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Notices

(1) Applications and correspondence relating to applications to the Commission should be sent to the Executive Secretary at the address given on the inside of the front cover or on the Commission website. English is the official language of the Bulletin. Please take careful note of instructions to authors (present in a one or two page form in each volume) as incorrectly formatted applications will be returned to authors for revision. The Commission’s Secretariat will answer general nomenclatural (as opposed to purely taxonomic) enquiries and assist with the formulation of applications. As far as it can, the Secretariat will check the main nomenclatural references in applications. Correspondence should be by e-mail to ‘iczn@nhm.ac.uk’ where possible.

(2) The Commission votes on applications eight months after they have been published, although this period is normally extended to enable comments to be submitted. Comments for publication relating to applications (either in support or against, or offering alternative solutions) should be submitted as soon as possible. Comments may be edited.

(3) Requests for help and advice on the Code can be made direct to the Commission and other interested parties via the Internet. Membership of the Commission’s Discussion List is free of charge. You can subscribe and find out more about the list at http://list.afriherp.org/mailman/listinfo/iczn-list.

(4) The Commission also welcomes the submission of general-interest articles on nomenclatural themes or nomenclatural notes on particular issues. These may deal with taxonomy, but should be mainly nomenclatural in content. Articles and notes should be sent to the Executive Secretary.

New applications to the Commission

The following new applications have been received since the last issue of the Bulletin (volume 62, part 1, 31 March 2005) went to press. Under Article 82 of the Code, existing usage of names in the applications is to be maintained until the Commission’s rulings on the applications (the Opinions) have been published.


CASE 3341: Cardium egmontianum Shuttleworth, 1856 (currently Trachycardium egmontianum; Mollusca, Bivalvia): proposed conservation of usage of the specific name by the replacement of the earliest lectotype with a later designated lectotype. H.G. Lee & R.E. Petit.
CASE 3342: *Phalaena croesella* Scopoli, 1763 (currently *Adela croesella*; Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation of the specific name. M.V. Kozlov.

CASE 3343: *Gigantoepecten* Rovereto, 1899 and *Lissochlamys* Sacco, 1897 (Mollusca, Bivalvia, PECTINIDAE): proposed conservation. T.R. Waller & M. Bongrain.


Presidency of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Dr Neal Evenhuis, who has been President of the Commission since November 2001, has found it necessary to resign from both the Commission and the Trust as a result of an increased workload at the Bishop Museum in Honolulu, Hawaii. It is with regret that the Commission’s Council has accepted this resignation. Under ICZN Bylaw 19, Prior Termination of Membership, ‘In the event of the death, effective resignation or incapacity of the President or of his ceasing to be a member of the Commission, the Vice-President shall become the President and shall serve as President for the remainder of the latter’s term of office’. Vice-President Prof Denis Brothers has agreed to assume the role of the Commission President at least until April 2007. Dr Evenhuis has also found it necessary to cease hosting the ICZN discussion list, which has now been transferred to a server in London, U.K., through the good offices of Mr Lynn Raw, DEFRA, London U.K.

Call for nominations for new members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Since the last election of five new Commissioners in June 2001, three Commissioners have expressed their wish to retire: President Dr N.L. Evenhuis (U.S.A.; Diptera), former Vice-President Dr W.N. Eschmeyer (U.S.A.; Ichthyology) and Prof. U.R. Martins de Souza (Brazil; Coleoptera). Their anticipated retirement will therefore bring at least three vacancies to the Commission.

The Commission therefore invites nominations, from any person or institution, of potential candidates for election. The nationalities and specialist fields of the present members of the Commission may be found on the Commission’s Website (www.iczn.org) or on the inside cover of each part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*.

Article 2b of the Commission’s Constitution prescribes that:

‘The members of the Commission shall be eminent scientists, irrespective of nationality, with a distinguished record in any branch of zoology, who are known to have an interest in zoological nomenclature’.

It should be noted that ‘zoology’ here includes the applied biological sciences (medicine, agriculture, etc.) which use zoological names.

Nominations made since June 2001 will automatically be taken into account and need not be repeated. Additional nominations, giving the age, nationality and qualifications (by the criteria mentioned above) of each nominee should be sent as soon as possible, either by e-mail to icznhm.ac.uk or by post to: Executive Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, c/o Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.
Ernst Mayr, 5 July 1904–3 February 2005

For the second half of his life, Ernst Walter Mayr was primarily occupied with evolutionary theory and with the history and philosophy of biology. But we must remember that his training and his empirical research was in avian systematics and biogeography which formed the foundation of his later theoretical work. The rough division between these two phases in his scholarly work can be put at 1953 when he joined the Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University. At that time he left behind the American Museum of Natural History and the superb collection of Pacific Island birds gathered by the Whitney South Sea Expedition, as well as the Rothschild Collection on which he had worked for 22 years. During this time he revised numerous genera, described 26 new species and 445 new subspecies, and most importantly published his first book, *List of New Guinea Birds* (1941), which is still the basic systematic and nomenclatural reference to the birds of this area. Hence Mayr had to become involved early in zoological nomenclature and published his first purely nomenclatural paper on the generic name *Calao* in 1931. Because he worked with birds, a group for which there probably are more active researchers than species, Mayr developed the position that the best way to achieve stability in nomenclature for such groups was by conserving well-established names rather than only by the use of strict priority. He stressed that stability in zoological nomenclature was difficult to reach efficiently with a single set of rules that applied to groups such as birds as well as to groups with large numbers of species and few specialists.

Mayr was not able to take part directly in meetings of the Commission because he was only a young assistant at the time of the Budapest Congress in 1927, was just married at the time of the Lisbon Congress in 1935, and could not attend the Paris Congress in 1948 because he had not yet obtained his American passport. As with a number of other zoologists, Mayr was disturbed by some of the extreme changes advocated at the 1948 International Zoological Congress, Paris, but which never became part of the Rules of Zoological Nomenclature. He attended the Nomenclatural Colloquium immediately prior to the Zoological Congress in Copenhagen (1953) and became the leader of the group advocating stability in zoological names. Shortly after the 1953 Congress Mayr was elected to the Commission and served from 1954 to 1976. He was present at the London Congress (1958) at which the first edition of the new Code was adopted, as well as the Washington Congress (1963) and the Monaco Congress (1972). His most important achievement was the adoption of his proposed Preamble to the Code which is an integral part of this set of rules and has remained essentially unchanged in all editions of the Code to the present one. The Preamble sets the basic scope and tone of the Code in emphasizing that stability is predominant, that each taxon has a unique name and that the Code does not restrict freedom of taxonomic action.

Mayr remained an active member of the Commission and attended all its meetings until his retirement from the Commission in 1976. Although he did little empirical research in ornithology after leaving the American Museum of Natural History in 1953, he did remain active in systematic ornithology and nomenclatural matters by becoming the main editor of the remaining volumes (8-15 and volume 1, 2nd edition) of Peters’ *Check-list of Birds of the World*. The clear presentation of zoological
nomenclature is an important part of the three editions of his text book on animal systematics.

Ernst Mayr retired from the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard University in 1975, but remained active until his 100th year. He wrote or edited over ten books after his retirement, with his last appearing just after his 100th birthday. After his wife died in 1990, he continued to live in his home in Cambridge until 1997 when he moved to an apartment in a retirement home in Bedford, Massachusetts, about 20 miles north of Cambridge, but continued to drive to the Museum of Comparative Zoology until summer 2003. Ernst was active until early December 2004 when an illness forced him to move to the nursing wing. He passed away peacefully in the late morning of 3 February 2005.

Ernst Mayr had a long and remarkable career in the systematics and biogeography of birds, evolutionary theory and the history and philosophy of biology. It is most fortunate for zoological nomenclature that this remarkable zoologist took such an active interest in it for many decades.

Walter J. Bock
Department of Biological Sciences, Columbia University, 1212 Amsterdam Avenue, Mail Box 2431, New York, NY 10027–7004, U.S.A. (e-mail: wb4@columbia.edu).

Andrew Polaszek, Executive Secretary, ICZN

GBIF Copenhagen

On 14 January 2005 a one-day workshop on the nomenclatural codes was convened and hosted by GBIF at their headquarters in Copenhagen, Denmark. The following participants were present: James Edwards, Per de Place Bjørn and Meredith Lane (GBIF); Chris Lyal (Chair, electronic catalogue of known organism names — ECAT); David Hawksworth (BioCode); Mike Mayo (virus code); Brian Tindall (prokaryote code); John McNeill and Nick Turland (botanical code); Andrew Polaszek (zoological code) and ICZN Commissioner Claus Nielsen.

ECAT — electronic catalogue of names of known organisms. The ECAT project is a GBIF Initiative that aims to provide a ‘names service’ to the biological user community. It does this by forming partnerships with various organisations (‘data providers’) involved in generating databases on living organisms, and sharing this information freely. Most important among the data providers until now is the Catalogue of Life partnership of ITIS (Integrated Taxonomic Information Service) and Species2000. The ECAT Science Subcommittee wishes to expand its names services by engaging with the nomenclatural representatives of the different biological kingdoms.

A proposal was tabled (Andrew Polaszek) that the ICZN Official Lists and Indexes of Names in Zoology should be digitised and databased in the very near future, and thereby form the basis of ICZN’s contribution to GBIF. Such a project would, however, require financial input which is currently being sought. In order to ratify ICZN-GBIF cooperation, ICZN will become an Associate Participant of GBIF.

BioCode. The BioCode proposal (David Hawksworth) for a unified nomenclatural Code for all living organisms received a great deal of attention in publications and discussion lists in the 1990s. Despite the apparent logic of unifying the Codes, it faced very widespread opposition. It is generally thought among taxonomists that the degree of disruption to their current working practices would far outweigh any benefits. During this meeting it was noted that the viral code is the least compatible with the others, lacking binominals and having no Principle of Priority.

Code representatives present agreed to work more closely together in future, with the re-establishment of the International Committee on Bionomenclature (ICBN). While implementation of the BioCode seems unlikely in the foreseeable future, it would be desirable for the Code authorities to a) provide links between their Codes on the web, and b) provide a shared web page where the various Codes could be discussed, particularly in relation to equivalence between terms or lack thereof. A large body of literature already exists on this subject; this could be digitised and placed on the web with relative ease.


An international congress took place at UNESCO headquarters in Paris 24–28 January 2005. ICZN Commissioner Philippe Bouchet co-chaired a congress
workshop ‘Documenting Biodiversity’ on 27 January, during which ICZN Executive Secretary Andrew Polaszek gave a verbal presentation entitled ‘The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature — a strategic approach for the 21st Century’. A poster with the same title was displayed during the entire meeting. ICZN’s fundraising Appeal Patron, Professor Edward O. Wilson, was among the plenary lecturers during the opening day of the meeting, sharing the stage with the French President Jacques Chirac. The week entailed many interesting and useful presentations as well as fruitful meetings and discussions with representatives of several organisations including BioNET International, CITES, GBIF, IUCN, Natural History Museum, London, Smithsonian Institution, and the Zoological Society of London. Andrew Polaszek also met with Elliot Morley, U.K. Minister for Environment and Agroenvironment, to discuss the relevance of ICZN to animal taxonomy and conservation.

Immediately after the Congress a special meeting of ICZN Commissioners was convened at the Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle on 29 January, with facilities kindly provided by Commissioner Philippe Bouchet. Also present were Commissioners Miguel Alonso-Zarazaga, Shunsuke Mawatari, Alessandro Minelli and Jan van Tol, ICZN Executive Secretary Andrew Polaszek (Chair), Director MNHN Herpetology Department Alain Dubois, and European Association for Zoological Nomenclature (EAZN) Secretary Donat Agosti. Several agenda items were discussed in detail as follows: EAZN — prospects and progress, fundraising in Europe; Code 4th Edition — problems and solutions; lists of animal names; solutions to problems in nomenclature of higher taxa; moving BZN to the web; registration of animal names; ICZN Strategy Document and development programme; GBIF report and memorandum of cooperation, and Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) memorandum of cooperation. Discussion papers are available (from the ICZN Secretariat) for the agenda items concerning registration, ICZN strategy document and GBIF Memorandum of Cooperation. The main conclusions of the day’s discussions were as follows: the European Association for Zoological Nomenclature needs to be revived and actively involved in fundraising for ICZN in Europe, in cooperation with the Secretariat; ICZN Secretariat to digitise and database Official Lists and Indexes and to have them available on the ICZN website; Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature to consider publishing an article by Prof. Dubois on nomenclature in higher animal taxa, i.e. above the family-group level; Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature to recruit a panel of Associate Editors to assist with processing cases; ICZN to develop, in collaboration with other interested parties, a system of registration of animal names, and finally, ICZN to establish three committees on: 1) registration of animal names; 2) Official Lists and Indexes of names and works in zoology; and 3) the 5th edition of the Code. Membership of these committees is not yet finalised, and the ICZN Secretariat welcomes inquiries from all interested parties.

