(3) J.Y. Liu
Chinese Crustacean Society, Institute of Oceanology, Academia Sinica, 7 Nan-Hai Road, Qingdao, People’s Republic of China

Considering that (i) Bathynomus is a well known and clearly defined genus, whereas Palaega is a vague taxon based on incomplete fossils, and (ii) Bathynomus is a widely recognized name in deep-sea biology and is often included in popular accounts of Crustacea and of deep-sea life, and is the only name that has been used for these isopods since 1879, I agree with Martin & Kuck’s proposal to give precedence to Bathynomus over Palaega.

(4) L.B. Holthuis
National Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

Comparing the description of the type species of Palaega, P. carteri, with Bathynomus giganteus it seems most unlikely that the two belong to the same genus. In the course of time many other fossil species have been added to Palaega; these species, usually known only from fragments, probably belong to various genera but some may indeed be Bathynomus. However, unless and until it is proved that Palaega carteri is a Bathynomus, the latter generic name has nothing to fear.

Giving the name Bathynomus precedence over Palaega would do no harm and may set aside fears that eventually, if the two are synonymized, Bathynomus will disappear. Therefore, I am willing to support the application.

(5) Thomas E. Bowman
Department of Invertebrate Zoology, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

I do not see the need for the Commission to act on this application. Wieder & Feldmann’s Palaega goederorum seems to be a Bathynomus because of the large size and coarsely toothed posterior margin of the pleotelson, but that does not make Palaega carteri, the type species of Palaega, also a Bathynomus. The pleotelson of P. carteri resembles those of species of Aega Leach, 1815 (especially A. dentata and A. gracilipes) rather than those of Bathynomus spp., and if Palaega and Bathynomus are kept separate for the time being there should be no cause for confusion nor need for the Commission to act. Wieder & Feldmann did not give persuasive arguments for combining these genera, and might better have simply placed their new species in Bathynomus.

(6) Austin B. Williams

I disagree with Martin & Kuck (BZN 47: 27, para. 2) that ‘Palaega is of doubtful validity’. Palaega may be a ‘form’ genus, but it has a type species, P. carteri. Nevertheless, I agree with the applicants’ stand that Bathynomus and Palaega are distinct entities. The question is, does the Commission need to use plenary powers to give precedence to Bathynomus over Palaega?
This seems an ordinary case of synonymy. The Wieder & Feldmann material (\(P. \text{goedertiorum}\)) can well be considered as a species of \(Bathynomus\) closely related to the extant \(B. \text{giganteus}\). \(Palaega \text{carteri}\) and its allies can continue to be regarded as members of a ‘form genus’, admittedly somewhat nebulous because of their incompleteness.

Comments on the proposed conservation of \(Griffithides\) Portlock, 1843 and \(Bollandia\) Reed, 1943 (Trilobita)
(Case 2762; see BZN 47: 114–116, 216)

(1) Brian A. Engel
The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, N.S.W. 2308, Australia

I wish to record my strong endorsement for the conservation of the names \(Griffithides\) Portlock, 1843 and \(Bollandia\) Reed, 1943. Both trilobite names are entrenched in the relevant literature and, as outlined by Professor Hahn, adoption of a long neglected type designation for \(Griffithides\) would cause extensive and unacceptable confusion.

(2) Carsten Brauckmann

I completely agree with this application and trust that \(Griffithides\) and \(Bollandia\) will be conserved in their accustomed sense.

(3) S.F. Morris
The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

Acceptance of \(Asaphus \text{globiceps}\) as the type species of \(Griffithides\) would be disastrous. I have doubts as to whether Oldham made a valid type designation (see BZN 47: 114, para. 2), but if he did then I support Hahn’s application to conserve \(Griffithides \text{longiceps}\) as the type species.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific names of \(Culex \text{stigmatosoma}\) Dyar, 1907 and \(C. \text{thriambus}\) Dyar, 1921 (Insecta, Diptera)
(Case 2702; see BZN 46: 247–249; 47: 215–216)

(1) William K. Reisen
Arbovirus Field Station, University of California, Bakersfield, California 93312, U.S.A.

The resurrection of \(Culex \text{stigmatosoma}\) and the rejection of \(C. \text{peus}\) as the scientific name for the ‘banded foul-water mosquito’ has been accepted by most culicidologists,
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