forest, southern Venezuela. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Exeter, Devon, UK.
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**LAGOTRIX LAGOThRICA** OR **LAGOTRIX LAGOThRICA: WHICH IS IT?**

**Thomas R. Deffler**

When von Humboldt (1812) wrote the holotypic description of Humboldt’s woolly monkey, he spelled the species name both *lagotricha* and *lagothricha*. According to some, *lagothricha* (and its variant *lagothricha*) are incorrect Latinizations of the Greek words λᾰγός (*lago*) (hare) + θρῐχος (*thrico*) (hair)1 because of the preceding vowel, ο, which would require the form “trichos” rather than “thrichos”. The use of the two versions was certainly a *lapsus* on von Humboldt’s part. However, when revising the genus, Foeden (1963), under Article 24 (24.2) of the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature*, chose the variation *lagothricha* as the “correct legal spelling” for *Lagothrix lagothricha*.

“This Article 24: Precedence between simultaneously published names, spellings or acts.

24.1. Automatic determination of precedence of names. When homonyms or synonyms are established

---

1 No pun intended, as von Humboldt was writing in French, not English.
simultaneously, but proposed at different ranks, in the family group, genus group or species group the name proposed at higher rank takes precedence [Arts. 55.5, 56.3, 57.7]. See Article 61.2.1 for the precedence of simultaneous but different type fixations for taxa and their nonminotypical subordinate taxa.

24.2. Determination by the First Reviser.

24.2.1. Statement of the Principle of the First Reviser. When the precedence between names of nomenclatural acts cannot be objectively determined, the precedence is fixed by the action of the first author citing in a published work those names or acts and selecting from them; this author is termed the “First Reviser”.

24.2.2. Determination of precedence of names or acts by the First Reviser. If two or more names, different or identical, and based on the same or different types, or two or more nomenclatural acts, are published on the same date in the same or different works, the precedence of the names or acts is fixed by the First Reviser unless Article 24.1 applies.” (International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 1999.)

Thus has the binomial *Lagotrix lagotricha* been spelled by Hershkovitz (1977), Napier and Napier (1967), Napier (1976), Eisenberg (1989), Emmons (1990, 1997), Eisenberg and Redford (1999) and many others, although Mittermeier and Coimbra-Filho’s (1981:95) inclusion of a brief comment by R. Thorington Jr. on von Humboldt’s original spelling has influenced many primatologists to use the *lagotricha* variant. (Thorington’s published comment on p.95 itself is incorrect, since von Humboldt used both spellings.)

Some years ago I asked Philip Hershkovitz what he thought about the legality of all of this. He consulted with Jack Fooden (Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago) and wrote to me that Fooden (1963) had “unfortunately” legalized *lagotricha* under the Code when he chose that variant of the spelling. Thus, they opined, *lagotricha* is legal under the Code, *lagotricha* is not (P. Hershkovitz and J. Fooden, pers. comm. to T. R. Defler). The dilemma is whether to use a legal but perhaps incorrect Latinization, or to use the correctly Latinized (I suppose) but illegal form. Each person makes his own choice whether to respect the Code or not; but by the Code, *lagotricha* is correct.

We all understand there are two (or three) spelling variations for this taxon. Despite my own constant misspelling of the binomial, what is to me far more important is to determine what we shall mean in the future when we refer to *Lagotricha lagotricha*. Should *Lagotricha lagotricha* include *lugens*, *poepigii* and *cana* as subspecies, or are these truly distinct, separate species, as suggested by Groves (2001:190-192)? Urgent chromosomal, molecular and morphological research is needed to resolve these questions. Ruiz and Alvarez (2003) have made a start by identifying separate haplotypes of mtDNA from individuals of the two taxa *lagotricha* and *lugens*, but in the same study they found different haplotypes of mtDNA in *Saimiri sciureus albigena* and *Saimiri sciureus macdonald*, suggesting that we need yet more molecular information to be able to truly solve the species problem in *Lagotricha*. A difference in haplotypes alone is insufficient for the establishment of a new species name.
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