

OPINION 102

Proteocephala BLAINVILLE, 1828, vs. *Proteocephalus*
WEINLAND, 1858

SUMMARY.—A generic name (example *Proteocephalus*, 1858) is not invalidated by the earlier publication of the identical or a similar name of higher rank (example *Proteocephala*, 1828). If *Taenia ambigua* (tod. of *Proteocephalus*, 1858) is congeneric with *ocellata* (tsd. of *Ichthyotaenia*, 1894), *Ichthyotaenia* is a subjective synonym of *Proteocephalus*.

STATEMENT OF CASE.—Prof. George R. LaRue of the University of Michigan has presented the following case for opinion:

I wish to submit for a ruling the question of the availability of the generic name *Proteocephalus* Weinland, 1858. The facts are substantially these:

Weinland (1858a, p. 53) proposed the generic name *Proteocephalus*, designating *Taenia ambigua* Dujardin as type and assigning *Taenia filicollis* and *T. dispar* to the genus.

It so happens that Blainville (1828, p. 552) had already used the name *Proteocephala* for a family of Cestodaria with the single genus *Caryophyllaeus*. The question now arises whether *Proteocephalus* Weinland, 1858, is invalidated by the prior use of *Proteocephala* Blainville, 1828, as the designation of a family. As I see it the question resolves itself into two parts, namely, whether two words differing only in termination ("us" and "a") are to be considered as homonyms, and whether the use of a name to designate a family bars the subsequent use of that name to designate a genus.

The first question seems to have been answered in the first recommendation following Art. 36 of the International Code, see Bulletin No. 24, Hygienic Laboratory, Wash., p. 47.

The second question does not seem to be covered by the Code as published in 1905. Art. 34 which governs the rejection of a generic name which has previously been used to designate another genus obviously does not apply and no recommendation appears to have been made by the Commission to cover cases similar to the one in question.

The argument against the use of the name *Proteocephalus* Weinland, 1858, has been stated by Luehe (1899, Zool. Anz., v. 22: 525-526). Since he has been followed in his use of the name *Ichthyotaenia*, by Rudin (1916), Meggitt (1914), Wagner (1917), M. Plehm (1924), it has seemed well to quote Luehe's argument:

"Railliet (1899, Sur la classification des Téniaidés. In: Centrbl. f. Bact. u. Paraskde. Bd. 26, p. 33 f) hat inzwischen den Namen *Ichthyotaenia* Lömb., 1894, als synonym eingezogen zu *Proteocephalus* Weinkl., 1858. Dass letzterer Name an sich seines grösseren Alters wegen prioritätsberechtigt wäre, ist zuzugeben und war auch mir bekannt. Gleichwohl sehe ich keine Veranlassung ihn zu Ungunsten des bisher allgemein üblichen Gattungsnamens *Ichthyotaenia* auszugraben. Schon 1828 nämlich hat Blainville (Dict. Sci. nat., T. 57, p. 552) den Namen *Proteocephala* gebraucht für eine Cestodenfamilie (einzige Gattung *Caryophyllaeus*). Wenn nun auch dieser Name, weil den heute geltenden

Vorschriften für die Bildung der Familiennamen nicht entsprechend, in Wegfall kommt, so darf doch meines Erachtens ein homonymer Gattungsname nicht anerkannt werden. Dass es sich bei Blainville um einen Familien-, nicht um einen Gattungsnamen handelt, kommt hierbei für mich um so weniger in Betracht, als wir heute allgemein die Familiennamen von den Gattungsnamen ableiten.

“Nicht besser ist es um das Prioritätsrecht von *Tetracotylus Montic.*, 1892, bestellt. Dieser Name unterscheidet sich nur durch das Geschlecht von *Tetracotyle* Filippi, 1854, mit welchem er im übrigen vollständig gleich gebildet ist. Ich muss daher beide Namen als homonym ansehen, sonst könnte ja beispielsweise auch noch einmal der Name *Bothriocephalum* (neben *Bothriocephalus* Rud.) gebildet werden. Das in No. 4 der von der Deutsch. Zoolog. Gesellsch. bearbeiteten Nomenclaturregeln angeführte Beispiel “*Picus* und *Pica*” kann gegen diese meine Anschauung nicht geltend gemacht werden, da dies beides altlateinische Worte sind, welche schon von den Römern in der ihnen auch heute noch von uns beigelegten verschiedenen Bedeutung gebraucht wurden und welche daher mit einem anderen Massstabe gemessen werden müssen als neue Wortbildungen.