UNESCO, Paris, IUBS-ICZ-ICZN meeting

A meeting was organised at UNESCO, Paris, on 4 March 2005 at the request of the ICZN Executive Secretary. The meeting was kindly hosted by Natarajan Ishwaran (UNESCO Director of Ecological Sciences) and involved the following participants:
Salvatore Arico — UNESCO, Man and Biosphere programme; Per de Place Bjørn — GBIF, ECAT Programme Officer; Philippe Bouchet (MNHN, ICZN Commissioner); Jean-Marc Jallon (Université Paris-Sud; organising Committee, 20th ICZ); Hugo von Linstow — GBIF, Dep. Dir. Management & International Relations; Michael Schmitt, Museum Alexander Koenig, Bonn (ISZS); Talal Younès — Executive Director, IUBS.

The meeting was convened to address two issues: first, the position of ICZN within IUBS and in relation to the International Congresses of Zoology; second, the planned 2008 celebration of 250 years since Linnaeus’s *Systema Naturae* (10th Edition). On the first issue it was agreed that the International Committee on Bionomenclature (ICBN) needs to be re-established. However, the purpose of a revitalised ICBN would be to address the role of biological nomenclature in general, and not just the BioCode (the unified Code for all organisms). Andrew Polaszek, together with the other code representatives, will draft a concept paper detailing the role and function of the new ICBN. It was also suggested that ICBN could be reformed under the umbrella of ICSU, the International Council for Science.

Despite certain problems with the last two International Congresses of Zoology in Greece (2000) and China (2004) with respect to taxonomic and nomenclatural issues, the consensus of the meeting was that the 20th International Congress of Zoology, due to take place in Paris in 2008, will provide a good opportunity to re-establish the important relationship between ICZN and the International Congress of Zoology. The main organiser of the Paris 2008 ICZ, Jean-Marc Jallon, welcomed ICZN’s participation in the meeting, and in particular the inclusion of the ‘*Systema Naturae 250*’ symposium. This event is being developed as a celebration of 250 years since the publication of Linnaeus’s 10th Edition of *Systema Naturae* (1758), generally accepted as the starting point of binominal zoological systematics. The meeting will provide an opportunity to discuss the state of zoological nomenclature in an age of rapidly advancing technology, affecting both bioinformatics and systematics. Both GBIF and the Linnean Society of London have already pledged organisational and financial support for the meeting. Further financial support, intended to attract keynote speakers and as many ICZN Commissioners as possible to the meeting, is currently being sought. The 20th ICZ will take place in Paris in August 2008. An Organising Committee and Scientific Committee are currently being assembled, and anyone interested in participating in either or both should please contact the ICZN Secretariat.
Case 3262

*Nautilus spengleri* Gmelin, 1791 (currently *Calcarina spengleri*) and *C. hispida* Brady, 1876 (Foraminiferida): proposed conservation of usage of the specific names by the designation of a replacement neotype for *C. spengleri*

Willem Renema

*Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, P.O. Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands* (e-mail: Renema@naturalis.nl)

Johann Hohenegger

*Institut für Palaeontologie, Universität Wien, Universitätsstrasse 7, A-1010 Wien, Austria*

**Abstract.** The purpose of this application, under Article 75.6 of the Code, is the designation of a replacement neotype for *Nautilus spengleri* Gmelin, 1791, the type species of the prominent reef foraminiferan genus *Calcarina* d’Orbigny, 1826 (family *Calcarinidae*). In 1981, H.J. Hansen designated a neotype for *N. spengleri*, but this is a specimen of *C. hispida* Brady, 1876. The prevailing usage of both *C. spengleri* and *C. hispida* will be conserved by the designation of a replacement neotype.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Foraminiferida; *Calcarinidae*; *Calcarina spengleri*; *Calcarina hispida*; *Calcarina gaudichaudii*; foraminifera.

1. Foraminifera of the genus *Calcarina* d’Orbigny, 1826 (p. 276) are important carbonate producers in shallow tropical seas. The type species of *Calcarina* is the Indo-Pacific *Nautilus spengleri* Gmelin, 1791 (p. 3371) by designation by Parker & Jones (1859, p. 482); the original material of *N. spengleri* is lost but in 1981 one of a number of topotypic specimens was designated as neotype (Hansen, 1981, p. 198). Hansen assumed this specimen, with prominent sharp spikes (the term hispid denotes the possession of spikes), to be a juvenile example conspecific with larger ‘adult’ non-hispid specimens with smooth blunt spines. Blunt-spined specimens had been figured by Spengler (1781, p. 379, pl. 2, figs. 9a-c) and Fichtel & Moll (1798, pls. 14, 15), and have been illustrated by modern authors (e.g. Hottinger & Leutenegger, 1980, pl. 6; Rögl & Hansen, 1984, pls. 20, 21). Rögl & Hansen (1984, p. 59) noted that ‘the neotype is a young form while the material of Fichtel & Moll compares well with the adult specimens figured by Hottinger & Leutenegger’.

2. It is now clear (see Lobbegeier, 2002, p. 204; Renema & Hohenegger, 2005) that the ‘juvenile’ hispid and ‘adult’ non-hispid specimens discussed by Rögl & Hansen (1984) belong to two different taxonomic species rather than to different developmental stages. The ‘juvenile’ specimens (including Hansen’s neotype of *Nautilus spengleri*) are conspecific with *Calcarina hispida* Brady, 1876 (p. 589) while the ‘adult’ specimens are conspecific with *C. gaudichaudii* d’Orbigny, 1840 (p. 131). The name
C. hispida has been applied only to the small hispid taxon (e.g. Cushman, 1919, p. 365, pl. 44) and it is desirable to maintain this consistent usage of more than a century. The name C. spengleri has referred in most cases to the non-hispid species only, but has also been used in a composite sense by authors (e.g. Hottinger & Leutenegger, 1980; Rögl & Hansen, 1984) who were unaware that more than one taxon was involved.

3. Lobegeier (2002, p. 204) noted ‘Calcarina spengleri, as represented by the neotype [of Hansen, 1981] . . . is conspecific with C. hispida . . . The name spengleri has priority’. In accordance with this, she applied the name C. spengleri to the small hispid taxon known in general usage (see para. 2 above) as C. hispida. The larger non-hispid species illustrated as spengleri by Fichtel & Moll (1798) and Rögl & Hansen (1984) and which was described as C. gaudichaudii by d’Orbigny in 1840 is restricted to the northern part of the West Pacific; it does not occur at the Great Barrier Reef locality studied by Lobegeier and so was not considered by her.

4. According to current taxonomy there is a group of at least four taxonomic species of Calcarina relevant to the present issue. These are (A) C. spengleri (Gmelin, 1791) (in the non-hispid sense of most authors), (B) C. gaudichaudii (d’Orbigny, 1840), (C) C. hispida Brady, 1876 (= C. spengleri in the taxonomic sense of Hansen’s neotype and hence of Lobegeier (2002)) and (D) C. mayori Cushman, 1924 (p. 44). Due partly to high intraspecific variability, the differences between the species have not always been clear, but they are clarified by Lobegeier (2002; species C and D) and Renema & Hohenegger (2005: species A, B, C and D). Species A has thick, blunt spines; the test shows some tubercles but has no spikes in either adults or juveniles. Species C is about half the size of species A and has long spikes on the test and short spines, while species D has relatively shorter spikes and longer spines. Apart from Lobegeier (2002), all publications have used the name C. hispida for species C, of which C. mayori has sometimes been regarded as a ‘form’ (in doing this in his unpublished thesis Baccaert (1987) used the name C. spengleri for the species).

5. Retaining the unfortunate choice of neotype of Nautilus spengleri Gmelin, 1791 by Hansen (1981; MGUH 15076, Copenhagen) would increase confusion, since the name spengleri would be transferred from species A to species B (as already done by Lobegeier), displacing the name hispida consistently used for the latter taxon. C. hispida has been described and figured in at least 20 publications. In contrast to the consistent use of hispida, the name spengleri has been applied to species A, B, C and D. Until 1980, usage of the name for species A was consistent, while since then that taxon has been called both C. spengleri and C. gaudichaudii. The name spengleri has also been used for species D due to misidentification. Renema & Hohenegger (2005) give the full synonymy of these names.

6. We propose in the interests of stability that the ‘juvenile’ hispid neotype of Nautilus spengleri should be set aside and that the blunt-spined non-hispid specimen figured by Fichtel & Moll (1798) and by Rögl & Hansen (1984, pl. 21, fig. 1) as N. spengleri var. γ should be designated as replacement. This specimen is preserved in the Fichtel and Moll collection in the Naturhistorisches Museum, Vienna, under the number NHMW Inv. Mi-541 (see Rögl & Hansen, 1984).

7. The nominal species Tinoporus baculatus Montford, 1808 is conspecific with Nautilus spengleri Gmelin, 1791, as typified by the proposed neotype (see Hansen & Rögl, 1984) and is the type species of de Montfort’s genus Tinoporus. In order to
conserve the name *Calcarina* d'Orbigny, 1826 the generic name *Tinoporus* de Montfort was placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology (Opinion 1569, March 1990), but the specific name *baculatus* de Montfort, 1808, as published in the binomen *Tinoporus baculatus*, was not placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology. The presumed conspecificity of *Tinoporus baculatus* and Nautilus spengleri is reinstated with the proposed designation of a replacement neotype for *N. spengleri*.

8. The nominal species *Nautilus spengleri* Gmelin, 1791, was placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology in 1990 (Opinion 1569).

9. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary power to set aside all type fixations for the nominal species *spengleri* Gmelin, 1791, as published in the binomen *Nautilus spengleri*, and to designate specimen NHMW Inv. Mi-541 as neotype;

(2) to emend the entry on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology for *Nautilus spengleri* Gmelin, 1791 to record that it is to be interpreted by the neotype designated in (1) above.

References
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Acknowledgement of receipt of this application was published in BZN 60: 1.

Comments on this case are invited for publication (subject to editing) in the Bulletin; they should be sent to the Executive Secretary, I.C.Z.N., Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e-mail: iczn@nhm.ac.uk).
Case 3324

Tramea Hagen, 1861 (Insecta, Odonata): proposed conservation

K.-D.B. Dijkstra and J. van Tol  
National Museum of Natural History, Naturalis, P.O. Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands (e-mails: dijkstra@naturalis.nmm.nl; tol@naturalis.nmm.nl)

J. Legrand  
Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle, Laboratoire d’Entomologie, 45 rue Buffon, F-75005 Paris, France (e-mail: legrand@mnhn.fr)

G. Theischinger  
2A Hammersley Road, Grays Point, N.S.W., Australia 2232 (e-mail: theischinger@epa.nsw.gov.au)

Abstract. The purpose of this application, under Article 23.9.3 of the Code, is to conserve the generic name Tramea Hagen, 1861 for a group of common and widespread dragonflies by suppression of the senior objective synonym Trapezo-stigma Hagen, 1849. In addition, it is proposed that all previous fixations of type species for the nominal genus Tramea Hagen, 1861 before that by Kirby (1889) of Libellula carolina Linnaeus, 1763 be set aside.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Odonata; libellulidae; Tramea; Trapezo-stigma; Tramea carolina; dragonflies.

1. Hagen (1849, p. 174) proposed the genus Trapezostigma, defined by indication as belonging to the first and second groups of the dragonfly (Odonata) genus Libellula Linnaeus, 1758 in Rambur (1842, pp. 32–46), and to sections A. I. a. δ and ε and b. α of Libellula Linnaeus, 1758 in Burmeister (1839, pp. 852–853). These groups included L. carolina Linnaeus, 1763 (p. 411) and L. variegata Linnaeus, 1763. Hagen never used the name Trapezostigma again.

2. Twelve years later, Hagen (1861, p. 143) established the generic name Tramea for seven nominal species of North American Odonata. Kirby (1889, p. 268) designated Libellula carolina Linnaeus as the type species of Tramea Hagen. The genus Tramea presently includes 32 valid species and subspecies, occurring in all tropical and subtropical regions of the world, including several oceanic islands. Most taxa have been named from the Old World. Their relationships are poorly understood up to now. This complexity is probably the combined effect of strong dispersal power and large but fragmented ranges. The New World species are more distinct; ten species are known from tropical America and the Caribbean. The ranges of four of them extend well into North America.

3. The name Trapezostigma Hagen was not used between 1849 and 1913 when Ris (1913, p. 971), in his monograph of the Libellulidae, mentioned the existence of the
name, but noted that a generic description was lacking and added that resurrection of the name *Trapezostigma* was unnecessary and very undesirable. The status of Ris’s work was such that the name *Tramea* became the standard for many authors, including Needham & Heywood (1929), Williamson (1932), Fraser (1936) and Lieftinck (1954).

