

- *STEARNS, C. W. 1956. Stratigraphy and paleontology of the Interlake group and Stonewall formation of southern Manitoba. *Mem. geol. Survey Brch Canada* **281** : 152 pp.
- *KLAAMANN, E. R. 1962. Rasprostranenie ordovikskich i silurijskich tabuljat Estonii (s opisaniem nekotorych novych vidov). *Geologia Inst. Uurim* **10** : 149-172
- *FLOWER, R. H. 1961. *Montoya* and related colonial corals. *Mem. Inst. Min. Mexico Bureau Min.* **7** : 97 pp.
- *YU, C. M. 1956. Some silurian corals from the Chiuchüan Basin, western Kansu. *Acta palaeont. Sin.* **4** : 599-620. In Chinese, with English summary
- *STASINSKA, A. 1967. Tabulata from Norway, Sweden and from the Erratic Boulders of Poland. *Palaeont. pol.* **18** : 9-112
- OEKENTORP, K. & SCHOUPE, A. 1969. Kritische Betrachtungen über die Anordnung der Poren bei *Palaeofavosites* Twenhofel, 1914. *Neues Jb. Geol. Paläont. Abh.* **133** : 89-100
- HILL, D. & STUMM, E. C. 1956: *Tabulata*: F444-F477. In: MOORE, R. C. (Ed) *Treatise on Invertebrate Palaeontology. Part F. Coelenterata.* Geological Society of America and University of Kansas Press

PROPONENT'S COMMENT ON EFFECT OF ARTICLE 29(d) ON THE APPLICATION FOR CORRECTION OF CERTAIN NAMES ON THE OFFICIAL LIST OF FAMILY-GROUP NAMES. Z.N.(S.) 1965
(See volume 29, pages 26-27)

By George C. Steyskal (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory, Agricultural Research Service, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*)

1. In the two years that have elapsed since the submission of my application for correction of certain names on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology, the new Article 29(d) was added to the Code at the XVIIth International Congress of Zoology held at Monaco in September 1972. My application was published in May 1972 and comment on it was made by Dr. Theresa Clay in December 1972 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **29** : 199). Article 29(d) appeared in somewhat different form in the agenda for the Monaco meeting in August 1972 (*ibid.* : 99) and was acted upon one month later (*ibid.* : 189).

2. Aside from any reservations I may have as to the degree to which the new Article 29(d) represents the opinion of the majority of zoologists, it was evidently adopted in a regular manner and is now a part of the Code. It is therefore now necessary that an incorrectly formed family-group name proposed before 1961 be proved to be not in general use before it may be corrected. It seems highly doubtful to me that this procedure will lead to greater stability in nomenclature than the following of a rule of general application, especially one dealing with Latin grammar as does Article 29, which is the codification of a practice in effect virtually since the inception of the Linnaean system.

3. In response to the comment by Theresa Clay, I would like to point out that even if the "majority of zoologists using names are totally ignorant of classical grammar" they still must follow its rules when proposing new names, even those in the family group. If enough knowledge of classical grammar is needed to follow the rules in proposing new names, certainly no more such knowledge is needed to make old names conform to the same rules. We now must determine whether or not both of the names *Trinotonidae* and *Gyropidae* are in sufficient general use to remain uncorrected. There could be a considerable amount of discussion and at least a sizeable amount of work to determine accurately and objectively just how general, for example, is the use of *Pyralidae* as against *Pyralididae*. It should also be noted that Mayr's

wording of the proposal for the new Article in the agenda included the word "universal" instead of "general", a word of distinctly different meaning. The question still remains whether the many family-group names, at least in insects, that have been corrected in conformance with Article 29 should not now revert to their former "general use". At least the problem of determining how general has become the use of the corrected forms is not slight.

4. In view of the fact that the subject names were contrary to the rules in force at the time they were added to the Official List, I believe that my proposal should stand as it is, that is, as a proposal to place the subject names on the same footing as those others which were placed on it before the adoption of Article 29(d).

COMMENT ON PROPOSAL TO SUPPRESS *PTERODACTYLUS CRASSIPES* MEYER, 1857 AND COUNTER-PROPOSAL TO RECOGNIZE *ARCHAEOPTERYX LITHOGRAPHICA* MEYER, 1861, AND TO FIX ITS TYPE-SPECIES. Z.N.(S.) 1977

By Eugene Eisenmann (*American Museum of Natural History, New York, U.S.A.*,
Chairman, Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the
International Ornithological Congress)

In a worthy effort to ensure the continuing validity of the well-known *Archaeopteryx lithographica* Meyer, 1861 for the earliest recognized fossil remains of a bird (Jurassic), Dr. J. H. Ostrom has applied for the complete suppression of an earlier unused name, previously (1857) proposed by Meyer for fossil remnants from the same Solenhofen limestone beds, in the belief that they represented a flying reptile. Dr. Ostrom states his conviction that both fossil remains relate to the same bird species (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 29 : 30-31), and he is concerned that *crassipes* has priority. We support the applicant's aim to preserve *Archaeopteryx lithographica*, one of the most famous names in zoology and paleontology, and already on the Official List; but we suggest that to accomplish this, it is unnecessary totally to suppress the name *crassipes*.

2. As the type material of *Pterodactylus crassipes* consists, according to Dr. Ostrom, only of fragmentary skeletal remains, it is possible that, even if of a bird, it may represent a species different from *A. lithographica*; it is therefore desirable to preserve the available name. In saying this we are not questioning Dr. Ostrom's conclusion of identity (as to which we have no competence), but are pointing out a factual possibility, which involves a taxonomic issue, not within the proper sphere of the Commission. To protect *lithographica* does not require the complete suppression of *crassipes*. *A. lithographica* is already on the Official List, and the Commission may now rule (if necessary by exercise of the Plenary Powers) that name be applied as the valid name of the species, regardless of the applicability and priority of *crassipes*, or any other name that may be unearthed. This would leave *crassipes* available if considered applicable to a different species.

3. Dr. Ostrom's application also discusses the contention, which has been made by a few zoologists, that Meyer's name *Archaeopteryx lithographica* was applied only to an unidentifiable single feather imprint, and not to the oft-pictured fossil skeleton, which has long been in the British Museum (Natural History) and for which the name has been used almost universally. To end any further nomenclatural question, we ask that the Commission rule that the type-specimen of *Archaeopteryx lithographica* Meyer, 1861, is the animal, considered a Jurassic bird, whose fossil skeletal remains in Solenhofen limestone have long been in the British Museum.

It is therefore requested that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: