Artemia franciscana Kellogg, 1906 (Crustacea, Branchiopoda): specific name conserved

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the following specific names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy:
   (i) guildingi Thompson, 1834, as published in the binomen Artemis guildingi;
   (ii) fertilis Verrill, 1869, as published in the binomen Artemia fertilis;
   (iii) utahensis Lockington, 1876, as published in the binomen Artemia utahensis;

(b) the specific name franciscana Kellogg, 1906, as published in the binomen Artemia franciscana, is hereby given precedence over the specific name gracilis Verrill, 1869, as published in the binomen Artemia gracilis, whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms.

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

(a) franciscana Kellogg, 1906, as published in the binomen Artemia franciscana, with the endorsement that it is to be given precedence over gracilis Verrill, 1869, as published in the binomen Artemia gracilis, whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms;

(b) gracilis Verrill, 1869, as published in the binomen Artemia gracilis, with the endorsement that it is not to be given priority over franciscana Kellogg, 1906, as published in the binomen Artemia franciscana, whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms.

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

(a) guildingi Thompson, 1834, as published in the binomen Artemis guildingi and as suppressed in (1)(a)(i) above;

(b) fertilis Verrill, 1869, as published in the binomen Artemia fertilis and as suppressed in (1)(a)(ii) above;

(c) utahensis Lockington, 1876, as published in the binomen Artemia utahensis and as suppressed in (1)(a)(iii) above.

History of Case 2728

An application for the conservation of the specific name of Artemia franciscana Kellogg, 1906 was received from Prof Denton Belk (Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio, Texas, U.S.A.) and Dr Sarane T. Bowen (San Francisco State University, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.) on 19 June 1989. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 47: 178–183 (September 1990). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals.

Comments in support from Drs P. Sorgeloos, P. Lavens & W. Tackaert (Artemia Reference Center, Rijksuniversiteit Gent, Gent, Belgium) and Dr Francisco Amat (Instituto de Acuicultura de Torre de la Sal, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas)
Cientificas, Castellón, Spain) were published in BZN 48: 57 (March 1991). A note of further comments in support from Prof. C. Barigozzi (Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy), Drs Laura Torrenera Blanco (University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin, U.S.A.), A.M. Maeda-Martinez (Institute of Ecology, University of Gent, Gent, Belgium) and Graziella Mura (Università di Roma ‘La Sapienza’, Roma, Italy) was published at the same time.

Comments from five members of the Nomenclature Committee of the Crustacean Society were published in BZN 48: 246–248 (September 1991). Drs Joel W. Martin (Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, California, U.S.A.) and Gary C.B. Poore (Museum of Victoria, Abbotsford, Victoria, Australia) supported the application. Drs Austin B. Williams (NOAA/NMFS Systematics Laboratory, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, U.S.A.) and Thomas E. Bowman (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, U.S.A.) supported the suppression of the names Artemia guildingi Thompson, 1834 and A. utahensis Lockington, 1876; Williams thought that gracilis Verrill, 1869 should be used, whilst Bowman was in favour of fertilis Verrill, 1869. Prof. L.B. Holthuis (Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Leiden, The Netherlands) suggested that until the taxonomy and nomenclature of Artemia Leach, 1819 as a whole had been reviewed it was premature to deal with the single species A. franciscana.

A reply to Bowman’s and Holthuis’s comments by one of the authors of the application (Prof. Denton Belk) was published in BZN 49: 72–73 (March 1992).

Decision of the Commission

On 1 September 1992 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 47: 180–181. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 1992 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes — 22: Bock, Bouchet, Cocks, Cogger, Corliss, Hahn, Halvorsen, Kabata, Kraus, Macpherson, Mahnert, Nielsen, Nye, Ride, Savage, Schuster, Starobogatov, Štys, Thompson, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Willink

Negative votes — 2: Bayer and Holthuis.

Dupuis and Minelli abstained.

No votes were received from Heppell, Lehtinen and Martins de Souza.

Dupuis abstained because of the lack of taxonomic information on Artemia gracilis Verrill, 1869 (para. 4 of the application). Minelli commented that conservation of the name A. franciscana Kellogg, 1906 would be better considered within the wider perspective of the whole genus Artemia.

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:

fertilis, Artemia, Verrill, 1869, American Journal of Science and Arts, (2)48: 430.
gracilis, Artemia, Verrill, 1869, American Journal of Science and Arts, (2)48: 248.
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