OPINION 711

CULEX AEGYPTI LINNAEUS, 1762 (INSECTA, DIPTERA): VALIDATED AND INTERPRETED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers:
(a) the specific name aegypti Linnaeus, 1762, as published in the binomen Culex aegypti is hereby validated;
(b) it is hereby directed that the nominal species Culex aegypti Linnaeus, 1762, be interpreted by reference to the neotype specimen described by Mattingly, Stone and Knight, 1962.
(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified;
(a) aegypti Linnaeus, 1762, as published in the binomen Culex aegypti, and as interpreted under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above (Name No. 1993);
(b) caspius Pallas, 1771, as published in the binomen Culex caspius (Name No. 1994).
(3) The generic name Stegomyia* Theobald, 1901 (gender: feminine), type-species, by designation by Neveu-Lemaire, 1902, Culex fasciatus Fabricius, 1805, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1602.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1216)

The present case was first submitted to the office of the Commission in April 1957, though it was not until January 1961 that an agreed application was submitted by Dr. P. F. Mattingly, Dr. Alan Stone and Dr. Kenneth L. Knight. This application was sent to the printer on 31 January 1963 and was published on the 16 July 1962 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 19 : 208–219. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the Bulletin as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4 : 51–56) and to seven entomological serials.

The application was supported by Prof. D. S. Bertram, Dr. J. R. Busvine, Dr. B. R. Laurence, Dr. M. G. R. Varma, Dr. G. A. H. McClelland, Dr. W. E. Macdonald, Mr. P. K. Rajagopalan, Dr. Elizabeth N. Marks, Dr. J. Haman, Dr. A. J. Haddon and Dr. E. C. C. van Someren.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 24 October 1963 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (63)33 either for or against the

* It has been suggested that those unfamiliar with nomenclatural procedure may form the impression that the above declaration prejudices the use of the name aegypti in such combinations as Aedes aegypti (Linnaeus) or Aedes (Stegomyia) aegypti (Linnaeus). This is not the case. It remains perfectly proper to employ the name in these combinations or any others that further taxonomic study may render desirable. P. F. Mattingly.

proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 19:211–212. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 24 January 1964 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—twenty-eight (28), received in the following order: China, Hemming, Brinck, Hering, Holthuis, Vokes, Bonnet, Mayr, Tortonese, Hubbs, Riley, Boschma, Stoll, Lemeche, Uchida, Simpson, Jaczewski, Borcherdsenius, Miller, do Amaral, Alvarado, Forest, Binder, Mertens, Kraus, Ride, Sabrosky, Evans.

Negative votes—one (1): Obruchev.

Voting Papers not returned—one (1): Munroe.

The following comments were made by Commissioners in returning their votes:

*Mr. Francis Hemming* (29.x.63): I welcome the settlement proposed for this important and long-standing case. I feel sure that the best method of securing a uniform interpretation is by the establishment of a neotype, as proposed. I think however that in the formal designation of the neotype the species bearing the name *aegypti* Linnaeus, 1762, should be cited in the original combination *Culex aegypti* (the combination in which on page 211 it is proposed that this specific name should be placed on the Official List) and not in the combination "*Aedes aegypti* " under which it is subjectively cited in Annexe I on page 212. Moreover, the course suggested above would harmonise the description (:212) with the title given (:214) for this taxon in the explanation of the figures of the neotype.

*Dr. Carl L. Hubbs* (18.xi.63): My vote "for" is in principle, but with some reservation. In such situations, where it is probable or certain that the first author did not apply the name in the modern sense, I'd much prefer to have his use suppressed by plenary power and to have the species attributed to a more recent author and date.

*Prof. Dr. A. do Amaral* (3.i.64): As a medical zoologist I think this is a very happy and timely solution for an immensely confusing case.

**Original References**

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

*aegypti*, *Culex*, Linnaeus, 1762, Reise nach Palästina: 470

*caspius*, *Culex*, Pallas, 1771, Reise Prov. Russl. 1:475


The following is the original reference for the designation of a type-species for a genus concerned in the present Ruling:


The following is the original reference for the designation of a neotype for a species concerned in the present Ruling:

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (63)33 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, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 711.

W. E. CHINA
Acting Secretary
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London
3 March 1964