PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME "CAMPSICNEMUS" HALIDAY, 1851 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)
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(Commission’s reference: Z.N.(S.) 1080)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to validate the long-established generic name Campsicnemus Haliday, 1851 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). The facts of this case are set in the following paragraphs.

2. In 1832 (Zool. J. 5(19) : 357) Haliday established the nominal genus Camptosceles. He did not designate a type species for this genus but the first of the included species, Dolichopus scambus Fallén, 1823 (Mon. Dolichop. Svec. (3) : 19) was selected as the type species by Coquillett in 1910 (Proc. U.S. nat. Mus. 37 : 518).

3. In 1851 (in Walker’s Ins. Brit., Diptera 1 : 187) Haliday replaced the name Camptosceles Haliday, 1832, by the new name Campsicnemus, because he regarded that name as a junior homonym of Camptoscelis Dejean, 1828 (Spec. gén. Coléopt. 3 : 430). Again Haliday did not designate a type species but in 1910 Coquillett (loc. cit. 37 : 518) selected the second of Haliday’s species, Dolichopus curvipes Fallén, 1823 (Mon. Dolichop. Svec. (3) : 20) to the type species of Campsicnemus Haliday.

4. Under the Règles a generic name is not to be treated as a homonym of another such name differing from it only in termination (Article 36) and this provision was underlined and generalised in 1953 when the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology inserted in the Règles a provision that “a generic name is not to be treated as a homonym of another such name if it differs from it in spelling by even one letter” (1953, Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl. : 78, Decision 152). It will be seen therefore that the name Camptosceles Haliday, 1832, is not a homonym of Camptoscelis Dejean, 1828, that it is accordingly an available name and that the name Campsicnemus Haliday, 1851, is invalid as a junior objective synonym of Camptosceles Haliday, 1832.
5. In the mistaken belief that *Camptosceles* Haliday was not an available name, the name *Campsicnemus* Haliday, 1851, has been consistently used in the dolichopodid literature for over a hundred years. The genus concerned is widespread throughout the world. It contains about one hundred known species, over half of them occurring in Hawaii. This group represents over 60 per cent. of the Hawaiian dolichopodid fauna. There are over fifty undescribed species at hand. There can be no doubt that the best interests of stability would be served by maintaining the generic name *Campsicnemus* Haliday and that no advantage would be served by abandoning the practice of a century through re-introducing the almost completely unused and now virtually forgotten name *Camptosceles* Haliday, 1832.

6. Under Rule (f) in Article 30 where one nominal genus is replaced by another (as was done in this case) the two genera automatically take the same species as type species and the designation, indication or selection of a type species for either nominal genus automatically makes the species so designated, indicated or selected the type species also of the other nominal genus concerned. Coquillett (1910) was therefore in error when he sought to select different species to be the type species respectively of *Camptosceles* Haliday, 1832, and *Campsicnemus* Haliday, 1851. The species (*Dolichopus scambus* Fallén, 1823) selected by Coquillett as the type species for the original genus should therefore be accepted as the type species also of *Campsicnemus* Haliday, 1851.

7. The generic names discussed above have not been taken as the base for the names of family-group taxa and in consequence no family-group-name problem arises in the present case. The genus to which these names have been applied is, as has already been indicated, currently referred to the family Dolichopodidae (correction of Dolichopidae) Latreille, 1807, for the addition of which to the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology a proposal is already before the International Commission in connection with a different application (Hemming, 1955, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 11: 79–81).

8. In the light of the considerations set out above, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its Plenary Powers to suppress the under-mentioned generic name for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:—*Camptosceles* Haliday, 1832;

(2) to place the under-mentioned generic name on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:—*Campsicnemus* Haliday, 1851 (gender: feminine) (type species by selection by Coquillett (1910): *Dolichopus scambus* Fallén, 1823);

---

1 The proposal here referred to has since been approved by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, whose decision on this matter has been embodied in Direction 49 (now in the press).
(3) to place the under-mentioned specific names on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*:

(a) *scambus* Fallén, 1823, as published in the combination *Dolichopus scambus* (specific name of type species of *Campsicnemus* Haliday, 1851);
(b) *curvipes* Fallén, 1823, as published in the combination *Dolichopus curvipes*;

(4) to place the generic name specified in (1) above as there suppressed under the Plenary Powers on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*.

---
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Mr. E. A. Ellis sent me a reprint of his paper in the *Bulletin*, in which he asks the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to validate the currently accepted usage of the generic name *Unio* Philipsson, 1788. I think that the propositions made under para. 11 of this paper are all very sound, and will avoid confusion in the use of some often used generic names of Mollusca.