4. Cowley (1935, p. 283) designated *Libellula carolina* Linnaeus, 1763 as type species of *Trapezostigma*. This was already the type species of *Tramea* Hagen which therefore became a junior objective synonym of *Trapezostigma*. Cowley realised that this would upset the continued use of *Tramea*, mentioned that Ris’s principle ‘Stabilität vor Priorität’ was worthy of every respect, but held the opinion that any resulting instability would only be temporary. Unfortunately, the expected chaos remains today. Indeed, after Cowley’s (1935) publication, a minority of authors adopted the generic name *Trapezostigma*, including some influential authors such as Pinhey (1951), working on the fauna of Africa, and Watson (1967), working in Australia. However, an overwhelming majority of Cowley’s contemporaries retained the use of *Tramea* instead of *Trapezostigma*, including Fraser (1936), Lieftinck (1954), Longfield (1947) and Schmidt (1951), who all published much-used regional faunal overviews or keys. Generally, the name *Tramea* was used by authors working in the Americas and Asia, whereas *Trapezostigma* was used in Africa and Australia. A list of references is available from the Commission Secretariat.

5. Gloyd (1972) discussed the use of *Tramea* and *Trapezostigma* extensively, concluding that ‘we end the duality of names by a unanimous return to the time favored *Tramea*. Although her appeal was not formalised with an application to the Commission, it was widely accepted. Some authors even altered their usage of the generic name. For instance, Pinhey (e.g. 1974, 1984) published using the name *Tramea* from that time on, explicitly referring to Gloyd (1972). Only in Australia has the name *Trapezostigma* remained in general use (e.g. Watson, Theischinger & Abbey, 1991; Hawking & Theischinger, 1999). The usage for African species is inconsistent, both for a single author over time, as well as for contemporary authors. A count in the Zoological Record on CD (1980–2003) on 30th June 2004 revealed 78 references using *Tramea* and two using *Trapezostigma*. These references (available from the Commission Secretariat) include numerous handbooks and field guides for this group of insects attracting growing interest from amateurs and professionals.

6. A recent revival of the name *Trapezostigma*, most notably by Hedge & Crouch (2000) in a checklist of the Odonata of South Africa, has made it clear that a ruling by the Commission is needed to resolve this nomenclatural problem that has existed for over 150 years. The third and fourth authors of this application have used the name *Trapezostigma* in favour of *Tramea* until now, but stress the necessity for stable nomenclature by suppression of the name *Trapezostigma*.

7. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary power:
   (a) to suppress the generic name *Trapezostigma* Hagen, 1849 for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;
   (b) to set aside all fixations of type species for the nominal genus *Tramea* Hagen, 1861 before the designation of *Libellula carolina* Linnaeus, 1763 by Kirby (1889);
(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name *Trapeza* Hagen, 1861 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by Kirby (1889) *Libellula carolina* Linnaeus, 1763, as ruled in (1)(b) above;

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *carolina* Linnaeus, 1763, as published in the binomen *Libellula carolina* (specific name of the type species of *Trapeza* Hagen, 1861);

(4) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the name *Trapezostigma* Hagen, 1849, as suppressed in (1)(a) above.
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Case 3072

*Crioceris* Geoffroy, 1762, *Lilioceris* Reitter, 1912 and other genus-group names with the suffix –*ceris* in the family *Chrysomelidae* (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed Official Correction of gender to feminine

Michael Schmitt

Zoologisches Forschungsinstitut und Museum Alexander Koenig, Adenauerallee 160, D-53113 Bonn, Germany
(e-mail: m.schmitt@uni-bonn.de)

Abstract. The purpose of this application, under Article 80.4 of the Code, is to fix the gender as feminine for the names of two economically important genera of beetles recognized as crop pests, *Crioceris* Geoffroy, 1762, *Lilioceris* Reitter, 1912, and other genus-group names with the suffix –*ceris* in the family *Chrysomelidae*.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; *Chrysomelidae*; *Crioceris*; *Crioceris asparagi*; *Lilioceris*; *Lilioceris lilií*; beetles; crop pests.

1. The name *Crioceris* was first used by Geoffroy (1762) in *Histoire abrégée des insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris* vol. 1, p. 237. Names published in that work were ruled to be unavailable for purposes of nomenclature, and the work was placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature in Opinion 228 (Opinions and Declarations Rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 4: 211–220 (21 April 1954)). The name *Crioceris* was subsequently placed on the Official List with the following author and date of publication: Müller, 1764. An application for the conservation of 24 of the generic names published by Geoffroy (1762) was later received from I.M. Kerzhner (Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, Russia) and published as Case 2292 (BZN 48: 107–133 (June 1991)) and approved by the Commission. In the resultant Opinion 1754 para. A(1) (BZN 51: 58–70 (March 1994)) some of the generic names published in that work were deemed to be available and in para. K(5)(h) the entry on the Official List for *Crioceris* Müller, 1764 was emended to *Crioceris* Geoffroy, 1762.

2. An application (Case Z.N(S.) 1786) to the Commission to designate, under the plenary power, type species for the nominal genera *Crioceris* ‘Müller, 1764’ and *Lema* Fabricius, 1798 and to place these names and *Lilioceris* Reitter, 1912 on the Official List was published in BZN 24: 116–118 (April, 1967). The Commission approved the proposals in Opinion 908 (BZN 27: 12–13 (June 1970)) and the names *Crioceris* ‘Müller, 1764’ and *Lilioceris* Reitter, 1912 were both placed on the Official List with their gender given as masculine (BZN 27: 12, paras. (2)(a) and (2)(c) respectively). The name *Crioceris* is based on the Greek words κριός (krios: ram) and κέρας (kéras: horn). The name *Crioceris* has been treated as feminine since it was established.
Geoffroy (1762, p. 237) left no doubt that he intended *Crioceris* to be feminine since he listed as the first species *C. rubra* (L.). Müller (1764, p. xiii) did not include any nominal species but later (Müller, 1766, p. 85) published numerous species-group names in this nominal genus, which clearly supported the use of the generic name as feminine (e.g. *duodecimpunctata*, *cyanella*, *merdigera*, *melanopoda*, *hirta* and *elongata*). Fabricius (1775, p. 120) also treated *Crioceris* as feminine by using the species-group name *bifasciata* in addition to others in the previous example. Additionally, Fabricius (1776, p. 222) used the name *C. duodecimpunctata* (‘magnitudo et statura *C. duodecimpunctatae’*). In the previous (3rd, 1985) edition of the Code a genus-group name that is or ends in a noun of variable gender, masculine or feminine, was to be treated as masculine, irrespective of the gender of that noun, unless its author stated, when establishing the name, that it was feminine, or treated it as feminine in combination with a species-group name. In the current (4th, 2000) edition of the Code a genus-group name that is or ends in a Greek word transliterated into Latin without other changes takes the gender given for that word in standard Greek dictionaries (Article 30.1.2, see example). The gender of the suffix *-ceris* is feminine (since κέρας (keras — horn) is neuter in Greek) however, and the generic name *Crioceris* is treated as feminine in current use.

3. The generic names *Lilioceris* Reitter, 1912 and *Metopoceris* Heinze, 1931 are also treated as feminine in current use. The names *Pseudocrioceris* Pic, 1916 and *Donaciocrioceris* Pic, 1936 were treated as masculine or feminine by the original and subsequent authors. In other animal groups generic names ending in *-ceris* are treated as feminine: *Cerceris* Latreille, 1803 (Hymenoptera, *Sphecidae*, see Poole & Gentili, 1966, pl. 320f) or *Cleoceris* Boisduval, 1834 (Lepidoptera, *Noctuidae*, see Boisduval, 1834, pl. 71, figs. 1, 2). However, usage is not consistent since the name *Anniceris* Stål, 1878 (Orthoptera) was used as masculine (see Kirby, 1910, p. 422).

4. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

1. to rule that the gender of generic names in the family *Chrysomelidae* ending with the suffix *-ceris* are feminine;

2. to emend the entries on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology for the following names to record that their gender is feminine:

(a) *Crioceris* Geoffroy, 1762 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation *Chrysomela asparagi* Linnaeus, 1758 and placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology by the Commission in Opinion 908, Ruling (2)(a);
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Case 3314

Stegopterus Burmeister & Schaum, 1840 and Trichiotinus Casey, 1915 (Insecta, Coleoptera, SCARABAEIDAE): proposed conservation

Andrew B.T. Smith

Canadian Museum of Nature, P.O. Box 3443, Station D, Ottawa, ON K1P 6P4, Canada (e-mail: asmith@mus-nature.ca)

Abstract. The purpose of this application, under Article 23.9.3 of the Code, is to conserve the names of two well-established genera of cetoniine scarab beetles, Stegopterus Burmeister & Schaum, 1840 and Trichiotinus Casey, 1915. Stegopterus Burmeister & Schaum is a junior synonym of Tetrophthalmus Kirby, 1827 and Trichiotinus Casey a junior synonym of Trichinus Kirby, 1827. The two junior names are in prevailing use and it is proposed that they be conserved by suppression of both Kirby’s names.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Coleoptera; SCARABAEIDAE; Stegopterus; Trichiotinus; Stegopterus suturalis; Trichiotinus piger; scarab beetles; North America; South Africa.

1. Kirby (1827, p. 156) established the names Trichinus and Tetrophthalmus as subgenera of the genus Trichius Fabricius, 1775. The original spellings of the names were Trichini and Tetrophthalmi but this was in Latin text as plural nouns. Kirby explicitly stated that the gender of both subgenera was male, stating: ‘Instead of giving the denominations of the subgenera a feminine termination as proposed in the Introduction to Entomology, I have followed the gender of the genus [Trichius]’. Kirby (1837, p. 137) later correctly emended Trichini to Trichinus and designated Trichius piger Fabricius, 1775 as the type species. The name Tetrophthalmus should also be emended, retaining the original author and date, to Tetrophthalmus in accordance with Article 11.8.1 so that the name is in the nominative singular. The type species of Tetrophthalmus is Trichius suturalis Kirby, 1827 by monotypy.

2. Burmeister & Schaum (1840, p. 404) established the name Stegopterus for the same taxonomic group described as Tetrophthalmus by Kirby, with Trichius suturalis Gory & Percheron, 1833 (p. 48) as one of the included species. Burmeister & Schaum mentioned Tetrophthalmus in a footnote, but chose to use the generic name Stegopterus instead. I (Smith, 2004, p. 288) designated Trichius suturalis Gory & Percheron as the type species of Stegopterus. The name Tetrophthalmus has not been used as a valid name for over 150 years and qualifies as a nomen oblitum under Article 23.9.1.1. However, the name Stegopterus is a little-known genus that has been mentioned in fewer than 10 papers over the past 50 years, including Krikken (1984), Evans (1987), Ricchiardi (1998, 2001) and Smith (2004). This limited use of the name Stegopterus is insufficient to allow its automatic conservation as a nomen protectum under Article 23.9.1.2. It is for this reason that I propose that the Commission
should use its plenary power to conserve the name *Stegopterus* by suppression of *Tetrophthalmus*.

3. Casey (1915, p. 381) described the genus *Trichiotinus* without mention of the name *Trichinus*, apparently being unaware of its existence. *Trichius piger* Fabricius, 1775 (p. 41) was designated by Kirby (1837, p. 137) as the type species of *Trichinus*; the same nominal taxon is the type species of *Trichiotinus* by original designation by Casey (1915, p. 381), making *Trichinus* and *Trichiotinus* objective synonyms. The name *Trichiotinus* has been used in the majority of publications for this taxonomic group since 1915, although a few authors lump *Trichiotinus* under the name *Trichinus*. The following authors have used *Trichiotinus* as a valid name in the last 50 years: Ritcher (1958), Kaul (1960), Woodruff (1960), Dillon & Dillon (1961), Gates & Peters (1962), Borror & DeLong (1964), Ritcher (1966), Arnett (1968), Howden (1968), Ritcher (1969a), Ritcher (1969b), Borror & White (1970), Thien (1974), Green (1978), Lago et al. (1979), Arnett et al. (1980), White (1983), Morón (1984), Schneider & Nichols (1984), Travis (1984), Howden (1985), Glaser (1986), Lago & Miller (1986), Lago & Mann (1987), Fierrez & Cole (1988), Borror et al. (1989), Howden & Ratcliffe (1990), Vogt (1990), Delgado-Castillo & Morón (1991), Ratcliffe (1991), Downie & Arnett (1996), Harpoothian (2001) and Ratcliffe (2002). The only author to use *Trichius* as a valid genus-group name since Kirby (1837) was Hatch (1971, pp. 482, 484) who used the name as valid without explanation or justification in a work on the beetles of Washington and Oregon in the United States. Hatch’s use of *Trichius* as a valid name after 1899 prevents its qualification as a nomen oblitum under Article 23.9.1.1. It is for this reason that I propose that the Commission should use its plenary power to conserve the name *Trichiotinus* Casey by suppression of *Trichinus* Kirby.

4. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary power to suppress the following names for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy:
   (a) *Tetrophthalmus* Kirby, 1827;
   (b) *Trichinus* Kirby, 1827;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the following names:
   (b) *Trichiotinus* Casey, 1915 (gender: masculine), type species by original designation *Trichius piger* Fabricius, 1775;

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the following names:
   (a) *suturalis* Gory & Percheron, 1833, as published in the binomen *Trichius suturalis* (specific name of the type species of *Stegopterus* Burmeister & Schaum, 1840);
   (b) *piger* Fabricius, 1775, as published in the binomen *Trichius piger* (specific name of the type species of *Trichiotinus* Casey, 1915);

(4) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the following names:
   (a) *Tetrophthalmus* Kirby, 1827 (as suppressed in (1)(a) above);
   (b) *Trichinus* Kirby, 1827 (as suppressed in (1)(b) above).
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Case 3280

*Melitaea nycteis* Doubleday, 1847 (currently *Chlosyne nycteis*; Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation of the specific name

John V. Calhoun
977 Wicks Drive, Palm Harbor, Florida 34684, U.S.A.
(e-mail: bretcall1@verizon.net)

Lee D. Miller and Jacqueline Y. Miller
McGuire Center for Lepidoptera and Biodiversity, Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, P.O. Box 112710, Gainesville, Florida 32611, U.S.A. (e-mail: jmiller@flmnh.ufl.edu)

**Abstract.** The purpose of this application, under Article 23.9.3 of the Code, is to conserve the specific name *Melitaea nycteis* Doubleday, 1847 for a widespread North American species of butterfly (family *Nymphalidae*) by suppression of the problematic name *M. ismeria* Boisduval & Le Conte, 1835.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Lepidoptera; *Nymphalidae*; *Melitaea*; *Chlosyne nycteis*; *Chlosyne gorgone*; *Chlosyne ismeria*; butterflies.

---

1. Boisduval & Le Conte (1835, p. 168, pl. 46) described and figured *Melitaea ismeria* from ‘la Caroline et la Géorgie’ based on a drawing by John Abbot. There is no extant type material and the original written description was too vague to determine the intended species with any certainty. Due to the poor quality of the engraved plate that accompanied the original description, the true identity of *M. ismeria* remained enigmatic.

2. Doubleday (1847, pl. 23, fig. 3) named *Melitaea nycteis* (currently *Chlosyne nycteis*) in association with an illustration by W.C. Hewitson. No written description was provided, but text issued separately by Doubleday (1848, p. 181) attributed the species to the ‘Middle States’. The holotype is deposited in the Natural History Museum, London (labelled: ‘B.M. Type no. Rh8433, *Melitaea nycteis*, ?D. & H.’).

3. Boisduval (1869, p. 53) characterised *Melitaea nycteis* as similar in appearance to *M. ismeria*, but he did not consider these taxa to be conspecific.

4. Scudder (1872, p. 85) identified a John Abbot drawing in the British Museum as ‘Ismeria (carlota Reek. [sic.])’. *Eresia carlota* was described in 1866 by Reakirt (p. 141). Since 1955 (Brown et al., p. 82), *carlota* has been treated as a subspecies of *Dryas gorgone* (currently *Chlosyne gorgone*), which was named by Hübner (1810, pl. [41], figs. 1–2) as *Dryas reticulata Gorgone* without any textual description or reference to his published plate. The origin of Hübner’s figured specimens is unknown, but Miller & Brown (1981, p. 155) speculated that they came from John Abbot and the type locality is probably coastal Georgia. Since Scudder (1872), most authors have tentatively treated *M. ismeria* as a synonym of *D. gorgone*. 
5. Brown (1974, p. 2) concluded that the Abbot drawing examined by Scudder (1872) did not directly serve as the model for the published plate of *Melitaea ismeria*. Due to a lack of supporting evidence, he was unable to determine the intended species and proposed (p. 10) that nomenclatural stability would perhaps best be served if *M. ismeria* were considered nomen incognitum.

6. Gatrelle (1998, p. 1) argued that *Melitaea ismeria* was synonymous with *M. nycteis*. He collected three male *M. nycteis* on 20 August 1989 in Burke County, Georgia, and designated (p. 5) one of these specimens as the neotype of *Melitaea ismeria* Boisduval & Le Conte (labelled: ‘Neotype, *Melitaea ismeria* Boisduval & LeConte, Det. R.R. Gatrelle’ and deposited in the McGuire Center for Lepidoptera and Biodiversity, Florida Museum of Natural History, Gainesville, Florida). Because *M. ismeria*, 1835 was described 12 years prior to *M. nycteis*, 1847, Gatrelle (1998, p. 5) proposed the priority replacement of *nycteis*. In addition to the above, Gatrelle designated a neotype for *Dryas reticulata gorgone*. Gatrelle collected this neotype specimen on 27 April 1993 in Burke County, Georgia (labelled: ‘Neotype δ, *Dryas reticulata gorgone*’ and deposited in the McGuire Center for Lepidoptera and Biodiversity, Florida Museum of Natural History, Gainesville, Florida).

7. Kons (2000, p. 505) disagreed with Gatrelle’s (1998) claim that *Melitaea ismeria* and *M. nycteis* were synonymous and hesitantly suggested that *M. ismeria* could be synonymous with *Phyciodes harrisii* Scudder, 1864 (currently *Chlosyne harrisii*). Higgins (1960, p. 440) had previously proposed this synonymy, but ultimately treated *M. ismeria* as a nomen dubium.

8. Calhoun (2003, p. 208) determined that the Abbot drawing mentioned by Scudder (1872) (now in the Natural History Museum, London) represented *Dryas gorgone*. Through further investigation, Calhoun (2003, p. 211) discovered the original Abbot drawing that was used for the published plate of *M. ismeria* (in the Thomas Cooper Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia). Abbot often duplicated his own artwork, but his attention to detail varied. It was determined that the figures in the original drawing in South Carolina are copies of those in Abbot’s earlier drawing of *D. gorgone* in the Natural History Museum, London. Two exact duplicates of Abbot’s earlier drawing of *D. gorgone* were also found (at the Houghton Library, Harvard University, and the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand). Yet another duplicate of this drawing was recently located (at the Hargrett Rare Books and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia). The written description of *M. ismeria* corresponded to the figures in Abbot’s original drawing in South Carolina, thus Calhoun (2003, p. 214) concluded that the actual species was *D. gorgone*.

9. Gatrelle (2003, p. 8) countered that the original French description of *Melitaea ismeria* was indicative of a specimen of *M. nycteis*. However, Calhoun (2004, p. 161) claimed that Gatrelle’s translation and interpretation of the description were erroneous. Calhoun (2004, p. 162) further proposed that Abbot’s drawings of *Dryas gorgone* probably portray the subspecies tentatively recognized as *D. g. carlota*, which is consistent with an old Georgia specimen of *D. gorgone* (at the Natural History Museum, London) that probably corresponds to a specimen that Edward Doubleday identified as *M. ismeria* from John Abbot (Calhoun, 2003, p. 114).

10. Calhoun (2004, p. 163) subsequently discovered that James H. McDunnough examined the surviving Boisduval collection in 1913 and appears to have selected a
specimen to serve as the ‘type’ of *M. ismeria*. Calhoun was unable to locate this missing specimen, ostensibly labelled by Boisduval as *M. ismeria*, but Barnes & McDunnough (1917, p. 10) published a checklist of Lepidoptera in which *M. ismeria* was treated as a synonym of *D. gorgone*.

11. Calhoun (in press) found an even earlier and more detailed drawing of *Dryas gorgone* by Abbot (at the Natural History Museum, London). The figures are consistent with those in Abbot’s four other duplicate renderings of *D. gorgone*, including the original drawing for *Melitaea ismeria*. Calhoun has personally examined nearly 1000 original Lepidoptera drawings by John Abbot and none has been found to represent *M. nycteis*. In addition, no specimens of *M. nycteis* are known to exist that can be attributed to Abbot.


13. In view of the historical uncertainty regarding the identity of *M. ismeria*, and evidence that this taxon is synonymous with *Dryas gorgone*, the proposed priority replacement of *M. nycteis* by *M. ismeria* would not promote nomenclatural stability. We therefore propose the suppression of *M. ismeria* to avoid any further confusion.

14. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

1. to use its plenary power to suppress the name *ismeria* Boisduval & Le Conte, 1835, as published in the binomen *Melitaea ismeria*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

2. to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the following names:

(a) *gorgone* Hübner, 1810, as published in the trinomen *Dryas reticulata gorgone* and as defined by the neotype designated by Gatrelle (1998);

(b) *nycteis* Doubleday, 1847, as published in the binomen *Melitaea nycteis* and as defined by the holotype in the Natural History Museum, London;

3. to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the name *ismeria* Boisduval & Le Conte, 1835, as published in the binomen *Melitaea ismeria* and as suppressed in (1) above.
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Comment on the proposed conservation of *Rosacea* Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 (Cnidaria, Siphonophora) and the conservation of *Desmophyes annectens* Haeckel, 1888 and *Rosacea plicata* Bigelow, 1911 (Case 3309; see BZN 61: 149–153)

Dhugal J. Lindsay

*Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology, 2–15 Natsushima-cho, Yokosuka, Japan 237-0061*

I am writing in support of the application by Mapstone & Pugh. Use of the name ‘*Rosacea plicata*’ for the taxon known as *Desmophyes annectens* would cause considerable confusion and not serve the interests of nomenclatural stability.


Miguel A. Alonso-Zarazaga

*Departamento de Biodiversidad y Biología Evolutiva, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales (CSIC), José Gutiérrez Abascal 2, E-28006 Madrid, Spain*

In Jameson & Howden’s application (BZN 59: 246–248) as well as in the comment on Jameson & Howden’s application by Krell, Ziani & Ballerio (BZN 60: 303–311), a mistake was made regarding the gender of the generic name *Bolboceras* Kirby, 1819. This name is compounded by the stem *bolbo-* (from the Greek word *bolbós*, ‘bulb’) and ending stem *-ceras* (from the Greek word *kératos* — meaning ‘horn’) for the bulbous apex of the clypeal horn. Gender of a genus is to be taken from the final component (Article 30.1.1) and *kéras* is neuter. Moreover, this ending is so common in generic names that it has been placed among the Examples of Article 30.1.2 for a neuter ending, an example overlooked by the above mentioned authors.

I therefore request that the proposals are modified as follows:

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the following names:

(a) *Bolboceras* Kirby, 1819 (gender: neuter), type species by subsequent designation by Curtis (1829) *Scarabaeus mobilicornis* Fabricius, 1775, with the endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the name *Odonteus* Samouelle, 1819 whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.

Comment on the proposal to remove the homonymy between *Clionidae* Rafinesque, 1815 (Mollusca) and *Clionidae* d’Orbigny, 1851 (Porifera) (Case 3211; see BZN 60: 99–102; 61: 167–169)

Philippe Bouchet

*Muséum national d’Histoire naturelle, 55 rue Buffon, 75005 Paris, France*

I oppose Willan et al.’s comments for nomenclatural (para. 1 below) and taxonomic (para. 2 below) reasons.
1. Willan et al. argued that the family-group name Clionidae Rafinesque, 1815 has ‘neither validity nor standing’ and that ‘the next available name must be brought into use’. I agree with Willan et al.’s interpretation of ‘Clione R. Clio Brown’ and I agree that the type genus of the family name should be regarded to be Clione Rafinesque, 1815, not Clione Pallas, 1774. However, a family-group name based on a junior homonym, although invalid, is still an available name (Articles 11.7, 39; and flow chart on pp. 123 and 260 of the Code, which however does not form part of the Code). Thus, we run into the absurd situation that clionidae Rafinesque, 1815, as an available name, is a senior homonym of any subsequent clionidae based on Clione Pallas, 1774.

2. Willan et al. argued that the first author who unequivocally used a family name clionidae based on Clione Pallas was Gray (1847) and that the first author who used a family name clidae based on Clio Linnaeus, 1767 was Menke (1828). This is incorrect and reflects the persisting confusion surrounding the spelling and taxonomic extensions of the names Clio and Clione. All authors prior to Gray (1847), including Menke, used Clio and Clione for the gymnosome (Table 1, p. 86 below); for the thecosome, they used Cleodora Pérón & Lesueur. Although Gray synonymized Cleodora with Clio Linnaeus, 1767, subsequent authors continued to classify the latter in cleodoridae, cavoliniidae, or hyalaeidae. I maintain my earlier analysis of the case as presented in the original application, i.e. Jeffreys (1869) is the first author to have used the thecosome genus name Clio as valid, and to have classified it in a family name based on it.

3. It is clear that, ever since Rafinesque (1815), there has been a continuous usage of a family name with the stem clio-, based on Clio or Clione, with authorship attributed to different authors, but consistently extended to designate gymnosomes and not thecosomes. This should be reflected by a ruling of the Commission that the type genus of clionidae Rafinesque, 1815, Clione, should be attributed to Pallas, 1774 and not to Rafinesque, 1815. The rest of the original application remains unchanged.

Additional references

Adams, H. & Adams, A. 1853–1858. The genera of Recent Mollusca arranged according to their organisation, 2 volumes of text, 1 volume of plates. J. van Voorst, London. [Published in parts: volume 1, part 2, pp. 33–64, February 1853].


