

ON SOME INVALID MOLLUSCAN GENERIC NAMES.

By TOM IREDALE.

Read 12th June, 1914.

WHILST engaged upon the verification of the generic and specific names to be used for molluscs from the Kermadec Islands, Lord Howe Island, Norfolk Island, and New Zealand, I have made quite a number of interesting notes. I here put on record some of those that are of more than local interest, and introduce some extra-limital corrections.

I wish here to draw attention to the very imperfect manner in which generic names given to Mollusca have been recorded, and, as I should think that the class in which we are interested does not form an exception, the grave danger there is in depending upon the usual Nomenclators when introducing new generic names. I find that a very large number of comparatively well-known molluscan names included by Fischer in his *Manuel de Conchyliologie* do not appear in Sharp's *Index Zoologicus*, Nos. i and ii. As a matter of fact, I conclude that it is due to the general familiarity of malacologists with Fischer that serious confusion has not been caused. With regard to *Miodon*, upon which I give a note, neither of the displacing names occur in the *Index Zoologicus*, though both appeared in the period 1880-1900. As an example of this imperfection I think it advisable to give the following extraordinary case. Referring to Fischer's *Manuel* I note the following names quoted and introduced, but omitted from the *Index Zoologicus* :—

- p. 850. *Talantodiscus*, Fischer, 1885.
- „ *Pyrgotrochus*, Fischer, 1885.
- „ *Perotrochus*, Fischer, 1885.
- „ *Chelotia*, Bayle, 1885.
- „ *Entemnotrochus*, Fischer, 1885.
- „ *Ptychomphalina*, Bayle, 1885.
- „ *Ptychomphalus*, De Koninck, 1883.
- „ *Gosseletina*, Bayle, 1885.
- „ *Gosseletia*, De Koninck, 1883.
- „ *Gosseletia*, Barrois, 1881.
- „ *Pithodea*, De Koninck, 1881.
- „ *Mourlonia*, De Koninck, 1883.
- „ *Agnesia*, De Koninck, 1883.
- p. 851. *Worthenia*, De Koninck, 1883.
- „ *Phanerotrema*, Fischer, 1885.
- „ *Rhineoderma*, De Koninck, 1883.
- „ *Yvania*, Bayle, 1885.
- „ *Baylea*, De Koninck, 1883.
- „ *Luciella*, De Koninck, 1883.

That *nineteen* unrecorded names should appear on two consecutive pages of Fischer's *Manuel* is of course extraordinary, but on almost

every page, wherever many names occur, I note unrecorded examples. As above stated, through the general usage of malacologists of Fischer's Manuel, we have not felt this omission deeply, but it is probable that other branches will have suffered, and I note *Agnesia* included in the Index Zoologicus as having been introduced by Michaelsen in 1898 for a Tunicate. The reverse case of course affects us, i.e. that names proposed in other classes of zoology have likewise been omitted from the Index Zoologicus, and that such may invalidate apparently unassailable names given by malacologists. I cannot suggest any remedy to provide for the protection of malacologists in such instances.

ADEORBIS, Searles Wood.

In these Proceedings (vol. ix, p. 259, 1911) I published a note drawing attention to Sacco's usage of "*Tornus*, Turton, 1829", in place of *Adeorbis*, Searles Wood, 1842, and asked for confirmation or otherwise. An immediate result was the receipt from Dr. W. H. Dall of a reference to *British Conchology*, vol. iv, p. 231, 1867, where Jeffreys wrote: "Searles Wood was anticipated in giving a name to the present genus. In an 'Enumeration of Marine Shells' found on the South Devon coast, published in 1829 (a copy of which was presented to me by Dr. Turton 'from the author'), the genus *Tornus*, signifying a turner's wheel or lathe, was characterized as follows:—'Shell orbicular, depressed, aperture oval or roundish; pillar none. Operculum horny. Includes *Helix subcarinata*.' This publication was anonymous, a circumstance which may deprive the author of the right of precedence according to the laws of scientific nomenclature. I therefore retain *Adeorbis*, although the other name is preferable."

At that time I could not trace the publication Jeffreys mentions, so the matter had to be shelved. Consequently Hedley, introducing the new genus *Naricava* (Proc. Linn. Soc. N.S.W., vol. xxxviii, p. 294, 1913), commented: "It has been indicated by Iredale that *Adeorbis* may be replaced by *Tornus*, but this is not established." It is with very great pleasure that I now complete my tale, and eliminate all doubt concerning the genus-name *Tornus*.

