

OPINION 86

CONULINUS VON MARTENS, 1895

SUMMARY.—The generic name *Conulinus* von Martens, 1895, takes as type *Buliminus* (*Conulinus*) *conulus* Rv., and is not necessarily invalidated by *Conulina* Bronn.

STATEMENT OF CASE.—Major M. Connolly has presented the following case:

Conulinus von Martens (*Mollusca*) was first proposed as a subgenus of *Buliminus* without description of its points or definition of genotype in Nachr. d. Deutsch. Malak. Ges., 1895, p. 180, in a descriptive list of new species:

"No. 16. *Buliminus* (*Conulinus* n.) *Ugandae*." The author then describes the species and adds at the end of the description the words "verwandt mit *B. conulus* Rv." He then describes two other new species, *Buliminus* (*Conulinus*) *hildebrandti* and *B. (C.) metula*.

No genotype is nominated, and the whole point is whether it is possible for *B. conulus* Rv. to be admitted as the type, as it is not placed by the author in his new subgenus in his original list, although he mentions that one of his new species, belonging to that subgenus is "verwandt" with *conulus*.

In his work on "Beschalte Weichthiere deutsch Ost-Africa," 1897, on p. 64, von Martens defines and extends the subgenus *Conulinus* and nominates *L. conulus* Pfr. (a misprint for Rv.) as type, thus showing that he probably had that species in his mind as type when he originally propounded the subgenus, although he omitted to say so.

In 1914, Gude (*Fauna of British India, Mollusca*, vol. II, p. 280) rejects *Conulinus* von Mts. as void, owing to the prior existence of *Conulina* Bronn, 1835, and proposes in its place *Edouardia* [not *Edwardsia* quatr., 1842], with *B. conulus* "Pfr." (another misprint for Rv.) as type.

The questions therefore which require to be settled are:

(1) Is the name *Conulinus* acceptable at all, or should it be replaced by *Edouardia*?

(2) If it is acceptable, is *B. conulus* Rv. acceptable as its type?

The matter is now of very considerable importance, as recent anatomical investigation has proved that practically all the large South African species, which have usually been placed in *Pachnodus*, do not belong to that genus at all, but are similar to *conulus* in their anatomy, and even further, are so different in that respect from the nearest subfamilies in which they can be placed that it may be necessary to place them in a separate one, in which case it is important that the name of their genus should be absolutely unassailable. If *conulus* is acceptable as the type of *Conulinus*, the latter name is available for the genus; but if the type of *Conulinus* must be selected from the three [new] species in von Martens' original list, it will not be safe to apply it to the South African forms, including *conulus*, until the anatomy of whatever is selected as the type species is known; there is no proof, as yet, that it is the same as that of *conulus*. A ruling is also very desirable as to whether *Edouardia* Gude should replace *Conulinus* or be relegated to its synonymy.

DISCUSSION.—

(1) The statement by von Martens, 1895, that *B. (Conulinus) ugandae* is "verwandt mit *B. conulus* Rv." is equivalent to saying that *B. conulus* Reeve is allied to *B. (C.) ugandae*; and by that must be meant that *B. conulus* Reeve belongs to the new subgenus *Conulinus*. No more is said about *B. conulus* because von Martens was describing new species and not revising old ones.

(2) We have, then, given four syn-genotypes of the subgenus *Conulinus* viz. *B. ugandae*, *B. hildebrandti*, and *B. metula*, all new species, and *B. conulus* the well-known species of Reeve.

(3) If attention be confined for the moment to this paper (1895), anyone selecting a genotype would fix on *B. conulus* Reeve for two reasons:

(a) As the common well-known species, reference to which is dragged in by the author with the obvious purpose of explaining his new subgenus;

(b) As bearing the trivial name on which the subgeneric name is, without any doubt, based.

(4) The correctness of this conclusion is proved by von Martens' own action (1897) in fixing *B. conulus* as genotype.

(5) *Conulinus* von Martens is not preoccupied by *Conulina* Bronn;

(6) But, whether as *Conulinus* or as *Edouardia*, Gude (1914) confirms *B. conulus* as genotype.

(7) There is accordingly no difficulty in following the action of previous authors and retaining *B. conulus* as genotype.

The answer therefore is:

Conulinus von Martens stands, with genotype *Buliminus conulus* Reeve.

The foregoing case has been studied for the Commission independently by Dr. Wm. H. Dall, by Dr. Paul Bartsch, and by the Secretary, and all agree with the foregoing findings.

Opinion prepared by Commissioner Bather.

Opinion concurred in by 13 Commissioners: Apstein, Bather, Handlirsch, Hartert, Horvath, Hoyle, Jordan (D. S.), Jordan (K.), Kolbe, Loennberg, Monticelli, Skinner, Stiles.

Opinion dissented from by no Commissioner.

Not voting 2 Commissioners: Dautzenberg, Stejneger.