OTIORHYNCHUS versus BRACHYRHINUS (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA, FAMILY CURCULIONIDAE). Z.N.(S.) 1819

By Elwood C. Zimmerman (Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii)

The genus commonly and widely known as Otiorhynchus Germar, 1824: 343, is a large assemblage of a thousand or more Palaearctic species and lesser forms. It includes a number of species of economic importance, and some of these have been transported to and established in widely separated parts of the world. The literature on the genus is one of the most extensive in all of the Coleoptera, and it is evidently the most voluminous of any genus of the Curculionidae. There is confusion, however, regarding the generic name. For more than 140 years the name Otiorhynchus (or Otiorrhynchus) has been used extensively in hundreds of publications, but the name Brachyrhinus has been used by a number of North American authors who have followed Pierce's unfortunate 1913 report and the Leng Catalogue of 1920. The purpose of this communication is to attempt to establish stability, and the facts are as follows:

2. Brachyrhinus Latreille, 1802: 200, was erected to include four species: Curculio pyri Linnaeus, C. ligustici Linnaeus, C. lineatus Linnaeus and C. niger Fabricius. No type-species was selected by Latreille in 1802, but he cited Curculio viridis Linnaeus as type-species in 1810: 430, although viridis was not one of the originally included species and is thus not available as type-species. Germar, 1817: 341, moved pyri to Polydrusus, lineatus to Sitona and viridis to Chlorima, thus leaving only niger and ligustici in Brachyrhinus. Today, niger is in Otiorhynchus, sensu stricto, and ligustici is in subgenus Aromaticus of Otiorhynchus.

3. Pierce, 1913: 422, said "The type of the genus is ligustici Linnaeus, designated by virtue of elimination by Latreille (1807) and Bedel (1881)." Pierce was wrong when he concluded that ligustici became type-species by the process of "elimination" by Latreille and Bedel. Latreille, 1807: 255-257, listed the following three species as examples of Brachyrhinus: viridis, incanus and ligustici. (The species viridis Linnaeus belongs to Chlorophanus Germar, 1824, in the Tanymeleinae and incanus Linnaeus belongs to Brachyderes Schoenherr, 1826, in the Brachyderinae.) Perhaps Pierce concluded that Latreille had by "elimination" chosen ligustici as type-species because ligustici is the only one of these three species that originally was included in the genus when Latreille described Brachyrhinus in 1802. In 1802, Latreille said "Exemples, Curculio pyri; ligustici; lineatus; niger. F." It is probable that Latreille considered in 1802 that more than these four described species belonged to his genus, although he cited only these four species as "exemples", because only two years later, in 1804: 157-186, he listed 118 species in Brachyrhinus. Brachyrhinus ligustici did not become type-species of Brachyrhinus by "elimination" by Latreille in 1807 as Pierce contends, and the originally included niger remained in the genus. Bedel did not publish on the group in 1881, and I presume that Pierce meant to refer to Bedel, 1883. It cannot be considered
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that Bedel had anything to do with establishing *ligustici* as type-species by "elimination", because in his 1883 paper he reported only upon the fauna of the Seine Basin and was not treating all of the species, and he did not remove *niger* from the genus. Pierce’s suggestion that Bedel established *ligustici* as type-species by "elimination" also is incorrect. Although Pierce was wrong when he said that *ligustici* is type-species for the reasons he gave, we are required to accept that designation, provided there are no other objections, under Article 69a(iii) which states that “In the absence of a prior valid type-designation for a nominal genus, an author is considered to have designated one of the originally included nominal species as type-species, if he states that it is the type (or type-species), for whatever reason, right or wrong, and if it is clear that he himself accepts it as the type-species.” Pierce would have caused less confusion and have been on sounder ground had he designated the available *niger* as type-species, because *ligustici* had been removed from *Brachyrhinus*, sensu stricto, by Stierlin when he placed it in subgenus *Cryphiphorus* in 1883: 535, and *Cryphiphorus* was later merged with subgenus *Arammicinus* Gozis, 1882: 203. The acceptance of Pierce’s listing *ligustici* as type-species of *Brachyrhinus* would result in the reduction of *Arammicinus* and *Cryphiphorus* to junior synonyms of *Brachyrhinus*.

