A REVISION OF THE NOMENCLATURE OF THE
BRACHYURA.*

BY MARY J. RATHBUN.

In reviewing the history of the genera of Brachyura† it is evident that many names in current use violate accepted rules of nomenclature. In the following pages special attention has been paid to generic names, with incidental notes on the names of species. The Code of the American Ornithologists' Union has been observed in making changes. Many of the problems which have arisen are, however, not covered by the provisions of the code, and recourse to the opinions of individuals has been deemed advisable. The writer is under obligation especially to Dr. Walter Faxon and Dr. Theodore Gill not only for advice, but for much practical assistance. Others whose opinions have been consulted on various doubtful points are Drs. J. A. Allen, W. H. Dall, C. Hart Merriam, T. S. Palmer, C. W. Richmond, L. Stejneger, C. W. Stiles, Profs. A. E. Verrill and S. I. Smith, and Messrs. J. E. Benedict, G. S. Miller, Jr., and R. Ridgway. It is but proper to add that no one but the writer is responsible for errors which may appear.

For convenience, the names which it is thought necessary to change are discussed under ten different headings.

1. Names diverted from their original meaning.—Canon XXII of the Code of the American Ornithologists' Union says: "In no

*Published by permission of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

†The term Brachyura is here used as limited by Miers, 1886, with the addition of the Raninidae, Alcock, 1896.
case should the name [of the genus] be transferred to a group containing none of the species originally included in the genus.” The following names have been thus transferred: *Uca, Lupa, Leptopodia, Chlorodiopsis, Stenocionops,* and *Naxia* of Leach, *Halimus* and *Platyonichus* of Latreille, and *Stenorynchus* Lamarck.

*Uca* was established by Leach in Brewster's Edinburgh Encyclopaedia, volume VII, 1814,* for the *Cancer uca* or *uka* Shaw, 1802, which he proposed to call *Uca una.* This is a fiddler crab and not the *Cancer Vca [uca]* of Linnaeus, 1767, and the *Uca una* of the Marcgrave de Liebstad, 1648. Latreille in 1817 (Nouv.-Dict. Hist. Nat., XII, 517), rightly considering it a case of mistaken identity, attempted to improve matters by calling Leach's *Uca, Gelasimus,* and giving the genus *Uca* to the Linnean species; but this proceeding is not sanctioned by the rules of today. Before Leach's *Uca* was abandoned its existence was recognized by Say in 1817. *Uca* Latreille may be known as *Ucides,* nov., and its type species as *Ucides cordatus* (Linnaeus, 1763) = *Uca una* Marcgrave, 1648, which can no longer “be mentioned as a rare instance of one that has been allowed to possess the names by which it was figured and described centuries ago.” (Stebbing, Hist. Crust., p. 84.)

In 1814, Edin. Encyc., VII, 390, Leach placed *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus, 1758, in the genus *Lupa,* and in the same year, in the

---

*There has been some doubt as to the date of Leach's article, ‘Crustaceology.’ All the volumes of the Edinburgh Encyclopaedia bear the date 1830 on the title page. Desmarest and other writers give the dates 1813-1814 for Leach's article. Dr. Stebbing, who has taken pains to collect evidence on the subject, informs me that volume VII of the Edinburgh Encyclopaedia gives no dates subsequent to 1814, the history of Denmark being carried down to January of that year. (See also Challenger Amphipoda, vol. I, p. 85, and quotation of Leach on page 155 of this article.) It has been suggested that the original article appeared in 1813 and the Appendix in 1814. I believe, however, that the first two pages of the article were published in 1813 and the remainder, including the Appendix, in 1814. In the Edinburgh edition of vol. VII, but not in the Philadelphia reprint, the signatures of the first half are marked “vol. VII, part I,” and of the second half “vol. VII, part II.” Part II begins on page 385, or the third page of Leach's article, and the inference is that Part I appeared in 1813 and Part II in 1814. All descriptions of genera and species appear in Part II of the volume, and in this part of the original article appear many references to the Appendix and Index, indicating that the Appendix, although written later than the body of the article, was not published later.
Zoological Miscellany, I, 123, pl. liv, described the new species *Lupa forceps*. That the former should take precedence is proved by the following, which appears in Leach’s article ‘Annulosa’ in the Encyclopædia Britannica, Supplement, vol. I, 1816: “This genus was instituted by Dr. Leach in the Edinburgh Encyclopædia, and has since been given with amended characters in the Zoological Miscellany and in the eleventh volume of the Transactions of the Linnean Society.” *Lupa* is a synonym of *Portunus* as restricted by Latreille, 1810 (see page 160). Those who do not admit his restriction must use the name *Lupa* in place of *Nepthus* de Haan, 1833. *Lupella*, nov., is proposed for *Lupa forceps* Leach, or the genus *Lupa* of de Haan, 1833. *Portunus* as used by Leach, 1814, and by succeeding writers may be called *Liocarcinus*, a name proposed by Stimpson, 1871, for a perhaps unnecessary division of that genus.

