Comments on the proposed conservation of Araneidae Clerck, 1758, Araneus Clerck, 1758 and Tegenaria Latreille, 1804 (Arachnida, Araneae)
(Case 3371: see BZN 64: 15–18)

(1) Peter Jäger
Sektion Arachnologie, Forschungsinstitut und Naturmuseum Senckenberg.
Senckenberganlage 25, D-60325 Frankfurt, Germany
(e-mail: Peter.Jaeger@Senckenberg.de)

I fully agree with the statements and proposals made in this application. I support the proposal, as the generic names Araneus and Tegenaria are very widely used and any other ruling would cause terrible and unnecessary confusion. Moreover, the solution proposed fully conforms to the presumed intentions of the original authors.

(2) O. Kraus
Zoological Institute & Zoological Museum, University of Hamburg,
Martin-Luther-King-Platz 3, D-20146 Hamburg, Germany
(e-mail: Otto.Kraus@zoologie.uni-hamburg.de)

I strongly support N.J. Kluge's application. This is in conformity with current usage. His proposals will prevent further useless digging in old works.

(3) Herbert W. Levi
Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, 26 Oxford Street,
Cambridge, MA 02138–2902, U.S.A. (e-mail: levi@fas.harvard.edu)

Forty years ago I was unsuccessful finding a designated type species for the genus Aranea and designated A. diademata L. as type (Levi. 1971, p. 133). It was overlooked by Kluge (Kluge, personal communication). I think this type designation solves the hypothetical problem presented by Kluge (Case 3371). There is no objection to having similar generic names Aranea and Araneus, Aranea now a synonym of Araneus. The type species of both genera are much alike. Problems of hypothetical family names based on similar generic names have been solved in the past.

Latreille's type designation (and I have not checked on this), forgotten for 200 years, could be annulled, but both the Preamble of the Code and General Recommendations of the Code stress stability of Nomenclature, not searching for obsolete names, making the use of this old type designation unlikely. I do not think that there is a nomenclatural problem.

Additional reference

(4) Nikita J. Kluge

Department of Entomology, St. Petersburg State University, 195213 St. Petersburg, Russia (e-mail: kluge@FK13889.spb.edu)

The type designation made by Levi (1971) is invalid, because it ignores the earlier type designation made by Latreille (1810). Levi (1971) suggested that Aranea diadema be designated as the type species of Aranea Linnaeus, 1758 and Araneus angulatus is confirmed as the type species of Araneus Clerk, 1758. If this approach was followed, Aranea would become an older objective synonym of Epeira Walckenaer, 1805 and a junior subjective synonym of Araneus Clerk, 1758. The purpose of this action is unclear, as both species are considered to belong to the same genus. If in the future the recently accepted large genus Araneus is subdivided into smaller genera in such a manner that the species presently identified as Araneus angulatus and Araneus diadema will fall into different genera, these genera will get the hardly distinguishable names Araneus and Aranea respectively, instead of the distinct names Araneus and Epeira. If these taxa are elevated to the family-group rank, their names will become identical, and a new ruling by Commission will be necessary. The suggestion made by Levi (1971) does not clarify the situation with the recently used family name Araneidae Latreille, 1806. When the family-group name Araneidae was established, its type genus Aranea was interpreted as being based on Aranea domestica (which was subsequently designated as the type species by Latreille (1810)). This interpretation of Aranea is different from that based on the type species proposed by Levi (1971).

Comment on the proposed conservation of Termes serratus Froggatt, 1898 (currently Microcerotermes serratus) and Termes serrula Desneux, 1904 (currently Microcerotermes serrula) (Insecta, Isoptera, Termitinae)

(Case 3385; see BZN 64: 83–86, 185–187)

David T. Jones

Department of Entomology, Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e-mail: dtj@nhm.ac.uk)

The specific name Microcerotermes serratus (Froggatt, 1898) has been used since its publication to refer to an Australian termite, while the specific name M. serrula (Desneux, 1904) has been used since its publication to refer to a species from Southeast Asia. Because both names are invalid, Roisin & Pasteels (2000, p. 165) recommended the strict application of the Code to correct these names, which would necessitate the Southeast Asian species being called M. serrata (Haviland, 1898), and the Australian species being called M. parviceps Mjöberg, 1920. Roisin & Pasteels (BZN 64: 186) are correct in their assumption that I overlooked this recommendation (Roisin & Pasteels, 2000, p. 165), with the result that I continued to follow the prevailing trend and used the junior names. In 2006, on reading their correction, I applied for the conservation of both junior names (Case 3385; BZN 64: 83–86), an application that Roisin & Pasteels wish the Commission to reject (BZN 64: 185–187).

My application cannot be described as ‘nomenclatural anarchy’ (Roisin & Pasteels, BZN 64: 187), as an application to the Commission asking for their ruling on this matter is the official method for resolving such disagreements over nomenclature.
I have found six additional publications (Gay, 1952, p. 127; Gay, 1956, p. 211; Ferrar & Watson, 1970, p. 101; Grassé, 1982, p. 614; Grassé, 1984, p. 243; Watson & Gay, 1991, p. 346) using the name *M. serratus* (Froggatt, 1898). This brings the number of publications citing this name in the fifty years immediately preceding Roisin & Pasteels's (2000) correction to 13. These 13 publications have more than five different authors, and thus the criteria for conserving this name (Article 79(c) of the 3rd edition of the Code, which was still current when Roisin & Pasteels submitted their correction for publication) would have been met. I have also found five additional publications (Tho, 1982, p. 185; Collins, 1984, p. 70; Chey, 1989, p. 101; Ahmad & Akhtar, 2002, p. 58; Houseman, 2004, p. 237) using the name *M. serrula* (Desneux, 1904), bringing the number of publications citing this name during the same period to seven.

Roisin & Pasteels (BZN 64: 185–187) disagree with my assertions that these two junior names are now 'widely accepted and extensively used' and 'well known' (BZN 64: 84–85). While I acknowledge that the number of publications using these names is relatively low, I would argue that my assertions are justified within the context of termite research for the following reasons:

1. These names have been accepted and used by everyone who has published anything on these species, including all the recognised termite experts (Silvestri, Mjöberg, Hill, Gay, Watson, Miller, Grassé, Ahmad, Tho and Thapa) who have published on the Australian or Southeast Asian fauna. The only exceptions are Holmgren (1911), who subsequently adopted the use of the junior name in 1913, and Roisin & Pasteels (2000).

2. The junior name *M. serratus* (Froggatt, 1898) has been used in every major publication on the termite fauna of Australia: *Termites (Isoptera) from the Australian region* (Hill, 1942), *Termites of the Australian region* (Gay & Calaby, 1970), *The insects of Australia* (Watson & Gay, 1991), *Atlas of Australia termites* (Watson & Abbey, 1993) and the *Zooological catalogue of Australia* (Watson et al., 1998). In regard to the Southeast Asian fauna, there are only two major publications available, *Termites of Peninsular Malaysia* (Tho, 1992) and *Termites of Sabah* (Thapa, 1981), and both of these use the junior name *M. serrula* (Desneux, 1904).

3. Those of us who work on the termites of Southeast Asia or Australia are familiar with these widespread species because they are well documented in the literature as part of their respective regional fauna, and in the case of *M. serrula* (Desneux, 1904) because it is often abundant on the forest floor and easily recognized due to the relatively short, stout mandibles of the soldiers.

Roisin & Pasteels's desire to reject the application and to revert to the valid names ignores a huge potential cause of confusion. Everyone who studies either the Southeast Asian or the Australian fauna relies on the major publications listed above, all of which use the junior names. Also, any new researchers starting in either region will immediately turn to those same obvious sources for an authoritative view of the fauna. They might not consult a paper from an adjoining region entitled 'The genus Microcerotermes (Isoptera: Termitidae) in New Guinea and the Solomon Islands', and thus Roisin & Pasteels's (2000) correction would go unnoticed. Reverting to the correct names would render all those major publications inaccurate. However, those publications will continue to be consulted, with the likely result that the junior names will continue to be used and published.
To reject the application and revert to the correct names may satisfy the letter of the Code but it would: (1) require overturning the prevailing usage of the junior names, (2) leave all the major publications from both regions with a nomenclatural inaccuracy, which is likely to be perpetuated in the future literature, and (3) cause confusion over species distributions because of the switching of the binomen *Microcerotermes serratus* from an Australian species to a Southeast Asian species. A ruling to conserve the junior names would cause no such problems but instead would legitimise the use of the currently accepted names, protect the accuracy of the major regional publications, and ensure nomenclatural stability.

