APPLICATION TO FIX THE NAME OF THE TYPE-SPECIES OF THE GENUS AMPULLA RÖDING, 1798 (OLIM HALIA RISSO, 1826) GASTROPODA: VOLUTIDAE. Z.N.(S.) 1804

By Harald A. Rehder (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)

The genus Halia Risso, 1826, now quite generally placed in the family Volutidae, subfamily Haliinae or Scaphellinae, must take the prior name Ampulla Röding 1798, with the type Ampulla priamus Röding, designated by Pilsbry (Nautilus 22: 83, 1908). This change, first put forth over sixty years ago but only recently generally adopted, has one fortunate consequence; the type-species of the genus becomes a recent species whose systematic position can be more accurately placed than could the type-species of Halia, which is the fossil species Ampulla helicoides (Brocchi), apparently more rare than the recent species. Winckworth (Proc. Mal. Soc. London, 26: 137, 1945) accepted the genus Ampulla but designated another species as type, not aware of the fact that Pilsbry had designated a type 37 years earlier (see also Winckworth, op. cit., 27: 49, 1946).

2. The genus has as its only recent representative a mollusk that in recent years has gone under the name of either Halia priamus (Meuschen) or Halia priamus (Gmelin). Neither priamus (Meuschen) nor priamus (Gmelin), however, can be used at the present time.

3. The species was first made known by F. C. Meuschen in the Museum Gronovianum, p. 128, 1778, and in the Index and Explanation of plates (1781) to Zoophylacium Gronovianum, referring to fasc. 3, no. 1561 and pl. 2, fig. 10, 11, 1781 of the latter work. Although for many years, and even until very recently, the name Halia priamus was ascribed as a valid taxon to Meuschen, 1778 and/or 1781, both of these works have been rejected for nomenclatorial purposes by the I.C.Z.N., the former in Opinion 260 (Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl. 5: 265-280, 1954) and the latter in Opinion 261 (I.c.: 281-296, 1954). In the latter opinion both the whole of the Zoophylacium Gronovianum (1763-81) and its Index (1781) were placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works. Meuschen’s names are therefore unavailable for use.

4. The reason for using the specific name priamus has never to my knowledge been stated. Priamus is the Latin form of the name of the last king of Troy, and it is my belief that it was used because of the fancied resemblance of the shell to the Phrygian cap commonly considered to have been used by the people of Troy (see, for example, David’s painting of Helen and Paris in the Louvre).

5. The name Halia priamus (Gmelin) has also been used recently (Weaver, Provisional Species List of Living Volutidae, p. 5, 1963; op. cit. ed. 2, p. 7, 1964; Wagner and Abbott, Van Nostrand’s Standard Catalog of Shells, ed. 2: 131, 1967), but Gmelin never used this specific name.

6. The next available names are two given by Gmelin in the Systema Naturae, ed. 13, 1791. Bulla stercus pulicun Gmelin (op. cit., 1: 3434) is based on the description and figure published in 1786 by J. H. Chemnitz (Neues
Syst. Conchylien-Cabinet, 9 (2) : 35, pl. 120, fig. 1026–1027); it has not been used as valid a senior synonym for over eighty years.

7. Helix priamus Gmelin (Syst. Nat., Ed. 13, 1 : 3654) is based on the Meuschen 1781 reference (Zoophylacium Gronovianum, fasc. 3, pl. 19, fig. 10–11), and the diagnosis was apparently copied almost verbatim from that work. This name has never been used for a valid taxon, and Kobelt (Iconographie schalenr. europ. Meeresconch., 2 : 7, 1901) considered the name to be an error and changed it to priamus Gmelin listing it as a synonym of Halia priamus (Meuschen). This viewpoint is somewhat strengthened by the fact that the two names differ by only one letter. There is, however, “in the original publication no clear evidence of an inadvertent error, such as a lapsus calami, or a . . . printer’s error” (Code Int. Nom. Zool., Article 32a (ii)), and although it might be argued that Gmelin changed the name purposely, there is no apparent reason for the use of such an allusive appellation.

8. I have been able to find no “first reviser” who can be shown to have cited both of Gmelin’s names and chosen one of them as the name of the taxon. All authors have used either the species name priamus (Meuschen) or priamus (Gmelin) and listed both stercus pulicum Gmelin and priapus Gmelin as junior synonyms.

9. One year after the appearance of Gmelin’s names Bruguière (Encycl. Meth., Hist. Nat. Vers., 1 : 360, 1792) described the species in detail under the name “Bulinus priamus Nob.” If Gmelin’s two names, Bulla stercus pulicum, and Helix priapus dating from 1791 are to be considered nomina oblitata, Bulla priamus Bruguière 1792 is the next available after Gmelin’s names.

10. Ampulla priamus Röding, 1798 is validated by a reference to Gmelin’s species Bulla stercus pulicum and the reference to Chemnitz (see above), the author obtaining his specific name from the Meuschen references cited by Chemnitz.

11. I have made an attempt to count the number of times each of the three names has been used in valid publications since their inception, with the following result:

- stercus pulicum Gmelin 5
- priamus 33
- priapus 1

12. It is obvious that the trivial name priamus has been by far the most commonly used; for the last eighty years it has been the only one used, usually with Meuschen cited as author; the name stercus pulicum has not been used since 1888, and priapus has not been used since its original proposal.

13. The genus Halia (recte Ampulla) has been made sole representative of the subfamily Halinae (= Ampullinae) in the Volutidae (Wenz, Handb. Palaozool., 6, Gaztropoda, pt. 6 : 1353, 1943), and so the species has considerable systematic importance.

14. To preserve a name that has been in fairly continuous use for this unique and systematically important species, I see two possible actions that the Commission may take. One would be to declare the specific name priapus in the binomen Helix priapus Gmelin, 1791, to be a lapsus for priamus, and place this latter name on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
15. The other alternative would be to place the specific name *priapus* Gmelin, 1791, on the Official Index ofRejected and Invalid Names and place the specific name *priamus* Bruguière, as published in binomen *Bulimus priamus*, on the Official List of Specific Names.

16. Of these two alternatives I favor the former as it would preserve the complete binomen as it has been used three times in the last five years, and would not introduce an author's name which has never been used since the original citation in 1792 as authority for the name *priamus*.

I therefore request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(a) to rule that the specific name *priapus* Gmelin, 1791, as published in the binomen *Helix priapus*, is an error for *priamus* Gmelin, 1791;

(b) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the specific name *priamus* Gmelin, 1791, as published in the corrected binomen *Helix priamus* (type-species of the genus *Ampulla* Röding, 1798);

(c) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the generic name *Ampulla* Röding, 1798, type species by subsequent designation (Pilsbry, 1908), *Ampulla priamus* Röding (= *A.p.* Gmelin).