“Ich gebe zu, dass es sich hier um strittige Fragen handelt. Stiles ist, wie er mir brieflich mitgeteilt hat, hinsichtlich beider Punkte anderer Ansicht wie ich. So lange indessen diese Fragen noch nicht in einer allgemein gültigen und auch mich bindenden Weise entschieden sind (wozu diese Zeilen vielleicht die Anregung geben), beanspruche ich für mich das Recht, den bisher allgemein üblichen Gattungsnamen *Ichthyotaenia* auch fernerhin zu gebrauchen. Als typische Art dieser Gattung sehe ich *Ichthyotaenia ocellata* (Rud.) Lönnberg an, da dies nicht nur die Art ist, welche Lönnberg (Centrbl. f. Bact. u. Paraskde., Bd. 15, 1894, p. 803) an erster Stelle nennt (*I. filicollis* [Rud.] Lönnbg. ist synonym zu *I. ocellata* [Rud.] Lönnberg), sondern auch diejenige von den von Lönnberg aufgeführten Arten, welche am besten bekannt ist. . . .

“Ich bin gern bereit zuzugeben, dass dereinst vielleicht auch die *Ichthyotaenien* wieder eine Auftheilung erfahren müssen, aber vorläufig ist unsere Kenntnis der überwiegenden Mehrzahl der hierher gehörigen Arten noch viel zu gering, um eine solche Auftheilung zuzulassen. Am allerwenigsten würde dieselbe gerechtfertigt sein, wenn wirklich der Name *Proteocephalus* Weinl. zur Anerkennung gelangen sollte und damit eine *Species inquirenda* (*Taenia ambigua* Duj.). Typus der Gattung würde. Wenn übrigens Weinland in dieselbe Gattung auch die *Taenia dispar* Gze. einreihet, so ist dies zweifellos unberechtigt.”

Concerning *Tetracotylus* Monticelli, 1891, I have pointed out (LaRue, 1914) that *T. coryphicephalus*, the type of this genus, is not congeneric with *Proteocephalus filicollis*, *P. percae*, and other species of *Proteocephalus*. Hence I can not agree that *Tetracotylus* is a synonym of *Proteocephalus* and *Ichthyotaenia*.

As for *Taenia ambigua*, which Lühe considered to be a species inquirenda, I have pointed out that it is a synonym of *Taenia filicollis* Rud., (LaRue, 1914, 38-48). I am unable to accept Lühe's statement that *Ichthyotaenia filicollis* is a synonym of *I. ocellata*. The arguments for my view are too long to state here. They are given in full in my monograph (LaRue, 1914, 38-48, and 93-108).

The fact that Weinland included *Taenia dispar* in his genus *Proteocephalus* is not a serious matter.

DISCUSSION.—Professor LaRue's premises raise two distinct points. The first of formal nomenclature, the second a question of nomenclature dependent to some extent upon subjective conceptions of synonymy.

Proteocephalus Weinkl., 1858a, 53, tod. *Taenia ambigua* versus the dead family name *Proteocephala* Blainville, 1828a, v. 57, 552.—Art. 34 of the International Code is unambiguous. It reads as follows: "A generic name is to be rejected as a homonym when it has previously been used for some other genus of animals. Example: *Trichina* Owen, 1835, nematode, is rejected as homonym of *Trichina* Meigen, 1830, insect."

There is nothing in Art. 34 which provides that a generic name becomes a homonym if the identical name has previously been used for a systematic unit of some other rank (for instance, species, family, order, etc.). On the contrary Art. 33 definitely states that: "A name is not to be rejected because of tautonymy, that is, because the specific or the specific and subspecific names are identical with the generic name. Examples: *Trutta trutta*, *Apus apus apus*."