*Leptopodia* was established by Leach, Edinburgh Encyclopædia, Appendix, 431, 1814, for two species, *Maia phalangium* (Pennant, 1777) Leach [= Cancer rostratus Linnaeus, 1761 = Inachus longirostris Fabricius (sp. 1775), type examined = Macropodia longirostris Leach, 1814 (teste Leach, 1815)] and *Leptopodia tenuirostris* Leach, 1814 (Appendix), which are congeneric, and the first of which is the type of *Macropodia*, Edin. Encyc., 395, 1814. It should be observed that on page 395 the name *Leptopodia* appears in the synonymy of *Maia phalangium*, thus: ‘[Maia] 8. Phalangium. C. phalangium Pennant. Leptopodia phalangium, Leach’s MSS. See plate ccxxi, fig. 4, and Appendix.’ This is followed by ‘[Genus] XXV. Macropodia. Sp. 1. Longirostris Fabr. C. dodecos L.? ’ The genus *Macropodia* is then described. As noted above, the species *phalangium* and *longirostris* are identical. The preference should be given to the name of the genus regularly established rather than to one suggested but not adopted. *Leptopodia* of the Appendix, although probably published simultaneously with *Macropodia*, was the result of subsequent revision, and should not, I think, take precedence. *Leptopodia* is therefore a synonym of *Macropodia*. The species *sagitta*, Fabricius, 1793, which has been considered the type of *Leptopodia*, was not placed in the genus until 1815, Zool. Misc., II, 15, and Trans. Linn. Soc. London, XI, 331, where Leach retains *Macropodia* for *phalangium* and *tenuirostris* and recharacterizes *Leptopodia*. See also Mal. Podoph. Brit., explan. of pl.
xxiii, 1815.* For Leptopodia Leach, 1815, not 1814, Stenorynchus may be used. (See page 158.)

Clorodius was a manuscript name of Leach, first published, but not adopted,† by Desmarest, 1823, with the name of the type, 'Cancer dentatus Fabr.,' corrected in 1825 to 'Cancer 11-dentatus Fabr.' The first citation was an undoubted typographical error, as there is no such species as C. dentatus Fabricius. The genus was briefly defined by Desmarest as having fingers with spoon-shaped tips, a character which he includes in his diagnosis of Cancer 11-dentatus, but which unfortunately that species does not possess, a circumstance which, it seems to me, does not invalidate the genus. Clorodius appears with its original signification in de Haan's 'Fauna Japonica,' 1833. In 1830, Rüppell added to the genus a species, C. niger (Forskal, 1775), having little in common with the type. In 1834, Milne Edwards recharacterized the

