

THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE GENUS  
*PARAGOMPHUS* COWLEY, 1934 (ANIS-  
OPTERA: GOMPHIDAE)

In the course of compiling a bibliography of F. Förster's papers for eventual publication, and in checking a manuscript by Tridib R. Mitra, I became aware that *Gomphus cognatus* Rambur, designated as the type species by J. COWLEY (1934, *Entomologist* 67: 200-205) when proposing *Paragomphus* as a new name

for *Mesogomphus* F. FÖRSTER (1906, *Jb. nassau. Ver. Naturk.* 59: 299-344), was not selected in accordance with the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature.

As recorded by F.E. SCHULZE et al. (1932, *Nomenclator animalium generum et subgenerum*, Bd.3, p. 2044. Preuss. Akad. Wiss., Berlin) and by S.A. NEAVE (1940, *Nomenclator zoologicus*, Vol.3, p.116, Zool. Soc. Lond.), and pointed out by COWLEY (1934), the name *Mesogomphus* was first proposed by J.W. DAVIS in 1883 (*Trans. R. Dublin Soc.*, II, 1: 470) for a genus in Pisces; and in October 1906 the same name was given to two more new genera, one by A. HANDLIRSCH (1906, *Die fossilen Insekten und die Phylogenie der rezenten Formen*, Bd.3, pp. 579-600, Engelmann, Leipzig) for two fossil species of Gomphidae, and the other by F. FÖRSTER (cf. above) for two new species, also in the gomphidae. F. RIS (1921, *Ann. sth Afr. Mus.* 18: 343), who was aware of duplicity in Insecta, "thought it advisable to adopt the name as given for the living group", but did not propose a new name for the fossil genus. H. CAMPION (1923, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* 12: 669) replaced *Mesogomphus* Handlirsch with *Necrogomphus* n. nov., and this was later change to *Necygomphus* n. nov. by H. COWLEY (1942, *Proc. R. ent. Soc. Lond.* 11: 75).

In his description of *Mesogomphus*, FÖRSTER (1906, p. 323) definitely states, "Typen der Gattung, *Mesogomphus nguelicus* n.sp. M. bitarsatus n.sp. und wahrscheinlich die ganze *Cognatus*gruppe von *Onchogomphus* (nach Karsch), also *costae*, *pumilio*, *lacustris*, *made-gassus* und *abnormalis*?". His two new species were the only ones unquestionably included. The other species and the *cognatus*-group were mentioned as possibly belonging in *Mesogomphus*. Insofar as I have been able to determine, RIS (1921) was the first author to place *G. cognatus* Rambur definitely in *Mesogomphus*.

COWLEY (1934) did not redefine the genus nor mention Förster's two typical species, nor list the species included in *Paragomphus* at that time. In overlooking Förster's definitely included species and selecting *cognatus* as the type species of *Paragomphus*, he did not take into consideration Article 67i of the International

Code of Zoological Nomenclature, viz. "If a zoologist proposes a new generic name expressly as a replacement for a prior name, both nominal genera must have the same type species." The species *cognatus* was not listed as such by Förster and therefore, the selection of the type species should have been either *nguelicus* or *bitarsatus*, both of which Förster named as typical of the genus. E. PINHEY (1962, *Publçoes cult. Comp. Diam. Angola* 59: 183) records *nguelicus* as the type species of *Mesogomphus* (without comment), lists it as a variety of *cognatus* (p. 184), and *bitarsatus* as a synonym of *P. hageni* (Selys) (p. 185). If *nguelicus* should eventually prove to be a distinct species, which seems doubtful considering Pinhey's study of the genus, it would be the type species. However, as a variety it loses status as a species, and thus *Paragomphus cognatus* (Rambur, 1842) must be regarded as the type species of *Paragomphus* Cowley, 1934 under circumstances obviously not anticipated when the new name was proposed for *Mesogomphus*.

Mr. RICHARD V. MELVILLE, Secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature was consulted and his much appreciated replies of June 26, 1981 and April 14, 1982 are incorporated in the above account.

L.K. Gloyd, Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, United States.