

In the Taylor and Brown Catalogue (p. 62) the name *gilberti* in *Crematogaster*, first proposed in quadrinomial format by Forel (1915: 54) as listed above, was wrongly considered to have been elevated by Emery (1922: 132). This is not the case, and the name remains infrasubspecific.

Two quadrinomial names wrongly excluded by Taylor and Brown are in fact available under the Code. They attained status by being published for subspecies in the following combinations: *Camponotus nigriceps prostars* Forel 1910: 72, and, *Camponotus migroaeneus xuthus* Emery 1925A: 111.

The name *luteiforceps* in *Myrmecia*, first proposed infrasubspecifically by Forel (1915), became available when used as a subspecific name by Wheeler (1933: 74), and was raised to specific rank (in the synonymous genus *Promyrmecia*) by Clark (1943: 143). This name has been variously attributed to both Forel and Clark (the latter in the Taylor and Brown catalogue, p. 12)—its correct form is, however, *Myrmecia luteiforceps* Wheeler, 1933.

In taking the actions reviewed in the preceding two paragraphs I have concluded that the criteria of availability specified by the Code were properly satisfied when each of the previously infrasubspecific names involved was first used for a subspecies. Certainly in each case the author specified, by an appropriate reference 'indication', that the relevant infrasubspecific name had been the source of the name he then used. Also, each name had originally satisfied the criteria of availability (as outlined in Chapter V of the Code), except for its publication in a quadrinomial format. Type specimens are known to exist for each in its infrasubspecific context.

The Code is surprisingly unspecific concerning the types of such names. It may be presumed (as I have presumed) that the types of source infrasubspecific names become the types of the names as used in their subsequently available form, despite the differences in authorship and dates of availability. Thus, the type specimens concerned emerge from limbo and attain validity at this point, despite having referred previously to names excluded from the provisions of the Code. Without such arrangements regarding types the later use of the name would perforce stand not as an act of elevation, but as the establishment of a completely new name. There appears however to be no clear sanction for the above presumption, or even for concluding that reference to the original quadrinomen by the later author should in fact be accepted as an 'indication' under the provisions of Article 12b of the Code. Clearly, clarification of these matters by the International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature is desirable. In my opinion the Commission should also consider a declaration that all past infrasubspecific names which have not been previously elevated, and all future new names published in an infrasub-specific context, should be rendered invalid and unavailable for future elevation. All of those which have clear facility must surely by now have been elevated!

### References

- Brown, W. L. Jr. (1955). A revision of the Australian ant genus *Notoncus* Emery, with notes on the other genera of Melophorini. *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool. Harv.* 113: 471-494.
- Brown, W. L. Jr. (1958A). A review of the ants of New Zealand (Hymenoptera). *Acta Hymenopt.* 1: 1-50.
- Brown, W. L. Jr. (1958B). Contributions towards a reclassification of the Formicidae. II. Tribe Ectatommini (Hymenoptera). *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool. Harv.* 118: 175-362.
- Brown, W. L. Jr. (1976). Contributions toward a reclassification of the Formicidae. Part VI. Ponerinae, tribe Ponerini, subtribe Odontomachiti. Section A. Introduction, subtribal characters. Genus *Odontomachus*. *Studia ent.* 19: 67-171.
- Clark, J. (1936). A revision of the Australian species of *Rhytidoponera* Mayr (Formicidae). *Mem. natn. Mus. Vict.* 9: 14-89.
- Clark, J. (1943). A revision of the genus *Promyrmecia* Emery (Formicidae). *Mem. natn. Mus. Vict.* 13: 83-149.