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We support the proposal of Cernohorsky, Cornelius & Sysoev to remove the homonymy between the family-group names clavidae McCrady, 1859 (Cnidaria) and CLAVIINAЕ Casey, 1904 (Mollusca) by changing the latter to clavusinae. Replacement or respelling of the senior homonym, widely used in the literature on hydrozoans for more than a century, would not serve the interests of nomenclatural stability.

Comments on the proposed conservation of some generic names first proposed in Histoire abrégée des insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris (Geoffroy, 1762) (Crustacea, Insecta)
(Case 2292; see BZN 48: 107–134; 49: 71–72, 149–150)

(1) L.B. Holthuis
Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9157, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

I have the greatest admiration for the thoroughness and expertise with which Dr Kerzhner treated this case and so has made possible a final decision concerning Geoffroy’s generic names, many of which have been ‘illegally’ used since Geoffroy’s work was rejected for nomenclatural purposes in 1954 (Opinion 228). There are a few points, however, that need some comment.

(i) As stated by Kerzhner and Cameron (BZN 48: 107–108, 133–134), Müller (1764) in the introduction to his Fauna Insectorum Fridrichsdalina simply listed Geoffroy’s names and their Linnaean equivalents in tabular form. This does not make the Geoffroy names available as from Müller’s 1764 work, since Article 11d(ii) of the Code says that ‘the status of a previously unavailable name is not changed by its mere citation accompanied by a reference to the work in which the name was published but was not made available’.

(ii) I do not feel competent to comment on the insect names in this application, but can do so on the two crustacean ones (see BZN 48: 111–112). It seems likely that among the insect generic names of Geoffroy (1762) there are many that could be used without intervention by the Commission, although with a later authorship and date.

(iii) Asellus Geoffroy, 1762 is unavailable from Geoffroy (1762) under Opinion 228, or from Müller (1764). The first use of Asellus as an available generic name seems to be by Schaeffer (1766) in his Elementa Entomologica, an unpaginated work consisting of four sections and an index. Asellus is given on the 16th page of Section 3 with a number of characters and a reference to plate 22, the explanation of which again gives
characters; the description and figure make *Asellus* available, even though Schaeffer did not use specific names.

(iv) Schluga (1767, p. 46) used both *Asellus* and *Binoculus* in a list of the genera of ‘Insecta’, with short diagnoses; as with Schaeffer no specific names were mentioned in the work.

(v) The genus usually cited as *Asellus* Geoffroy, 1762 (or, wrongly, 1764) should be correctly referred to as *Asellus* Schaeffer, 1766 (Section 3, p. [16] and pl. 22), and *Binoculus* should be cited as *Binoculus* Schluga, 1767 (p. 46). *Binoculus* was suppressed in Opinion 502 (January 1958), but the authorship was given as Müller (1776) and this should be changed.

(vi) Summarizing, I propose that the requests in Kerzhner’s para. B.3 on BZN 48: 112 be changed as follows:

1. abandon;
2. (b) amend authorship of *Binoculus* Müller, 1776 to Schluga, 1767;
3. amend authorship of *Asellus* Geoffroy, 1762 to Schaeffer, 1766;
4. as for (3);
5. (b) as for (2)(b).

These changes are purely editorial.

(2) Hans Silfverberg
*Universitetets Zoologiska Museum, Järnvägsgatan 13, SF-00100 Helsingfors, Finland*

Dr Kerzhner’s application is very thorough, and he presents good arguments for his solution to the old problem of Geoffroy’s names. His application preserves current use, and is therefore in the spirit of the Code. The procedure I once suggested (1978; *Notulae Entomologicae*, 58: 117–119), that is attributing the names to Müller (1764), may have stretched the Code but did not break it, and did not require Commission action. However, I do not oppose Kerzhner’s proposals except for a detail relating to one particular name.

The exception is *Peltis* (see para. K.22 on BZN 48: 122). As explained by Kerzhner, Geoffroy used it in a sense different from current use and Müller (1776) was the first to include nominal species (including the currently accepted type species *Silpha grossa* Linnaeus, 1758) in the genus. I consider that *Peltis* should be taken from Müller (1776) and not, as suggested by Kerzhner, from Kugelann (1792), who merely further restricted the genus. Kerzhner’s proposals (6)(r) and (9)(k) in para. K.30 should be amended accordingly.

(3) P.K. Tubbs
*Executive Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

1. As discussed in Dr Kerzhner’s application (BZN 48: 109, para. A.7) Geoffroy’s 1762 *Histoire abrégée...* contained 59 new generic names. If Kerzhner’s proposals and those of Dr Borowiec (BZN 45: 194–196) are approved 40 of Geoffroy’s names will have been conserved, and 14 will have been suppressed to conserve the usage of the same or other names from later authors. In the remaining five cases senior Linnaean synonyms are in use.