As long ago as 1903 Mr. B. B. Woodward had seen this name, but, comparatively uninterested in marine shells, had failed to note its significance. I obtained my clue from a footnote published by him in the Journ. Conch., vol. x, p. 359, 1903, with regard to the genus-name *Odontostoma*. There will be found details practically as here given.

A book entitled *The Teignmouth, Dawlish, and Torquay Guide*, by N. T. Carrington and others, was published at Teignmouth, and also sold at Exeter, London, etc. Part ii bears on the title-page "The | Natural History | of | the District; | or, | Lists | of | the different species | of | animals, vegetables, and | minerals, | and their respective localities, | scientifically arranged; | with References to the best Standard Works in which | they are figured and described: | together with | a Geological Account | of | the rock strata, and the fossils | contained in them. | By | W. Turton, M.D., and J. F. Kingston."

There is no pagination to the pages, but conchology occupies about twenty-five pages, and this is succeeded by an article entitled "Conchology, arranged on the amended system". Therein the families are indicated with succinct diagnostic sentences; then the genera are also shortly described, whilst species belonging to each genus are named. In the present instance the matter reads thus:—

"TURBINACIDÆ. Pillar without plaits—shell conic or elongated; aperture roundish or oblong, never expanded, with the lips either united or separated.

"*Tornus*. Shell orbicular, depressed; aperture oval or roundish; pillar none. Operculum horny.

"Includes *Helix subcarinata*."

It will at once be observed that this is word for word the matter quoted by Jeffreys, and we can now assume that the "Enumeration" was identical with the conchology included in the Guide. So far I have not seen a copy of the "Enumeration", but under the present circumstances this does not matter much. It is seen that Jeffreys gives the date of the "Enumeration" as 1829; the Guide is undated, but Mr. Sherborn kindly made inquiries, with the result that 1830 can be safely taken as date of publication; this suggests that Turton's anonymous "Enumeration" was probably printed first. The inevitable conclusion is that

TORNUS, Turton & Kingston, 1830,

must replace *Adeorbis*, Searles Wood, 1842.

I carefully studied all the names given in this work, as no suggestion of novelty is attached to any, with the result that one other new introduction was noted. In this case, however, no change is necessary.

Haminea is generally quoted as of the Proc. Zool. Soc., 1847 (November, 1847), but I had noted that it appeared earlier in the Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., vol. xx, p. 268, October 1, 1847, where it was spelt as *Haminæa*. I now trace it back to 1830, as this is included, thus: "*Haminæa*. Shell thin, somewhat globular, without spire; aperture narrow, as long as the shell. Includes *Bulla hydatis*." We must therefore quote

HAMINÆA, Turton & Kingston, 1830.

I have now acquired an interesting copy of this work, which shows that the natural history portion was also published separately. The title-page and contents are exactly as in the complete work, but no reference to the principal title-page, of which this is "Part II", is given. It is in the original cloth covers as published, and on the outside cover exactly the same wording with the exception of the words "Part II" is printed. Down the back, however, appears the following wording: "Guide | to the | Watering | Places. | Vol. II | The | Natural | History | of the | District | 1830. |"

This is again important, as we have here definite evidence of the date which was previously missing. There is no connexion here given with Carrington's Guide, so that such a copy would be easily quoted as "The Natural History of the District, by W. Turton and

J. F. Kingston". The limits of the "District" would rest in the imagination of the reader.

MODIOLARCA, Gray.

This genus-name first appears in the Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum, 42nd ed., p. 151, 1840, where, associated with *Crenella*, the two genera constitute the family Crenellidæ. I have shown in my Collation of these Synopses (these Proceedings, vol. x, pp. 294-309, 1913) that here the genus-names are all absolutely *nomina nuda*. On p. 306 I noted that in the forty-fourth edition short diagnostic remarks were added, and quoted those referring to this generic name, which read "(p. 82) The *Crenellæ* are suborbicular and the *Modiolaria* ovate elongated shells", and added a "Note: *Modiolarca*, 1840, is thus a misprint for *Modiolaria*".

Further investigation shows this conclusion to have been incorrect, and that we have here another instance of Gray's juggling with names, as in the case of *Livona*.

