Je suis tout à fait d'accord avec l'argumentation des deux auteurs de la requête, retenant deux points principaux:

1. La synonymie des deux genres est douteuse.
2. Le nom de Bathynomus a été appliqué de façon continue à un nombre croissant d'espèces et son emploi est habituel dans la littérature carcinologique.

Dans l'intérêt de la stabilité de la nomenclature, je souhaite vivement que la Commission preserve l'usage de Bathynomus.

Comments on the proposed designation of Lysianax cubensis Stebbing, 1897 as the type species of Shoemakerella Pirlot, 1936 (Crustacea, Amphipoda) (Case 2711; see BZN 46: 236-238)

(1) Richard C. Brusca
Natural History Museum, P.O. Box 1390, San Diego, California 92112, U.S.A.

I would like to state briefly my support for the proposition of Lowry & Stoddart favoring the designation of the nominal species Lysianax cubensis Stebbing, 1897 as the type species of Shoemakerella Pirlot, 1936. I believe Lowry & Stoddart are correct in their assessment of the situation, and that other amphipod workers would welcome this official clarification of a long-standing problem.

(2) Michael H. Thurston
Institute of Oceanographic Sciences, Deacon Laboratory, Godalming, Surrey GU8 2UB, U.K.

I support the case made for the designation of L. cubensis as the type species of Shoemakerella.

It is clear that Pirlot (1936) based his concept of Shoemakerella on his own material and on the specimens received from Shoemaker. The separation of L. nasuta and L. cubensis is valid. While the illustrations provided by Dana lack much of the detail required by modern taxonomists, such detail as is given can be relied upon. The structure of uropod 3 provides an unequivocal separation of the two species.

(3) Support for the proposals on BZN 46: 237 was also received from Prof. Krzysztof Jazdzewski, Uniwersytet Lodzki, Lodz, Poland.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of Curculio viridicollis Fabricius, 1792 (currently Phyllobius viridicollis', Insecta, Coleoptera) (Case 2678; see BZN 46: 241-243)

(1) M.A. Alonso-Zarazaga
Seccion de Entomologia, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales, J. Gutierrez Abascal 2, 28006 Madrid, Spain.

I cannot support the application to conserve Fabricius's specific name viridicollis. We (entomologists and biologists in general) should be prepared to handle synonymies.
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Additional references


We were interested to see Dr. Petersen’s comments (above) on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Aphrodita imbricata* Linnaeus, 1767 and *A. minuta* Fabricius, 1780, and were pleased to have her support and additional information regarding *A. minuta*. We also carefully considered her alternative proposals for conditional suppression of the specific name *lepidota*, but are unable to agree with that for the reasons given below.

We agree that there are probably several taxa included under *H. imbricata*, and that *H. lepidota* is probably a colour form of the same taxon, given our current knowledge of the species. If the name *lepidota* were to be suppressed only conditionally, however, it would not be available for use for a segregate species unless it could be shown that the morphological, developmental or behavioural differences which characterized the new species were present in individuals of the ‘*lepidota*’ colour form, but not in those of typical ‘*imbricata*’. As the ‘*lepidota*’ form is well known from populations studied throughout the distribution range of *imbricata*, we doubt that any such correlation between the distinctive colour pattern and other observable differences would have been overlooked by all previous workers.

There seem, therefore, to be only two alternative actions: to acknowledge the priority of *lepidota* and use the name in place of *imbricata*; or to suppress *lepidota* and accept *imbricata* as the valid name. Perhaps it would have been better if Malgren, or some other worker last century, had accepted *lepidota* as the name to use, but they were working before an agreed code of nomenclature had been accepted. They regarded the name *imbricata* as representing the typical form of the species, and *lepidota* as the name of the variety of it. The relative priority of the names was subordinate to their interpretation. We believe sufficient usage of the names in that sense warrants conservation of the name of the typical form as the name of the species, and this can only effectively be done by total suppression of the name of the variety.

Even if some of the ‘free-spawning’ individuals of ‘*imbricata*’ were of the ‘*lepidota*’ form, we do not think that would justify retention of the name. For such individuals to be recognized as a distinct species other, primarily morphological, characters would need to be associated, and we believe it would be impossible, in the absence of original type material, to show that these were found in the specimens described by Pallas. It would be preferable to introduce a new name, with a full new description. As Cazaux’s observations have not been repeated elsewhere the possibility remains that the developmental anomalies observed by him were an artefact of the handling techniques involved. As *H. imbricata* in laboratory conditions will readily shed scales, it seems not unlikely that they would also shed eggs normally brooded under the scales. Cazaux was unable to find any other point of distinction from normal *H. imbricata*. He did not give a description of the parent animals and, as noted by Daly (1972), did not describe those stages between the egg and the trophophore which correspond to the protected stage.

After reconsidering our original proposals and responding to the comments, we believe that our request for the suppression of the name *lepidota* for the purposes of the Principle of Priority should stand.
https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.2718.
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