AMBYSTOMA TSCHUDI, 1838 (AMPHIBIA); VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers the following generic names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

(a) Axolotus Jarocki, 1822;  
(b) Philhydrus Brookes, 1828;  
(c) Siredon Wagler, 1830;  
(d) Phyllhydrus Gray, 1831;  
(e) Axolot Bonaparte, 1831;  
(f) Sirendon Wiegmann, 1832;  
(g) Stegoporus Wiegmann, 1832.

(2) The generic name Amhystoma Tschudi, 1838 (gender: neuter), type-species, by monotypy, Lacerta subviolacea Barton, 1804, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1509.

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

(a) maculata Shaw, 1802, as published in the binomen Lacerta maculata (Name No. 1868);

(b) mexicanus Shaw, 1789, as published in the binomen Gyrinus mexicanus (Name No. 1869).

(4) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) The following generic names as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above:

(i) Axolotus Jarocki, 1822 (Name No. 1591);  
(ii) Philhydrus Brookes, 1828 (Name No. 1592);  
(iii) Siredon Wagler, 1830 (Name No. 1593);  
(iv) Phyllhydrus Gray, 1831 (Name No. 1594);  
(v) Axolot Bonaparte, 1831 (Name No. 1595);  
(vi) Sirendon Wiegmann, 1832 (Name No. 1596);  
(vii) Stegoporus Wiegmann, 1832 (Name No. 1597);

(b) Ambystoma Agassiz, 1846 (an invalid emendation of Amhystoma Tschudi, 1838) (Name No. 1598).

(5) The family-group name AMBYSTOMATIDAE (correction of AMBYSTOMIDAE) Hallowell, 1856 (type-genus Ambystoma Tschudi, 1838) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name No. 337.

(6) The family-group name AMBYSTOMIDAE Hallowell, 1856 (type-genus Ambystoma Tschudi, 1838) (an incorrect original spelling for AMBYSTOMATIDAE) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name No. 367.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 762)

The present case was first submitted to the office of the Commission in August 1956 by the late Dr. Karl P. Schmidt. In July 1960 Professor Hobart

M. Smith and Dr. Joseph A. Tihen, having independently investigated the problem, also submitted an application. Since the latter paper was the more inclusive it was decided by the Secretary to the Commission that it be advanced in lieu of the former. The application was sent to the printer on 8 December 1960 and was published on 16 June 1961 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 18:172–176. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4:51–56) and to two herpetological serials. No objection to the proposal was received.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

On 7 February 1962 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (62)3 either for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 18:175–176. At the close of the prescribed Voting Period on 7 May 1962 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—twenty-three (23) received in the following order:
Hering, Holthuis, Evans, Munroe, Mayr, Vokes, Miller, Lemche, Riley, Kühnelt, Key, Bonnet, Uchida, Stoll, Borchsenius, Alvarado, do Amaral, Jaczewski, Tortonese, Bradley, Boschma, Mertens, Poll.

Negative Votes—none (0).


Voting Papers not returned—two (2): Hemming, Obruchev.

**ORIGINAL REFERENCES**

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists and Indexes by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:
*Amblystoma* Agassiz, 1846, *Nomen. Zool.* (Rept.) : 2
*AMBYSTOMIDAE* Hallowell, 1856, an incorrect original spelling for *AMBYSTOMATIDAE* q.v.
*Axolotus* Jarocki, 1822, *Zoologii . . .* 3(Gady i plazy) : 179
*Sirenodon* Wiegmann, 1832, in Wiegmann & Ruthe, *Handb. Zool.* (ed. 2) : 204
*Stegoporus* Wiegmann, 1832, in Wiegmann & Ruthe, *Handb. Zool.* (ed. 2) : 204

**CERTIFICATE**

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (62)3 were cast as set out above, that the proposal set out in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted
under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of
the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 649.

N. D. RILEY
Secretary

W. E. CHINA
Assistant Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
11 May 1962

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF CYPRAEA PIPERITA
GRAY, 1825

By Ray H. Summers (Petaluma, California, U.S.A.)

(see volume 19, pages 317–322)

I have one of the three largest and most complete private collections of Cypraea
in the world and specialize in the Cypraeidae particularly in the identification
of them by the study of their morphological features.

I am very interested in the stabilization of the nomenclature to correct the
confusion that now exists. I am in complete agreement with Griffiths’ recom-
mendations except the alternative to retain C. piperita and rule bicolor a synonym.
I do not feel that the name C. piperita is suitable for C. bicolor, and there is probably
as many or more specimens labelled C. bicolor in collections than there is those
labelled C. piperita.

The collectors, who specialize in Cypraea, that I have talked with are in
agreement with the above.

The use of the name C. angustata by some conchologists for C. fuscodentata
is very undesirable as the latter does not have lateral spots.

By Ernst Mayr (Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard College, Cambridge,
Mass., U.S.A.)

It would seem infinitely better to adopt the alternative listed by Griffiths in
the last paragraph on page 320. To select a neotype for C. piperita in accordance
with modern usage would be entirely in accordance with stability and univer-
sality, and preserve usage of the name piperita as established by Sowerby’s interpreta-
tion as made in 1832. I would like to call attention to the fact that the Commission
has repeatedly used its plenary powers in recent years for such neotype designations
that would serve stability and universality of usage. I would strongly favour
such an action by the Commission in order to preserve such a well-known name
as C. piperita.