



THE  
CONE  
COLLECTOR

## ***Filmer 2011.***

**Nomenclature and Taxonomy in Living Conidae**

### **Decisions by ICZN affecting Conus**

#### **Contents:**

**Rejected and Invalid Works(Appendix 1 A)**

**Rulings on Names (Appendix 1 B)**

**Notes on Stability and Priority (Appendix 1 C)**

Copyright © 2011.R Filmer Conditions of use.

The content of this website is provided for personal and scientific use and may be downloaded for this purpose. It may not be used in whole or part for any commercial activity and publication of any of the content on the internet is limited to the Cone Collector website([www.TheConeCollector.com](http://www.TheConeCollector.com) ). Authors wishing to publish any of the pictures may do so on a limited basis but should inform M Filmer so that the original owner of the rights to the picture can be acknowledged. ([mike@mfilmer.fsnet.co.uk](mailto:mike@mfilmer.fsnet.co.uk)).

Version 1.0 October 2011.

**OFFICIAL LIST OF WORKS RELATIVE TO THE FAMILY CONIDAE WHICH  
HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED BY THE ICZN AND ARE PLACED ON  
THE OFFICIAL INDEX OF REJECTED AND INVALID WORKS  
IN ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

- 1) **HUMPHREYS J.** Museum Calonnianum, London, 1797. Opinion no. 51, February 1912.
- 2) **MARTINI F.H.W. AND CHEMNITZ J.H.** Neues Systematisches Conchylien-Cabinet, Nürnberg, 1769-1795. Volumes 1-11. Opinion no. 184, 15th July 1944.
- 3) **MEUSCHEN F.C.** Museum Gronovianum, Rotterdam, 1778, Opinion no. 260, 22nd December 1953.
- 4) **MEUSCHEN F.C.** Index to the "Zoophylacium Gronovianum" of Gronovius, Rotterdam, 1781, Opinion no. 261, 23rd December 1953.
- 5) **RENIER S.A.** Tavola Alfabetica Delle Conchiglie Adriatiche, Padua, 1804. Opinion no. 316, 7th April 1954.
- 6) **MARTYN T.** The Universal Conchologist, London, 1784, Opinion no. 456, 24th November 1956.

Therefore none of the names introduced in any of the above works are included in this Catalogue.

**LIST OF NAMES RELATIVE TO THE FAMILY CONIDAE, WHICH  
HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED BY THE ICZN AND ARE PLACED ON THE  
OFFICIAL INDEX OF REJECTED AND INVALID SPECIFIC NAMES  
IN ZOOLOGY.**

1) **Opinion no. 753. (1965).** The below mentioned names published in Syst. Nat. 10th ed. (1): are suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy:

*C. clavus* Linnaeus, 1758.

*C. minimus* Linnaeus, 1758.

*C. rusticus* Linnaeus, 1758.

*C. senator* Linnaeus, 1758.

2) **Opinion no. 757. (1966).** The name *C. candidus* Born, 1778 published in Ind. Mus. Caes. Vindob: is suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

3) **Opinion no. 1699. (1993).** The name *C. modestus* Sowerby, 1833 published in Conch. Ill. (*Conus*): is suppressed for the purpose of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy. See also 6) hereunder, on *C. fulmen* Reeve, 1843.

**LIST OF NAMES RELATIVE TO THE FAMILY CONIDAE, WHICH  
HAVE BEEN RULED UPON BY THE ICZN AND ARE PLACED ON THE  
OFFICIAL LIST OF SPECIFIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY.**

4) **Opinion no. 1163. (1981).** The name *C. moluccensis* Dillwyn, 1817 is a totally suppressed name on Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology. The name *C. moluccensis* Küster, 1838 is on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

5) **Opinion no. 1502. (1983).** The name *C. fergusonii* Sowerby III, 1873 published in Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. unnumbered (41), pt. 1: is to be given precedence (nomen protectum) over the name *C. fulvocinctus* Crosse, 1872 (nomen oblitum) published in J. Conch. Paris, 20. Whenever the two names are considered synonyms. The name *C. fergusonii* is placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the endorsement that it is to be given precedence. The name *C. fulvocinctus* is placed on the Official List of Specific

Names in Zoology with the endorsement that it is not to be given priority.