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Thecosome genus</th>
<th>Thecosome family</th>
<th>Gymnosome genus</th>
<th>Gymnosome family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rafinesque (1815)</td>
<td>Cleodora Péron</td>
<td>family HYALINEA</td>
<td>Clio R. Clio</td>
<td>subfamily CLIONIDIA (family OLIGOPTERIA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menke (1828)</td>
<td>Cleodora Péron &amp; Lesueur</td>
<td>family HYALAEACEAE</td>
<td>Clio Brown</td>
<td>family CLIODINAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menke (1830)</td>
<td>Cleodora Péron &amp; Lesueur (Cleodora Lamarck; Rang)</td>
<td>family HYALAEACEAE</td>
<td>Clio Linnaeus; Brown (Clio Pallas)</td>
<td>family CLIOIDEA (Gymnosomata, Blainville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiegmann &amp; Rüthe (1832)</td>
<td>Hyalea Lamarck</td>
<td>family HYALEACEA</td>
<td>Clio Brugièrew</td>
<td>family CLIOIDEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmeister (1837)</td>
<td>Hyalea Lamarck</td>
<td>family HYALEACEA</td>
<td>Clio Brugièrew</td>
<td>family CLIOIDEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiegmann &amp; Rüthe (1843)</td>
<td>same as Wiegmann &amp; Rüthe (1832)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (1847)</td>
<td>Clio Brown, 1756; not O.F. Müller, 1776; Cleodora Péron &amp; Lesueur; Lamarck, 1812</td>
<td>family CLEODORIDAE</td>
<td>Clio Pallas, 1774. Clio O.F. Müller, 1776; Péron &amp; Lesueur, 1810; Lamarck 1812; not Brown, 1756</td>
<td>family CLIONIDAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward (1851)</td>
<td>Cleodora Péron &amp; Lesueur (=Clio L. (part) not O.F. Müller, 1776)</td>
<td>family HYALEIDAE</td>
<td>Clio (Linnaeus) O.F. Müller, 1776</td>
<td>family CLIDAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippi (1853)</td>
<td>Clio Linnaeus, 1767 [=Clio Browne, 1756; Cleodora Péron &amp; Lesueur, 1810]</td>
<td>family CAVOLINIAE</td>
<td>Clio Pallas, 1774 [=Clio O.F. Müller, 1776]</td>
<td>family CLIONACEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffreys (1869)</td>
<td>Clio Browne</td>
<td>family CLIIDAE</td>
<td>shell-less molluscs not treated by Jeffreys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Macropodus concolor* Ahl, 1937 (Osteichthyes, OSPHRONEMIDAE)
(Case 3255; see BZN 60: 206–207; 61: 114–116, 173–174, 256–257)

The professional systematic ichthyologists listed below (1–17) have individually submitted comments indicating that they consider the application to be pointless and unhelpful. They all recorded their preference for using the correct name for this species, *Macropodus spechti* Schreitmüller, 1936, concurring with the comments of Kottelat, Kullander, Fang, Britz & Ferraris (BZN 61: 114–116) and recommend that the Commission rejects the proposals.

(1) Roberta Barbieri (*Hellenic Centre for Marine Research, Institute of Inland Waters, P.O. Box 712, 190 13 Anavyssos, Greece*)

(2) Marcelo R. de Carvalho (*Departamento de Biologia (FFCLRP), Universidade de São Paulo, Av. dos Bandeirantes, 3900, Ribeirão Preto, SP, 14040-901 Brasil*)

(3) Brian Coad (*BCoad@mus-nature.ca*)

(4) I.-Shiung Chen (*iscfish@yahoo.com.tw*)

(5) Panos S. Economidis (*Aristotle University, Karakasi str. 79, GR-54453 Thessaloniki, Greece*)

(6) Renny Kurnia Hadiaty (*Ichthyological Laboratory, Div. of Zoology, Research Center for Biology, Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI), Jl. Raya Bogor Km 46, Cibinong 16911, Indonesia*)

(7) Tan Heok Hui (*Raffles Museum of Biodiversity Research, National University of Singapore, Science Drive 2, Kent Ridge, Singapore 117543, Republic of Singapore*)

(8) Juraj Holick (*Institute of Zoology, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Dubravska cesta 9, 845 06 Bratislava, Slovakia*)

(9) Joseph S. Nelson (*Department of Biological Sciences, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2E9, Canada*)

(10) Heok Hee Ng (*Fish Division, Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan, 1109 Geddes Avenue, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109–1079, U.S.A.*)

(11) Jorgen Nielsen (*Zoological Museum, Universitetsparken 15, 2100, Copenhagen O, Denmark*)


(13) Rohan Pethiyagoda (*Wildlife Heritage Trust, 95 Cotta Road, Colombo 8, Sri Lanka*).
1. The comment by Schindler & Staeck (see BZN 61: 256–257) comprises, in our opinion, a series of invalid arguments and apparent misinterpretations of the Code, aimed to preserve the name *Macropodus concolor* Ahl, 1937 over the older available name *M. spechti* Schreitmüller, 1936. As stated correctly by Kottelat et al. (BZN 61: 114–116), *Macropodus concolor* Ahl, 1937 is a permanently unavailable junior primary homonym of *M. concolor* Schreitmüller, 1936 and a junior objective synonym of *M. spechti*. Schindler & Staeck’s arguments are discussed below.

2. Schindler & Staeck claimed that Schreitmüller’s work (1936a, b) was published in popular aquarium magazines in contrast to Ahl’s work, published in a zoological journal. This is irrelevant since all of these works satisfy the criteria of publication under the Code (see Chapter 3, Articles 8 and 9).

3. Schindler & Staeck misinterpreted the Code when they argued that *M. concolor* Ahl, 1937 is not acceptable because it is a junior primary homonym of *M. concolor* Schreitmüller, 1936 and because Schreitmüller (1936b) disclaimed the intention to create a nomen novum. The Code regulates the disclaiming of whole publications (Article 8.2) and names and acts in a published work (Article 8.3). These Articles refer to the publication in which the disclaimer is printed. There is no provision in the Code for a retroactive disclaimer. Similarly misleading, Schindler & Staeck argued that Schreitmüller did not publish his 1936b work with the purpose to provide a public and permanent record. In fact, he did publish the article 1936b in a widely distributed aquarium journal, giving a permanent record to the public. Maybe his intention was not to give a permanent record of the name *M. opercularis concolor* Schreitmüller, 1936, but this is exactly what he did. Therefore, the argument that Article 8.1.1 was not being fulfilled has to be rejected. Schindler & Staeck erred again, citing Article 13 they claimed that Schreitmüller’s (1936) work does not fulfil the
requirements of a formal description. This is clearly not the case as Article 13.1.2 explicitly allows the citation of a bibliographic reference giving the required characters. This means that Schreitmüller (1936b), besides reproducing his original figure, incorporated all characters included in his original description of *M. spechti* (1936a). Therefore, Schreitmüller’s 1936b work fulfils the formal requirements of descriptions as argued by Kottelat et al. (BZN 61: 114–116) exactly as did his earlier publication (1936a).

4. There is no reason to doubt that Schreitmüller (1936b) used the name *Macropodus opercularis concolor* for the first time as a valid taxon. It is easy to reverse Schindler & Staeck’s argument: why should Schreitmüller have published his 1936b statement, if not for introducing the new name?

5. Schindler & Staeck argued that *M. concolor* Schreitmüller, 1936, like *M. spechti* Schreitmüller, 1936, was a nomen oblitum. As explained elsewhere in detail (see BZN 60: 206–207; 61: 173–174 and Herder & Freyhof, 2002), *M. spechti* Schreitmüller, 1936 is not a nomen oblitum. Paepke’s 1994 act declaring *M. spechti* Schreitmüller, 1936 as a nomen oblitum was de facto not admissible, because it was published after 1 January 1973 (Article 23.12). Schindler & Staeck’s arguments to treat *M. spechti* as a nomen oblitum have been disproved (see BZN 61: 114–117; 173–174). Though they repeated their view (BZN 61: 256–257), they failed, as Paepke (BZN 61: 173) did, to give any valid argument for their repeated demand.

6. Schindler & Staeck recorded that Paepke (1994), not Freyhof & Herder (2002), published the first revision of the genus *Macropodus*. However, this is irrelevant to the case discussed here.

7. The argument opposing our application that the Black Paradise Fish could be compared to cases of commercially important species (Kottelat et al., BZN 61: 114–116) is specious. From our fieldwork in Vietnam, we can agree that the species is known to some local people around Hue under its local but not under the scientific name. We visited many fish markets within the distribution area of *Macropodus* in Vietnam but recorded only one specimen in a basket of mixed small fish. In fact we doubt that the name *M. concolor* is used in Vietnam. We have been unable to see a single reference to it in the Vietnamese literature. It is hard to understand why the exceptional conservation of a taxon only used as an aquarium pet should be given more importance than that of the commercially highly important rainbow trout *Oncorhynchus mykiss*, which was renamed following the Code.

8. Schindler & Staeck criticized Herder & Freyhof for having used the name *M. concolor* Ahl themselves before publishing their revision (Herder & Freyhof, 2002). We fail to see the pertinence of the argument. We maintain that this was the only responsible attitude awaiting the publication of our nomenclatural conclusions.

9. To conclude, all of the arguments given by Schindler & Staeck (BZN 60: 206–207; 61: 256–257) are flawed or result from a misunderstanding of the Code. Paepke (BZN 61: 173) also did not give any valid argument. Although we recognize Schindler & Staeck’s as well as Paepke’s efforts to find arguments for preserving a name which has been used by aquarists for many years, we recommend that the Commission does not approve the application.
OPINION 2105 (Case 3245)

Hastigerinella Cushman, 1927 and Clavigerinella Bolli, Loeblich & Tappan, 1957 (Rhizopoda, Foraminiferida): usage conserved by the designation of Hastigerina digitata Rhumbler, 1911 as the type species of Hastigerinella

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the current usage of the generic names Hastigerinella Cushman, 1927 for a group of extant planktonic foraminifera and Clavigerinella Bolli, Loeblich & Tappan, 1957 for a group of fossil foraminifera is conserved by the designation of Hastigerina digitata Rhumbler, 1911 as the type species of Hastigerinella.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Foraminifera; HASTIGERININAE; Hastigerinella; Clavigerinella; Hastigerinella digitata; Clavigerinella akersi.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that the name digitata Rhumbler, 1911, as published in the binomen Hastigerina digitata, is deemed to be the specific name of a then-new nominal species and is not to be treated as a misidentification of Globigerina digitata Brady, 1879.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) Hastigerinella Cushman, 1927 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation Hastigerina digitata Rhumbler, 1911;
   (b) Clavigerinella Bolli, Loeblich & Tappan, 1957 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation Clavigerinella akersi Bolli, Loeblich & Tappan, 1957.

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) digitata Rhumbler, 1911, as published in the binomen Hastigerina digitata and as defined by the neotype BMNH Cat. no. 1959.5.11.744 in the collections of the Natural History Museum, London, designated by Banner (1965), ruled in (1) above to be deemed to be the specific name of a then-new nominal species (specific name of the type species of Hastigerinella Cushman, 1927);
   (b) akersi Bolli, Loeblich & Tappan, 1957, as published in the binomen Clavigerinella akersi (specific name of the type species of Clavigerinella Bolli, Loeblich & Tappan, 1957).

History of Case 3245

An application to conserve the current usage of the generic names Hastigerinella Cushman, 1927 for a group of extant planktonic foraminifera and Clavigerinella Bolli, Loeblich & Tappan, 1957 for a group of fossil foraminifera was received from
Helen Coxall (School of Ocean and Earth Science, Southampton Oceanography Centre, Southampton S014 3ZH, U.K.) on 6 May 2002. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 182–187 (September 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. No comments on this case were received.

**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 185–186. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 21 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, no Commissioners voted AGAINST, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

**Original references**

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:


The following is the reference for the designation of the neotype of *Hastigerina digitata* Rhumbler, 1911:

OPINION 2106 (Case 3268)

Conidophrys Chatton & Lwoff, 1934 (Ciliophora, Pilisuctorida): conserved

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the name Conidophrys Chatton & Lwoff, 1934 for a genus of pilisuctorid ciliates (family Conidophryidae Kirby, 1941) parasitic on marine crustaceans is conserved by suppression of the unused probable subjective synonym Mycodinium Averinzeff, 1916.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Ciliophora; Pilisuctorida; Conidophryidae; Conidophrys; Mycodinium; Conidophrys pilisuctor; parasitic ciliates.

Ruling
(1) Under the plenary power the name Mycodinium Averinzeff, 1916 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.
(2) The name Conidophrys Chatton & Lwoff, 1934 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation Conidophrys pilisuctor Chatton & Lwoff, 1934, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.
(3) The name pilisuctor Chatton & Lwoff, 1934, as published in the binomen Conidophrys pilisuctor (specific name of the type species of Conidophrys Chatton & Lwoff, 1934) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
(4) The name Conidophryidae Kirby, 1941, type genus Conidophrys Chatton & Lwoff, 1934, is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.
(5) The name Mycodinium Averinzeff, 1916, as suppressed in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3268
An application to conserve the name Conidophrys Chatton & Lwoff, 1934 for a genus of pilisuctorid ciliates (family Conidophryidae Kirby, 1941) parasitic on marine crustaceans by suppression of the probable subjective synonym Mycodinium Averinzeff, 1916 was received from I.V. Dovgal (Schmalhausen Institute of Zoology, 01601 Kiev, Ukraine) on 3 February 2003. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 266–268 (December 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. No comments on this case were received.

