any parasitologist interested in this subject will be good enough to forward as soon as possible, to the Secretary to the Commission (address : 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England) a statement setting out his views for the consideration of the International Commission.



Hemming, Francis. 1951. "On The Question Of The Desirability Of Retaining The Trivial Name Views On The Question Raised By Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 2, 291–293.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/43930>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/33478>

Holding Institution

Natural History Museum Library, London

Sponsored by

Natural History Museum Library, London

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.