**6) Opinion no. 1539. (1989).** The name *C. floridanus* Gabb, 1869 published in Am. J. Conch. 4 (4): is not to be given precedence over the name *C. anabathrum* Crosse, 1865 published in J. Conch. Paris, 13: whenever the two names are considered synonyms. The name *C. anabathrum* is placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

**7) Opinion no. 1699. (1993).** The name *C. fulmen* Reeve, 1843 published in Conch. Icon. 1 (*Conus*): is to be given precedence (nomen protectum) over the name *C. modestus* Sowerby, 1833, (see also 3) above on *C. modestus*). The name *C. fulmen* is placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

**8) Opinion no. 1905. (1998).** The work by S.D. Kaicher (1973 - 1992) entitled Card Catalogue of World Wide Shells is not suppressed for nomenclatural purposes. The above work is hereby placed on The Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature. As a result, the following *Conus* names are included.

*C. alexandrinus. C. hawaiiensis. C. lineopunctatus.  
C. lobitensis. C. nasui. C. negroides.*

**9) A proposal (Case 3396)** by A.J. Kohn & D.L.N. Vink to declare the designation of a second neotype for *C. jaspideus* Gmelin, 1791 replacing the first designation by Vink on the grounds that this first designation did not meet the Rules of the ICZN was rejected because it was deemed that the first designation did meet the rules.

## ICZN PRINCIPLE OF PRIORITY AND STABILITY

Article 23.1 in the ICZN Code (4th edition, year 2000) describes the Principle of Priority as follows  
"The valid name of a taxon is the oldest available name applied to it, unless that name has been invalidated or another name is given precedence by any provision of the Code or by any ruling of the Commission"

The purpose of the Principle is described in Article 23.2 as follows

"The Principle of Priority is to be used to promote stability and it is not intended to be used to upset a long-accepted name in its accustomed meaning by the introduction of a name that is its senior synonym or homonym, or through an action taken following the discovery of a prior and hitherto un-recognized nomenclatural act".

The establishment or reversal of precedence is clarified in Article 23.9 as follows

23.9.1 "prevailing usage must be maintained when the following conditions are both met:

23.9.1.1 the senior synonym or homonym has not been used as a valid name after 1899 and

23.9.1.2 the junior synonym or homonym has been used for a particular taxon, as its presumed valid name, in at least 25 works, published by at least 10 authors in the immediately preceding 50 years and encompassing a span of not less than 10 years.

23.9.2. An author who discovers that both the conditions of 23.9.1 are met should cite the two names together and state explicitly that the younger name is valid, and that the action taken is in accordance with this

Article; at the same time the author must give evidence that the conditions of Article 23.9.1.2 are met, and also state that to his or her knowledge, the condition in Article 23.9.1.1 applies. From the date of publication of that act the younger name has precedence over the older name. When cited the younger but valid name may be qualified by the term **nomen protectum** and the invalid but older name by the term **nomen oblitum**. In the case of subjective synonymy, whenever the names are not regarded as synonyms the older name may be used as valid".

An author who considers that the application of the Principle of Priority would disturb stability or universality or cause confusion must maintain existing usage and refer the case to the Commission for a ruling if suppression of one of the two names is desirable.

The cases mentioned hereunder require research to clarify each one. This author has been unable to do the necessary research on these cases. In accordance with the new Code, especially in relation to the specifics of Articles 23.9.1.1 and 23.9.1.2, both new provisions, appropriate action is recommended to others. The remarks in the under mentioned cases are the un-researched opinion of this author and in themselves do not constitute an action under the Code.

#### **CASES WHICH NEED CLARIFICATION.**

1) **C. jickelii** Weinkauff, 1873. This name is very well established for the species. Recently a senior synonym **C. quadratus** Röding, 1798 has come to light. Although the name *C. quadratus* has been in use for many years it has been wrongly applied to a different species *C. spurius* Gmelin, 1791. It is now clear that it is a synonym not of *C. spurius* but of *C. jickelii*. Consequently *C. jickelii* should be confirmed as the valid name for the species (nomen protectum) and *C. quadratus* should be forgotten (nomen oblitum), in order to maintain stability.