Decision of the Commission
On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 267. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 18 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals,
3 Commissioners voted AGAINST, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

Voting against, Alonso-Zarazaga considered that the limited use of the name proposed for conservation did not justify suppression of the senior name.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Conidophryidae Kirby, 1941, Protozoa in biological research, p. 954.


**OPINION 2107** (Case 3220)

*Cypraea coombii* Sowerby in Dixon, 1850 (Mollusca, Gastropoda): priority maintained over *Ovula gisortiana* Passy, 1859 (currently *Gisortia gisortiana*)

**Abstract.** The Commission has ruled that priority is maintained for *Cypraea coombii* Sowerby in Dixon, 1850, the senior subjective synonym of *Ovula gisortiana* Passy, 1859, for an Eocene fossil species of cowrie (family *Cypraeidae*) from Western Europe.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Mollusca; Gastropoda; *Cypraeidae*; *Cypraea coombii*, *Gisortia gisortiana*; cowrie; Eocene; western Europe.

**Ruling**

(1) It is hereby ruled that the name *coombii* Sowerby in Dixon, 1850, as published in the binomen *Cypraea coombii*, retains priority over the name *gisortiana* Passy, 1859, as published in the binomen *Ovula gisortiana*, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.

(2) The name *coombii* Sowerby in Dixon, 1850, as published in the binomen *Cypraea coombii*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

**History of Case 3220**

An application to conserve the specific name of *Cypraea gisortiana* Passy, 1859 by giving it precedence over *Cypraea coombii* Sowerby in Dixon, 1850 was received from Jean-Michel Pacaud (Muséum national d’Histoire naturelle, Laboratoire de Paléontologie, rue Buffon, F-75005 Paris, France) and Luc Dolin (1 rue des Sablons, Mesvres, 37150 Civray-de-Touraine, France) on 22 October 2001. After correspondence the case was published in *BZN* 59: 173–175 (September 2002). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. A comment opposing the application was published in *BZN* 60: 218–220 to which the authors replied (*BZN* 61: 40–42). A further comment in opposition to the application was published in *BZN* 61: 104–106.

**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in *BZN* 59: 174. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 3 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 17 Commissioners voted AGAINST, 1 Commissioner ABSTAINED, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

Voting against, Alsono-Zarazaga commented that both names seemed to belong to rarely found and poorly understood fossils. He considered the application to be premature and that priority must be maintained. Likewise, Halliday commented that the proposed action was unnecessary. Action to give *gisortiana* Passy, 1859
precedence over *coombii* Sowerby, 1850 would only be necessary if these two names were synonyms. As pointed out by Todd (*BZN* 61: 104), there was no clear evidence that this was the case. If the action proposed was taken, the Commission might have to reverse that decision in the future when more research had been done. He agreed with Todd that the proposal was premature and unnecessary. Štys, also voting against and citing the comments opposing the application, further argued that the *Bulletin* should not become a forum for solving taxonomic problems.

**Original reference**

The following is the original reference to the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

*coombii*, *Cypraea*, Sowerby in Dixon, 1850, *The geology and fossils of the Tertiary and Cretaceous formations of Sussex*, p. 188, pl. 8, fig. 6.

Editorial note:
The title of the paper by Passy (1859) in the list of references should read:

OPINION 2108 (Case 3260)

Titanodamon johnstonii Pocock, 1894 (currently Damon johnstonii; Arachnida, Amblypygi): specific name conserved

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the widely used specific name Titanodamon johnstonii Pocock, 1894 (currently Damon johnstonii; family Phrynichidae) for a species of whip spider (Amblypygi) is conserved by the suppression of its senior synonym D. australis Simon, 1886, that has been used doubtfully only once.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Amblypygi; Phrynichidae; Damon; Damon johnstonii; whip spiders.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power the name australis Simon, 1886, as published in the binomen Damon australis, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The name johnstonii Pocock, 1894, as published in the binomen Titanodamon johnstonii (specific name of the type species of Titanodamon Pocock, 1894) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

(3) The name australis Simon, 1886, as published in the binomen Damon australis and as suppressed in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3260

An application to conserve the specific name Titanodamon johnstonii Pocock, 1894 (currently Damon johnstonii; family Phrynichidae) for a species of whip spider (Amblypygi) by the suppression of its senior synonym D. australis Simon, 1886 was received from Peter Weygoldt (Institut für Biologie I, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, D-79104 Freiburg, Germany) on 10 December 2002. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 188–190 (September 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. No comments on this case were received.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 189. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 16 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 4 Commissioners voted AGAINST, Evenhuis, Kerzher and Ng were on leave of absence; no votes were received from Böhme and Martins de Souza.

Voting against, Alonso-Zarazaga and Bouchet noted that the names involved had been little used and considered that priority should be maintained.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

OPINION 2109 (Case 3281)

Nahecaris Jaekel, 1921 (Crustacea, Malacostraca, Phyllocarida, Archaeostraca): given precedence over Dilophaspis Traquair in Walther, 1903

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the generic name Nahecaris Jaekel, 1921 for a group of Lower Devonian phyllocarid crustaceans (order Archaeostraca) is conserved by giving it precedence over the older name Dilophaspis Traquair in Walther, 1903 whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Phyllocarida; Archaeostraca; Nahecaris; Dilophaspis; Nahecaris stuertzi; Dilophaspis lata; Hunsrück Slate; Lower Devonian; Germany.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that the name Nahecaris Jaekel, 1921 is given precedence over the name Dilophaspis Traquair in Walther, 1903 whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) Nahecaris Jaekel, 1921 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation N. stuertzi Jaekel, 1921, with the endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the name Dilophaspis Traquair in Walther, 1903 whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms;
   (b) Dilophaspis Traquair in Walther, 1903 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation D. lata Traquair in Walther, 1903, with the endorsement that it is not to be given priority over the name Nahecaris Jaekel, 1921 whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms.

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) stuertzi Jaekel, 1921, as published in the binomen Nahecaris stuertzi (specific name of the type species of Nahecaris Jaekel, 1921);
   (b) lata Traquair in Walther, 1903, as published in the binomen Dilophaspis lata (specific name of the type species of Dilophaspis Traquair in Walther, 1903).

History of Case 3281

An application to conserve the generic name Nahecaris Jaekel, 1921 for a group of Lower Devonian phyllocarid crustaceans (order Archaeostraca) by giving it precedence over the older name Dilophaspis Traquair in Walther, 1903 whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms was received from Derek E.G. Briggs (Department of Geology and Geophysics, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520–8109, U.S.A.) and Christoph Bartels (Deutsches Bergbau-Museum, Am Bergbaumuseum 28, D-44791 Bochum, Germany) on 2 April 2003. After
correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 269–271 (December 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. Eight comments in support of this case were published in BZN 61: 109–110.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 270. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 20 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 1 Commissioner voted AGAINST, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Dilophaspis Traquair in Walther, 1903, Neues Jahrbuch für Mineralogie, Geologie und Paläontologie, 17: 30.

lata, Dilophaspis, Traquair in Walther, 1903, Neues Jahrbuch für Mineralogie, Geologie und Paläontologie, 17: 30-31.


OPINION 2110 (Case 3253)

Libellula aenea Linnaeus, 1758 (currently Cordulia aenea) and L. flavomaculata Vander Linden, 1825 (currently Somatochlora flavomaculata; Insecta, Odonata): usage of the specific names conserved by the replacement of the lectotype of L. aenea with a newly designated lectotype

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the current usage of the names of two dragonfly species, Libellula aenea Linnaeus, 1758 (currently Cordulia aenea) and L. flavomaculata Vander Linden, 1825 (currently Somatochlora flavomaculata), is conserved by the replacement of the lectotype of L. aenea with a newly designated lectotype. In 1956, Fraser had designated one of Linnaeus's specimens as the lectotype of L. aenea. However, the specimen he designated was the one used by Vander Linden to denote his species L. flavomaculata and this action made L. aenea a senior objective synonym of L. flavomaculata.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Insecta; Odonata; corduliidae; Cordulia aenea; Somatochlora flavomaculata; dragonflies.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that all type fixations for the nominal species Libellula aenea Linnaeus, 1758 are set aside and the female specimen no. 769 in the collection of the Linnean Society of London is designated as the lectotype.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) aenea Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen Libellula aenea and as defined by the lectotype designated in (1) above;
   (b) flavomaculata Vander Linden, 1825, as published in the binomen Libellula flavomaculata and as defined by specimen no. 768 in the collection of the Linnean Society of London.

History of Case 3253

An application to conserve the current usage of the names of two dragonfly species, Libellula aenea Linnaeus, 1758 (currently Cordulia aenea) and L. flavomaculata Vander Linden, 1825 (currently Somatochlora flavomaculata), by the replacement of the lectotype of L. aenea with a newly designated lectotype, was received from R. Jödicke (Am Liebfrauenbusch 3, Westerstede, Germany) and J. van Tol (National Museum of Natural History Naturalis, RA Leiden, The Netherlands) on 8 August 2002. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 272–274 (December 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. Two comments in support of this case were published in BZN 61: 42, 110.
Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 273–274. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 21 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, no Commissioners voted AGAINST, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:


OPINION 2111 (Case 3093)

NEMONYCHIDAE Bedel, November 1882 (Insecta, Coleoptera): given precedence over CIMBERIDAE Gozis, March 1882; and Cimberis Gozis, 1881: usage conserved

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the usage of the weevil (CURCULIONOIDEA) family name NEMONYCHIDAE Bedel, 1882 (November) is conserved by giving it precedence over the senior name CIMBERIDAE Gozis, 1882 (March) and also that the current usage of the generic name Cimberis Gozis, 1881 is conserved by validating Kuschel’s (1959) designation of Rhinomacer attelaboides Fabricius, 1787 as its type species.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; CURCULIONIDAE; NEMONYCHIDAE; CIMBERIDAE; Cimberis; Nemonyx; Rhinomacer attelaboides; Rhinomacer lepturoides.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that:
   (a) the name NEMONYCHIDAE Bedel, 1882 (November) and other family-group names based on Nemonyx Redtenbacher, 1845 are given precedence over CIMBERIDAE Gozis, 1882 (March) and other family-group names based on Cimberis Gozis, 1881 whenever their type genera are placed in the same family-group taxon;
   (b) all fixations of type species for the nominal genus Cimberis Gozis, 1881 before the designation by Kuschel (1959) of Rhinomacer attelaboides Fabricius, 1787 are set aside.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) Cimberis Gozis, 1881 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by Kuschel (1959) Rhinomacer attelaboides Fabricius, 1787;
   (b) Nemonyx Redtenbacher, 1845 (gender: masculine), type species by monotypic Rhinomacer lepturoides Fabricius, 1801.

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) attelaboides Fabricius, 1787, as published in the binomen Rhinomacer attelaboides (specific name of the type species of Cimberis Gozis, 1881);
   (b) lepturoides Fabricius, 1801, as published in the binomen Rhinomacer lepturoides (specific name of the type species of Nemonyx Redtenbacher, 1845).

(4) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:
   (a) CIMBERIDAE Gozis, 1882, type genus Cimberis Gozis, 1881, with the endorsement that it and other family-group names based on Cimberis are not to be given priority over NEMONYCHIDAE Bedel, 1882 and other
family-group names based on *Nemonyx* Redtenbacher, 1845 whenever their type genera are placed in the same family-group taxon;

(b) *Nemonychidae* Bedel, 1882, type genus *Nemonyx* Redtenbacher, 1845, with the endorsement that it and other family-group names based on *Nemonyx* are to be given precedence over *Cimberidae* Gozis, 1882 and other family-group names based on *Cimberis* Gozis, 1881 whenever their type genera are placed in the same family-group taxon.

(5) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index ofRejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Rhinomacer* Fabricius, 1781 (a junior homonym of *Rhinomacer* Geoffroy, 1762);

(b) *Neocimberis* O’Brien & Wibmer, 1982 (a nomen nudum).

(6) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology:

(a) *Rhinomacerides* Schoenherr, 1823 (based on a misidentified type genus);

(b) *Cimberidae* Gozis, 1882 (an incorrect original spelling of *Cimberididae*).

**History of Case 3093**

An application to conserve the usage of the weevil (*Curculionoidea*) family name *Nemonychidae* Bedel, 1882 (November) by giving it precedence over the senior name *Cimberidae* Gozis, 1882 (March), and also to conserve the current usage of the generic name *Cimberis* Gozis, 1881 by validating Kuschel’s (1959) designation of *Rhinomacer* attelaboides Fabricius, 1787 as its type species, was received from Christopher H.C. Lyal (*Department of Entomology, Natural History Museum, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*) and M.A. Alonso-Zarazaga (*Depto. de Biodiversidad y Biologia Evolutiva, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales (CSIC), E-28006 Madrid, Spain*) on 2 June 1998. After correspondence the case was published in *BZN* **60**: 275–280 (December 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. Four comments in support of the application were published in *BZN* **61**: 171, 256.