Additional references


Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific names *Hemerobius elegans* Stephens, 1836 (currently *Sphororbus elegans*) and *Hemerobius elegans* Guérin-Méneville, 1844 (currently *Vieira elegans*) (Insecta, Neuroptera) (Case 3392; see BZN 64: 174–177)

Catherine A. Tauber

Department of Entomology, Comstock Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853–2601, U.S.A. (e-mail: cat6@cornell.edu)

I strongly support John Oswald’s application to conserve the specific names *Hemerobius elegans* Stephens, 1836 and *Hemerobius elegans* Guérin-Méneville, 1844 for two species of lacewings in separate, well-recognized families. The duplication of names has not led to any confusion for over 150 years, and there is not even a remote likelihood that it would do so in the future. In contrast, suppression of the junior homonym would require additional name changes in a small genus that has already undergone several recent alterations. For stability and simplicity, I urge the
Comments on the proposed conservation of the ichnogenus *Coprinisphaera* Sauer, 1955 ([Ichnotaxa, Insecta, Coleoptera, COPRINISPHERIDAE](#))
(Case 3360; see BZN 63: 243–246)

(1) Frank-Thorsten Krell

*Department of Zoology, Denver Museum of Nature & Science, 2001 Colorado Boulevard, Denver, CO 80205–5798, U.S.A.*
(e-mail: Frank.Krell@dmns.org)


The senior subjective synonym *Fontanai* Roselli is still in use (Buatois & Mángano 2007, 288; MacEachern et al. 2007, 58), but these authors did not consider its synonymy with *Coprinisphaera* proposed by González et al. (1998) and Laza (2006). Both names were mentioned as valid ichnogenera. *Fontanai* has never been used as a valid senior synonym of *Coprinisphaera*.

Dealing with non-organic entities without tokogenetic or phylogenetic relationships and poor in characters, ichnotaxonomy is notoriously difficult and subjective. It is current understanding by many ichnologists that ‘producer-based criteria, as such [...] may not be considered relevant for ichnotaxonomy, because the assignment
generally is too ambiguous’ (Bertling et al., 2006). Ichnotaxonomy is at a stage of structural typology. With increasing ichnotaxonomical knowledge and new finds the assignment of traces to trace-makers might become more reliable and eventually an accepted ichnotaxonomical criterion. Currently I consider it rash to suppress a subjective senior synonym in ichnology because it might represent a distinct ichnotaxon in a future refined ichnotaxonomy. Therefore I suggest the modification of the application by Genise et al. (BZN 63: 244) and ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary power to give the name Coprinisphaera Sauer, 1955 precedence over the name Fontanai Roselli, 1939, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name Coprinisphaera Sauer, 1955 (gender: feminine), with the endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the name Fontanai Roselli, 1939 whenever the two are considered to be synonyms, type ichnospecies by monotypy Coprinisphaera ecuadoriensis Sauer, 1955;

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name ecuadoriensis Sauer, 1955, as published in the binomen Coprinisphaera ecuadoriensis (specific name of the type ichnospecies of Coprinisphaera Sauer, 1955).

I do not ask for Fontanai Roselli to be placed on the Official List because it should currently not be used as a valid genus-group name. Names that should not be used as valid should not be on the Official List. Putting Fontanaiichnus Roselli, 1976 (junior objective synonym of Fontanai Roselli, 1939) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology as asked for by Genise et al. in (4)(b) (BZN 63: 244) is appropriate but unnecessary because it is a junior objective synonym anyway.