2. The Commission attempted to deal with the status of Geoffroy’s generic names in Opinion 228. It was noted in that Opinion that ‘in some cases the rejection of names as
first published by such authors [as Geoffroy] would clearly give rise to great confusion'.

The ruling in the Opinion denying availability to many generic names in established use which were published in Geoffroy's work, on the ground that he had used polynomial specific names, has proved to be unfortunate. The decision was approved at a meeting in July 1948, and in the Proceedings and again in 1952 (BZN 7: 198–199) 'specialists' were invited to apply for the conservation of appropriate Geoffroy names. Despite the receipt of several applications [all later agreed] the Opinion was published in April 1954. It will have taken four decades and immense efforts by numerous authors, and by the Commission and its Secretariat, to remedy the never intended consequences. So far less than half of the names have been finally dealt with. If Dr Kerzhner's application is not successful the 'illegal' nomenclature referred to by Kerzhner and Holthuis will continue. I earnestly recommend acceptance of the application, with some amendments as discussed below.

3. Sixteen Geoffroy names have already been conserved in nine separate Opinions, and Kerzhner has proposed the conservation of 24 more (including two at present attributed to later authors). In every instance this is based on well established usage, and comments in support of some have been published. Eight names published by Geoffroy have been in established use in the different senses of later authors: Crabo Fabricius, 1775 has already been conserved, Bruchus Linnaeus, 1767 and Mylabris Fabricius, 1775 have been proposed by Borowiec (BZN 45: 194–196), and Kerzhner has proposed conservation of the remaining five junior homonyms.

4. Kerzhner has proposed that all the 40 Geoffroy names which have been, or should be, conserved by the Commission's plenary powers should be attributed to the Histoire abrégée, i.e. to Geoffroy, 1762. However, he has suggested that the ones not in use should be placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names with the authorship ‘Geoffroy in Müller, 1764’. Müller (1764) presented a comparison of Linnaean and Geoffroy names and descriptions. The citation ‘Geoffroy in Müller, 1764’ is cumbersome and undesirable (Pope, BZN 49: 71); its validity has been disputed by Holthuis (above), and there is no logical reason why it (or Müller, 1764) should be the reference for the rejected names and Geoffroy, 1762 that for the conserved ones. This is further discussed in para. 7 below.

5. Prof Holthuis has suggested above that the crustacean name Asellus should be placed on the Official List with the authorship of Schaeffer (1766), rather than being conserved from Geoffroy (1762) as suggested by Kerzhner. The argument is that it is unnecessary to use the Commission's plenary powers to conserve the authorship of the name. If Asellus were an isolated case this would be undeniable, but, as already mentioned, 16 of the 40 names in use have already been conserved with Geoffroy's authorship. If no more were to be, the Official List would contain 16 attributed to Geoffroy (1762), 14 to Schaeffer (1766) and 10 to Schluga (1767), despite the fact that all had been published in the same work. The names have for more than two centuries been referred to Geoffroy, and not to Schaeffer or Schluga. There are further complications: for instance Pyrochora 'Schluga, 1767' would need to be conserved (cf. Kerzhner's para. K.26) by the suppression of the spelling Pyrochorda Schaeffer, 1766. Rejected names on the Official Index would be assigned some to Schaeffer and some to Schluga. All this would be the 'chaos and arbitrary attribution to different authors and dates' deplored by Kerzhner in his para. A.7. More work and delay would be needed to achieve this undesirable end, whereas the effort needed to conserve the Geoffroy names has already been invested by
Dr Kerzhner and others, including the Commission. For these reasons, the suggestion of Prof Holthuis regarding *Asellus* has considerable disadvantages. However, the formal proposals in Kerzhner’s application have been structured so that the Commission will be asked to vote on a name-by-name procedure (see para. A.8), and it will therefore be easily possible, although entirely anomalous, to attribute *Asellus* to Schaeffer, 1766 and to have 39 names conserved from Geoffroy, 1762.

6. I am convinced that only the acceptance of Kerzhner’s application can give stability; it is in accord with historical reality and with the ‘invitation to specialists’ issued in association with the 1954 Opinion.