In Dieffenbach's *Travels in New Zealand*, vol. ii, p. 259, 1843, Gray included

"*Modiolarca impacta*.

Mytilus cor, Martyn, U.C., t. 77.

Myt. impactus, Hermann, Naturf., xvii, 147, t. 3, f. 5-8, xix, 183;
Wood, Cat., 59, f. 40.

M. discors, *Australis*, Chemn., viii, f. 768.

Modiola discor, Lam., vi, p. 16.

Myt. lanatus, Calonne, Cat., 43.

Inhab. New Zealand, Dr. Solander; Bay of Islands, Dr. Sinclair; East Cape, Dr. Dieffenbach."

This is the first recognizable introduction of the genus-name *Modiolarca*, and as it is associated with *impacta* it must fall as a synonym of the earlier *Modiolaria*. It is now obvious that the name was intended by Gray for the species now called *Modiolaria*, but that in 1847 when he drew up his List of the Genera of Recent Mollusca (Proc. Zool. Soc., 1847, p. 129 et seq.), recognizing Beck's prior name, he deliberately transferred his genus-name to a different group.

Sentimentally it grieves me to part with the genus-name *Modiolarca*, as it will ever be associated in my memory with my discovery of its existence on the mainland of New Zealand, and my personal acquaintance with it and its strange habits (Trans. New Zeal. Inst., vol. xl, 1907, pp. 386-7, 1908).

As a delightful recompense, however, I found the available substitute was none other than

GAIMARDIA, Gould, U.S. Expl. Exped., vol. xii, p. 459, 1852.

The loss of *Modiolarca* seems more than balanced by the restoration to active use of the genus-name given to honour one of the two most famous shell collectors that have ever visited the shores of New Zealand. It was my unfortunate lot to consign to synonymy the genus-name *Quoyia* (these Proceedings, vol. ix, p. 259, 1911), and I tried to make amends by the introduction of the genus-name *Quoyula*

(these Proceedings, vol. x, p. 221, 1912). That I should have the pleasure of reinstating *Gaimardia*, even at the loss of *Modiolarca*, seems a fitting reward for my unwilling, but inevitable, rejection of *Quoyia*.

I have just observed that Scudder, in his *Nomenclator Zoologicus*, pt. i, p. 215, 1882, noted the confusion, but interpreted it in the contrary manner to my explanation, thus: "*Modiolaria*, Gray., Syn. Brit. Mus., p. 82 (Err. typ. pro *Modiolarca*) 1842. Moll. Biv." Moreover, as usual, I see that Dr. Dall in his magnificent essay on the Tertiary Mollusca of Florida, published in the Transactions of the Wagner Free Institute of Science, Philadelphia, comments (vol. iii, pt. iv, pp. 804-5, 1898-9) on the spelling in Dieffenbach, which, however, he only knew at second-hand, quoting Hutton's misspelling as *Modiōlacra*. Dall concluded that such a spelling could only be regarded as a typographical error. The facts, however, as now known and here presented, show, I think conclusively, that Gray really invented the name *Modiolarca* for the Crenelloid molluscs. If we accept the derivation of the name as *Modiola* and *Arca*, the name is quite applicable to these, whilst it as certainly would scarcely be suggested by the type species of the later-named *Modiolarca*, as I see little resemblance to either *Modiola* or *Arca* in this shell. However, it is little use theorizing as to the origin of any Grayian name, as I conclude that the systems upon which J. E. Gray made names are beyond the ken or the imagination of later workers.

PANDA, Albers.

According to Scudder's *Nomenclator*, *Panda*, Albers, is invalid through preoccupation. It is notorious that Albers introduced names quite commonly in use in other branches of zoology, and I could scarcely think such a case as this could have been overlooked.

Panda was introduced as of Albers by Martens in the second edition of *Die Heliceen*, 1860, p. 149, the type, by original designation, being *Helix falconari*, Reeve. Scudder noted a prior *Panda*, Van Heyden, 1826, and upon reference I find Van Heyden lawfully proposed the name in the *Isis* (Oken), 1826, col. 612.

In the Proc. Linn. Soc. N.S.W., vol. xxxvii, p. 254, pl. iv, figs. 1-4, 1912, Hedley described a most beautiful mollusc as *Panda whitei*, making, according to his conclusions, the fourth species of the genus, his revision of twenty years earlier having reduced the recognizable species to three only (Rec. Austr. Mus., vol. ii, p. 29, 1892), viz., *falconeri*, Gray, *atomata*, Gray, and *larreyi*, Brazier.

