be dropped for biological or ecological papers but retained for taxonomic ones. This would allow a researcher to trace the nomenclatural status of a species for his literature review.

The only valid alternative that I can see for taxonomists would be to list all the combinations under which a specific name has appeared. This system is followed by some workers but seems even more cumbersome than the present system.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED COMPLETION OF THE OFFICIAL LIST ENTRY FOR RHABDITIS DUJARDIN, [1855] (NEMATODA). Z.N.(S.)937
(see vol. 42, pp. 197–198)

By W. Grant Inglis (Office of the Chief Scientific Adviser, GPO Box 1625, Adelaide, South Australia 5001)

The former Secretary has advanced proposals intended to overcome a problem which I, and others, had thought to have been resolved in 1928 when the name Rhabditis was purportedly placed on the Official List of Generic Names by Opinion 104, with R. terricola as ‘type by subsequent designation’ (see Dougherty, E. C. 1955, J. Helminthol. vol. 29, pp. 105–152). That not being so, the proposals are acceptable because they do not alter the situation as it is generally understood. Nevertheless, they seem vacuous because they do not (1) alter or protect the status of either the generic or the specific name, nor (2) solve any known, obvious or anticipated problem in nomenclature, because of the provisions of Article 78(f).

The proposals refer to Dougherty’s brief paper of 1953 (Thapar Commemorative Volume, pp. 69–76) but the justifications for those conclusions are given in a later paper (1955, J. Helminthol., vol. 29, pp. 105–152). In this a very persuasive case is made for treating R. terricola as a species of that genus and so, by default, as its type species. This conclusion was reached, and still stands, on the basis of Dujardin’s original description so that any reference to R. aspera Bütschli, 1873 is superfluous.

The significant question for the Commission, however, is whether it is necessary to add either name to either Official List. As I read the latest edition of the Code this would give no additional protection to either name, and there is no evidence that either is at risk. The only slight advantage might be to make anyone considering the possibility of changing the generic name to think again, because Rhabditis now supplies the root for higher-taxon names up to Class and Subclass.

Note by R. V. Melville (former Secretary)

I am grateful to Dr Inglis for the additional information he has supplied. However, he misunderstands the formal position, which is that the putting into effect of the decision in Opinion 104 on Rhabditis and R. terricola was postponed in 1958, pending clarification of the taxonomic status of R. terricola. My proposals merely aimed to complete this piece of unfinished business before the Commission, and I maintain that this should be done.

Dougherty’s 1955 paper shows that Dujardin’s original description of the species does not allow it to be identified beyond doubt. It is only as a result of Reiter’s work (1928, Arb. zool. Inst. Univ. Innsbruck, vol. 3, pp. 93–184) that that description can be used to recognise R. aspera Bütschli as conspecific with R. terricola Dujardin, so that reference to the latter still has point.
It is true that placing a name on the Official List does not give that name any added protection against hitherto undiscovered senior homonyms or synonyms; that protection is afforded by Article 78i. But at least the status of the names involved has been thoroughly examined and this alone provided a measure of security.

COMMENTAIRE SUR CAECILIIDAE CHEZ LES AMPHIBIENS ET CHEZ LES PSOCOPTERES: NOUVEAUX ELEMENTS ET NOUVELLE PROPOSITION. Z.N.(S.)2333
par Alain Dubois (Laboratoire des Reptiles et Amphibiens, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 25 rue Cuvier, 75005 Paris, France)


L'application des Articles 32(c) (iii) et 35(d)(ii) du nouveau Code exigerait dans ce cas de corriger automatiquement le nom CAECILINA Rafinesque-Schmaltz, 1814 en CAECILIIDAE Rafinesque-Schmaltz, 1814, mais alors le problème d'homonymie avec le nom de famille de Psocoptères subsisterait.

Nous proposons comme solution à ce problème d'homonymie l'action suivante, à notre avis, bien plus simple et économique que celles suggérées jusqu'ici: il suffirait que la Commission décide de suspendre dans ce cas l'application des Art. 32(c)(iii) et 35(d)(ii) du Code, de manière à rétablir la simple primauté du Principe de Préorité. Le nom valide de la famille d'Amphibiens Gymnophiones serait alors CAECILIIDAE Rafinesque–Schmaltz, 1814, et l'homonymie avec le nom CAECILIIDAE Kolbe, 1880 serait levée sans qu'aucune autre action soit nécessaire.
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