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The taxonomy of the deepwater porter crabs of the genus *Hypsophrys* Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891 (Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891c: 269) (Brachyura, Homolidae) was recently revised by Guinot & Richer de Forges (1995: 439). Eight species are currently recognized from Indo-Pacific and Atlantic waters (Guinot & Richer de Forges, 1995), and their carrying behaviour was reviewed by Guinot et al. (1995).

Agassiz (1859: 408), however, had named four new genera and four new species of freshwater cichlid fishes (including *Hypsophrys*) in a short note. The note was published (in 1859) as the minutes of a meeting of the Boston Natural History Society held on 6th October 1858, and was authored by the secretary of the meeting, Dr. C. T. Jackson. The heading for Jackson’s minutes read “Prof. Agassiz, as an introduction to the description of some new fishes from Lake Nicaragua, made some remarks on classification” (p. 407). As such, in accordance with Article 50b of the current zoological code (International Code
of Zoological Nomenclature, 1985), the authorship of the new names should belong to Agassiz and not Jackson. The brevity of the descriptions, however, has caused some problems, and the validity of these names has been the matter of some debate (see review in Kullander & Hartel, 1997).

Recently, Kullander & Hartel (1997) showed that all of Agassiz’s names are in fact available. Agassiz (1859), in using the name Hypsophrys, stated the following: “The Nicaraguan fishes, collected by Julius Froebel, are representatives of four genera of a single family, foreign to North America; though much resembling Pomotis, they belong to the family of Chromis” (p. 407) ... Of the four genera from Nicaragua, one, were it not for the interrupted lateral line, would resemble very closely Dentex; Prof. Agassiz proposed to call it Parachromis gulosus. A second, resembling Chrysophrys, he called Hypsophrys unimaculatus ... Prof. A. showed how from the simple vertical bands of the sides, a longitudinal line was formed by the increase and union of the colour in the centre of the bands, and its fading above and below; and how in the H. unimaculatus a single spot was developed to the exclusion of the rest” (p. 408).

Article 12a of the zoological code (1985) states that “To be available every new scientific name published before 1931 must satisfy the provisions of Article 11 and must have been accompanied by a description or a definition of the taxon that it denotes, or by an indication”. Hypsophrys Agassiz, 1859, is thus an available name, regardless of the brevity of Agassiz’s comments. Kullander & Hartel (1997) also argued that Hypsophrys unimaculatus Agassiz, 1859, is almost certainly a senior subjective synonym of Heros nicaraguensis Günther, 1864.

The name Hypsophrys Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891, is thus a junior homonym of Hypsophrys Agassiz, 1859. Consequently, a replacement name is necessary. I hereby propose Lamoha as the replacement name. The name is derived from an arbitrary recombination (and the change of one o to a) of the letters of the name Homola. The gender is feminine and the type species remains as Hypsophrys superciliosa Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891 (by monotypy). The deepwater crabs of the family Homolidae are a generally poorly studied group, and the present change of name for Hypsophrys should pose no problems.

A note on the authorships for Wood Mason & Alcock’s (1891a-h) papers and their new species also seems pertinent here. The genus Hypsophrys was described in a series of connected parts authored by J. Wood Mason and A. Alcock reporting on the animals collected by the Indian Marine Survey Steamer "Investigator" in two seasons, 1889-1890, and 1890-1891. The results for the 1889-1890 season were published in parts 37, 38 and 39 in volume 7 of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History (Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891a-c) whilst those for the 1890-
1891 season were published in parts 43, 44, 46, and 47 in volume 8 (Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891d-h).

The three parts published in volume 7, all carried the same title and stated clearly that they were authored by J. Wood Mason and A. Alcock. The second and third parts indicated clearly that they were continuations of the preceding ones. When new taxa were reported in volume 7, however, either Wood Mason’s or Alcock’s name was appended after the new taxon’s name. This is the case for *Hypsophrys*, which was published as “*Hypsophrys superciliosa*, gen. et sp. n., Wood-Mason” (Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891c: 269). Following Article 51 of the current zoological code strictly, however, this is not a clear indication that Wood Mason was the person who actually described the new genus and new species. Neither was it stated or indicated anywhere in the earlier parts of the series in volume 7 that Wood Mason alone described or dealt with the Crustacea or that Alcock did the same with the fish (see Ng, 1994). As such, authorship for all the new taxa in volume 7 dealing with the specimens of the “Investigator” for the 1889-1890 season should be credited to both Wood Mason and Alcock, including *Hypsophrys* and *Hypsophrys superciliosa*.

It is also relevant to note here that in volume 8, Wood Mason and Alcock changed their format somewhat. The overall authorship was the same (Wood Mason & Alcock), and again, all the parts in volume 8 were connected (Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891d-h). While they shared authorship for the first three pages (Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891d: 16-18), they made it very clear now who was responsible for describing the various groups. For example, the first group dealt with had the heading “Subgrade B. COELOMATA. Phylum VERTEBRATA. Class PISCES. By A. Alcock” (Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891d: 19). This remained unchanged through the next part (Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891e) and ended on the first page of the third part (Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891f: 268). The next group treated had the heading “Phylum APPENDICULATA. Branch ARTHROPODA. Class CRUSTACEA. By J. WOOD-MASON” (Wood Mason & Alcock, 1891f: 269). This authorship was maintained until the last part in volume 8. As such, the authorship for all the new taxa described in volume 8 (specimens collected during the 1890-1891 season) should be cited as Alcock in Wood Mason & Alcock, or Wood Mason in Wood Mason & Alcock. Those described in volume 7 should be cited with the authorship of Wood Mason & Alcock.
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