* As the plates of Leach's 'Malacostraca Podophthalma Britanniae' are not dated and were not issued in numerical order, it is impossible to determine the sequence of publication in a bound copy of the volume. The following table, showing the plates and the date of each number, was kindly furnished me by Mr. Stebbing, who obtained them from Mr. Bernard Quaritch, the publisher of the concluding parts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8, 14, 22</td>
<td>Jan. 1, 1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4, 15, 40</td>
<td>Mar. 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>17, 28 A, 28 B</td>
<td>May 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19, 29, 41</td>
<td>July 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>23, 30</td>
<td>Sept. 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1, 2, 26</td>
<td>Nov. 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>24, 36</td>
<td>Jan. 1, 1816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>3, 12, 13</td>
<td>Mar. 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>42, 7, 43</td>
<td>May 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>6, 31, 32</td>
<td>July 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>9, 11, 33</td>
<td>Sept. 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>21 A, 21 B, 5</td>
<td>Nov. 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>18, 20</td>
<td>Jan. 1, 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>16, 25, 44</td>
<td>Apr. 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>22 B, 37 A, 37 B</td>
<td>July 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>22 C, 38, 39</td>
<td>Dec. 1, &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>9 B, 10</td>
<td>Mar. 1, 1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>{ 9 A, 24 A, 27, 34 }</td>
<td>1875.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>{ 33, 37 C, 45 }</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† I believe that if an author defines and publishes a name it becomes available over a later name whether he adopts it or not.
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genus, making C. niger the type, and this meaning has clung to it to the present day. In restoring Chlorodius to its original status, it becomes a synonym of Aletecyclus Leach, 1814. Chlorodiella, nov., is proposed for Chlorodius Milne Edwards.

Stenocionops Leach, MS., while not adopted by Desmarest, 1823, was said to include Maia taurus Lamarck, 1818, which is synonymous with Cancer cornudo Herbst, 1804,* and C. furcatus Olivier, 1791. Later, in 1825, the generic name was transferred by Latreille to the species cervicornis Herbst, 1803, which has ever since been regarded as the type. In its rightful meaning, Stenocionops takes the place of Pericera Latreille, Encyc. Méth., X, 699, 1825. S. cervicornis may be known as Ophthalmias (nov.) cervicornis.

Naxia, a manuscript name of Dr. Leach, was first defined and published, but not adopted, by Latreille, Encyc. Méth., Entom., X, 140, 1825, and one species assigned to it, Pisa aurita, nov. Naxia of Milne Edwards, 1834, has a different definition and contains only the species serpulifera Guérin; it should be considered a synonym of Naxioides A. Milne Edwards, 1865.

Halimus was very briefly described by Latreille in Cuvier's Règne Animal, ed. 2, IV, 60, 1829. No type was specified, but a single species, H. aries Latreille, is figured in Guérin's Iconographie. As this was the only species previous to 1834, it must

* Perhaps no single copy of Herbst’s ‘Naturgeschichte der Krabben und Krebse’ contains all the title pages of the different parts, and hence quotations from this work are full of inaccuracies. The following table gives the date of issue, number of plates, signatures, and pages of each Heft:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A-L</td>
<td>1-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>II-IX</td>
<td>M-Z</td>
<td>87-182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>X-XIII</td>
<td>Aa-Cc</td>
<td>183-206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>XIV-XVII</td>
<td>Dd-Gg</td>
<td>207-238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>XVIII-XXI</td>
<td>Hh-Mm</td>
<td>239-274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>XXII-XXV</td>
<td>A-F</td>
<td>1-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>XXVI-XXIX</td>
<td>G-K</td>
<td>49-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>XXX-XXXII</td>
<td>L-N</td>
<td>79-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>XXXIV-XXXVI</td>
<td>O-T</td>
<td>99-146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>XXXVII-XL</td>
<td>U-X</td>
<td>147-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6 et seq.</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>XLI-XLVI</td>
<td>Y-Pf</td>
<td>163-226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>XLVII-L</td>
<td>A-I</td>
<td>1-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>LI-LIV</td>
<td>A-F</td>
<td>1-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>LV-LVIII</td>
<td>A-G</td>
<td>1-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>LIX-LXII</td>
<td>A-G</td>
<td>1-49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be considered the type. *Halimus*, Milne Edwards, 1834, contained two species, *aries* and *auritus*. The latter was already the type of *Naxia* Leach in Latreille, 1825, and the former the type of *Halimus* Latreille, 1829. *Auritus*, on the contrary, has up to this time been held the type of *Halimus*, *aries* having been put in *Hyastenus* White, 1847, which genus now becomes a synonym of *Halimus*. *Halimus*, it should be noted, was proposed by Latreille, in 1829. for "deux espèces de la collection du Jardin du Roi, et dont l'une paraît être très-voisine du *Cancer superciliosus* [superciliosus] de Linné." As this is not sufficient to define the genus, the name must be considered as a nomen nudum, at least until its description in 1829.

