OPINION 1047

ALELLA LEIGH-SHARPE, 1925 (CRUSTACEA: COPEPODA):
DESIGNATION OF TYPE-SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type-species for the nominal genus Alella Leigh-Sharpe, 1925, are hereby set aside and the nominal species Anchorella pagelli Kroyer, 1863 is designated as type-species of that genus.

(2) The generic name Alella Leigh-Sharpe, 1925 (gender: feminine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, Anchorella pagelli Kroyer, 1863, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2021.

(3) The specific name pagelli Kroyer, 1863, as published in the binomen Anchorella pagelli (specific name of type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, of Alella Leigh-Sharpe, 1925) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2563.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 2006)

An application for the designation of a type-species for the nominal genus Alella Leigh-Sharpe, 1925 (a genus based on a misidentified type-species) was received from Dr. Z. Kabata (Fisheries Board of Canada, Nanaimo, B.C., Canada) on 17 April 1972. It was sent to the printer on 20 September 1972 and published on 29 December 1972 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 29: 216-7. 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 (Constitution Art. 12b; Bull. zool. Nomencl. 31: 97) and to one crustacean serial. No comment was received for publication in the Bulletin, but the following exchange of letters was circulated to members of the Commission with their Voting Papers.

Dr. W. D. L. Ride to Secretary (8 June 1973): “From the application, it appears that there has been no use at all of Alella in the sense which would be demanded if A. canthari (Heller, 1865) sensu Kabata were the type. If it is generally held by specialists that two species are involved here, it could reasonably be held that the Commission would be justified in declaring A. pagelli to be the type-species in accordance with the choice which it can exercise to adopt the provisions of Article 70a(i) without the use of the plenary powers, since such an action would best serve the stability and uniformity of nomenclature.

“But there is another reason for the use of the plenary powers which should probably be stated. This is that such action might be justified in view of the very late designation of A. canthari as type-species (in 1966). It would be wise to employ the plenary powers to set aside all designations made before that date just in case A. alata (Brian, 1906) had been selected on some previous occasion unknown to the applicant.
“However, before either of these matters are voted on, the Commission will want to know from workers in this field whether, in view of the long history of believed synonymy between *A. canthari* and *A. pagelli* and the apparent loss of the type-specimens of *A. canthari*, it would not be wise to deal with the matter by selecting an undoubted specimen of *A. pagelli* to be a neotype of *A. canthari*. Such an action would also solve the question of the type-species without action by the Commission.”

Secretary to Dr. Ride (23 June 1973): “This seems to me a simple mis-identified type-species case. Leigh-Sharpe got *Anchorella canthari* wrong when setting up *Alella*; we are invited to designate not the species she named, but the one actually before her, namely *Anchorella pagelli*. Plenary powers must be used to do this because *pagelli* was not one of the originally included nominal species. Alternatively, we can overrule the applicant and Nunes-Rivo by designating *alata*, thus presumably sinking *Alella* as a synonym of *Clavella*, or *canthari*, presumably sinking it as a synonym of *Clavelloides*. Neither of these would be a justifiable thing to do. The true *canthari* Heller, 1865, is not a synonym of *pagelli* Kroyer, 1863, but has been recognised as a valid species as recently as 1964 by Kabata (the applicant).

“The action you suggest in your second paragraph would be standard operating procedure in a case of this kind. But selecting a specimen of *pagelli* as a neotype of *canthari* would only make the latter a junior synonym of the former. They would still be different nominal species because [originally] founded on different types. Nothing can make *pagelli* an originally included nominal species of *Alella*. Besides, why should we make *canthari* and *pagelli* identical when both names are currently valid for different species? Failing any comments on the case, this seems to me a case that ought to succeed.”

Dr. Z. Kabata (21 October 1974) on seeing the above: “I am in agreement with Mr. Melville. The matter is really quite simple. We have a genus, originally established with two species but without designation of a type. One of these species is later found to have been misidentified and its incorrect name is established in the literature. Under that incorrect name, it is subsequently designated as type-species. My reading of Article 70a(i) is that action by the Commission is necessary to correct this situation.

“In considering this matter I did seek views from several of my colleagues. However, it appears that at present I am the only person with a reasonable knowledge of the *Lernaeopodidae*, and most commentators deferred to my judgment.”

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

On 8 November 1974 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (74)28 on the proposals concerning the type-species of *Alella* Leigh-Sharpe, 1925 set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 29 : 217. At the close of the Voting Period on 8 February 1975, the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—twenty-one (21), received in the following order: Melville, Vokes, Holthuis, Lemche, Alvarado, Willink, Eisenmann, Rohden-
Dr. G. G. Simpson: Article 70a specifies three possible actions by the Commission and enjoins choice of whichever best serves stability and uniformity in nomenclature. This proposal mentions only one alternative—70a(i)—and gives no evidence that this will indeed serve those ends. I am not impressed by the somewhat dictatorial subsequent argumentation.

Dr. Mayr: Anchorella canthari Heller, 1865, is left in the air. To what genus does it belong?

M. Dupuis: Je vote pour, car j’aurais personnellement résolu ainsi ce “simple misidentification of type-species case” (Melville, accompanying letter)—mais je suis réticent pour l’inscription officielle de noms, que je n’aurais pas demandée, tant il me paraît que le jeu normal des Règles suffit pour obtenir le résultat.

Original References

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

Alella Leigh-Sharpe, 1925, Parasitology 17: 194–200
pagelli, Anchorella, Kroyer, 1863, Naturh. Tidsskr. (3) 2: 75–320

Certificate

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (74)28 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. 1047.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
21 September 1975