The fact that *Proteocephala* is a dead family name because it is not formed in accordance with Art. 4 (ending *idae*) has no bearing upon the present case, which opens up the very broad question whether generic names are to be invalidated as homonyms because of the prior publication of an identical name for a supergeneric group. If this kind of homonymy were to be admitted, numerous cases would arise for adjudication. The history of nomenclature clearly shows that the rule of homonyms is applicable only as applied to systematic units of identical rank except in so far as the contrary might be implied from the custom of some authors to consider tautonyms as homonyms. As pointed out above, however, Art. 33 distinctly provides that tautonyms are not homonyms.

The answer to Professor LaRue's first question is, therefore, that *Proteocephala*, 1828, has no nomenclatorial bearing on *Proteocephalus*, 1858.

Proteocephalus, 1858, tod. *ambigua* versus *Ichthyotaenia*, 1894, tsd. *ocellata*.—It is to be noticed that *Taenia ambigua* is a species inquirenda fide Lühe, 1899k, but that it is a synonym of *filicollis* fide LaRue, 1914; also that *filicollis* is a synonym of *ocellata* fide Lühe, 1899k, but that it is distinct from *ocellata* fide LaRue, 1911. Thus there is a difference of opinion between Lühe and LaRue in regard to the subjective synonymy in case of the names *ambigua*, *filicollis*, and *ocellata*. This difference of opinion belongs in the field of systematic zoology, not in the field of nomenclature.

If *ambigua* and *ocellata* (the type species of *Protocephalus* and *Ichthyotaenia*) are congeneric, *Protocephalus*, 1858, has clear priority over *Ichthyotaenia*, 1894, and *Ichthyotaenia* is a subjective synonym of *Protocephalus* regardless of the subjective synonymic status of *ambigua*, *filicollis*, and *ocellata*.

On basis of the foregoing premises and argument the Secretary recommends that the Commission adopt the following opinion:

A generic name (example, *Protocephalus*, 1858) is not invalidated by the earlier publication of the identical or a similar name of different [higher] rank (example, *Protocephala*, 1828). If *Taenia ambigua* (tod. of *Protocephalus*, 1858) is congeneric with *ocellata* (tsd. of *Ichthyotaenia*, 1894), *Ichthyotaenia* is a subjective synonym of *Protocephalus*.

The foregoing Opinion was submitted at the Budapest (1927) Meeting to Lord Rothschild as special subcommittee of one for consideration and report. He reported as follows:

I desire to report on Circular Letter No. 124 that I find that *Protocephalus* as a generic name can and must stand beside *Protocephala*, as Family names and names of higher groups have no connection with generic designations.

Opinion written by the Secretary.

Opinion concurred in—

(a), regarding *Protocephalus*, by thirteen (13) Commissioners: Apstein, Bather, Chapman, Handlirsch, Horvath, Jordan (D. S.), Jordan (K.), Kolbe, Neveu-Lemaire, Stejneger, Stiles, Stone, and Warren.

Commissioner Stone states: "With the understanding that generic and subgeneric names are treated exactly alike nomenclatorially, *i. e.*, an earlier subgeneric name of identical form, renders invalid a subsequent generic name. So with species and subspecies."

Commissioner Stejneger appended a footnote, as follows: "I suggest, however, that the summary is not quite clear. The subgenus has not the same 'rank' as the genus, hence someone might argue that 'a generic name is not invalidated by the earlier publication of the identical or similar subgeneric name.' Would not 'higher' for 'different' remedy that?" [Change adopted as an editorial correction. —C. W. S.]

(b), regarding synonymy, by eleven (11) Commissioners: Bather, Chapman, Handlirsch, Horvath, Jordan (D. S.), Jordan (K.), Kolbe, Neveu-Lemaire, Stejneger, Stiles, and Warren.

Opinion dissented from—

(a), regarding *Protocephalus*, by no Commissioner.

(b), regarding synonymy, by no Commissioner.

Not voting—

(a), regarding *Protocephalus*, four (4) Commissioners: Dabbene, Hartert, Ishikawa, and Loemberg.

(b), regarding synonymy, six (6) Commissioners: Apstein, Dabbene, Hartert, Ishikawa, Loemberg, and Stone.

Votes not clear on either (a) or (b) cast by Commissioner Monticelli.