*Platyonichus* Latreille, Nouv. Dict. Hist. Nat., XXVII, 4, 1818, was offered as a substitute for *Portumnus*, the orthography of the latter name being considered too near that of *Portunus*; consequently *Platyonichus* must have the same type as *Portumnus*, viz., *P. latipes* (Pennant, 1777). If *Portumnus* be restored, as it has been by many writers, *Platyonichus* becomes a synonym of it, and cannot be used for the species *ocellatus*, as this species was not known to *Platyonichus* until 1825 (Latreille, in Encyc. Méth., Entom., X, 151). *Xaiva* of MacLeay, 1838, is available for *ocellatus* and its allies, the earlier *Anisopus* de Haan, 1833, being preoccupied by Meigen (Illig. Mag., II, 1803) for Diptera.

*Stenorynchus* Lamarck, 1818, was a name given to two species, *S. phalangium* and *S. seticornis* Latreille. The former was already a member of *Macropodia*, 1814. The second species is therefore the type of *Stenorynchus*. It is said to be equivalent to *Cancer seticornis* Herbst, 1788, which is congeneric, if not conspecific, with *Cancer sagittarius* Fabricius, 1793. *Stenorynchus* has always been considered synonymous with *Macropodia*.

2. The name of a composite genus tenable for one or more of its species which do not belong in older genera.—*Platypodia* is a name given by Bell, Trans. Zoöl. Soc. London, I, 336, 1835, to that group of species included by Milne Edwards, 1834, under *Cancer*. This last genus as defined by Milne Edwards contained none of the Linnaean species of *Cancer*, and therefore the propriety of Bell's action would not be questioned, except for the fact that previous to the publication of Milne Edwards's *Cancer*, four of the species contained therein had been assigned by de Haan, 1833, to *Atergatis* and three other species to *Actea*. Milne Edwards does not specify the type of *Cancer*, but in illustration of the genus figures.
Cancer limbatus. Later, 1839, Randall adopts the name Platypodia, coupling it with the same specific name, granulosus Rüppell, 1830 = limbatus Milne Edwards, 1834. Subsequently all the species of Bell's Platypodia were assigned to other genera, viz., Medeus Dana, 1851, Euxanthis Dana, 1851, Hypocelus* Heller, 1861, and Lophaectea A. Milne Edwards, 1865, this last genus containing the species Cancer limbatus Milne Edwards. The question now arises, should Platypodia be considered a synonym of Atergatis and Actea, or should it be retained for the species limbatus? In reviewing the genera of Brachyura, I find that in all similar cases the name of the composite genus has not been treated as a synonym, e.g., Goniopsis de Haan, 1833, contained three species, two of which were already in the genus Grapsus, yet the name Goniopsis has been used without question for the third species. As a contrary decision would involve many needless changes, Platypodia is retained in place of Lophaectea.

3. The name of a composite genus, when made up wholly of older genera, tenable for a component part requiring a name. —I propose to restore the name Phalangipus Latreille, 1825, for Egeria Leach, 1815 = Leptopus Lamarck, 1818 = Stenopus Leach in Latreille, Encyc. Méth., Entom., X, 700, 1825, all preoccupied. (Egeria Roissy, an XIII [1804—5], Mollusca; Leptopus Latreille, Gen. Crust. Insect., IV, Addenda, 383, 1809, Hemiptera; Stenopus Latreille in Desmarest, Dict. Sci. Nat., XXVIII, 321, 1823, Macrura.) As originally defined, Encyc. Méth., Entom., X, 699, 1825, Phalangipus included Libinia + Doclea + Egeria, all genera of Leach, 1815. The name was never used subsequently. A precedent for its restoration now in a restricted sense is to be found in Maja, a genus formed by Lamarck, Sys. Anim. sans Vert., 154, 1801, for Inachus + Parthenope, both of Fabricius, 1798, and first restricted by Leach, 1814, to the species Cancer squinado Herbst, 1785, which was a component part of the Fabrician genus Inachus under the name I. cornutus (not C. cornutus Linnaeus, 1758). Maja or Maia in its Leachian sense has been in use without question down to

