

OPINION 1150

CHILODUS MÜLLER & TROSCHEL, 1844, AND
CAENOTROPUS GUENTHER, 1864 (PISCES) PLACED
 ON THE OFFICIAL LIST

RULING – (1) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *Chilodus* Müller & Troschel, 1844 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Chilodus punctatus* Müller & Troschel, 1844 (Name Number 2099);
- (b) *Caenotropus* Guenther, 1864 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Eigenmann, 1910, *Microdus labyrinthicus* Kner, 1858 (Name Number 2100).

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *punctatus* Müller & Troschel, 1844, as published in the binomen *Chilodus punctatus* (specific name of type species of *Chilodus* Müller & Troschel, 1844) (Name Number 2701);
- (b) *labyrinthicus* Kner, 1858, as published in the binomen *Microdus labyrinthicus* (specific name of type species of *Caenotropus* Guenther, 1864) (Name Number 2702).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.) 1502

An application for a ruling on the validity of a designation of type species for the nominal genera *Chilodus* Müller & Troschel, 1844 and *Caenotropus* Guenther, 1864 was first received from Messrs J.R. Géry (*Strasbourg, France*) and J.J. Hoedeman (*Zoological Museum, Amsterdam, Netherlands*) on 18 October 1961. It was sent to the printer on 20 October 1961 and published on 28 May 1962 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 19, pp. 191–192. No use of the plenary powers was asked for. An adverse comment by E. Trewavas and P.H. Greenwood (*British Museum (Natural History) London*) was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 20, p.147.

FIRST VOTE OF THE COMMISSION

On 24 October 1963 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1963) 30 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 19, p. 192. At the close of the voting period on 24 January 1964 there were eight affirmative votes, 21 negative votes, and one voting paper not returned. The proposals of Messrs Géry & Hoedeman were thus rejected; but the contrary proposals of Trewavas & Greenwood, not having been specifically voted on, had not been adopted. No action to resolve this stalemate was taken at that time.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CASE

On 31 October 1969 I received a letter from Dr L.B. Holthuis asking me to look into the reasons why no Opinion had been published on the original application. When I came to deal with this request (with the help of the late Dr W.E. China), I found that the facts had not been fully or clearly presented to the Commission. I therefore prepared a report to the Commission in which these facts were stated. I proposed that the Commission, in resolving the stalemate resulting from its earlier vote, should rule that the Code should be directly applied to the case, since this would confirm existing practice among ichthyologists. My report was published on 28 March 1975 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, pp. 45-50. No use of the plenary powers was involved. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 20 August 1979 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1979)6 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, pp. 49-50. At the close of the voting period on 20 November 1979 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes – nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Vokes, Holthuis, Alvarado, Hahn, Willink, Trjapitzin, Tortonese, Sabrosky, Habe, Welch, Brinck, Bernardi, Bayer, Dupuis, Corliss, Nye, Cogger, Heppell

Negative Vote – Mroczkowski.

Late Affirmative Votes were returned by Kraus, Halvorsen and Starobogatov. Ride was on leave of absence. No vote was returned by Binder.

In returning his voting paper Dr Sabrosky observed: 'My quoted comment (2) [see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, p. 48] was not

well stated, but it is still my strong feeling that the simple application of the *Règles* (the 1961 Code may not have been available to Géry & Hoedeman) would have rendered this application unnecessary.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Caenotropus Guenther, 1864, *Cat. Fishes Brit. Mus.* vol. 5, p. 297

Chilodus Müller & Troschel, 1844, *Arch. Naturg.* Jahrgang 10, vol. 1, p. 85

labyrinthicus, *Microodus*, Kner, 1858, *Sitzungsber. k. Akad. Wiss. Wien*, vol. 30, Heft 13, p. 77

punctatus, *Chilodus*, Müller & Troschel, 1844, *Arch. Naturg.*, Jahrgang 10, vol. 1, p. 85

The following is the original reference to a designation of type species accepted in the ruling given in the present Opinion: of *Microodus labyrinthicus* Kner, 1858, as type species of *Caenotropus* Guenther, 1864 by Eigenmann, 1910, *Repts Princeton Univ. Expeds Patagonia, 1896-9*, vol. 3, part 4, p. 424.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on V.P.(79)6 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1150.

R.V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

2 January 1980