No generic synonymy being known to me, I referred to the Man. Conch., ser. II, vol. xviii, p. 122 et seq., 1900, where Pilsbry used *Panda*, and gave no synonyms. Reference to the famous vol. ix, p. 163, 1894, showed that Pilsbry made use of *Panda*, but extraordinarily enough he cited the prior usage of the name by Van Heyden, but did not rectify the error. As the invalidity of the name has thus been on record for exactly twenty years without action being taken, I propose to remedy the defect by renaming the genus

HEDLEYELLA.

The four species above named will constitute the genus, the type remaining as *H. falconeri* (Gray). It is not without misgiving that I thus transgress upon my fellow-worker's territory, but I have long wished the opportunity of associating the name of my friend Mr. Charles Hedley with some notable shell, and I do not anticipate such a splendid chance again. The genus comprises the most interesting and magnificent land shells of Australia, and I sincerely hope that my "industry will not prove abortive", to quote my friend's remarks on a like occasion.

PENION, Fischer.

In these Proceedings (vol. x, p. 223, 1912) I advocated the usage of *Penion* for the Austro-Neozelanic molluscs classed under *Siphonalia*, and rejected the transference of *Siphonalia maxima*, Tryon, to *Megalatractus*, declaring that species to be absolutely congeneric with *Fusus dilatatus*, Quoy & Gaimard.

Hedley in a paper on Mollusca from the Great Australian Bight (Biol. Rec. Fishing Exp. *Endeavour*, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 73, 1914) has accepted my data, and has recorded *Penion maximus*, Tryon, and *P. waitei*, Hedley. I further find that Dr. Verco in the Trans. Roy. Soc. South Austr., vol. xxxvi, p. 221, 1912 (1913), has gone so far as to synonymize *Siphonalia maxima*, Tryon, with *Fusus dilatatus*, Quoy and Gaimard.

It has been decided that errors of transliteration may be amended: this decision, given by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, has the effect of causing the rejection of *Penion*, as there is a prior *Penium*¹ (Philippi, Verh. Zool.-botan. Gesell. Wien, vol. xv, p. 741, 1865). These two names are simply the same, one being wrongly transliterated, and cannot both be maintained. I have therefore to propose the genus-name

VERCONELLA

to replace *Penion*, Fischer, and maintain the same type, *Fusus dilatatus*, Quoy & Gaimard. The name given is an attempt to express my appreciation of the work on Australian Marine Mollusca still being performed by Dr. J. C. Verco.

MONTROUZIERA, Souverbie.*

Hedley has recently (Rec. Austr. Mus., vol. viii, p. 135, 1912) recorded the rediscovery of the interesting mollusc which Souverbie (Journ. de Conch., vol. xi, p. 282, pl. xii, fig. 5, 1863) introduced as generically and specifically new, under the name *Montrouziera clathrata*. I would point out that in honouring the brilliant Montrouzier, Souverbie had been anticipated by Bigot (Ann. Soc. Ent. France, 3rd ser., vol. viii, p. 224, 1860), and consequently the molluscan genus must be renamed. I would ask Mr. Hedley to undertake this task, as to him belongs the credit of the recognition of this long-lost form, and it is only fair that he should complete this item, especially as I have already interfered in his province in the case of *Panda*.

¹ Latinized from πένιον.

* Err. typ. = *Montrouzieria* p. 135

HELIOMANES, Moquin-Tandon.

Mr. B. B. Woodward kindly allowed me to see a proof of the List of British Non-marine Mollusca prepared by A. S. Kennard and himself. I noticed as a sub-genus of *Helicella*, Férussac, appeared the name *Heliomanes*, Moquin-Tandon, 1855. I pointed out that according to the Nomenclators this name was invalid.¹ It was therefore replaced by *Heliomanes*, Férussac, 1821, which appears on p. 6. I had no interest in the subject, and nothing further would have been heard from me had the matter not cropped up again in a different direction. Conversing with Mr. G. K. Gude, he mentioned the genus-name *Pupoides*, Pfeiffer. I remembered Connolly (Revised Reference List South African Non-marine Mollusca, 1912, p. 176) had commented upon the validity of this name, whereupon Mr. Gude referred to that work. Connolly's remarks are: "There is, however, an earlier *Pupoides*, proposed by Férussac (Tabl. Syst., pt. 3, p. 61, 1821) as a section of *Cochlodina*, but on an equal footing with *Clausilia*, *Pupa*, and *Cyclostoma*." Mr. Gude and I then consulted Férussac's work, and our conclusions do not agree with Connolly's, and, moreover, *Heliomanes* occurs in the same place. Mr. Edgar A. Smith was then called in to advise, and I asked permission to put on record our results.