2) **C. kawamurai** Habe, 1962. This name is very well established as a species (some authors consider it to be a subspecies of *C. milneedwardsi* Jousseume, 1894). Recently (Callomon 2000) established that *C. aratispira* Pilsbry, 1905, an acknowledged fossil, is in fact the same species as *C. kawamurai* Habe, 1962. The name *C. aratispira* has not been used for *C. kawamurai* since the latter was described in 1962 and consequently *C. kawamurai* should be confirmed as the valid species (or subspecies ?) (nomen protectum) and *C. aratispira* should be forgotten (nomen oblitum) in order to maintain stability.

3) **C. kerstitchi** Walls, 1978. This uncommon species has recently been identified as probably a junior synonym of **C. selectus** Adams, 1855. The latter name has been unused

and of uncertain identity for over one hundred years, if the two prove to be synonyms then *C. kerstitchi* should be confirmed as the valid name for the species (nomen protectum) and *C. selectus* should be forgotten (nomen oblitum), in order to maintain stability.

4) **C. perplexus** Sowerby, 1857. This name is very well established for the species. Recently a senior synonym has come to light, ***C. pustulatus*** Kiener, 1845 (1847), which was, in the past, considered a synonym of either *C. jaspidaeus* Gmelin, 1791 or *C. puncticulatus* Hwass, 1792, is now accepted as a senior synonym of *C. perplexus*. Consequently *C. perplexus* should be confirmed as the valid name for the species (nomen protectum) and *C. pustulatus* should be forgotten (nomen oblitum), in order to maintain stability.

The same applies to ***C. luzonicus*** Hwass, 1792 which is also a senior synonym of ***C. perplexus*** Sowerby II, 1857

5) **C. sanguinolentus** Quoy & Gaimard, 1834. This name is very well established for the species. ***C. unicolor*** Sowerby, 1833 is almost certainly a senior synonym which has not been applied to any taxon for well over one hundred years. Assuming *C. unicolor* is indeed a synonym of *C. sanguinolentus* (Kohn concludes *C. unicolor* is a nomen dubium) then *C. sanguinolentus* should be confirmed as the valid name for the species (nomen protectum) and *C. unicolor* should be forgotten (nomen oblitum), in order to maintain stability.

6) **C. spirofilis** Habe & Kosuge, 1970. This name is very well established for the species. However ***C. japonicus*** Hwass, 1792 is a senior synonym. *C. japonicus* has, in the past, been tentatively applied to a number of other species, mainly from the western Atlantic. Kohn (1968 & 1992) concluded that *C. japonicus* was a nomen dubium, however da Motta (1985) recognised the true status of *C. japonicus* but decided to give it a new name, *C. nipponicus* da Motta, 1985, being unaware of the earlier publication of the name *C. spirofilis*. *C. japonicus* has not been used for almost two hundred years in its proper status, and consequently *C. spirofilis* should be confirmed as the valid name for the species (nomen protectum) and *C. japonicus* should be forgotten (nomen oblitum), in order to maintain stability.

7) **C. stearnsi** Conrad, 1869. This name is very well established for the species. **C. sticticus** A. Adams in H. & A. Adams, 1853 has been the subject of doubt and uncertainty and it had not been applied to any taxon until recently. It has now been accepted as a senior synonym of *C. stearnsi*, (Vink, 1991). Consequently *C. stearnsi* should be confirmed as the valid name for the species (nomen protectum) and *C. sticticus* should be forgotten (nomen oblitum), in order to maintain stability.

8) **C. victor** Broderip, 1842. This name is very well established as a subspecies of *C. nobilis* Linnaeus, 1758. Recently a senior synonym *C. vincoomnes* Lichtenstein, 1794 has come to light as being the same subspecies (Geiger 2003). This name has not been used for over two hundred years and consequently *C. victor* should be confirmed as the valid subspecies of *C. nobilis*, Linnaeus, 1758 (nomen protectum) and *C. vincoomnes* should be forgotten (nomen oblitum), in order to maintain stability, (designated by Geiger in 2003).

#### **ELECTRONIC PUBLICATIONS**

In September 2012 The Commission published an amendment of Articles 8, 9, 10, 21 and 78 of the Code to expand and refine methods of publication to include electronic publication under specified conditions. The new provisions will apply from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012.