* It may be claimed that as Hypocelus was a preoccupied name (see page 164) it was not a genus in the proper sense, and that therefore the species of Platypodia (Cancer sculptus Milne Edwards) which was referred to Hypocelus, would by the process of elimination be the type of Platypodia. On the other hand, C. sculptus was an abnormal species of Cancer Milne Edwards (= Platypodia Bell), and therefore could not legitimately become its type.
the present day, and forms the typical genus of the Maiinae, Maiidae, and Maioidae. Should Plahongria be ruled out, Moju also must fall. It is of interest that Maia was used by Brisson, 1760, for a genus of birds, accepted by many ornithologists.

4. Specification of type.—In 1810, Latreille, in his 'Considérations Générales sur l'ordre naturel des animaux composant les classes des Crustacés, des Arachnides, et des Insectes,' gives a supplementary list with the following heading, 'Table des Genres avec l'indication de l'espèce qui leur sert de type.' At the time of the publication of Dr. Herrick's monograph, 'The American Lobster,' I believed that the species designated by Latreille should be regarded as types of their genera, and I am not yet persuaded to reverse that decision. It has been argued 'that 'Astacus fluviatilis Fab.' is given not as the type, but merely as a type, an example, a specimen of the genus, the handiest one for a Parisian reader to recognize.' The French word 'type,' however, is defined as 'type' or 'standard,' not as 'example' or 'illustration,' and although Astacus fluviatilis may have been the species most familiar to the Parisian reader, the same cannot be said of Portunus pelagicus or Dromia rumphii, East Indian species, chosen in preference to European. It has also been claimed that fluviatilis is the type of Astacus because it was placed first among those enumerated by Fabricius; but if this rule were applied to other Fabrician genera, we should have fornicate the type of Parthenope instead of Cryptopodia, vigil the type of Portunus instead of Podophtalmus, scabriuscula the type of Leucosia instead of Philyra, while muricatus would be an Inachus instead of a Doclea.

The present adoption of Latreille's specification affects the type of only two genera among the Brachyura, Portunus and Leucosia Fabricius, 1798. The type of the former becomes pelagicus, commonly attributed to Neptunus, de Haan, 1833, and of the latter, nucleus, afterward made the type of Ilia by Leach, 1817. Leucosia of Leach may be known as Leacosides, nov. Latreille in 1810 makes the species pagurus the type of Cancer. In 1825, in his 'Familles Naturelles,' he forms presumably for this species the genus Tourteau, in Gallic form, = Pagurus in Berthold's translation, 1827. This circumstance might be a weighty argument against the recognition of the Latreillian species as types, were it not that Leach in the mean time had indisputably restricted the genus Cancer to C. pagurus, and that in the early
days it was not deemed unpardonable to change the type of a genus.

5. Earlier names neglected.—A recent example of the abandonment of a valid name is the case of *Holometopus* Milne Edwards, 1853, which is a constituent of de Man's subgenus *Episesarma* of later date, 1895. Other names which have been laid aside without sufficient reason are as follows:


Charybdis de Haan, 1833, for *Goniosoma* A. Milne Edwards, 1860, on account of *Charybdea* Peron and Lesueur, 1809. *Goniosoma* was itself used by Perty, Delect. An. Art., 201-202, 1830-1834, for a genus of Arachnida.


Xanthodius Stimpson, 1859, if considered congeneric with *Leptodius* A. Milne Edwards, 1863, as it is by some writers, should take precedence, and not be treated as a synonym or a subgenus of *Leptodius*.

Paulson, 1875, gives *Cryptochirus* Heller as a synonym of *Lithoscapsa* A. Milne Edwards, but the former genus was described in 1861, the latter in 1862.

