

CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (76) 15 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that Voting Paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1079.

I.W.B. NYE
Assistant Secretary

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
14th February, 1977.

OPINION 1080

DIDERMOCERUS BROOKES, 1828 (MAMMALIA) SUPPRESSED
UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.- (1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Didermocerus* Brookes, 1828, is suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Dicerorhinus* Gloger, 1841 (gender, masculine), type-species, by monotypy, *Rhinoceros sumatrensis* Fischer, 1814, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names with the Name Number 2045.

(3) The specific name *sumatrensis* Fischer, 1814, as published in the binomen *Rhinoceros sumatrensis* (specific name of type-species of *Dicerorhinus* Gloger, 1841) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2604.

(4) The work "A catalogue of the anatomical and zoological museum of Joshua Brookes, Part One" published in London in 1828 is hereby placed on the Official List of Works approved as available for zoological nomenclature with the Title Number 43.

(5) the generic name *Didermocerus* Brookes, 1828, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2084.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.) 1779

In October 1966 an application was received from Mr Patrick J. Boylan (*Kingston upon Hull Museums, Hull, England*) for a decision by the Commission as to whether *Didermocerus* Brookes, 1828, or *Dicerorhinus* Gloger, 1841, should be used for the genus of which the Sumatran rhinoceros is the type-species. This application was published on 6 March 1967 in *Bull. Zool. Nom.* vol. 26: 55-56. Comments in favour of *Dicerorhinus* were received from Dr D.A. Hooijer (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*) (: 202) and Dr Colin P. Groves (then of *University of California, Berkeley*) (: 279) and one in favour of *Didermocerus* from Lord Medway (then of *University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur*). Dr Holthuis observed that Brookes's catalogue appeared to be an available work under the Code.

For reasons which cannot now be ascertained, the case was not then proceeded with. Eventually, after further correspondence with Mr Boylan in 1971 and 1973, a revised application prepared jointly by him and Mrs Green was sent to the printer on 29 May 1974 and published in *Bull.* vol. 31: 135-139 on 20 September

1974. This application asked for the suppression of *Didermocerus* Brookes, 1828 and for *Dicerorhinus* Gloger, 1841 to be placed on the Official List. It was opposed by Lord Medway and supported by Dr Groves in the following note which was circulated to the members of the Commission with their Voting Papers:

"Although I originally used the name *Didermocerus* in considering the extant Sumatran rhinoceros alone (Groves, 1965), following Ellerman & Morrison-Scott (1951), I later (Groves 1967, 1972) revised this opinion having in the meantime become aware of the invariable usage of *Dicerorhinus* by palaeontologists: a usage which, as far as I know, is without a single exception in recent years. As fossils referred rightly or wrongly to *Dicerorhinus* are abundant in key fossil localities and are frequently used as "guide" fossils (Guérin et al., 1969; Guérin 1973; Hooijer, 1967), it is of great importance (a) that consistent usage be maintained, and (b) that the currently accepted nomenclature be sanctioned by the Commission. I therefore strongly urge the Commission to place *Dicerorhinus* on the Official List of Generic Names.

REFERENCES

- ELLERMAN, J.R. & MORRISON-SCOTT, T.C.S., 1951. *A checklist of palaeartic and Indian mammals*. British Museum Trustees.
 GROVES, C.P., 1965. *Säugetierk. Mitt.*, vol. 13: 128-131
 ——— 1967. *Säugetierk. Mitt.*, vol. 15: 221-237
 ——— & KURT, F., 1972. *Mammalian species* (21): 1-6
 GUÉRIN, C., 1973. *Nouv. Arch. Mus. nat. Hist. nat.* vol. 11: 55-84
 ——— BALLELIO, R. & MÉON-VILAIN, H., 1969. *Docum. Lab. Géol. Fac. Sci. Lyon*, vol. 31: 55-145
 HOOIJER, D.A., 1967. *Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.) Geol.* vol. 13: 119-190."

Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in this case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the prescribed serials (Constitution Art. 12b) and to two mammalogical serials.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 September 1976 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (76)16 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*: vol. 31: 136-137. The Voting Paper was divided into two parts. Part 1 dealt with the proposal to suppress *Didermocerus* Brookes, 1828 under the plenary powers. Part 2 dealt with the proposal that Brookes's 1828 "Catalogue" should be placed on the Official List.