4. *Otiorhynchus* was erected by Germar, 1824: 343, with the statement "Genus novum", about 80 species were assigned to it, and Germar did not select a type-species. Schoenherr, 1826: 205, designated *Curculio clavipes* Bonsdorff, 1785: 40 (= *tenebricosus* Olivier, 1790) as type-species. Today, *clavipes* is included in *Otiorhynchus*, sensu stricto. A complicating factor is the fact that Germar originally called the group *Pachygaster* but that name proved to be a homonym of *Pachygaster* Meigen, 1803, in the Diptera. In 1817, Germar said “36) *Pachygaster* nob. *Curc. niger, gemmatus, ovatus, rauceus, hirticornis* Hb., *Ligustici, sulphurifer, caudatus* Rossi.” In 1824, when Germar proposed the "Genus novum" *Otiorhynchus*, he included all eight of the species he placed originally in *Pachygaster*, and, as noted above, many others. However, Germar did not state that *Otiorhynchus* was a replacement name for his *Pachygaster*, and, in fact, he did not mention *Pachygaster* in his 1824 text. Hence, it can be accepted that *Otiorhynchus* was a new genus proposed in 1824, and the designation by Schoenherr of *Curculio clavipes* Bonsdorff (= *tenebricosus* Olivier) as type-species is a valid type designation. [Had Germar stated or indicated that *Otiorhynchus* was a replacement name for *Pachygaster*, then the type selection of *Curculio clavipes* by Schoenherr would be invalid, and one of the species originally included in *Pachygaster* would have to be designated type-species to conform to Article 67(i) and (i)(i) which rules that “The type-species must be a species eligible for fixation as the type of the earlier nominal genus.”]

5. Although *Brachyrhinus* was validly proposed, it has been ignored by most authors since it was erected in 1802, for the probable reason that it was originally a compound concept that included representatives of several genera. Most authors who have written about the insects have used *Otiorhynchus* and have not even mentioned *Brachyrhinus*, although a few have listed *Brachyrhinus* in synonymy.

6. Some authors have used the family-group name Brachyrhininae (or
Brachyrrhininae) in error, because the first use of a family-group name for these weevils was by Schoenherr, 1826:203, and he used Otiorhynchides. Hence, the name of the subfamily is Otiorhynchinae.

7. An outline of the use of the two generic names in some of the more pertinent publications follows:

**FOR OTIORRHYNCHUS**

In 1826:203, the great master Schoenherr, in his basic *Curculionidum Dispositio Methodica* . . . used *Otiorrhynchus* and listed *Brachyrhinus* as one of several synonyms.

In 1839, Stephens, *A Manual of British Coleoptera or Beetles*, used *Otiorrhynchus*.

In 1840, Blanchard, in *Histoire Naturelle des Insectes*, used *Otiorrhynchus*.

In 1853, Melsheimer, in *Catalogue of the Described Coleoptera of the United States*, used *Otiorrhynchus*.

In 1854, Jacquelin Du Val, in his *Genera Coléoptères D’Europe*, used *Otiorrhynchus* with *Brachyrhinus* placed in synonymy.

In 1861, Stierlin, in his *Revision der Europäischen Otiorrhynchus-Arten*, the first revisional monograph of the group, used *Otiorrhynchus*.

In 1863, Lacordaire used *Otiorrhynchus* in his monumental *Genera des Coléoptères*, and he did not mention *Brachyrhinus* even in synonymy.

In 1868, Seidlitz published his large revision entitled *Die Otiorhynchiden s. str.* He used *Otiorrhynchus* and did not mention *Brachyrhinus*.

In 1871, in Gemminger and Harold, *Catalogus Coleopterorum*, 444 species are listed in “*Otiorrhynchus*”, and “*Brachyrhinus Billberg*” is listed as a synonym of “*Sitones*”, but there is no mention of *Brachyrhinus* Latreille.

In 1873, Stierlin published his *Analytische Uebersicht der Arten der Gattung Otiorrhynchus* without mention of *Brachyrhinus*.

In 1876, LeConte and Horn published their great monograph *The Rhynchophora of America, North of Mexico*, the most important of all works on American Curculionidae, and they used *Otiorrhynchus* and did not mention *Brachyrhinus*.

In 1883, LeConte and Horn followed the same course in their *Classification of the Coleoptera of North America*.

In 1885, Des Gozis used *Otiorrhynchus* when he established some new subgenera and gave a key to subgenera.

In 1885, the Henshaw *List of the Coleoptera of America, North of Mexico* was issued, and *Otiorrhynchus* was used.

In 1891, Fowler, in his *The Coleoptera of the British Islands*, used *Otiorhynchus* with *Brachyrhinus* in synonymy.

In 1894, Seidlitz published an article in which he defended the use of *Otiorhynchus* and opposed Bedel’s 1883 resurrection of *Brachyrhinus* (see Bedel, 1883, under *Brachyrhinus* below).

In 1906, the Heyden, Reitter and Weise *Catalogus Coleopterorum Europae, Caucasi et Armeniae Rossicæ*, ed. 2, was issued, and *Otiorrhynchus* was used with *Brachyrhinus* listed as a synonym.

In 1912–13, Reitter used *Otiorrhynchus* in his important *Bestimmungs-Tabellen der europäischen Coleopteren*.
In 1913, In Kuhnt’s *Illustrierte Bestimmungs-Tabellen der Käfer Deutschlands*, *Otiorrhynchus* is used.

In 1916, Reitter used *Otiorrhynchus* in his important *Fauna Germanica*.

In 1916, Blatchley and Leng, in their manual *Rhychnophora or Weevils of North Eastern America*, used *Otiorrhynchus*.