7. A procedural difficulty arises in the case of those Geoffroy names which are senior homonyms or synonyms of names in use, and whose conservation is therefore not requested by Kerzhner or Borowiec. These are *Acrydium, Binoculus, Bruchus, Byrrhus, Cistela, Cucujus, Formicaleo, Melolontha, Mylabris, Peltis, Rhinomacer, Tetigonia* and *Tritoma*. At the present moment these names cannot be suppressed from Geoffroy (1762), even though this was done for *Crabro* in Opinion 144 (1943), since they are not available from that work as a consequence of Opinion 228. Their availability from the work of Müller (1764) has been challenged as mentioned in para. 4 above. All of Geoffroy’s names are available from either Schaeffer (1766) or Schluga (1767), but, as pointed out in para. 5, it would be extremely confusing to introduce these ‘new’ authorships (even for purposes of suppression only). By far the most straightforward course is to take all the names from where they appeared, Geoffroy’s work. All 59 new generic names therein have now been considered in detail, either in Opinions already made or in the applications of Kerzhner and Borowiec. The result is that Opinion 228 has been in effect totally superseded, even though by instalments; the logical conclusion is the revocation of that Opinion and this is proposed below. It should be emphasized that the validity of no name will be affected by this seemingly drastic step. Also proposed below are minor amendments to Kerzhner’s formal proposals incorporating those which have been published in comments, and the addition of *Forbicina, Hepa* and *Tinaea* Geoffroy to the Official Index as junior objective synonyms of Linnaean names. As already mentioned, the Commission will be asked to vote on a name-by-name basis in all cases.

8. I comment separately (BZN 49: 227–228) on Dr Borowiec’s application (BZN 45: 194–196), and on the name *Acrydium* (BZN 49: 228–229).

9. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that, notwithstanding the use of polynomial specific names in the work by E.L. Geoffroy (1762) entitled *Histoire abrégée des insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris*, generic names published in that work are deemed available for nomenclatural purposes;

(2) to delete this work from the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature, and to place it on the Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature with an endorsement to reflect the ruling requested in (1) above;

(3) to make such editorial changes in the Official Lists and Indexes as are necessary from the rulings requested in (1) and (2) above, together with previous Opinions;

(4) to accept the following amendments to the proposals published by I.M. Kerzhner in BZN 48: 107–133 (references being given to his paragraphs in each case):
(i) amend all references to Geoffroy in Müller, 1764 to read Geoffroy, 1762;
(ii) B.3 (2) (a) withdraw [covered by deletion of (5)(a) below];
      (b) amend Müller, 1776 to read Geoffroy, 1762;
      (5) (a) delete this entry from Official Index;
      (b) amend Müller, 1776 to read Geoffroy, 1762;
C.2 [new para.] add Forbicina Geoffroy, 1762 to Official Index as a junior
      objective synonym of Lepisma Linnaeus, 1758;
D.3 no changes [apart from amendment of Geoffroy in Müller, 1764];
E.2 (1) and (2) amend Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785 to read Geoffroy, 1762;
F.2 [new para.] add Hepa Geoffroy, 1762 to Official Index as a junior objective
      synonym of Nepa Linnaeus, 1758;
G.2 no changes [apart from amendment of Geoffroy in Müller, 1764];
H.5 (3)(b) amend (Olivier, 1791) to read (Fabricius, 1781);
J.3 add new (4) to amend entry for Tinea Geoffroy, 1762 on the Official
      Index to record that it is a junior objective synonym of Tinea Linnaeus,
      1758;
K.30(3)(a) and (c) amend authorships to read Geoffroy, 1762;
      (3)(b) and (7)(f) omit;
      (6)(r), (7)(e) and (9)(k) amend Kugelann, 1792 to read Müller, 1776;
      (8) amend Müller, 1776 to read Geoffroy, 1762.
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Comment on the proposed conservation of Bruchus Linnaeus, 1767, Ptinus Linnaeus,
1767 and Mylabris Fabricius, 1775 (Insecta, Coleoptera)
(Case 2618; see BZN 45: 194–196; 48: 143–147)

P.K. Tubbs

Executive Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

1. The generic names *Bruchus* and *Mylabris* were first published, with descriptions,
on pp. 163 and 266 of Geoffroy’s 1762 *Histoire abrégée des insectes qui se trouvent aux
environs de Paris*. They appeared again in Müller (1764) and Schaeffer’s 1766 *Elementa
Entomologica*. The latter two works included no species in any genus, but Geoffroy
employed polynomial specific names and for this reason his work was ruled in Opinion
228 to be unavailable; the new generic names were not excepted but specialists were
asked for advice. The authorship of these names, as of 1764, has been given as ‘Müller’
by Borowiec (BZN 45: 194–196) and as ‘Geoffroy in Müller’ by Kerzhner (BZN 38: 5–7;
48: 107–133), Kerzhner & Kirejtshuk (BZN 48: 143–144) and myself (BZN 48:
146–147). However, doubt exists as to whether, under Article 11d of the Code, any
names were made available in Müller’s work, and it has been proposed (BZN 49: 226)
that generic names should now be accepted as having been made available in Geoffroy
(1762); this course has already been accepted by the Commission in 16 particular
instances. If Kerzhner’s proposals (BZN 48: 107–133) and those of Borowiec are
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