At the close of the Voting Period on 22 December 1976, the state of the voting was as follows:

PART 1

Affirmative Votes - seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Eisenmann, Holthuis, Vokes, Willink, Brinck, Rohdendorf, Tortonese, Mroczkowski, Ride, Binder, Corliss, Starobogatov, Bayer, Welch, Nye, Kraus

Negative Votes - Lemche, Bernardi

Abstentions - Dupuis, Sabrosky

PART 2

Affirmative Votes - nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Vokes, Willink, Lemche, Brinck, Rohdendorf, Tortonese, Mroczkowski, Ride, Binder, Corliss, Starobogatov, Dupuis, Bayer, Welch, Nye, Kraus, Bernardi

Negative Vote - Sabrosky

Abstention - Eisenmann.

No Voting Paper was returned by Dr Heppell. Dr Alvarado returned a late affirmative vote on both parts 1 and 2.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their Voting Papers:

Eisenmann: As long as I am voting in favour of *Dicerorhinus*, I think it unnecessary to decide on the validity of the Brookes catalogue. Without knowing what other names might be affected, I prefer not to vote on Part 2.

Sabrosky: I object to the 'incidental' vote on the status of a work. This should be the subject of a separate application that tells us more about the work, the names involved, etc. In principle, I am opposed to sales catalogues, hence I can vote gladly on that part. If it is rejected, no vote is necessary on the first part because *Didermocerus* would be rejected. However, I will support action on *Dicerorhinus* anyway, in order not to hold up that part. As for *Acinonyx*, the Commission can always recognise the name under plenary powers, if that name is desirable.

Dupuis: (on Part 1) Abstention car les raisons de principe de Lord Medway me sont inconnues.

Bernardi: Puisque les deux noms sont l'un et l'autre largement utilisés soit en zoologie soit en paléontologie, pourquoi ne pas appliquer la loi de priorité, puisque le travail de Brookes est déjà reconnu comme un travail valide.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

- Dicerorhinus* Gloger, 1841, *Handb. Naturgesch.*: 125
Didermocerus Brookes, 1828, *A catalogue of the anatomical and zoological museum of Joshua Brookes, Part One*, London.
sumatrensis, *Rhinoceros*, Fischer, G., 1814, *Zoognosie*, vol. 3: 301.

The following is the bibliographic reference to a work placed on the Official List of Works approved as available for zoological nomenclature by the Ruling given in the present Opinion: Brookes, Joshua, 1828. *A catalogue of the anatomical and zoological museum of Joshua Brookes, Esq.; F.R.S. F.L.S. & Part 1*. London, Author.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (76) 16 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained 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 on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1080.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
23 February 1977

OPINION 1081

ADDITION OF FAMILY-GROUP NAMES BASED ON *ALCA* (AVES) AND *ALCES* (MAMMALIA) TO THE OFFICIAL LIST OF FAMILY-GROUP NAMES IN ZOOLOGY

RULING.- (1) The following names are hereby added to the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) ALCIDAE (ex Alcidae) Anon., 1820, type-genus *Alca* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves) (Name Number 486);
- (b) ALCEIDAE (ex Alcedae) Brookes, 1828, type-genus *Alces* Gray, 1821 (Class Mammalia) (Name Number 487).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.) 2011

An application for the resolution of the homonymy between two family-group names - one for the auks and the other for the elks - was received from Dr G.N. Kashin (*Moscow*) on 26 June 1972. After considerable correspondence aimed at establishing the authorship of ALCIDAE in Birds, the application was sent to the printer on 27 August 1974 and published on 13 January 1975 in Vol. 31 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, p. 215. No use of the plenary powers was involved.

Professor Ernst Mayr commented that it was absurd to propose a family name for the elks, though some authors had recognised a tribe for that genus.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 September 1976 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (76) 19 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* vol. 31: 215. At the close of the Voting Period on 22 December 1976 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes - eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Eisenmann, Holthuis, Vokes, Willink, Lemche, (for ALCIDAE (Aves) only) Brinck, Ride, Mroczkowski, Bayer, Binder, Corliss, Starobogatov, Welch, Dupuis, Nye, Kraus, Bernardi

Negative Votes - Rohdendorf, Tortonese, Habe

Abstention - Sabrosky.

Voting Paper not returned - Heppell. A late affirmative vote was returned by Dr Alvarado.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their Voting Papers:

Eisenmann: Although it is unlikely that a family, or even a subfamily, would be recognised for the elks (Mammalia), the nomenclatural conflict with ALCIDAE universally used for the auks