OPINION 1687

Phorusrhacos Ameghino, 1887 (Aves, Gruiformes): not suppressed

Ruling

(1) The name Phorusrhacos Ameghino, 1887 (gender: masculine), type species by monotypy Phorusrhacos longissimus Ameghino, 1887, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

(2) The name longissimus Ameghino, 1887, as published in the binomen Phorusrhacos longissimus (specific name of the type species of Phorusrhacos Ameghino, 1887), is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

(3) The name Phorusrhacidae Ameghino, 1889 (correction of Phororhacidae; type genus Phorusrhacos Ameghino, 1887) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.

(4) The name Phororhacos Ameghino, 1889 is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology (an unjustified emendation of Phorusrhacos Ameghino, 1887).

(5) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology:

(a) Phororhacosidae Ameghino, 1889 (an incorrect original spelling of Phorusrhacidae);

(b) Phororhacidae Lydekker, 1893 (an incorrect spelling of Phorusrhacidae).

History of Case 2723

An application for the conservation of Phororhacos Ameghino, 1889 was received from Drs Luis M. Chiappe & Miguel F. Soria (Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales, Buenos Aires, Argentina) on 5 May 1989. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 47: 198–201 (September 1990). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals.

An opposing comment from Dr Storrs L. Olson (National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.) was published in BZN 48: 156–157 (June 1991), together with a comment from Prof Walter J. Bock (Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature (SCON); Columbia University, New York, U.S.A.) reporting on the support for the application from the members of SCON. Dr Olson stated that, following the work of Brodkorb (1963, 1967) and as mentioned by the authors of the application (para. 8 in BZN 47: 199), the prior spelling Phorusrhacos Ameghino, 1887 was the name in current use and he considered that it would therefore be a mistake to suppress it. Instead of the proposals in BZN 47: 199, which sought to suppress Phorusrhacos and place Phororhacos Ameghino, 1889 on the Official List, Dr Olson proposed that Phorusrhacos should be confirmed as the valid name for the genus, with the concomitant family-group name Phorusrhacidae Ameghino, 1889.

It was noted on the voting paper that Phororhacos (1889) was an unjustified emendation of Phorusrhacos (1887) but was in exclusive use for many years. The rejection of Phorusrhacos as a nomen oblitum by Cracraft (1968) under Article 23b of the 1964 Code (see Article 79c(iii) of the current Code) was not strictly correct, since
Brodkorb (1963, 1967) had resurrected this spelling, but it had been argued (para. 7 of the application and comment by Prof Bock) that Brodkorb himself should have made the rejection. However, he did not do so, and *Phorusrhacos* entered use, with consequent lack of uniformity.

Both alternatives, the original proposal for the conservation of *Phororhacos* Ameghino, 1889 by the suppression of *Phorusrhacos* Ameghino, 1887 (BZN 47: 199; Proposal A), and the placement of *Phorusrhacos* Ameghino, 1887 on the Official List (BZN 48: 157; Proposal B), were offered for voting. The latter course did not involve the use of the Commission's plenary powers. The family name placed on the Official List would be *PHORORHACIDAE* or *PHORUSRHACIDAE* respectively.

**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 December 1991 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 47: 199. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 1992 the votes were as follows:

Proposal A — 14: Bock, Corliss, Dupuis, Hahn, Heppell, Kraus, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Nielsen, Ride, Savage, Starobogatov, Uéno and Willink.


Cocks commented that he agreed with Olson that priority and recent usage should be followed. Kabata noted that both proposals A and B had merit and that under these circumstances priority should be followed.

**Original references**

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion: