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The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers to validate the specific name currently used for the type species of the genus Chasmagnathus de Haan, [1835] (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), which was placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology by the Ruling given in Opinion 85 (1925, Smithson. misc. Coll. 74(No. 3) : 13–18).

2. The existence of the present problem came to light in the early part of 1955 when proposals were being formulated for submission to the International Commission for the addition to the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology of the specific names of the type species of the genera of Decapoda, the names of which had been placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology in the pre-Lisbon (1935) period. The facts of this case are set out in the following paragraphs.

3. The name Chasmagnathus was introduced by de Haan in the Crustacea Section of von Siebold’s Fauna japonica for use as the name of a subgenus of Ocypode Fabricius, 1798. This name occurs twice in the Crustacea Section, first on page 5 and later on page 27. These pages were published in Parts 1 and 2 respectively, the first appearing in 1833, the second in 1835. On page 5 the name Chasmagnathus was given only in a key without any cited nominal species; on page 27 the subgenus was more fully diagnosed and one species, the new species Ocypode (Chasmagnathus) convexa, was cited as belonging to it. This species is therefore the type species of Chasmagnathus de Haan by monotypy.
4. Reference to Sherborn's *Index Animalium* (Pars secund. (7): 1505) disclosed the existence of the name *Ocypode convexus* Quoy & Gaimard, 1825 *(Voy. "Uranie" (Zool.): 525)*. Since for the purpose of determining whether any two specific names are homonyms of one another the only relevant consideration is whether the generic name and the specific name employed is the same for each case the name *convexa* de Haan, [1835], as published in the combination *Ocypode* (*Chasmagnathus*) *convexa*, is a junior primary homonym of *Ocypode convexus* Quoy & Gaimard, 1825, and is therefore invalid.

5. Clearly the first matter to be investigated was the present status of the name *Ocypode convexus* Quoy & Gaimard, a name which had apparently escaped the sharp eye of the late Miss Mary Rathbun when she drew up the application upon which the Crustacea section of the Ruling given in *Opinion 85* was based. On this subject I first applied to Dr. Isobel Gordon (*British Museum* (Natural History), London) who, after checking the literature, informed me that the foregoing name did not appear to have been used by any authors since Quoy & Gaimard. I thereupon extended my inquiries by seeking the advice of the following specialists:—(i) Dr. Fenner A. Chace, Jr. (*Smithsonian Institution*, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.); (ii) Dr. John S. Garth (*Allan Hancock Foundation*, San Diego, California, U.S.A.); (iii) Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie*, Leiden, The Netherlands); (iv) Dr. M. W. F. Tweedie (*Director, Raffles Museum and Library*, Singapore).

6. The advice received from the foregoing consultants showed a high degree of agreement. Dr. Fenner Chace replied that the name *convexus* Quoy & Gaimard did not appear to have been in use, specialists regarding it as a *nomen dubium*, but that the name *convexa* de Haan was in use for the species concerned and that there was no other name available for that species. Dr. Garth replied that the name *convexus* Quoy & Gaimard had appeared sporadically in the literature, various authors synonymising it with other species such as *Ocypode kuhlii* de Haan, [1835], *Ocypode cordimana* Desmarest, 1825, and *Ocypode pygoides* Ortmann, 1894. Dr. Holthuis took the same line as Dr. Chace, stating that, so far as he knew no attempt had ever been made to replace the name *convexa* de Haan. He added that he himself had little doubt that *convexus* Quoy & Gaimard represented the same species as *pygoides* Ortmann but that no modern author had attempted to substitute Quoy & Gaimard's name for that of Ortmann. Dr. Tweedie, after discussing Ortmann's tentative identification of *convexus* Quoy & Gaimard with his own later *pygoides*, stated that the name *convexus* Quoy & Gaimard was not in use and had disappeared in the literature not as a junior synonym [of *pygoides*] but as a *nomen dubium*.

7. In view (a) of the unanimity of the Decapod specialists consulted that the name *convexus* Quoy & Gaimard is a *nomen dubium* and (b) of the fact that the later name *convexa* de Haan is in use for the species concerned and that that species possesses no other name, I recommend that the Commission should
validate the action taken at the time when the name *Chasmagnathus* de Haan was placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* by:

(1) using its Plenary Powers to suppress the specific name *convexus* Quoy & Gaimard, 1825, as published in the combination *Ocypode convexus*, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) placing the under-mentioned specific name, as validated under the Plenary Powers under (1) above on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—*convexa* de Haan, [1835], as published in the combination *Ocypode (Chasmagnathus) convexa* (specific name of type species of *Chasmagnathus* de Haan, [1833]) ;

(3) placing on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* the specific name specified in (1) above as there suppressed under the Plenary Powers.
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We are aware that Brøgger (1886) unfortunately did not definitely state that *Ptychopyge angustifrons* was the type species of *Ptychopyge*, and that the first legal designation of a type species was that of Vogdes (1890), who selected *Pt. applanata* as type species.

As pointed out by V. Jaanusson, it would be most unfortunate if *Pt. applanata*, apparently a *nomen dubium*, should be regarded as type species. We strongly support Jaanusson’s proposal to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of recognizing *Pt. angustifrons* as the type species of the genus *Ptychopyge*. 