Additional references


(2) J.F. Genise

Conicet, *Museo Paleontológico Egidio Feruglio*, Av. Fontana 140, 9100 Trelew, Chubut, Argentina (e-mail: jgenise@mef.org.ar)

J.H. Laza

Conicet, *Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales*, Av. Angel Gallardo 470, 1405 Buenos Aires, Argentina (e-mail: pepela@macn.gov.ar)

A.K. Rindsberg

*Department of Biological & Environmental Sciences, Station 7, University of West Alabama, Livingston, Alabama 35470, U.S.A.* (e-mail: arindsberg@uwa.edu)

We support the reversal of precedence of *Coprinisphaera* Sauer 1955 over *Fontanai* Roselli 1939 as proposed by Krell, instead of the conservation of the ichnogeneric name *Coprinisphaera* Sauer, 1955 by suppressing the senior synonym *Fontanai* Roselli, 1939 as proposed by Genise et al. (BZN 63: 243–246), thus avoiding the suppression of a name that might represent a distinct ichnotaxon in a future refined ichnotaxonomy.
Comments on the proposed conservation of the usage of the generic name of
Drosophila Fallén, 1823 (Insecta, Diptera)
(Case 3407; see BZN 64: 238–242)

Corrigendum

Please note that the correct date for Fallén’s establishment of the name Drosophila
is 1823, rather than 1832, as stated in the title and the abstract of the application

(1) Andrew Polaszek
Department of Entomology, Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road,
London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e.mail: a.polaszek@nhm.ac.uk)

The case to conserve the usage of the name Drosophila Fallén, 1832 over
Sophophora Sturtevant, 1939, for Drosophila melanogaster, is probably the most
important ever to have been submitted for a ruling by the Commission in its 113-year
history. Drosophila melanogaster, commonly referred to (especially by non-
taxonomists) as simply ‘Drosophila’, is the most widely studied animal, apart,
possibly, from Homo sapiens, in human history. At the time of writing, ‘Google’
searches result in the following numbers of ‘hits’: Drosophila: 6,700,000; Drosophila
melanogaster: 3,640,000; Sophophora: 19,000. Thus the number of hits for Drosophila
exceeds that for Sophophora by more than 350 times. This comparison illustrates,
very simply, the current global comparative usage of the two names.

It seems likely that were the Commission not to vote in support of the conservation
of Drosophila, such action would lead not only to unprecedented nomenclatural
instability, but also to a widespread lack of confidence in both the actions and the
purpose of the Commission itself. While being far from perfect, the present code
continues to provide stability, and is adhered to by almost the entire community of
zoological taxonomists, while providing opportunities for dealing effectively with
exceptional cases. Drosophila is just such an exception, and possibly the greatest test
of the Commission’s role and effectiveness since its formation in 1895.

(2) Amir Yassin
Département Systématique et Evolution, Muséum National d’Histoire
Naturelle (MNHN), 18 rue Buffon, 75005 Paris, France
(e-mail: yassin@legs.cnrs-gif.fr)

The authors showed the invalidity of the early type designation of Drosophila:
Musca cellaris Linnaeus, 1758 (p. 597) by Curtis, 1833 (p. 473) of which the
systematic status has never been clarified (and thus invalid); and Musca funebris
Fabricius, 1787 (p. 345) by Macquart, 1835 (p. 549) at the same time placed
in synonymy with M. cellaris Linnaeus, 1758 (thus equally invalid). However,
Zetterstedt’s (1847, p. 2542) designation of M. funebris Fabricius, 1787 has been
accepted by most subsequent taxonomists according to the Principle of the
First Reviser (Article 24.2 of the Code – Determination by the First Reviser).
Furthermore, M. funebris Fabricius, 1787 was transferred to Drosophila by the
author of the genus *Drosophila* Fallén, 1823 (p. 5), whereas *Drosophila melanogaster* Meigen, 1830 (p. 85) was described later. This can be taken as an additional taxonomic argument in favor of the preservation of *Musca funebris* Fabricius, 1787 as the type of the genus *Drosophila* Fallén than for *D. melanogaster* Meigen, 1830 (Article 23.1 of the Code—Statement of the Principle of Priority).