Pupoides occurs as quoted by Connolly on p. 61 of part iii of Férussac's Tabl. Syst., but on pp. 27-8 a synopsis is given entitled "Tableau Synoptique des subdivisions du genre Hélix, *Helix*, nobis". On p. 28 we have "Sixième sous-genre Helicelle, *Helicella*", which is divided into

"Les Lomastomes, *Lomastomæ*,
 Les Aplostomes, *Aplostomæ*,
 Les Hygromanes, *Hygromanes*,
 Les Héliomanes, *Heliomanes*."

On the same page "Huitième sous-genre Cochlostyle, *Cochlostyla*", is divided into

"Les Lomastomes, *Lomastomæ*,
 Les Aplostomes, *Aplostomæ*,"

and, further, "Quatorzième sous-genre Cochlodine, *Cochlodina*," is divided into

"Les Pupoides, *Pupoides*,
 Les Tracheloïdes, *Tracheloides*,
 Les Anomales, *Anomales*,
 Les Clausilies, *Clausiliæ*, Draparn."

Other sectional names used are *Lamellatæ*, *Marginatæ*, *Turritæ*, *Umbilicatæ*, *Perforatæ*, etc.

It is obvious that such *cannot* be regarded as names available for generic or subgeneric usage. The fact that *Heliomanes* and *Pupoides* are Greek plurals, whereas most of the others are of Latin form, cannot legitimize these. The only conclusion possible is that *Heliomanes* cannot be quoted as of this introduction, and when later correctly utilized by Moquin-Tandon it had been appropriated

¹ *Heliomanes*, E. Newman, Ann. Nat. Hist., vol. v, p. 17, March, 1840.

previously in another sense; also *Pupoides* of this introduction has no status, and does not invalidate the later *Pupoides*, properly proposed by Pfeiffer (Mal. Blätt., i, p. 192, 1854), as suggested by Connolly, loc. cit.

It is interesting to note that when Pilsbry (Man. Conch., ser. II, vol. ix, p. 248, 1894) used *Heliomanes*, Moquin-Tandon, 1855, as a sectional name, he wrote "Heliomanes (Fér., Tabl. Syst., not used in a generic or subgeneric sense)", a conclusion with which we agree.

The genus-name *Miodon* and its substitutes.

Some years ago I noticed the following paragraph in the *Nautilus*, vol. xvi, p. 143, April, 1903: "In the revision of the CARDITACEA, lately printed by the Academy of Natural Sciences, I preserved the name *Miodon* for a form of *Venericardia*, found on the Pacific coast, and applied by Carpenter in 1864. For *Miodon*, Sandberger, 1870, given to a fossil form of *Cyrena*, the name *Miodontopsis* was proposed. In Sharp's Index Zoologicus, just received, I find *Miodon*, however, was used for an Ophidian in 1859 by Duméril, and therefore Carpenter's shell will have to have a new name also. In this case I would propose *Miodontiscus* for the Venericardian. W. H. Dall."

Admittedly uninterested, these remarks remained unwanted in my mind until a casual reference to Fischer's Manuel de Conchyliologie brought them back in connexion with the following sentence (p. 1187), the last words in the Manuel concerning Pélécypodes: "*Coripia*, de Gregorio, 1884. Ce genre, qui a pour type le *Cardita corbis*, Philippi, du Tertiaire supérieur, passe dans la synonymie de *Miodon*, Carpenter, 1864 (p. 1011), genre qu'il ne faut pas confondre avec une section des *Cyrena* nommée *Miodon* par Sandberger et dont on devra changer l'appellation en *Neomiodon*, Fischer, 1887." This would indicate that both Dall's names must be superseded as follows:

NEOMIODON, Fischer, Man. de Conch., p. 1187, 1887,
will replace *Miodontopsis*, Dall, *Nautilus*, vol. xvi, p. 143, April, 1903, and

CORIPIA,¹ De Gregorio, Bull. Soc. Malac. Ital., vol. x, 1884, p. 153, 1885,²
will displace *Miodontiscus*, Dall, *Nautilus*, vol. xvi, p. 143, April, 1903.

