COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF AGAMA BIBRONII DUMÉRIL, 1851 (REPTILIA). Z.N.(S.) 1856 (see volume 25, pages 186–187)

By D. Rhys van den Audenaerde (Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren, Belgium)

I cannot agree with the proposed validation of Agama bibronii for the following reasons:

(1) The only way to arrive at a non-confused and non-confusing nomenclature is by the strict application of the Priority Rule without exceptions.

(2) The length of time during which an error was perpetuated should not influence

the application of the Priority Rule.

(3) The number of authors using a name is not a valuable argument. In this special case most authors using A. bibronii, i.e., Bons, Girot, Saint-Girons, Gauthier and Pasteur, are French and have adopted the name used in the Paris Museum. The authors using A. impalearis are both German. So it shows that some school-behaviour or fashion is involved. Furthermore, should Wermuth or Mertens have published many short notes or faunistic lists in which A. impalearis was mentioned, then the citation record would offer reversed proportions. This is, of course, not a valuable basis for a stable zoological nomenclature.

(4) What do we do when A. bibronii Fitzinger, 1843, does prove different from

A. aculeata Merrem, after the former name has been suppressed?

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *PTERORRHIZA* EHRENBERG, 1834 (ANTHOZOA). Z.N.(S.) 1851 (see volume 25, pages 171–172)

By A. E. H. Pedder (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, Calgary, Alberta, Canada)

I support Schouppé's and Cheng's application for the suppression of *Pterorrhiza*. To the points made by Schouppé and Cheng, I would add that it is not possible to interpret *Pterorrhiza* on topotypes of *P. marginata* since the precise type stratum and locality are unknown; on the other hand these are well known for *Macgeea solitaria*. Furthermore it is still possible to collect specimens of *M. solitaria* at the type locality, and in any case the species is well represented in many of the world's museums.

There has never been disagreement on the interpretation of *Macgeea solitaria*. There may well be some regarding *Pterorrhiza*. The only recent author (Pickett 1967) to use the genus in the primary literature did not support his redescription of the

type-species with figures of the interior.

By J. W. Pickett (Geological Survey, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia)

At the time of writing my article (Senck. leth. 48 (1)) I was not in favour of reintroducing the name Pterorrhiza. However, because of the declared intention of Dr. A. Glinski (letter to me dated 16.3.64) to publish his work immediately, and of the editorial policy of the publishers of Senckenbergiana (as indicated by Messrs. Struve and Birenheide) I was persuaded to use that name.

In view of the number of recent publications using the name Macgeea, and the non-appearance of Dr. Glinski's publication, I am pleased to vote in favour of the

suppression of the name Pterorrhiza, as proposed by Dr. Schouppé.



Pedder, A E H and Pickett, J W. 1969. "Comments on the proposed suppression of Pterorrhiza Ehrenberg, 1834 (Anthozoa). Z.N. (S.) 1851." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 26, 70.

https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.9864.

View This Item Online: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44468

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.9864

Permalink: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/9864

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.