SEPARATE

OF A PAPER PUBLISHED BY

THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE ON BEHALF OF

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

This paper contains an application relating to a question of zoological nomenclature which has been submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. As a preliminary, this paper has been published in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature". The volume in which this paper was so published and the date of publication are shown at the foot of the first page of the paper.

- 2. The object of publishing applications in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" is to provide an opportunity to interested specialists to submit comments to the Commission on the action recommended in the applications so published. For this purpose an interval of six months from the date of publication is allowed to elapse before the International Commission starts to vote on any given application.
- 3. One of the principal objects of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature in providing authors with separates (off-prints) of applications published in the "Bulletin" is to secure a rapid and wide distribution of those applications among interested specialists, in order to provide to those specialists an opportunity of commenting upon the applications in question before a decision is reached by the International Commission.
- 4. Recipients of separates of papers published in the "Bulletin" are therefore particularly requested to furnish their comments on the action proposed as soon as possible to the Assistant Secretary, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature c/o British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, S.W.7, England.

LOLIGO STEARNSII HEMPHILL, 1892 (MOLLUSCA, CEPHALOPODA): REQUEST FOR SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS Z.N.(S.) 2041

By Gilbert L. Voss (Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, University of Miami, 10 Rickenbacker Causeway, Virginia Key, Miami, Florida 33149, U.S.A.)

- 1. A new species of squid, Loligo stearnsii, was described by Henry Hemphill (1892:51) from specimens purchased in the San Francisco and Oakland, California fish markets. The fish dealers said these were "taken in nets outside the Heads by the Chinese fishermen." The description consists of the following statements. "The body and arms of my largest specimen measured about 10 inches, the two longest arms being about three inches longer. The arms are not webbed, but each of the eight short ones have two rows of suckers their entire length, while the other arms have a small patch of small suckers toward their tips... nine individuals... weigh a pound, so we may say they weigh about two ounces each.... In the form of its body and the coloring, as well as in the form of the fin, it closely resembles Loligo gahi D'Orbigny.... This form makes an interesting addition to our west coast Cephalopods, and if upon further study I should conclude it to be new, I propose to call it Loligo Stearnsii." No type material was mentioned or known to exist.
 - 2. Hoyle (1897: 370) in his Catalogue of Recent Cephalopoda listed L. Stearnsii from the California region and in a footnote stated "This is a mere nomen nudum: the description is quite worthless, as the species could never be recognized from it." However, the value of the description has nothing to do with the definition of a nomen nudum.
 - 3. S. S. Berry (1911: 591) described a new squid, *Loligo opalescens*, from Puget Sound, Washington. The type was deposited in the collections of Stanford University.
 - 4. In a subsequent review of the cephalopods of western North America, Berry (1912:294) included L. Stearnsii questionably in the synonymy of L. opalescens. Later (p. 297) he stated his reasons for rejecting L. stearnsii were. "It will be observed that the only 'diagnosis' offered is to be found in the lines, 'The arms are not webbed,' and 'it closely resembles Loligo Gahi.'" As it is upon these ten words alone that the validity of the name L. stearnsii must rest, it would seem that Dr. Hoyle was fully justified in his refusal to recognize it as more than a mere nomen nudum. The present writer was at first inclined to rehabilitate Hemphill's name and furnish it with the needful description, especially since he could not believe that the form in hand was really the one here dealt with, but in view of the suspicion that we have more than one Loligo on the coast, not to mention the obvious discrepancy in the statement that 'the arms are not webbed,' the safest course appeared to be to discard the title L. stearnsii entirely and adopt an entirely new name."
 - 5. In 1973 Mr. Allyn Smith, formerly curator of the invertebrate collections of the California Academy of Science, informed the writer that two specimens

of Loligo stearnsii, preserved in alcohol, were in the Henry Hemphill collection when it was acquired by the California Academy of Sciences and were accessioned into the Type Collection of the Department of Geology as Syntypes Nos. 2321 and 2322. Both specimens came from "Oakland Market" (Department of Geology locality No. 11,604) according to current labels. These specimens have now been transferred to the Department of Invertebrate Zoology. Along with the two preserved whole animals there are three drypreserved gladii, also labelled Loligo stearnsii, which are indicated as coming from "San Francisco Bay, California (H. Hemphill locality 5)". The present labels are in the handwriting of G. Dallas Hanna who transferred the specimens from the original jars to sealed lengths of fluorescent tubing. They are designated as Syntypes. It is presumed that Hanna recopied the deteriorated original labels but no positive proof now exists. From the information available it seems probable that these indeed are the types of L. stearnsii as they are from the Oakland Market as originally designated, and dissected pens are also present.