*Drosophila* is the nominotypical genus of the family DROSOPHILIDAE, and any change of the type designation of the genus would inevitably entail dramatic nomenclatural changes in the whole family (Article 36.2 of the Code – Type Genus). Although authors have attempted to make such changes on the basis of molecular phylogenetic studies, it is hard to think that a single application can resolve all nomenclatural problems in a group as large as the genus *Drosophila* (~1,500 spp.) of which molecular phylogenies are scarcely congruent (Ashburner et al., 2005). If the authors' propositions of the new generic names formed after the splitting of the current paraphyletic genus *Drosophila* were accepted, three out of the twelve model species with complete genome sequence of *Drosophila* would no longer carry the generic name *Drosophila*: namely, *D. virilis* Sturtevant, 1916 (p. 330), *D. mojavensis* Patterson in Patterson & Crow, 1940 (p. 251), and *D. grimshawi* (Oldenberg, 1914, p. 23). Regarding the popularity of *Drosophila* as a model to biology grant agencies, biologists working on these species and on other related taxa (including *D. funebris*) would feel considerable injustice in comparison to biologists working on *Drosophila melanogaster*-related taxa. Although I totally agree with the authors that the current paraphyletic status of the genus *Drosophila* violates modern systematic practice, I urge that if a taxonomic change has to be made, it has to follow conventional taxonomic rules with an upgrading of the monophyletic subgenus Sophophora, of which *Drosophila melanogaster* is the type by original designation (Sturtevant, 1939, p. 140) to the rank of genus.

In conclusion, I hope that the Commission will maintain *Drosophila funebris* (Fabricius, 1787) as the type of the nominotypical genus *Drosophila* Fallén, 1823 following both the Principles of Priority and of First Reviser.

References


(3) V. Sidorenko

*Laboratory of Entomology, Institute of Biology and Soil Sciences, Vladivostok, 690022 Russia* (e-mail: stegana@mail.ru)

In my opinion, if the Commission decides to support this application that would be against the rules of the Code and would create bad precedent.

**Comment on the proposed suppression of Gobius lagocephalus Pallas, 1770**

*(Osteichthyes, Teleostei, GOBIIDAE)*

(Case 3383; see BZN 64: 103–107)

**Maurice Kottelat**

*Route de la Baroche 12, Cornol, CH-2952, Switzerland* (address for correspondence); and *Raffles Museum of Biodiversity Research, Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore, 6 Science Drive 2, 03–01, Singapore 117546* (e-mail: mkottelat@dplanet.ch)

**Helen K. Larson**

* Museum and Art Gallery of the Northern Territory, PO Box 4646, Darwin, NT 0801, Australia* (e-mail: helen.larson@nt.gov.au)

**Ron E. Watson**

*3658 NW 41st Lane, Gainesville, Florida 32605–1468, U.S.A.*

(e-mail: gobyresearch@cox.net)

**Philippe Keith**

*Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle, Laboratoire d’Ichtyologie, CP 26, 57 rue Cuvier, 75231 Paris cedex 05, France* (e-mail: keith@mnchn.fr)

We are writing to register our objection to the proposed suppression of the specific name *Gobius lagocephalus*. As will be pointed out, the proposal by Smith & Sparks (2007) omits facts that make the application pointless; the described problem does not exist and has been solved elsewhere; suppressing the name *G. lagocephalus* would negatively affect the name of a well known and widely distributed species without creating any benefit (the effect would be the reverse) to the nomenclature of this group of fishes.

In their proposal Smith & Sparks (2007) present as Option 2: ‘designating a neotype that is most consistent with current usage (as a species of *Sicyopterus*)’—this has already been done (Kottelat 2007). The preservation of the status quo with regard to the name *Gobius lagocephalus*, presently known widely as *Sicyopterus lagocephalus*, is desired for stability of nomenclature.

In their application, Smith & Sparks (2007) mention as holotype the specimen on which Pallas (1770) based his description and figure. They mention that this specimen is lost and refer to ‘Kottelat, in press’ as a source for this information. This
information was included in a manuscript not yet accepted for publication, and was used by Smith & Sparks without the author’s knowledge. Smith & Sparks do not mention that this now published article (Kottelat, 2007; available online since June 2006) includes information and nomenclatural acts that show their application unnecessary and disagreeing with the facts.

Contrary to Smith & Sparks’ (2007) comment, there is no holotype for *G. lagocephalus* but there are two syntypes. Besides the specimen in his possession, Pallas explicitly identified in his description of *G. lagocephalus* a specimen described and figured by Koelreuter (1764). This specimen is thus part of the type series. These two syntypes are now lost (Kottelat, 2007).