**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in *BZN* **60**: 278–279. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 19 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 1 Commissioner voted AGAINST, 1 Commissioner voted FOR Rulings 1(b), 2, 3, 5 and 6 and AGAINST Rulings 1(a) and 4, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

**Original references**

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

*Attelaboides, Rhinomacer, Fabricius, 1787, Mantissa insectorum sistens eorum species nuper detectus adiectis characteribus generiitis, differentiis specificis, emendationibus, observationibus*, vol. 1, p. 123.

*Cimberidae Gozis, 1882, Feuille des Jeunes Naturalistes, 12(137): 58.*


Nemonyx Redtenbacher, 1845, *Die Gattungen der deutschen Käfer-Fauna nach der analytischen Methode bearbeitet* . . ., p. 96.


Rhinomacer Fabricius, 1781, *Species insectorum exhibentes eorum differentias specificas, synonyma auctorum, loca natalia, metamorphosin adiectis observationibus, descriptionibus*, vol. 1, p. 199.


The following is the reference for the designation of *Rhinomacer attelaboides* Fabricius, 1787 as the type species of *Cimberis* Gozis, 1881:

OPINION 2112 (Case 3194)

Lius Deyrolle, 1865 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the name Lius Deyrolle, 1865 for a group of jewel beetles (family Buprestidae) is conserved by suppression of its unused senior primary homonym Lius Chevrolat, 1838.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Coleoptera; Buprestidae; Lius; Lius ignitus; buprestids; jewel beetles.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power the name Lius Chevrolat, 1838 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The name Lius Deyrolle, 1865 (gender: masculine), type species by subsequent designation by Cobos (1979) Brachys ignitus Gory & Laporte, 1840, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

(3) The name ignitus Gory & Laporte, 1840, as published in the binomen Brachys ignitus (specific name of the type species of Lius Deyrolle, 1865) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

(4) The name Lius Chevrolat, 1838, as suppressed in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3194

An application to conserve the generic name Lius Deyrolle, 1865 for a group of jewel beetles (family Buprestidae) by suppression of its unused senior primary homonym Lius Chevrolat, 1838 was received from C.L. Bellamy (Plant Pest Diagnostics Branch, California Department of Food & Agriculture, Sacramento, California 95832, U.S.A.) on 8 February 2001. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 132–134 (June 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. Four comments in support of the application were published in BZN 61: 45–46.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 133. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 20 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, no Commissioners voted AGAINST, 1 Commissioner ABSTAINED, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

Abstaining, Štys questioned whether Lius Deyrolle, 1865 might have been a misapplied name whose availability was questionable.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:


The following is the reference for the designation of *Brachys ignitus* Gory & Laporte, 1840 as the type species of *Lius* Deyrolle, 1865:

OPINION 2113 (Case 3256)

*Leptusa* Kraatz, 1856 and *Cyllopisalia* Pace, 1982 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved

**Abstract.** The Commission has ruled that the generic name *Leptusa* Kraatz, 1856 and the subgeneric name *Cyllopisalia* Pace, 1982 for a widespread group of rove beetles (family Staphylinidae) are conserved. Both names were threatened by limited usage of a senior synonym, *Sipalia* Mulsant & Rey, 1853, which has been suppressed.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Coleoptera; Staphylinidae; Aleocharinae; Leptusa; Cyllopisalia; Sipalia; Bolitochara pulchella; Cyllopisalia difformis; rove beetles.

---

**Ruling**

(1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that the generic name *Sipalia* Mulsant & Rey, 1853 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Leptusa* Kraatz, 1856 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Gusarov & Herman (2002), *Bolitochara pulchella* Mannerheim, 1830;

(b) *Cyllopisalia* Pace, 1982 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation of the replaced nominal genus *Parapisalia* Scheerpeltz, 1966, *Homalota difformis* Mulsant & Rey, 1853.

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *pulchella* Mannerheim, 1830, as published in the binomen *Bolitochara pulchella* (specific name of the type species of *Leptusa* Kraatz, 1856);

(b) *difformis* Mulsant & Rey, 1853, as published in the binomen *Homalota difformis* (specific name of the type species of *Cyllopisalia* Pace, 1982).

(4) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Sipalia* Mulsant & Rey, 1853, as suppressed in (1) above;

(b) *Parapisalia* Scheerpeltz, 1966 (a junior homonym of *Parapisalia* Scheerpeltz, 1948).

**History of Case 3256**

An application to conserve the generic name *Leptusa* Kraatz, 1856 and the subgeneric name *Cyllopisalia* Pace, 1982 for a widespread group of rove beetles (family Staphylinidae) by suppression of a senior synonym, *Sipalia* Mulsant & Rey, 1853, was by received from Vladimir I. Gusarov (Natural History Museum, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045-7523, U.S.A.) and Lee H. Herman (American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY 10024-5192, U.S.A.) on
26 September 2002. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 191–195 (September 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. No comments on this case were received.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 193. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 19 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 1 Commissioner voted AGAINST, 1 Commissioner ABSTAINED, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Cyllopisalia Pace, 1982, Bollettino della Società entomologica Italiana, 114: 40.

diiformis, Homalota, Mulsant & Rey, 1853, Annales de la Société Linnéenne de Lyon, (2)1: 33.


pulchella, Bolitochara, Mannerheim, 1830, Précis d’un nouvel arrangement de la famille des Brachélytres, de l’ordre des Insectes Coléoptères, p. 83.

Sipalia Mulsant & Rey, 1853, Annales de la Société Linnéenne de Lyon, (2)1: 32.

The following is the reference for the designation of Bolitochara pulchella Mannerheim, 1830 as the type species of the nominal genus Leptusa Kraatz, 1856:

OPINION 2114 (Case 3257)

*Acmaeodera philippinensis* Obenberger, 1924 and *Polycesta aruensis* Obenberger, 1924 (Insecta, Coleoptera): priority maintained over *Acmaeodera oaxacae* Fisher, 1949 and *Polycesta deserticola* Barr, 1974 respectively

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that priority is maintained for the specific names of two species of jewel beetle (family Buprestidae), *Acmaeodera philippinensis* Obenberger, 1924 and *Polycesta aruensis* Obenberger, 1924, whenever they are considered to be synonyms of *Acmaeodera oaxacae* Fisher, 1949 and *Polycesta deserticola* Barr, 1974 respectively.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Coleoptera; Buprestidae; *Acmaeodera philippinensis*; *Polycesta aruensis*; *Acmaeodera oaxacae*; *Polycesta deserticola*; jewel beetles.

Ruling

(1) It is hereby ruled that:

(a) the name *philippinensis* Obenberger, 1924, as published in the binomen *Acmaeodera philippinensis*, retains priority over the name *oaxacae* Fisher, 1949, as published in the binomen *Acmaeodera oaxacae*, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms;

(b) the name *aruensis* Obenberger, 1924, as published in the binomen *Polycesta aruensis*, retains priority over the name *deserticola* Barr, 1974, as published in the binomen *Polycesta deserticola*, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *philippinensis* Obenberger, 1924, as published in the binomen *Acmaeodera philippinensis*;

(b) *aruensis* Obenberger, 1924, as published in the binomen *Polycesta aruensis*.

History of Case 3257

An application to conserve the specific names *Acmaeodera oaxacae* Fisher, 1949 and *Polycesta deserticola* Barr, 1974 for two species of jewel beetle (family Buprestidae) by giving them conditional precedence over their respective senior synonyms, *Acmaeodera philippinensis* Obenberger, 1924 and *Polycesta aruensis* Obenberger, 1924, was received from C.L. Bellamy (Plant Pest Diagnostics Lab., California Department of Food & Agriculture, Sacramento, California 95832, U.S.A.) and R.L. Westcott (Plant Division, Oregon Department of Agriculture, Salem, Oregon 97310, U.S.A.) on 27 September 2002. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 124–126 (June 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. Three comments opposing and one comment in support of the application were published in BZN 61: 46.
Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 125–126. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 2 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 18 Commissioners voted AGAINST, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no votes were received from Böhme and Martins de Souza.

Voting against, some Commissioners noted that inappropriate specific names or inaccurate locality details did not justify a reversal of precedence.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

OPINION 2115 (Case 3272)

Microsaurus Dejean, 1833 (Insecta, Coleoptera): usage conserved by designation of Staphylinus ochripennis Ménétriés, 1832 as the type species

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the current usage of the generic name Microsaurus Dejean, 1833 for a group of rove beetles (family Staphylinidae) is conserved by designating Staphylinus ochripennis Ménétriés, 1832 as the type species of Microsaurus in place of Staphylinus lateralis Gravenhorst, 1802.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Coleoptera; staphylinidae; Microsaurus; Microsaurus ochripennis; rove beetles; Holarctic; Palaearctic.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that all fixations of type species for the nominal genus Microsaurus Dejean, 1833 are set aside and Staphylinus ochripennis Ménétriés, 1832 is designated as the type species.

(2) The name Microsaurus Dejean, 1833 (gender: masculine), type species Staphylinus ochripennis Ménétriés, 1832 as ruled in (1) above is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

(3) The name ochripennis Ménétriés, 1832, as published in the binomen Staphylinus ochripennis (specific name of the type species of Microsaurus Dejean, 1833) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3272

An application to conserve the current usage of the generic name Microsaurus Dejean, 1833 for a group of rove beetles (family Staphylinidae) by designating Staphylinus ochripennis Ménétriés, 1832 as the type species of Microsaurus in place of Staphylinus lateralis Gravenhorst, 1802 was received from Ales Smetana (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Ottawa, ON K1A 0C6, Canada) on 24 February 2003. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 281–283 (December 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. No comments on this case were received.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 282. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 17 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 4 Commissioners voted AGAINST, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
Microsaurus Dejean, 1833, Catalogue des Coléoptères de la collection de M. le Comte Dejean, p. 61.

ochripennis, Staphylinus, Ménétriés, 1832, Catalogue raisonné des objets de zoologie recueillis dans un voyage au Caucase . . ., p. 145.
OPINION 2116 (Case 3279)

Curculio picipes Marsham, 1802 (currently Procas picipes; Insecta, Coleoptera): specific name conserved

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the specific name of Curculio picipes Marsham, 1802 (currently Procas picipes) for a widely distributed Palaearctic weevil (family Erirhinidae) is not invalid by reason of being a junior primary homonym of Curculio picipes Fabricius, 1777. The two nominal species have not been considered congeneric since the early 1800s and are currently placed in different families.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Coleoptera; Curculionoidea; Procas; Procas picipes; weevils; Palaearctic.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that the name picipes Marsham, 1802, as published in the binomen Curculio picipes, is not invalid by reason of being a junior primary homonym of Curculio picipes Fabricius, 1777.

(2) The name Procas Stephens, 1831 (gender: masculine), type species by subsequent designation by Westwood (1838) Curculio picipes Marsham, 1802, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

(3) The name picipes Marsham, 1802, as published in the binomen Curculio picipes (type species of Procas Stephens, 1831) and ruled in (1) above to be not invalid by reason of being a junior primary homonym of Curculio picipes Fabricius, 1777 is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3279

An application to conserve the specific name Curculio picipes Marsham, 1802 (currently Procas picipes) for a widely distributed Palaearctic weevil (family Erirhinidae) was received from R.T. Thompson (Department of Entomology, Natural History Museum, London SW7 5BD, U.K.) on 1 April 2003. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 196–197 (September 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. No comments on this case were received.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 197. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 20 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 1 Commissioner voted AGAINST, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme. Voting against, Halliday considered that the proposed action was unnecessary since the situation did not cause instability or confusion.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

The following is the reference for the designation of *Curculio picipes* Marsham, 1802 as the type species of the nominal genus *Procas* Stephens, 1831:

OPINION 2117 (Case 3269)

Rhamphomyia (Rhamphomyia) Meigen, 1822 and Rhamphomyia (Pararhamphomyia) Frey, 1922 (Insecta, Diptera): usage of the subgeneric names conserved by the designation of Empis sulcata Meigen, 1804 as the type species of Rhamphomyia

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the current usage of the subgeneric names Rhamphomyia (Rhamphomyia) Meigen, 1822 and Rhamphomyia (Pararhamphomyia) Frey, 1922 for groups of dance-flies (family Empididae) is conserved by designating Empis sulcata Meigen, 1804 as the type species of Rhamphomyia (Rhamphomyia) Meigen, 1822. In 1834 Curtis invalidly designated Empis sulcata Meigen, 1804 as the type species and all subsequent authors have accepted this designation. Acceptance of the valid type species designation by Guérin in 1828 of Empis marginata Fabricius, 1787 would destabilise the current usage of these subgeneric names and the names of over 200 species currently included in these groups.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Diptera; Empididae; Rhamphomyia; Rhamphomyia (Rhamphomyia) marginata; Rhamphomyia (Pararhamphomyia) geniculata; dance-flies.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that all fixations of types species for the nominal genus Rhamphomyia Meigen, 1822 before the designation by Curtis (1834) of Empis sulcata Meigen, 1804 are set aside.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) Rhamphomyia Meigen, 1822 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by Curtis (1834) as ruled in (1) above Empis sulcata Meigen, 1804;

(b) Pararhamphomyia Frey, 1922 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation Empis plumipes Fallén, 1816 (a misidentification of Rhamphomyia geniculata Meigen, 1830, fixed as the type species by Barták & Sinclair (2003)).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) sulcata Meigen, 1804, as published in the binomen Empis sulcata (specific name of the type species of Rhamphomyia Meigen, 1822);

(b) geniculata Meigen, 1830, as published in the binomen Rhamphomyia geniculata (specific name of the type species of Pararhamphomyia Frey, 1922).