- 6. Examination of the two specimens shows that they are identical with L. opalescens. Both Berry and Hoyle were incorrect in stating that L. stearnsii was a nomen nudum. No other species of the genus Loligo is known to occur on the western coast of North America north of San Diego. Therefore, L. opalescens Berry, 1911, is a junior synonym of L. stearnsii Hemphill, 1892.
- 7. The name L. stearnsii was used only sparsely from 1892 to 1911 when L. opalescens was described. Since 1911 it has rarely appeared and has never been used in primary scientific literature except as a questionable synonym or as a nomen nudum.
- 8. Since 1912 all students of cephalopods, without exception, have used the specific name *opalescens*. It is firmly established in teaching texts and laboratory manuals, the extensive fisheries literature and medical research literature. In accordance with Article 79(b) of the Code, the following is a list of authors, all of whom have employed *opalescens* in the last 50 years: Classic, R. R., 1929; Fields, W. G., 1950, 1965; Frey, H. W., 1971; Iverson, I. L. K. & Pinkas, L., 1971; MacGinitie, G. E. & MacGinitie, N., 1968; McGowan, J. A., 1954; Mercer, M. C., 1969; Okutani, T. & McGowan, J. A., 1969; Voss, G. L., 1973 and Zuev, G. V. & Nesis, K. N., 1971.
- 9. In order to maintain nomenclatural stability in this group of animals, and to prevent confusion in the fisheries, medical and academic literature, *Loligo opalescens* should be preserved as the valid name for this species important to the commercial fisheries and to medical research.
- 10. It is therefore requested of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to:
 - (1) use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *stearnsii* Hemphill, 1892, as published in the binomen *Loligo stearnsii*, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
 - (2) place the specific name suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology;

(3) place the specific name opalescens Berry, 1911, as published in the binomen Loligo opalescens, in the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

LITERATURE CITED

BERRY, S. S. 1911. Preliminary notices of some new Pacific cephalopods. Proc. U.S. natn. Mus., 40 (1838): 589-592

1912. A review of the cephalopods of Western North America. Bull. Bur.

Fish., Wash., 30: 269-336

CLASSIC, R. R. 1929. Monterey squid fishery. Calif. Fish. Game 15 (4): 317-320

FIELDS, W. G. 1950. A preliminary report on the fishery and on the biology of the squid, Loligo opalescens. Calif. Fish. Game 36 (4): 366-377

1965. The structure, development, food relations, reproduction, and life history of the squid *Loligo opalescens* Berry. Fish. Bull. Calif. No. 131: 1–108

Frey, H. W. 1971. Squid. In: California's living marine resources. Calif. Dept. Fish and Game: 33-34

Hemphill, H. 1892. Note on a California Loligo. Zoe 3: 51

Hoyle, W. E. 1897. A catalogue of Recent Cephalopoda. Supplement, 1887-

1896. Proc. R. phys. Soc. Edinb.: 363-375

IVERSON, I. L. K. and PINKAS, L. 1971. A pictorial guide to beaks of certain eastern Pacific cephalopods. Fish. Bull. Calif. No. 152: 83-105 [p. 91, figs of

MACGINITIE, G. E. and MACGINITIE, N. 1968. Natural History of Marine animals. Second edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company: 523 pp. [Loligo opalescens

p. 400-4011

McGowan, J. A. 1954. Observation on the sexual behaviour and spawning of the squid, Loligo opalescens, at La Jolla, California. Calif. Fish. Game 40 (1): 47-54

Mercer, M. C. 1969. A synopsis of the recent Cephalopoda of Canada. Proc. Symp. Mollusca, India Part 1, 1968: 265-276 [pp. 269, 271]

OKUTANI, T. and McGowan, J. A. 1969. Systematics, distribution, and abundance of the epiplanktonic squid (Cephalopoda, Decapoda) larvae of the California Current, April, 1954-March, 1957. Bull. Scripps Instn Oceanogr. 14: 1-90 [Loligo (s.s.) opalescens Berry, 1911 p. 8]

Voss, G. L. 1973. Cephalopod resources of the world. Fisheries Circular, F.A.O.,

Rome (In press)

ZUEV, G. V. and NESIS, K. N. 1971. [Biology and fishery of squids]. Pishchevaya, Moscow: 360 pp. [In Russian. L. opalescens, pp. 127-133]