The two specimens (based on data in the descriptions and on the figures) are not conspecific (differences described by Kottelat, 2007 and Smith & Sparks, 2007). The only specimen that can be partly identified is that of Pallas, as his Figure 7 (Plate II) shows the single central lip cleft characteristic of the genus *Sicydium* (unless the artist overlooked the two lateral clefts of *Sicyopterus*, however, given the accuracy of the illustrations of the other fish on the plates, this is unlikely). The drawings of Koelreuter’s specimen (Koelreuter, 1764: plate 9, figs 3–4) have not been done by such a skilled artist as was available for Pallas’s fish (Pallas 1770: plate 2, figs 6–7) and cannot be identified to genus with any certainty, but it is clearly a sicydine. The pectoral fin ray counts given by Koelreuter (15 rays) and Pallas (17 rays) are close to the lower end of the range of 17–21 pectoral fin rays for *Sicyopterus* and 17–22 for *Sicydium* (Watson, 2000; Watson et al., 2000; Larson, unpubl. data) and it is possible that both Koelreuter and Pallas missed seeing a fin ray or two (adult sicydines have fleshy pectoral fins and even today with better equipment these rays are often overlooked).

Pallas’s specimen was stated to be from ‘America’ and the origin of Koelreuter’s specimen is unknown (Pallas wrote: ‘ignorant of its native land’ (our rough translation)). The original type locality therefore cannot be ‘America’ as this is the locality of only one of the two syntypes. Where Koelreuter obtained his fish from remains unknown.

There have already been two neotype designations for *Gobius lagocephalus* (Fricke, 1999; Watson et al., 2000), both invalid because the authors did not satisfy the conditions of Article 75.3 of the Code, especially clause 75.3.4, which requires information on the lost type material and efforts made to locate it. This is discussed by Kottelat (2007) and Smith & Sparks (2007). Both Fricke’s and Watson et al.’s neotype designations were based on specimens from Réunion Island, linking the name to the species known under that name since 1842, thus attempting to preserve stability of nomenclature.

Kottelat (2007) discussed the situation, discussed his attempts to locate the syntypes and their absence and designated a neotype satisfying the criteria of Article 75.3 of the Code. To minimize the risk of future confusion, he designated as neotype the specimen (SMF 28571) previously invalidly designated by Watson et al. (2000). With this neotype designation the name *G. lagocephalus* is definitively linked with the species recognised under this name since 1842 and the type locality is now Ravine St. Gilles on Réunion Island.

Smith & Sparks’ argument seems to center around the type locality of *G. lagocephalus*, which they consider as ‘America’ alone, and they perceive that a
neotype would have been from ‘America’, thus threatening the generic name *Sicydium* presently used for for at least 17 North and South American species. To ‘rescue’ the stability of the nomenclature of the American genus name *Sicydium* (and of the Mascarene endemic *Cotylopus*), they choose the alternative to destabilize the nomenclature in use in the Indo-West Pacific. On the other hand, this potential problem was pointed out by Kottelat (2007) and his approach was to designate a neotype that consolidates the present use of the species and at the same time preserves the use of *Sicydium* and *Cotylopus*.

The name *G. lagocephalus* (now *Sicyopterus lagocephalus*) has been continuously used since 1842 for a fish species distributed along the coasts and islands of the Indian Ocean and the Western Pacific Ocean, from Madagascar to southern Japan and New Guinea (Watson et al., 2000). Some authors do not recognise the different populations throughout this area as conspecific and consider *S. lagocephalus* to be restricted to Madagascar, the Mascarene Islands and the east coast of Africa. But all have used the name as valid for a species within this area. Further, the species called *S. lagocephalus* has a commercial value, as the fish is a local delicacy on Réunion Island.

We have decided not to count usages of the name *S. lagocephalus*, we need only to mention that it is cited in all the classical as well as recent faunal works of that area; some examples: Boulenger (1916), Smith (1959), Teugels et al. (1985), Daget et al. (1986), Bauchot et al. (1988), Balon & Bruton (1994), Keith et al. (1999), Watson et al. (2000), Allen et al. (2002), Nakabo (2002), Senou et al. (2004), Keith et al. (2005) and Hoese & Larson (2006). It also seems sufficient to state that the only authors we are aware of who have not considered *S. lagocephalus* as valid (and *nolens volens* disturbed stability of nomenclature) were Sparks & Nelson (2004) and now Smith & Sparks (2007).

