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The present case was first brought to the attention of the Commission’s
Office by the late Dr. Th. Mortensen in 1932, when he made an application
to validate Encrinus as a generic name from Schultze, 1760, with Encrinus
liliformis Lamarck, 1801, as type-species. Dr. Mortensen at that time had
consulted a large number of specialists in Echinoidea and had their support
for his proposal. At the meeting of the Commission in Paris, 1948, during the
Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Dr. Mortensen suggested that
the application could better be submitted by a specialist in Crinoidea than by
himself. This suggestion was accepted by the Commission and the Secretary
was asked to find such a specialist so that a decision on whether or not to use
the plenary powers in this case could be taken as soon as possible (Bull. zool
Nomencl. 4: 513).

2. After the Paris meeting, the late Secretary to the Commission (Mr. Francis
Hemming) made a number of attempts to find an interested specialist who would
inform the Commission of the status of the name Encrinus under the Rules
and a request for information was published in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 7: 216–217,
but without success. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers
was several times given but without eliciting any objection to Dr. Mortensen’s
proposal.

3. Encrinus is a very well-known generic name used by biologists, geologists
and palaeontologists since pre-linnæan times for a genus of fossil crinoids.
The first post-linnæan author to use it was C. F. Schultze, 1760 (Betrachtung der
versteinerten Seesterne und ihrer Theile: 21). Schultze used the name only
once (in the form Encrinum), not as a generic name, and furthermore Schultze’s
book is non-binominal. Fisher (1908, Smiths. misc. Coll. 52: 91–93) discussed
at length the status of Schultze, 1760, and pointed out that most of the names
are derived directly from Linck (1733, De Stellis Marinis) and are given in the
same non-binominal manner. Those which seem to be binominal are not
generic and specific names, but are descriptive terms applied to “generic”
names mentioned earlier in the work. Fisher considered the effect on star-
fish nomenclature of the rejection of the work and cited three generic names—
Pentaceros, Astropecten and Pentagonaster—as being at that time in general
use and dating from Schultze, 1760. He explained that these three names were
easily replaced by Oreaster Müller and Troschel, 1842, Astropecten Gray, 1840
and Gonziaster Agassiz (1836), respectively. Pentaceros, Astropecten and
Pentagonaster are now no longer in use as from Schultze, 1760.

4. The discussion of the status of the name Encrinus was begun by Bather,
1898 (Natural Science 12: 245), to whom Schultze appeared to be binominal.
34: 517), in his review of the nomenclature of the crinoids, rejected Schultze as
non-binominal and pointed out that Andreea, 1763, used Encrinus in a binominal

and accepted *Encrinus* from Blumenbach, 1779. This involved the transfer of the generic name to *Isocrinus* Agassiz, 1836, the genus in which *Isis asteria* Linnaeus, 1767, was then placed. Also in 1909, Springer (*Proc. U.S. nat. Mus. 36* : 182-187) gave a very full account of the history of the name *Encrinus*. He considered that Schultze was non-binominal, and that Andreae's figured fragments were unrecognizable, but was prepared to use *Encrinus* dated from Schultze, 1760, in order to prevent confusion.

5. Bather in 1909 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. (8)* 4 : 37-42) admitted that Schultze was non-binominal but accepted *Encrinus* saying that it was perfectly clear what Schultze meant by the name and that terrible difficulties would arise if Schultze were not accepted. Bather urged that the case should be referred for decision to the Commission.

6. The first binominal author to use the generic name *Encrinus* was Andreae, 1763-4 *Briefe aus der Schweiz* published in the *Hannoverisches Magazin* and later (1776) in book form. Andreae applied the name *Encrinus coralloides* to fragments of what seemed to him to be a hitherto unrecognized species of *Encrinus*. These fragments are now supposed to be the terminal stem branches or roots of *Millericrinus*. It cannot, however, be certainly known what species were represented by Andreae's fragments and so the name is considered to be a nomen dubium.

7. The next use of the generic name *Encrinus* was by Blumenbach *Handb. Naturgesch.*, 1779 (ed. 1) : 435 for a genus with three included species:—(1) *asteria*, a recent crinoid; (2) *mylli*, a pennatulid; (3) *boltenii* (with ref. to Linnaeus, 1771), an ascidian. The oldest available names for these species are (1) *Isis asteria* Linnaeus, 1767; (2) *Isis encrinus* Linnaeus, 1758; (3) *Vorticella ovifera* Linnaeus, 1767 (= *Vorticella bolteni* Linnaeus, 1771). In 1788, in the third edition of the *Handb. Naturgesch.* : 503, Blumenbach again used the generic name *Encrinus* but replaced the specific names *mylli* and *boltenii* with *radiatus* and *ovifer* respectively.

8. None of the species first included in *Encrinus* Blumenbach belongs to *Encrinus* in its current sense. *Isis asteria* Linnaeus, 1767 (*Syst. nat.* (ed. 12) 1 : 1288) is type-species of the genus *Cenocrinus* Wyville Thomson, 1864 (*The Intellectual Observer 6* : 2). A. H. Clark, 1923 (*J. Wash. Acad. Sci. 13* : 10) cited *Pentacrinites caput-medusae* Miller, 1821 as the type of Thomson's genus. This name dates from Lamarck, 1801 (as *Encrinus caput medusae*) and is a junior objective synonym of *Isis asteria* Linnaeus.

