Orbitolina d'Orbigny, 1850 (Foraminiferida): Orbulites concava Lamarck, 1816 confirmed as the type species

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type species for the nominal genus Orbitolina d'Orbigny, 1850 prior to that of Orbulites concava Lamarck, 1816 by Davies (1939) are hereby set aside.

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

(a) Orbitolina d'Orbigny, 1850 (gender: feminine), type species by designation by Davies (1939) Orbulites concava Lamarck, 1816 as confirmed under the plenary powers in (1) above;

(b) Palorbitolina Schroeder, 1963 (gender: feminine), type species by monotypy Madreporites lenticularis Blumenbach, 1805.

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

(a) concava Lamarck, 1816, as published in the binomen Orbulites concava (specific name of the type species of Orbitolina d'Orbigny, 1850);

(b) lenticularis Blumenbach, 1805, as published in the binomen Madreporites lenticularis (specific name of the type species of Palorbitolina Schroeder, 1963).

History of Case 2663

An application for the confirmation of Orbulites concava Lamarck, 1816 as the type species of Orbitolina d'Orbigny, 1850 was received from Prof. R. Schuster (Universität Frankfurt, Frankfurt a. M., Fed. Rep. Germany) and Mr. M. Simmons (BP Research Centre, Sunbury-on-Thames, U.K.) on 4 May 1988. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 45: 254-257 (December 1988). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals. No comments were received. With reference to para. 3 (p. 254) of the application, it might be clearer to say that the expressions 'specific type' and 'type' of Parker & Jones (1860, p. 35) mean simply 'species', rather than 'typical form of a species'; as stated in the application Parker & Jones did not designate a type species for Orbitolina.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 1989 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 45: 256. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 1990 (the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes — 26: Bock, Cocks, Cogger, Corliss, Dupuis, Hahn, Halvorsen, Heppell, Holthuis, Kabata, Kraus, Lehtinen, Macpherson, Mahnert, Martins de Moura, Minelli, Mroczkowski, Nielsen, Nye, Ride, Savage, Schuster, Thompson, Frjapitzin, Ueno, Wilcsek

Negative votes — none.

No votes were received from Bayer and Starobogatov.

(4) John LaSalle

CAB International Institute of Entomology, 56 Queen's Gate, London SW7 5JR, U.K.

Our comment (BZN 46: 132–134) is not intended to alienate or cause undue confusion with field biologists, biological control workers, or other non-systematists who rely on systematics for the provision of stable names (nor do we wish to alienate the authors of the proposal). However, systematics has rules which provide stability: these rules should be used where applicable, and stability will best be served when priority is overturned only in cases where the evidence presented is both overwhelming and timely (by waiting several years after the recognition of Coccobius before approaching the Commission, and thereby giving the name Coccobius time to become established in the literature, the authors have removed whatever valid arguments they might once have had).

This case is nothing more than a question of usage versus priority. The Code allows for the suppression of an unused senior synonym only in cases where the use of that name rather than a well accepted junior synonym would disturb stability or cause undue confusion. Even if one assumes that Coccobius is an unused name, which it no longer is, this case does not rest on impassioned pleas or lists of works using the name Physcus in the past, but simply on the assumption that use of Coccobius would disturb stability and cause confusion. Such an assumption is contradicted by facts: since Coccobius was recognized in 1983, far more references have used the name Coccobius than Physcus.

I have deposited with the Commission Secretariat a list of 24 references published since 1983 and using the name Coccobius in its currently recognized sense. This list contains works by over 30 authors from nine countries, and includes catalogues, keys, studies on biological control, biology, systematics, a data base of natural enemies, and
a list of preferred names of economic insects. It appears to me that there is no question here; at the present time both priority and usage favor Coccobius.

Comment on the need for stability in fish family-group names
(See BZN 47: 97–100)

Nigel Merrett
The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

I fully endorse Mr Wheeler’s view that changes to family-group names for purely grammatical reasons, such as those proposed by Steyskal (1980), may have unfortunate and wide-ranging implications for stability. I support his call for the establishment of a specialist committee on fish nomenclature to give guidance on the most pragmatic solution to such proposals.

Comments on the proposed confirmation of Muraena helena Linnaeus, 1758 as the type species of Muraena Linnaeus, 1758 (Osteichthyes, Anguilliformes), so conserving Anguilla
(Case 1173; see BZN 46: 259–261)

(1) Alwyne Wheeler
Epping Forest Conservation Centre, High Beach, Loughton, Essex IG10 4AF, U.K.

The generic name Anguilla dates not from Shaw (1803, p. 15) as stated, but from Schrank (1798, pp. 304, 307). This fact has been cited by authors including Blache et al. (1973, pp. 220–222). The type species by monotypy is Muraena anguilla Linnaeus, 1758. The use of the specific name vulgaris by Shaw was clearly (not ‘possibly’ as in the application) to avoid tautonomy following the Linnaean precepts of taxonomy which were later encoded in the Strickland Code of Nomenclature in Zoology (Strickland, 1842). Although the avoidance of tautonomy was not encoded until that date it was shunned by adherents of the Linnaean system of nomenclature in accordance with the aphorisms set out in Linnaeus’s Critica Botanica (see Hort, 1938). For discussion of the nomenclature of fishes with the specific name vulgaris see Wheeler (1988).
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