In order to preserve the stability of nomenclature we recommend that the Commission rejects this unnecessary application. The Commission is further asked:

1. to place on the Official List of Available Names in Zoology the name *lagocephalus* Pallas, 1770, as published in the binomen *Gobius lagocephalus*;
2. to confirm the designation of specimen SMF 28571 as the neotype of *Gobius lagocephalus* Pallas, 1770, as designated in Kottelat (2007).

Kottelat’s (2007) paper is held by the Secretariat and forms an integral part of this comment.

Additional references


Comments on the proposed conservation of Buettneria Case, 1922 (Amphibia) (Case 3420; see BZN 64: 252–254)

(1) Gilles Cuny

The Natural History Museum of Denmark, Øster Voldgade 5–7, 1350 Copenhagen, Denmark (e-mail: Gilles@snm.ku.dk)

I am writing to support the application of Lucas et al. (2007) (Case 3420) to conserve the long- and widely-used name of the Triassic amphibian Buettneria Case, 1922. This name is a homonym of a little-used name of an insect (Buettneria Karsch, 1888), and abandoning it would destabilise the nomenclature of this amphibian group. To serve the stability and universality of zoological nomenclature, the name Buettneria Karsch, 1888 should be suppressed, and the name Buettneria Case, 1922 should be conserved.

(2) Robert M. Sullivan

Section of Paleontology and Geology, The State Museum of Pennsylvania, 300 North Street, Harrisburg, PA 17120, U.S.A. (e-mail: rsullivan@state.pa.us)

I support the application of Lucas et al. (2007) to conserve the long- and widely-used name of the Late Triassic metoposaurid amphibian Buettneria Case, 1922. Buettneria is one of the few Mesozoic vertebrates known from Pennsylvania that is represented by cranial and postcranial remains. As such, this metoposaurid has been the subject of much interest on the national, international and local levels (Kochanov & Sullivan, 1994; Lucas & Sullivan, 1996; Sullivan et al., 1995). It is also
a name that is widely used in many museum exhibits where material of this metoposaurid is on display. Abandoning this well known, and widely used, name because it is the homonym of a little-used, and arguably obscure, name of an insect (*Buettneria* Karsch, 1888), only serves to destabilize zoological nomenclature. Thus, the name *Buettneria* Karsch, 1888 should be suppressed, and the name *Buettneria* Case, 1922 should be conserved.
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(3) Claudia A. Marsicano

*Departamento de Cs. Geologicas, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina* (e-mail: claumar@gl.fcen.uba.ar)

I support the application of Lucas et al. (2007) to conserve the long- and widely-used name of the Triassic amphibian *Buettneria* Case, 1922. Abandoning this name in favour of a little-used name of an insect (*Buettneria* Karsch, 1888) would lead to a considerable confusion in the nomenclature. To maintain the stability and universality of zoological nomenclature, the name *Buettneria* Karsch, 1888 should be suppressed, and the name *Buettneria* Case, 1922 should be conserved.

(4) Bernhard Hausdorf

*Zoological Museum of the University of Hamburg, Martin-Luther-King-Platz 3, 20146 Hamburg, Germany* (e-mail: Hausdorf@zoologie.uni-hamburg.de)

When proposing to conserve the name of the Triassic amphibian genus *Buettneria* Case, 1922 by suppressing the senior homonym *Buettneria* Karsch, 1889 (Insecta, Orthoptera), Lucas et al. (2007) failed to notice that there is another senior homonym, *Buettneria* Simroth, 1888 (Mollusca, Gastropoda). Simroth (1910) replaced the supposedly preoccupied name *Buettneria* Simroth, 1888 by *Buettnerella* Simroth, 1910. However, as already noted by van Goethem (1977), the description of Karsch was published only at the beginning of February 1889, whereas the paper of Simroth (1888) had been published on 20th February 1888. *Buettneria* Simroth, 1888 is in current use for African land snails. The junior homonym *Buettneria* Karsch, 1889 has to be replaced by its junior subjective synonym *Stenacropteryx* Karsch, 1896. I do not think that the use of the plenary power to suppress the generic names *Buettneria* Simroth, 1888 and *Buettneria* Karsch, 1889 would be justified to conserve the junior homonym *Buettneria* Case, 1922. Rather, *Buettneria* Case, 1922 can be replaced by *Koskinodon* Branson and Mehl, 1929 as proposed by Mueller (2007) without threatening the stability or universality of nomenclature.
Additional references