9. *Isis encrinus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 800) was placed in the genus *Umbellularia* by Lamarck, 1801, and is the type-species, by monotypy, of that genus (*Syst. anim. s. vert. : 380*). Lamarck published at the same time the specific name *Umbellularia groenlandica* as a replacement for, and therefore an objective synonym of, *Isis encrinus* Linnaeus. There is a family name *UMBELLULARIIDAE* based on the generic name *Umbellularia* Lamarck, first published by Lindahl, 1874 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. (4)* 13 : 258) in the form *UMBELLULAE*.

10. The third species was placed in the genus *Boltenia* by Savigny in 1816. Savigny's genus contained two species: *Boltenia ovifera* (Linnaeus, 1767) (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) 1 : 1319) and *Boltenia fusiformis* (a replacement name for
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11. Thus the adoption of the genus Encrinus Blumenbach would affect the nomenclature not only of the fossil and recent Crinoidea, but also of the Pennatulids and the Ascidians, and would necessitate the replacement of one of the following generic names: Cenocrinus (a recent crinoid), Umbellularia (a pennatulid), or Boltenia (an ascidian), all of which are familiar generic names and are in common use.

12. The first binominal use of Encrinus in its currently accepted sense was by Lamarck, 1801 (Syst. Anim. s. vert. : 379) who included two species: Encrinus caput medusae (a replacement name for Isis asteria Linnaeus) and the new species Encrinus liliiformis which has always been regarded as the typespecies of Encrinus. The International Commission is now asked to use its plenary powers to preserve the generic name Encrinus in the sense in which it has been used since Lamarck, 1801 with Encrinus liliiformis as the type-species. There is in current use a family-group name ENCRIINIDAE first published in the vernacular French as ENCRINIENS by Dujardin & Hupé, 1862 (Hist. nat. Zoophytes, Echinodermes : 161).

13. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers:
   (a) to suppress for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy the following generic names:—
      (i) Encrinus Andreae, 1763 (a nom. dub.);
      (ii) Encrinus Andreae, 1776 (a nom. dub.);
      (iii) Encrinus Blumenbach, 1779;
      (iv) Encrinus Blumenbach, 1788;
   (b) to set aside all type-selections for the genus Encrinus Lamarck, 1801, made prior to the Ruling now requested and having done so to designate Encrinus liliiformis to be the type-species of that genus;

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:—
   (a) Encrinus Lamarck, 1801 (gender : masculine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b), above, Encrinus liliiformis Lamarck, 1801 (Class Crinoidea);
   (b) Cenocrinus Thomson, 1864 (gender : masculine), type-species by monotypy, Isis asteria Linnaeus, 1767 (Class Crinoidea);
   (c) Umbellularia Lamarck, 1801 (gender : feminine) type-species, by monotypy, Isis encrinus Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Anthozoa);
   (d) Boltenia Savigny, 1816 (gender : feminine) type-species, by designation by Huntsman, 1912, Vorticella ovifera Linnaeus, 1767 (Class Asciidiacea);

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:—
   (a) liliiformis Lamarck, 1801, as published in the binomen Encrinus liliiformis (type-species of Encrinus Lamarck, 1801);
(b) *asteria* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Isis asteria* (type-species of *Cenocrinus* Thomson, 1864);

(c) *encrinus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Isis encrinus* (type-species of *Umbellularia* Lamarck, 1801);

(d) *ovifera* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Vorticella ovifera* (type-species of *Boltenia* Savigny, 1816);

(4) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Encrinus* Schultze, 1760 (a technically unavailable name, published by a non-binominal author in a non-binominal work);

(b) *Encrinus* Andreae, 1763, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a)(i) above;

(c) *Encrinus* Andreae, 1776, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a)(ii) above;

(d) *Encrinus* Blumenbach, 1779, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a)(iii) above;

(e) *Encrinus* Blumenbach, 1788, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a)(iv) above;

(5) to place the following specific names on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *groenlandica* Lamarck, 1801, as published in the binomen *Umbellularia groenlandica* (a junior objective synonym of *Isis encrinus* Linnaeus, 1758);

(b) *caputmedusae* Lamarck, 1801, as published in the combination *Encrinus caput medusae* (a junior objective synonym of *Isis asteria* Linnaeus, 1767);

(c) *fusiformis* Savigny, 1816, as published in the binomen *Boltenia fusiformis* (a junior objective synonym of *Vorticella bolteni* Linnaeus, 1771);

(6) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature: Schultze (C. F.), 1760, *Betrachtung der Versteinerten Seesterne und ihrer Theile* (a work in which the author did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature);

(7) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology the following group-names:

(a) *UMBELLULARIDAE* (correction of *UMBELLULAE*) Lindahl, 1874 (type-genus: *Umbellularia* Lamarck, 1801);

(b) *ENCRIINI* (correction of *ENCRIENSI*) Dujardin & Hupé, 1862 (type-genus: *Encrinus* Lamarck, 1801);

(8) to place the following family-group names on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology:

(a) *UMBELLULAE* Lindahl, 1874 (an incorrect original spelling for *UMBELLULARIDAE*);


(c) *ENCRIENSI* Dujardin & Hupé, 1862 (an incorrect original spelling for *ENCRIINI*).