History of Case 3269

An application to conserve the current usage of the subgeneric names Rhamphomyia (Rhamphomyia) Meigen, 1822 and Rhamphomyia (Pararhamphomyia) Frey,
1922 for two groups of dance-flies (family Empididae) by designating Empis sulcata Meigen, 1804 as the type species of Rhamphomyia (Rhamphomyia) Meigen, 1822 was received from M. Barták (Czech University of Agriculture, 165 21 Praha 6, Czech Republic) and B.J. Sinclair (Zoologisches Forschungsinstitut und Museum Alexander Koenig, 53113 Bonn, Germany) on 6 February 2003. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 203–205 (September 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. No comments on this case were received.

Decision of the Commission
On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 204. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 21 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, no Commissioners voted AGAINST, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

Original references
The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Rhamphomyia Meigen, 1822, Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten europäischen zweiflügeligen Insekten, part 3, p. 42.

Pararhamphomyia Frey, 1922, Notulae Entomologicae, 2: 3.

sulcata, Empis, Meigen, 1804, Klassifikation und Beschreibung der europäischen zweiflüglichen Insekten (Diptera Linn.), Abt. 2, p. 229.

geniculata, Rhamphomyia, Meigen, 1830, Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten europäischen zweiflügeligen Insekten, part 3, p. 340.

The following is the reference for the designation of Empis sulcata Meigen, 1804 as the type species of the nominal genus Rhamphomyia Meigen, 1822:


The following is the reference for the designation of Rhamphomyia geniculata Meigen, 1830 as the type species of the nominal genus Pararhamphomyia Frey, 1922:

OPINION 2119 (Case 3277)

Chitra chitra Nutaphand, 1986 (Reptilia, Testudines): specific name given precedence over Chitra selenkae Jaekel, 1911

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the specific name of Chitra chitra Nutaphand, 1986 for the Narrow-headed Softshell turtle (Testudines; family Trionychidae) found in Thailand, Malaysia and on the islands of Sumatra and Java, Indonesia, is conserved by giving it precedence over the palaeontological name Chitra selenkae Jaekel, 1911, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.
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Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that the name chitra Nutaphand, 1986, as published in the binomen Chitra chitra, is given precedence over the name selenkae Jaekel, 1911, as published in the binomen Chitra selenkae, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) chitra Nutaphand, 1986, as published in the binomen Chitra chitra, with the endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the name selenkae Jaekel, 1911, as published in the binomen Chitra selenkae, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms;

(b) selenkae Jaekel, 1911, as published in the binomen Chitra selenkae, with the endorsement that it is not to be given priority over chitra Nutaphand, 1986, as published in the binomen Chitra chitra, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.

History of Case 3277

An application to conserve the widely used name Chitra chitra Nutaphand, 1986 for the Narrow-headed Softshell turtle (Testudines; family Trionychidae) by giving it precedence over the name Chitra selenkae Jaekel, 1911, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms, was received from William P. McCord (East Fishkill Animal Hospital, 455 Rte 82, New York, N.Y. 12533, U.S.A.) and Peter C.H. Pritchard (Chelonian Research Institute, 401 South Central Avenue, Oviedo, Florida 32765, U.S.A.) on 25 January 2003. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 208–210 (September 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. No comments on this case were received.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 209. At the close of the voting period on 1 March
2005 the votes were as follows: 18 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 3 Commissioners voted AGAINST, Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

**Original references**

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:


OPINION 2120 (Case 3240)

_Vespertilio nanus_ Peters, 1852 (currently _Pipistrellus nanus_; Mammalia, Chiroptera): specific name given precedence over _Vespertilio pipistrellus africanus_ Rüppell, 1842

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the specific name of _Pipistrellus nanus_ (Peters, 1852) for the African Banana bat (family VESPERTILIONIDAE) is conserved by giving it precedence over the senior subjective synonym _Pipistrellus africanus_ (Rüppell, 1842).

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Chiroptera; vespertilionidae; _Pipistrellus nanus_; _Pipistrellus africanus_; Banana bat; Africa.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that the name _nanus_ Peters, 1852, as published in the binomen _Vespertilio nanus_, is given precedence over the name _africanus_ Rüppell, 1842, as published in the trinomen _Vespertilio pipistrellus africanus_, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) _nanus_ Peters, 1852, as published in the binomen _Vespertilio nanus_, with the endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the name _africanus_ Rüppell, 1842, as published in the trinomen _Vespertilio pipistrellus africanus_, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms;

(b) _africanus_ Rüppell, 1842, as published in the trinomen _Vespertilio pipistrellus africanus_, with the endorsement that it is not to be given priority over the name _nanus_ Peters, 1852, as published in the binomen _Vespertilio nanus_, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.

History of Case 3240

An application to conserve the name _Vespertilio nanus_ Peters, 1852 by suppression of the senior synonym _Vespertilio pipistrellus africanus_ Rüppell, 1842 was received from Meredith Happold (School of Botany and Zoology, Australian National University, Canberra, A.C.T. 0200, Australia) on 11 March 2002. After correspondence the case was published in _BZN_ 60: 42-44 (March 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. Two comments opposing the application were published in _BZN_ 61: 48, 314-315. The second comment, by V. Van Cakenberghe, put forward an alternative proposal to give _V. nanus_ precedence over _V. pipistrellus africanus_ rather than to suppress the latter name. Dr Happold welcomed this proposal.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the alternative proposals published in _BZN_ 61: 315. At the close of the voting period on
1 March 2005 the votes were as follows: 16 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 4 Commissioners voted AGAINST, 1 Commissioner ABSTAINED. Evenhuis, Kerzhner and Ng were on leave of absence; no vote was received from Böhme.

Voting against, Bouchet said that the problem was essentially a taxonomic one which should be left to taxonomists to solve and that priority should apply when the two names were considered to be synonyms.

**Original references**

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:


Proposed conservation of the specific names *Melania curvicostata* Reeve, 1861 and *Goniobasis paupercula* Lea, 1862 (currently *Elimia curvicostata* and *E. paupercula*) (Mollusca, Gastropoda, PLEUROERIDAE): case closed
(Case 3232; see BZN 60: 109–112, 300–302; 61: 106–108)

1. Fred G. Thompson (*Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, U.S.A.*) and Elizabeth E. Mihalcik (*Bainbridge College, Bainbridge, Georgia 31317, U.S.A.*) submitted a proposal to conserve a specific name in prevailing use, *Melania curvicostata* Reeve, 1861, by designating a neotype. This action was regarded as necessary because the syntypes in the Natural History Museum, London, attributed to this taxon represent a different species, *Goniobasis paupercula* Lea, 1862.

2. Dietrich Kadolsky (BZN 60: 302; 61: 106–108) noted the existence of the name *Melania curvicostata* Melleville, 1843 (p. 94, pl. 4, figs. 10–12), which predates Reeve’s name. The name *Melania curvicostata* Reeve, 1861 is therefore a junior primary homonym and is not available under Articles 23.4, 57.2 and 60 of the Code.

3. The next oldest available name *Melania densicostata* Reeve, 1861 has been considered a junior subjective synonym of *Elimia curvicostata* since Tryon (1864). The species was described from ‘Florida, USA’. Reeve’s description is lacking diagnostic features essential for identifying this taxon (see Mihalcik & Thompson, 2002; BZN 60: 109–112). The extant syntypes attributed to this species in the Natural History Museum, London, bear no resemblance to Reeve’s figure nor does any known population have the densely costate sculpture depicted in Reeve’s figure. The name *Melania densicostata* is a nomen dubium because of the lack of essential identifying characters in Reeve’s description and illustration and also a nomen oblitum because it has not been used since Tryon (1864) except as a synonym of *Elimia curvicostata* (Article 23.9.1.1).

4. *Goniobasis doolyensis* Lea, 1862 had been used as the valid name for a species until Hannibal (1912) placed it without discussion in synonymy with *Ambloxis virginicus* (= *Elimia virginica* (Gmelin, 1791)). Goodrich (1942), also without discussion, included the name *Goniobasis doolyensis* in the synonymy of *Goniobasis curvicostata* (= *Elimia curvicostata* (Reeve, 1861)). This action was followed by Clench & Turner (1956) and Chambers (1990). Chambers designated and figured the lectotype (United States National Museum 119121). Mihalcik & Thompson (2002) published a figure of the lectotype and discussed salient features that identified it as being the species hitherto known as *Elimia curvicostata*. The name *Goniobasis doolyensis* is an available name with an identifiable primary type. Extant populations of the freshwater snail species hitherto known as *Elimia curvicostata* may be clearly identified as belonging to the same taxon. It is the oldest available name for the species known until now as *Elimia curvicostata* (Reeve, 1861) (Article 23.12.2) and, therefore, the name *Elimia doolyensis* (Lea, 1862) is adopted as the valid name for this taxon.

5. This case is now closed.
Additional references


Proposed conservation of the specific name of *Nicrophorus tomentosus* Weber, 1801 (Insecta, Coleoptera): case closed
(Case 3288; see BZN 61: 92–94)

1. D.S. Sikes (Department of Biological Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4) and S.T. Trumbo (Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Connecticut, Connecticut 06269, U.S.A.) submitted a proposal to conserve the specific name *Nicrophorus tomentosus* Weber, 1801 for a Nearctic species of burying beetle (family Silphidae) by suppressing its presumed senior, but less frequently used, synonym *N. velutinus* Fabricius, 1801. The authors were unable to establish the exact dates of publication of Weber (1801) and Fabricius (1801).

2. Commissioner Kerzhner has pointed out that Weber’s work was published before March, 1801 (see Evenhuis, N.L., 1997, *Litteratura taxonomica Dipterorum 1758–1930*, p. 809), whereas the Preface to Fabricius’s work is dated April 1801.

3. Since *Nicrophorus tomentosus* Weber, 1801 is shown to be senior to *N. velutinus* Fabricius, 1801, the problem is resolved. The case is now closed.
OPINION 2110 (Case 3253). Libellula aenea Linnaeus, 1758 (currently Cordulia aenea) and L. flavomaculata Vander Linden, 1825 (currently Somatochlopa flavomaculata; Insecta, Odonata): usage of the specific names conserved by the replacement of the lectotype of L. aenea with a newly designated lectotype.


OPINION 2112 (Case 3194). Lius Deyrolle, 1865 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved.

OPINION 2113 (Case 3256). Leptusa Kraatz, 1856 and Cyllopisalia Pace, 1982 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved.


OPINION 2115 (Case 3272). Microsaurus Dejean, 1833 (Insecta, Coleoptera): usage conserved by designation of Staphylinus ochripennis Menetries, 1832 as the type species.

OPINION 2116 (Case 3279). Curculio picipes Marsham, 1802 (currently Procas picipes; Insecta, Coleoptera): specific name conserved.

OPINION 2117 (Case 3269). Rhamphomyia (Rhamphomyia) Meigen, 1822 and Rhamphomyia (Pararhamphomyia) Frey, 1922 (Insecta, Diptera): usage of the subgeneric names conserved by the designation of Empis sulcata Meigen, 1804 as the type species of Rhamphomyia.

OPINION 2118 (Case 3225). Phymaturus Gravenhorst, 1837 and Lacerta palluma Molina, 1782 (currently Phymaturus palluma; Reptilia, Sauria): usage of the names conserved by the designation of a neotype for Lacerta palluma Molina, 1782.

OPINION 2119 (Case 3277). Chitra chitra Nutaphand, 1986 (Reptilia, Testudines): specific name given precedence over Chitra selenkae Jaekel, 1911.

OPINION 2120 (Case 3240). Vespertilio namus Peters, 1852 (currently Pipistrellus namus; Mammalia, Chiroptera): specific name given precedence over Vespertilio pipistrellus africanus Rüppell, 1842.

Closed cases

Proposed conservation of the specific names Melania curvicostata Reeve, 1861 and Goniobasis paupercula Lea, 1862 (currently Elimia curvicostata and E. paupercula) (Mollusca, Gastropoda, Pleuroceridae): case closed.

Proposed conservation of the specific name of Nicrophorus tomentosus Weber, 1801 (Insecta, Coleoptera): case closed.
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