Comment on the proposed precedence of Chelodina rugosa Ogilby, 1890 (currently Macrochelodina rugosa; Reptilia, Testudines) over Chelodina oblonga Gray, 1841 (Case 3351; see BZN 63: 187–193, 64: 68, 127–128)

Uwe Fritz
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I write in support of the proposed precedence of Chelodina rugosa Ogilby, 1890 over Chelodina oblonga Gray, 1841 for the reasons specified in Case 3351 and Thomson’s (2007) Comment (BZN 64: 127–128). Further, I support usage of the name Chelodina collieti Gray, 1856 for the species known under the misapplied name Chelodina oblonga Gray, 1841 for the past 40 years (see Case 3351). When it is considered that the same species was correctly named Chelodina collieti Gray, 1856 for 136 years, perpetuating the misapplication seems to be a bad choice, although Savage (2007, BZN 64: 68) suggested this by his application to the Commission to set aside all previous designations of type specimen for Chelodina oblonga Gray, 1841 and to designate as its neotype BMNH 1947.3.5.91, the lectotype of Chelodina colliei Gray, 1856. However, Savage (2007) overlooked the long correct usage of Chelodina collieti Gray, 1856 (see Thomson’s reply in BZN 64: 127–128).

In conclusion, the suggestions and considerations in Thomson’s Case 3351 and Comment in BZN 64: 127–128 seem reasonable and the best solution to a nomenclatural problem. Therefore, the name Chelodina colliei was already accepted in the recently published ‘Checklist of Chelonians of the World’ (Fritz & Havaš 2007, Vertebrate Zoology 57: 149–368), serving as standard reference for CITES.

Though, the matter became somewhat more complicated in the meantime. In a hobbyist journal, McCord & Joseph-Ouni (2007, Reptilia 52: 56–64) ‘rejected’ the holotype of Chelodina oblonga Gray, 1841 and designated the lectotype of Chelodina colliei Gray, 1856 as neotype of Chelodina oblonga Gray, 1841, thereby repeating the arguments of Savage (2007) without mentioning Savage’s Comment in the BZN. It is obvious from Article 75.6 of the Code that for such action the plenary power of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is needed. Therefore, the lectotype designation by McCord & Joseph-Ouni (2007) is invalid and unwelcome, contributing only to further confusion.
Comment on the proposed conservation of *Atractus* Wagler, 1828 and *Atractus trilineatus* Wagler, 1828 (Reptilia, Serpentes)
(Case 3365; see BZN 64: 60–63)
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As concerned taxonomists who separately and collaboratively continue to publish on *Atractus* we strongly support conservation of this name as proposed by Hoogmoed & Savage (BZN 64: 60–63). The senior name *Brachyura* Kuhl & van Hasselt, 1822 has not been used for well over a century and is virtually forgotten. The name *Atractus* Wagler, 1828, on the other hand is recognized by a wide range of biologists, inasmuch as it applies to the largest genus of colubrid snakes in the New World.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Columba roseogrisea* Sundevall, 1857
(currently *Streptopelia roseogrisea*; Aves, Columbidae)
(Case 3380; see BZN 64: 108–112, 118–122)
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I noted in Case 3380 that the wild and domestic species names given to the chicken *Gallus domesticus* and red junglefowl *Gallus gallus* may require Commission attention in future. However, the name *Gallus gallus* (Linnaeus, 1758, p. 158), which is usually applied to the red junglefowl, is senior to the name sometimes given to the domestic chicken *Gallus domesticus* (Gmelin, 1789, p. 737). Widespread usage of ‘*Gallus domesticus* (Linnaeus, 1758)’ or ‘*Gallus gallus domesticus* (Linnaeus, 1758)’ in recent ornithological literature and perpetuated in Case 3380 is an incorrect citation.

The relative priority of *Gallus gallus* and *Gallus domesticus* (in the context of wild and domestic names) does not require the Commission’s attention because the species name for the wild population is senior to the species name for the domestic population. If the two names are considered synonymous or a trinomial is used, the wild species name *Gallus gallus* (Linnaeus, 1758) has priority under the Principle of Priority (Article 23.1 of the Code).

The above matter was mentioned only by way of introduction in Case 3380 and does not affect the facts or recommendations in Case 3380.