TRITONIDEA, Swainson.

In these Proceedings (vol. x, p. 221, 1912), when introducing the genus-name *Quoyula*, I pointed out that *Pollia* dated from 1834, not 1839, as usually accepted, and that its type, when first proposed, was by monotypy "*Triton undosus*, Lam." In consequence *Pollia* was exactly equivalent to and antedated *Tritonidea*, Swainson, 1840. Since that date *Tritonidea* has still been used, so that I have thought it necessary to emphasize its invalidity whilst making a further contribution to this subject.

I have recently acquired a nice copy of Swainson's *Treatise on Malacology*, which is noteworthy in that the purchaser has inscribed

¹ A sub-genus of *Cardita*, for *Cardita* (*Coripia*) *unidentata*, Basterot=*corbis*, Philippi.

² In this work many unrecorded names appear. I have noted *Elegantula*, *Anfilla*, *Linga*, *Pirtus*, *Timbellus*, *Aplus*, and *Algrus*.

her name and date, the said date being "May, 1840". This date gives us the information that the book was published in or before that month, which is exceedingly valuable, as previously no exact date had been traced by me. Studying this work, I noted that on p. 74, when *Tritonidea* was first mentioned, Swainson added a footnote: "I have since learned that this genus is the same as *Polia*, Gray, a name I should gladly have adopted, had it not previously been given to a genus of European *Lepidoptera*." On p. 302, where the genus is elaborated, a fuller explanatory footnote also appears to the same effect, Hübner and Treitsch being quoted as the authors of the Lepidopteran genus. No such genus occurs in Scudder's Nomenclator, though there is a "*Polia*,¹ Ochsenh. Lep., 1816 A" given on p. 257. This genus-name would appear to have been proposed as a dedication of Poli, and would not seem to clash with Gray's *Polia*, which I would guess to have been suggested by the feminine name Polly. Gray also proposed *Fannya* and *Emma*, but note my remarks *re* Gray under *Modiolarca*.

VELORITA, Gray.

This name, generally quoted as Gray, 1840, is another of the "Synopsis B.M." names, where it is a *nomen nudum*. It apparently dates from the Proc. Zool. Soc. 1847 article. Full details of these papers have been given by me in these Proceedings (vol. x, pp. 294-309, 1913).

As a matter of fact, the name must be replaced by

VILLORITA,

as Griffith and Pidgeon, who contributed the molluscan portion of Griffith's edition of Cuvier's *Animal Kingdom*, vol. xii, had figured, on pl. xxxi, fig. 5, a shell under the name *Villorita cyprinoides*, and on p. 601, in an Alphabetical List of the Figures, gave the further information

"pl. 31, fig. 5, *Villorita cyprinoides*, Gray.

(*Cyrena cyprinoides*, Wood) Olive Green."

A note is given, which reads: "Most of the inedited shells figured in this work are from the collection in the British Museum." The plate is dated 1833, whilst, as the title-page indicates, the volume was completed in 1834. We can thus assume that as early as 1833, Gray, after the custom of his time, had labelled the shell in the British Museum with the name of *Villorita cyprinoides*, and that Griffith and Pidgeon introduced this into literature. Seven years later Gray apparently altered the spelling to *Velorita*, by which name it has since been known. The spelling *Villorita* does not occur in Scudder's Nomenclator, nor has it otherwise been recorded, though *Littoraria*, introduced in the same manner and place, is duly recorded. A peculiar circumstance has been noted, viz. that Fischer in his Manuel (p. 1092, 1887) dates *Velorita* of Gray back to 1834, which suggests that he had an inkling of Griffith and Pidgeon's usage.

¹ Huebner introduced it in 1806 as a *nomen nudum*, which was taken up by Ochsenheimer in 1816 and Treitschka in 1825. *Polia* was also proposed by Chiaje in 1827 for a member of the Order Vermes.



Iredale, Tom. 1914. "On some invalid molluscan generic names." *Proceedings of the Malacological Society of London* 11, 170–178.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/53528>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/52591>

Holding Institution

Smithsonian Libraries and Archives

Sponsored by

Smithsonian

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: Public domain. The BHL considers that this work is no longer under copyright protection.

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>.