In 1923, Mustache, in *Curculionidae Gallo-Rhénans*, used *Otiorrhynchus* and said, p. 1, footnote, “Le nom de *Brachyrhinus* a bien la priorité, mais celui d’*Otiorrhynchus* est consacré par un long et universel usage.”

In 1936, Lena, in *Coleopterorum Catalogus*, listed over 880 species and many “subspecies”, with several thousand references on about 225 pages, in *Otiorrhynchus*, and he listed *Brachyrhinus* as a synonym.

In 1950, Hoffmann, in his extensive study of the Curculionidae in *Faune de France*, used *Otiorrhynchus*, and he placed *Brachyrhinus* in synonymy. He said, p. 46, “La priorité de *Brachyrhinus* n’a pas eu raison de l’usage universel consacré à *Otiorrhynchus* resté nomen conservandum.”

In 1960, in the revised *Catalogus Fennoscandiae et Daniae*, Lindroth, ed., *Otiorrhynchus* is used.

The Zoological Record has used *Otiorrhynchus* (or *Otiorrhynchus*) for 100 years. The Review of Applied Entomology has used *Otiorrhynchus* (or *Otiorrhynchus*) since its beginning in 1913.

The above-mentioned citations are only a few examples from a vast literature that uses *Otiorrhynchus*.

FOR BRACHYRHINUS

In 1883 : 33, Bedel, in *Faune des Coléoptères du Bassin de la Seine*, resurrected *Brachyrhinus* Latreille, 1802, and he placed *Otiorrhynchus* in synonymy. In a footnote he said: “Germar, en 1824, pouvait restreindre le genre *Brachyrhinus* Latr., mais non le supprimer; Latreille, en mettant le nom d’*Otiorrhynchus* en synonymie du sien (Fam. Nat., 1825; p. 391), a protesté suffisamment contre cette suppression.” The so-called 1825 : 391 “protest” by Latreille consists only of the following: “Brachyrhine (*Otiorrhynque.*)” Bedel was one of history’s very few supporters of *Brachyrhinus*, and most of his contemporaries and successors did not follow him. Bedel himself changed his opinion, and in 1887, for example, he used *Otiorrhynchus* in two papers (1887A : 200, 1887B : CIX). Seidlitz, 1894 : 73, criticized Bedel for using *Brachyrhinus*.

In 1913, Pierce, who did much to confuse the taxonomy and nomenclature of the Curculionidae, unfortunately followed Bedel’s usage of *Brachyrhinus*. Various American authorities did not accept Pierce’s conclusions, but Pierce was followed by Leng in his 1920 *Catalogue of the Coleoptera of America, North of Mexico* where *Otiorrhynchus* is placed in synonymy and Brachyrhinini is used incorrectly for Otiorrhynchini. Since the publication of the Leng Catalogue in 1920, it has been the standard guide for North American coleopterists, and most North Americans have used *Brachyrhinus* without regard to the long-established usage of *Otiorrhynchus*. Since 1920, the United States Department of Agriculture and U.S. National Museum staffs have mostly used *Brachyrhinus*, and this has led to some confusion and debate. In 1964, Kissinger followed Pierce and Leng and used *Brachyrhinus* in his *Curculionidae*.
of America North of Mexico: A key to the Genera. It is obvious that the North American usage represents a minority opinion, and the remainder of the world has not followed the Americans.

Another detail that should be noticed is that the use of Brachyrhinini or Brachyrhininae (by those who do so incorrectly) has caused some confusion with the rather similar names Brachyderini and Brachyderinae as used for a different group of Curculionidae. Also, the names *Brachyrhinus* and *Brachyrhynchus* (in the Hemiptera) are subject to confusion.

8. It is thus evident that usage has been and is overwhelmingly in favour of *Otiorhynchus* and that *Brachyrhinus* has been suppressed by most workers since it was proposed in 1802. To avoid confusion and to establish stability and uniformity, we should conserve *Otiorhynchus* and suppress *Brachyrhinus*. Therefore, an appeal is made herewith to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

1. to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Brachyrhinus* Latreille, 1802, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
2. to place the generic name *Otiorhynchus* Germar, 1824 (gender: masculine), type-species, by designation by Schoenherr, 1826, *Curculio clavipes* Bonsdorff, 1785, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
3. to place the specific name *clavipes* Bonsdorff, 1785, as published in the binomen *Curculio clavipes* (type-species of *Otiorhynchus* Germar, 1824) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
4. to place the family-group name *OTiORHYNCHtNAE* (correction of *OTiORHYNCHIDES* Schoenherr, 1826 (type-genus *Otiorhynchus* Germar, 1824) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology;
5. to place the generic name *Brachyrhinus* Latreille, 1802 (as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;
6. to place the family-group name *BRACHYRHRINIDAE* Bedel, 1883 (type-genus *Brachyrhinus* Latreille, 1802) (invalid because the name of its type-genus has been suppressed under the plenary powers) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.
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