

ON THE DESIGNATION OF *ATTUS AUDAX* HENTZ AS THE TYPE OF *PHIDIPPUS* C. L. KOCH.**INTRODUCTION.** G. B. Edwards

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature has begun a consideration of the petition by Levi and Pinter (1970) to suppress *Salticus variegatus* Lucas in favor of *Attus audax* Hentz. While I believe that most of us thought that this would be a routine approval by the commission, two arachnologists, J. A. Beatty and R. Leech, wrote replies to the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature objecting to the petition. Since I am presently doing revisionary work with the genus *Phidippus*, it seems appropriate for me to make a statement regarding the petition. I have already requested that other American araneologists working primarily with the Salticidae in a taxonomic capacity also make a statement. Several replies are included below; later replies may be presented in a subsequent issue of PECKHAMIA.

REBUTTAL TO OBJECTIONS AGAINST DESIGNATION OF *ATTUS AUDAX* HENTZ AS TYPE SPECIES OF *PHIDIPPUS* KOCH 1846. Z.N. (S.) 1904. G. B. Edwards

In Bull. Zool. Nomencl. 27 (5/6), J. A. Beatty and R. Leech objected to a petition by H. W. Levi and L. Pinter (Bull. Zool. Nomencl. 27 (2)) to suppress the name *Salticus variegatus* Lucas 1833, in favor of *Attus audax* Hentz 1845. I would like to give a point by point rebuttal of Beatty's objections (Leech's objection is the same as Beatty's objection C); each rebuttal is coded by the same letter as each objection to which it refers:

A. The objection is trivial. While *Phidippus audax* (Hentz) may not be the most common jumping spider in absolute numbers, it certainly is one of the most common on or about human dwellings, and without doubt ranks either first or second in absolute numbers among species of the genus *Phidippus* (based on museum collections).

B. Even though the petition by Levi and Pinter indicates that ecologists and textbook writers have been the primary users of the name *Phidippus audax*, this name has also been used in taxonomic works and checklists for the species in question much more often than has the name *P. variegatus* (which has been used usually for the species now known as *P. regius* C.L. Koch, as previously indicated by Levi and Pinter).

C. Since no type is available for either *Salticus variegatus* or *Attus audax*, the most logical procedure would be to choose the most stable name, rather than dig up a third name to add to the confusion. This is what Levi and Pinter have done.

D. While at the time of writing (1971) this objection may have had some validity, it has no validity at present. There are more active taxonomists working primarily on the Salticidae in the United States (six) than are working primarily on any other family of spiders in that country. Generic and even subfamilial relationships have become much more clear due to collaboration by these specialists. There is no disagreement as to the limits of the genus *Phidippus*. Most importantly, the name *Phidippus audax* (Hentz) has been the only name used for the species in question since the original petition in 1970, including its use in several internationally distributed handbooks on spiders by noted spider authorities B. J. Kaston and H. W. Levi.

It is now time for the reconsideration recommended by Beatty; I am presently revising the genus *Phidippus* and am fully in support of the merits of nomenclatural stability provided by the Levi and Pinter petition.

LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE ICZN IN SUPPORT OF THE PETITION. The following letters were addressed to Ms. Margaret Speak/ICZN/British Museum (Natural History)/London SW7 5BD/England.

I have been asked by G.B. Edwards to comment on the petition by Levi and Pinter to suppress *Salticus variegatus* Lucas in favor of *Attus audax* Hentz. In 1970 I wrote to the commission in favor of this petition, and I continue to support it. Edwards has adequately covered the objections of Beatty and Leech in his rebuttal of their

positions. An additional factor is the paper by B. B. Taylor and W. B. Peck in the Journal of Arachnology (2: 89-99), a comparison of northern and southern forms of *Phidippus audax* (Hentz)(Araneida, Salticidae), published in 1975. The authors report successful interbreeding between northern specimens and southern specimens in this species. In addition to the confusion between *Phidippus regius* C. L. Koch mentioned by Edwards, and by Levi and Pinter in the original petition, the southern forms of this species have been considered as belonging to *P. variegatus*, while northern specimens were considered as *P. audax*. This interbreeding demonstrates that one biological species is involved. The overwhelming preponderance of usage favors the name *Phidippus audax* (Hentz) for this taxon. (Bruce Cutler)

In answer to your letter of 1 September 1978, regarding my application to preserve the name *Attus audax* Hentz, you should know that my application should be kept going. There has been considerable usage of the name since I made the application. As indicated, it is one of the common spiders, whose name is used in several papers every year by ecologists and in textbooks. I had forgotten about this application. At the time I made it there were few people interested in jumping spiders. Now there is considerable interest in this group of animals and we have six active people in the US working on this group. (Herbert W. Levi)

I fully support the petition by Levi and Pinter to suppress *Salticus variegatus* Lucas in favor of *Attus audax* Hentz (now known as *Phidippus audax*). Most recent arachnological books have used Hentz's name. Kaston used *P. audax* in "How to Know the Spiders" Third Edition, 1978, and Bruce Cutler and I also recently used *P. audax* in our list of the salticids of the United States and Canada (Peckhamia 1(5): 95). While both "type" specimens do not exist it seems worthwhile from the standpoint of stability to retain *P. audax* and reject *P. variegatus* (despite opinions to the contrary, the retention of *P. variegatus* would affect stability!). I find the objections of J. A. Beatty and R. Leech (Bull. Zool. Nomencl. 27(5/6)) to be trivial. Neither has offered sufficient reason to reject Levi and Pinter's petition. (David B. Richman)