Arctopsis Lamarck, 1801 (description insufficient ?) is retained by Miers, 1879 and 1886, as a subgenus of *Pisa* Leach, 1814; but if *Arctopsis* be used at all, which seems unwarranted, it must take precedence of *Pisa*. The type species of both is supposed to be the same; its earliest indisputable name is *biauculeata* (Montagu). *Tetraodon*, which Miers makes the type of the subgenus *Pisa*, was not put by Leach into *Pisa* until 1815.

An example of the same name being applied by two authors to the same new genus is that of *Aulacolambrus*, a name attributed

*Leptodius* is made a synonym of *Xantho* by Ortmann, Zoöl. Jahrb., Syst., VII, Heft 3, 443, 1893.
to A. Milne Edwards, 1878, but first used by Paulson, Investigation of the Kinds of Crabs in the Red Sea, I, 9, 1875,* for Lambrus pisoides Adams and White, a member of Milne Edwards's genus Aulacolambrus.

6. Names based on figures without description.—Dorynchus first appeared in the combination 'Dorynchus thomsoni Norman,' a species which was figured in the text but not described in Wyville-Thomson's ' Depths of the Sea,' 1873 (fig. 34 on page 174). It is referred to thus: A pretty little stalk-eyed form Dorynchus thomsoni, Norman (fig. 34), small and delicate, and very distinct from all previously described species of the genus, is very widely diffused. The italics are my own, and the words emphasized may indicate that the word Dorynchus was accidentally used for Inachus, a genus containing a species dorynchus.† Dorynchus thomsoni was described and figured in a new genus by A. Milne Edwards, Crust. Reg. Mex., 349, pl. XXXI A, fig. 4, 1880, as Lispognathus furcillatus. Later † Prof. Milne Edwards, after recognizing the identity of his species and D. thomsoni, refers to it as 'Lispognathus (Dorynchus) Thomsoni.' In 1886 Mr. Norman, in his ‘Museum Normanianum. Crustacea,’ enters the species as 'Lispognathus thomsoni,' although more recently (December 21, 1895) he has assured me that he sees no reason why Dorynchus should be displaced.

A different case is that of Planes, a manuscript name of Dr. Leach, published by Bowdich, 1825, the claims of which are set forth by Dr. Faxon in his report on 'The Stalk-Eyed Crustacea' of the 'Albatross,' p. 29, 1895. This name is based on plate figures. In the text, p. 15, Bowdich says: A small crab, fig. 3, a and b, which I conceive to be a new species of planes, was found in great numbers amongst the anatiferae. [Foot-note:] It was of a delicate, but bright, rose colour: from the symmetrical form of its test (notched so regularly as to increase the projection and distinctness of its chaperon) it may be called p. clypeatus.

Mr. C. Davies Sherborn in his 'Explanation of the Plan

*This work is in Russian and was published at Kiew. The title is as follows: 'Izleyedovaniya Rakoobraznuikh Krasnavo Morya.'
† Inachus dorynchus Leach, 1814, should be known as Inachus phalangium Fabricius, the Cancer phalangium of Fabricius, 1775, of which I have examined the type, being different from C. phalangium Pennant, 1777, a synonym of Macropodia rostrata (Linnæus), 1761.
adopted for preparing an 'Index Generum et Specierum Animalium,' * says, p. 612: "The figure depicted on a plate may or may not be the drawing intended by the author; it is the work of the artist, who is also responsible for the descriptive legend. In numerous instances the descriptive legend on a plate is quite erroneous, and has been repudiated by the author in his text. Until the text descriptive of a plate appears, the names on the plate must be considered as nomina nuda, and it is open to any one to describe and rename such nomina nuda."

Is this rule intended to cover cases similar to Dorynchus, based on a text figure, and Planes, based on a plate figure, the name of which appears in the text without adequate description?

