OPINION 1589
Phyllodoce (Carobia) rubiginosa Saint-Joseph, 1888 (currently also Nereiphylla rubiginosa; Annelida, Polychaeta): specific name conserved

Ruling
(1) Under the plenary powers the specific name breviremis de Quatrefages, 1865, as published in the binomen Phyllodoce breviremis, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The name rubiginosa Saint-Joseph, 1888, as published in the combination Phyllodoce (Carobia) rubiginosa, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

(3) The name breviremis de Quatrefages, 1865, as published in the binomen Phyllodoce breviremis and as suppressed in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 2633
An application for the conservation of Phyllodoce (Carobia) breviremis de Quatrefages, 1865 (a marine paddle worm) was received from Dr F. Pleijel (University of Stockholm, Stockholm, Sweden) on 30 December 1987. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 45: 260-261 (December 1988). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals. No comments were received.

Decision of the Commission
On 1 December 1989 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 45: 260. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 1990 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes — 18: Bock, Cocks, Cogger, Corlett, Halvorsen, Kraus, Lehtinen, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Minelli, Nielsen, Nye, Ride, Savage, Schuster, Thompson, Ueno, Willink

Negative votes — 9: Bayer, Dupuis, Hahn, Heppell, Holthuis, Kabata, Macpherson, Mroczkowski and Trjapitzin.

No vote was received from Starobogatov.

Bayer, Hahn, Mroczkowski and Nye would have preferred giving rubiginosa Saint-Joseph, 1888 precedence over breviremis de Quatrefages, 1865 to the suppression of the latter name. Heppell considered insufficient evidence had been presented (or probably existed) to depart from priority. Dupuis drew attention to the existence of a type specimen for breviremis but not for rubiginosa.

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:


Reference
*The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 47, 144–144.
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