APPLICATION FOR SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF THREE SPECIFIC NAMES OF SPANISH PALAEOZOIC CRINOIDEA. Z.N.(S.) 1513

By Albert Breimer (Afdeling Historische Geologie en Palaeontologie, Geologisch en Mineralogisch Instituut der Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden, The Netherlands.)

The rich Palaeozoic faunas of northwestern Spain (provinces of Palencia, León, and Asturias) have recently been the object of a comprehensive study by the applicant. This study was the consequence of extensive collecting work in this region during the last five years and investigation of important older museum-collections of Spanish crinoids never before described. The aim of the work has been to prepare a monograph on all the Crinoidea now known from Spain, including necessary revisions and complementary descriptions. In the course of this study several specific names were discovered that do not permit of the identification of the taxonomic species represented by them, because the descriptions of the species are wholly inadequate, while the type-specimens on which they are based are either lost or in bad condition. These names are consequently regarded by the applicant as nomina dubia. The discussions concerning these species are given in Leidse Geologische Mededelingen, vol. 27, pt. 1, 1962.

2. In 1932, W. E. Schmidt (Palaeontographica 76: 29) published the specific name planus in the binomen Orthocrinus planus for an imperfect and crushed part of a crinoid dorsal cup from the Devonian of Asturias, this being the first record of Orthocrinus from Spain. This type-specimen was lost during the second World War. The characters mentioned in Schmidt's description and those shown by his illustrations of the fragment are far too few to provide reliable evidence for the identification of the taxonomic species represented by this specific name. Nevertheless, in 1949, Rodriguez Mellado (Bol. Real Soc. Esp. Hist. Nat. 47: 657) assigned a well-preserved specimen from León to the nominal species Orthocrinus planus, mainly because planus was the only species of Orthocrinus known at that time from Spain. Her specimen, however, has characters contradictory to those mentioned in Schmidt's description of the species and shown in his illustrations. It is very unlikely, therefore, that Rodriguez's specimen should be conspecific with the type of Schmidt's species. The type-locality of Orthocrinus planus was examined by the applicant and proved to be very poor in fossils, it did not produce any reliable specimen to serve as a neotype, and the chance that it ever will produce such a specimen is infinitesimally small. The specific name planus must, therefore, be considered a nomen dubium, and, unless either suppressed or fixed by a neotype, will continue to form a threat to the stability of the nomenclature of Palaeozoic Crinoidea. As the name has hardly ever been used, and as the identity of the species cannot even be guessed from the original account, there seems to be little sense in selecting a neotype for it. To facilitate the definite classification of newly discovered Orthocrinus material from Spain, the Commission is requested now to
suppress the specific name planus W. E. Schmidt, 1932.

3. In 1896, Oehlert (Bull. Soc. Géol. Fr. (3) 24: 521) described the new species Storthingocrinus haugi. His type material consisted of three isolated dorsal cups from León, composed of basals and radials only. By attributing his specimens to Storthingocrinus he clearly classified them in the inadunate family Synbathocrinidae. Although Oehlert believed that the very wide radial facets of his specimens showed their generic position, in fact, his fragments do not show enough characters to make even sure that they are inadunate synbathocrinids: they could as well belong to the camerate super-family Platycrinitidae. Moreover, representatives of this latter super-family are known to occur in Spanish Devonian strata, whereas true synbathocrinids are still unknown from Spain.

In 1932, W. E. Schmidt (Palaeontographica 76: 25, 26) described two isolated crinoid dorsal cups from Asturias. These cups are composed of basals and radials only. Schmidt attributed his specimens to Storthingocrinus, which genus was ranked by him under the Platycrinitidae, contrary to common usage. He compared one of his specimens (25) to Storthingocrinus haugi. This specimen differs from Oehlert’s specimens by having narrow radial facets, leaving space for interradial plates, as are usually to be found among the platycrinitids. Hence, it can be understood why Schmidt made the mistake of classifying his specimens as Storthingocrinus in the Platycrinitidae. For his second specimen, which got lost during the second World War, Schmidt introduced the new specific name labiatus.

All the above specimens described by Oehlert and W. E. Schmidt, some of which are lost, are so imperfect that the available evidence is insufficient to warrant their classification in either of the families mentioned above. It is absolutely impossible to identify the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species Storthingocrinus haugi and S. labiatus. This is once more expressed by the study of recently discovered Spanish Devonian platycrinitids and hapalocrinids, complete specimens of which were not known from Spain in the days of Oehlert and Schmidt. The classification of these crinoids with essentially stabilized dorsal cups composed of radials and basals only, rests necessarily on the composition of the tegmen, the structure and position of ambulacral ducts, combined with the mode of arm branching in the arm bases. Specimens, as those discussed above, without these thecal elements are certainly not classifiable. Nominal species described on such imperfect specimens do not permit of recognition of any taxonomic species and are a handicap for further classification. Hence, the nominal species haugi Oehlert, 1896, and labiatus W. E. Schmidt, 1932, which are undoubtedly to be regarded as nomina dubia, are proposed for suppression under the plenary powers of the Commission.

4. In view of the facts set out above and in the interest of stability and continuity of nomenclature I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:—

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

(a) the specific name planus W. E. Schmidt, 1932, as published in the binomen Orthocrinus planus (a nomen dubium);
(b) the specific name *haugi* Oehlert, 1896, as published in the binomen *Storthingocrinus haugi* (a nomen dubium);

(c) the specific name *labiatus* W. E. Schmidt, 1932, as published in the binomen *Storthingocrinus labiatus* (a nomen dubium).

(2) to place the 3 specific names proposed to be suppressed in (1)(a)—(1)(c) above on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.