7. Post-Linnéan name given by a polynomialist invalid. —In 1763 Vosmaer in Mémoires de Mathématique et Physique, volume IV, established the genus Notogastropus for a crab noted and named for having feet on its dorsal as well as its ventral side. While this form was described and figured, no specific name was attached to it. It is without doubt referable to Dorippe dorsipes (Linneus) 1758 = D. quadridens Fabricius, 1798. The name Notogastropus was never adopted, though it appears in synonymy in Desmarest and de Haan, for the reason probably that Vosmaer was not a binomialist, and for the same reason I have not disturbed the current name Dorippe, preferring to follow Rule 44 b of the Rules of Nomenclature adopted by the International Zoological Congress held in Paris, 1889, which says: "Le nom attribué à chaque genre et à chaque espèce ne peut être que celui sous lequel ils ont été le plus anciennement désignés, à la condition: b.—Que l'auteur ait effectivement entendu appliquer les règles de la nomenclature binaire."

8. Preoccupied names. —The following new generic names are proposed for names preoccupied in the same kingdom:

Paeduma † for Amorphopus Bell, 1858. (Amorphopus Schönherr, 'in litt.,' Gen. Curc., V, ii, 577, 1840, given as a synonym of Calodromus; also Serville, Hist. Nat. des Insectes Orthoptères, Paris, 1839, teste Agassiz.)

Epinus ‡ for Apocremnus A. Milne Edwards, 1878. (Apocremnus Fieber, Wien Ent. Monschr., II, 320, 1858, Hemiptera.)

† Πηδεύμα, a rudiment, in allusion to the fifth pair of legs.
‡ Αἰγενός, steep.


Tympanomerus* for Dioxippe de Man, 1888. (Dioxippe Thomson, Fam. Cérambycides, 355, 1860, Coleoptera.)

Ericerodes for Ericerus Rathbun, 1893. (Ericerus Signoret, 1874, Coccidte, teste Cockerel.)

Hypocolpus† for Hypoccelus Heller, 1861. (Hypoccelus Eschscholtz, Silbermann's Rev., IV, tab., 1836, Coleoptera, teste Gemminger and Harold.)

Hapalonotus‡ for Malacosoma de Man, 1879. (Malacosoma Hübner, Verz., 192, 1816, Lepidoptera.)


Apiomithrax|| for Phycodes A. Milne Edwards, 1869. (Phycodes Guenee, Spéc. gén. d. Lép., VI, 389, 1852, Lepidoptera.)


Apinus¶ for Pyria Dana, 1851; pyrum, a pear. (Pyria Saint-Fargeau and Serville. Encyc. Méth., Entom., X, 494, 1825, Hymenoptera; πῦρ, a fire.)


Thersandrus†† for Sisyphus Desbonne and Schramm, 1867. (Sisyphus Latreille, Encyc. Méth., Entom., X, 438, 1825, Coleoptera; Sysipheus, 1818; Sisyphus, 1807.)

Sphenomerides for Sphenomerus Wood-Mason, 1891. (Sphenomerus Candèze, Mon. Élat., II, 1859, Coleoptera.)

*Tuμπανος, a drum or tympanum; μέρος, merus.
†Υγός, under; κόλπος, a hollow.
‡Αφαλός, soft; νότος, back.
§Δαυδος, hairy; ρυιος, limb.
||'Απιος, a pear; Μιθραξ.
¶'Απιως, a pear; with the suffix tay.
**Διανός, flat; κυλός, circle.
††The son of Sisyphus.

The following published names should be substituted for preoccupied names:

*Palicus† Philippi, 1838, for Cymoporia Roux, 1828. (Cymoporia Lamouroux, Hist. Pol. Coral. Flex., 292, 1816.)


The following may be used for names preoccupied though with different gender terminations:

*Rhodia Bell, 1835, for Herbstia Milne Edwards, 1834. (Herbstia Leach in Desmarest, Dict. Sci. Nat., XXVIII, 301, 1823, Maerura.)

*Grapseillus MacLeay, 1838, for Trapezia Latreille, 1825. (Trapezium Humphrey, Mus. Calonnianum, 1797, Mollusca.)

*Hypopellarium† Miers, 1886, for Pellarion Hombron and Jacquinot, 1852? (Pellarion G. Fischer de Waldheim, Bul. Soc. Imp. Nat. Moscou, XVII, part 1, 106, 1844, Coleoptera.)

*Eurypanopeus§ A. Milne Edwards, 1880, for Panopeus Milne Edwards, 1834. (Panopeus Ménard, Ann. Mus., IX, 135, 1807,


†Since the publication of my 'Synopsis of the American Species of Palicus Philippi (= Cymoporia Roux),' pp. 93 to 99 of these Proceedings, Professor Jeffrey Bell and Dr. Hilgendorf have kindly sent me copies of the original description of Palicus. Though brief, it agrees with Cymoporia. Dr. Philippi was doubtless soon convinced of the identity of his genus with the earlier one, as the complete description and figure which he promised to publish in Wiegmann's Archiv never appeared.

‡Hypopellarium was substituted by Miers, 1883, for Pellarion (name preoccupied) and has been in use ever since.

§Admitting that Eurytium Stimpson, 1859, is a distinct genus.
Mollusca.) Panopea is the name of one of the Nereids. Cancer Panope Herbst, from which the name Panopeus was derived, doubtless referred to the same character.


Charybdella, nov., for Cronius Stimpson, 1860. (Cronia H. and A. Adams, Gen., I, 128, 1858, Mollusca.)


Raphonotus,† nov., for Fabia Dana, 1851. (Fabius Duncan, Foreign Butterflies, 167, 1837, testa Scudder.)

Leucocarcinus,‡ nov., for Leucisca MacLeay, 1838. (Leuciscus Cuvier, Règne Animal, ed. 1, 194, 1817, Pisces.)

Zalasius,§ nov., for Trichia de Haan, 1841. (Trichius Fabricius, Sys. Entom., 40, 1775, Coleoptera.)

Those names which are spelled alike except for their termination and have different meanings are not considered the same, e. g., Achmus Leach, 1817, is not displaced by Achsea Hübner, 1816, both being proper names. The same is true of Nemausa A. Milne Edwards, 1875, and Nemausus, Stål, 1865.

9. Names given simultaneously to different genera.—Acanthodes was proposed by de Haan, 1833, for a genus of crabs. The same name was used by Agassiz, July, 1833, for a genus of fishes; it was, however, substituted for his Acanthoessus, 1832. For this reason, and because it cannot be proved that Acanthodes de Haan is of later date, it seems best to preserve the name for the crustacean genus.

Thia Leach, 1815, bears the same date as Thia Oken, Lehr. Naturg., 3te Theil, 1te Abth., a genus of Vermes. Thia Oken appears in a scheme of classification on p. xiii, and in the index or 'Register' at the end of the same work (p. xvii), but not in the body of the work, where it is called Amphinome (testa Faxon). It is impossible to tell which genus, Oken's or Leach's, was first published, but as the former is, I believe, a synonym, and per-

*Εγγώνους, angular; νῶτος, back.
† Πατή, suture; νῶτος, back.
‡ Λιοτός, white; ζπαχτός, crab.
§ Λάστυς, hairy; ζα, intensive prefix.
haps was never used except by Oken, the name Thia may properly be used for the crustacean genus.

Kraussia was used by Dana for a genus of crabs,* and by Davidson for a genus of mollusks† in the same month of the same year, May, 1852; but Davidson in 1859 changed his Kraussia to Kraussina, acknowledging the priority of Dana's genus.

10. Original orthography to be preserved except in case of typographical error.—According to Canon XL of the A. O. U. Code, we should write Ethusa not Ethusa, Ethra not Ethra, Eriocheir not Eriocheir, Podophtalmus not Podophtalmus, Zosimus not Zozymus, Lophozozymus, Stenorynchus, Dorynchus, Loxorynchus, Pyromaia Stimpson, 1871, not Apiannaia von Martens, 1873. Goneplax Leach, Edin. Encyc., VII, 1814, was spelled Goneplat on p. 393, Goneplax on p. 430. The first form may be considered a typographical error. Goneplax was so used by Leach in 1815; in 1816 written Gonoplax; since that time both Goneplax and Gonoplax by different authors.