

Case 3342***Phalaena croesella* Scopoli, 1763 (currently *Adela croesella*; Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation of usage of the specific name**

Mikhail V. Kozlov

Section of Ecology, University of Turku, 20014 Turku, Finland
(e-mail: mikoz@utu.fi)

Abstract. The purpose of this application, under Article 23.9.3 of the Code, is to conserve the widely used specific name *Phalaena croesella* Scopoli, 1763 (currently *Adela croesella*) for a common European fairy moth (family ADELIDAE) by designating a neotype. The current use of the name *P. croesella* is based on a misidentification and this makes it a junior subjective synonym of *Phalaena degeerella* Linnaeus, 1758 (currently *Nemophora degeerella*). It is proposed that all previous type fixations for *Phalaena croesella* Scopoli, 1763 are set aside and a neotype is designated.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; ADELIDAE; *Phalaena*; *Adela*; *Adela croesella*; *Nemophora degeerella*; fairy moth; Europe.

1. Scopoli (1763, p. 251) described and figured *Phalaena croesella* from Idrija, Slovenia. The type material is lost and to the best of my knowledge no neotype has ever been designated. The name *P. croesella* (currently *Adela croesella*) is currently used for a common European fairy moth species, resembling in wing pattern *Phalaena* (*Tinea*) *degeerella* Linnaeus, 1758 (p. 540) (currently *Nemophora degeerella*) (see Heath & Pelham-Clinton, 1976; Razowski, 1978; Zaguljaev, 1978; Wojtusiak, 1996). During 1871–2004 the name *P. croesella* was consistently used in at least 180 publications, including all major guide books and catalogues (reference list is available from the Commission Secretariat). The original description of *P. croesella* indicates that it is larger ('long. lin. 2') than *P. degeerella* ('long. lin. 2'), has 'violaceae' wings (*P. degeerella*: 'nigrae'), and 'longissimae' antennae (*P. degeerella*: 'longae'). The species that is currently recognised as *Adela croesella* is smaller than *N. degeerella* (wingspan 11–14 mm versus 17–23 mm in *N. degeerella*: see Heath & Pelham-Clinton, 1976), has relatively shorter male antennae and darker fore wings with prominent copper lustre. This contradicts the original description and indicates that the current use of the name *P. croesella* is based on a misidentification.

2. Among fairy moths inhabiting Slovenia (list for the former Yugoslavia given by Wojtusiak, 1996) only *Nemophora degeerella* and *Adela croesella* correspond to the description of wing pattern given by Scopoli (1763). It is likely that Scopoli (1763) erroneously identified the species currently known under the name *Adela croesella* as *Phalaena degeerella*, and described true *Phalaena degeerella* as *Phalaena croesella*. The figure of *Phalaena croesella* published by Scopoli (1763) fits better to *Phalaena degeerella*. Thus *Phalaena croesella* Scopoli, 1763 is a junior subjective synonym of *Phalaena degeerella* Linnaeus, 1758.

3. Goeze (1783, p. 146) and de Villers (1789, pp. 510–511), were, to the best of my knowledge, the only authors who used *Phalaena croesella* as the valid name before Zincken (Charpentier & Zincken, 1821, p. 159) unequivocally synonymised *P. croesella* with *N. degeerella*. This synonymy was accepted by Treitschke (1833, p. 131), Duponchel (1838, p. 360), Fischer von Rösslerstamm (1840, p. 189), Zeller (1853, p. 30) and many others. Frey (1880, p. 342) was the last author who referred to this synonymy.

4. Denis & Schiffermüller (1775, p. 143), Hübner (1796, pl. 18, fig. 121) and subsequently several other researchers used the name *P. sulzella* (an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Phalaena sultzella* Linnaeus, 1767 (p. 896)) for the species currently known as *Adela croesella*. However, this was also a misidentification. *Phalaena sultzella* Linnaeus, 1767 is a junior subjective synonym of *Phalaena degeerella* Linnaeus, 1758 (Fabricius, 1775, p. 669). The type material of *Phalaena sultzella* is lost (Robinson & Nielsen, 1983, p. 232).

5. Fabricius (1775, p. 669) used the name *Phalaena podaella* Linnaeus, 1767 (p. 896), which he assigned to his new genus *Alucita*, for the species nearest to *Phalaena degeerella*. However, this taxonomic decision was not followed by subsequent authors, although the name *P. podaella* was sometimes listed among the synonyms of *P. croesella*. Razowski (1978, p. 73) is probably the last author who referred to this synonymy. The type specimens of *P. podaella* have not been discovered in the Linnaean collection (Robinson & Nielsen, 1983, p. 224), and identity of this species remains unclear. Although *Phalaena podaella* Linnaeus, 1767 is the oldest available name for the species currently known as *Phalaena croesella*, it has not been used as a valid name for nearly two centuries, and should be considered a nomen oblitum under Article 23.9.1.1.

6. Esper (1791, pp. 49–51, tab. 2, fig. 3) described *Sphinx fasciata* on the basis of two females from Lyon, France. This name was synonymized with *Phalaena sulzella* by Charpentier (Charpentier & Zincken, 1821, p. 158) and had never been used later as a valid name for the species in question; it should be considered a nomen oblitum under Article 23.9.1.1.

7. Zeller (1839, p. 186) replaced the name *P. sultzella* Linnaeus (spelt *sulzella*) with *Adela* (*Eutyphia*) *sulzeriella* without explaining the reason. This replacement was followed in particular by Herrich-Schäffer (1855, p. 103, pl. 32, fig. 227). In contrast, Wocke (1861, p. 108) used the name *P. sulzella*, attributed to Denis & Schiffermüller (1775), and listed both *Adela degeerella* (sensu Scopoli, 1763) and *Adela sulzeriella* Zeller, 1839 as synonyms of *P. sulzella*. Although the name *Adela* (*Eutyphia*) *sulzeriella* Zeller, 1839, is also available for the species currently known as *P. croesella*, it has not been used as a valid name after 1899, and should be considered a nomen oblitum under Article 23.9.1.1.

8. Werneburg (1864, p. 239) did not accept the synonymy established by Zincken (in Charpentier & Zincken, 1821, p. 159) and listed *P. croesella* as a valid name. Wocke (1871, p. 274) only partially accepted Werneburg's argument and used *P. croesella* as the valid name for the species next to *P. degeerella*, but listed specimens described by Scopoli (1763) as *Adela degeerella* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Adela sulzeriella* Zeller, 1839 among the synonyms of *Phalaena croesella*. Subsequent major catalogues (Rebel, 1901, p. 245; Meyrick, 1912a, p. 9; Meyrick, 1912b, p. 11) accepted this decision and apparently influenced subsequent use of the name *Phalaena croesella* for

the species distinct from *Phalaena degeerella*. However, the current use of the name *P. croesella* is based on a misidentification, and *Phalaena croesella* Scopoli, 1763 is a junior subjective synonym of *Phalaena degeerella* Linnaeus, 1758. No other names are available for the taxon in question.

9. I propose that the existing usage of the specific name *Phalaena croesella* Scopoli, 1763 is maintained by designating a neotype for *P. croesella*. The most suitable specimen for the neotype is deposited in the Natural History Museum, London, and bears two labels: 5 × 7 mm, black ink 'Croat.[ia] | Man[n]'; 8 × 10 mm, black ink and print 'Zeller Coll. Walsingham Collection 1910-427'.

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

- (1) to use its plenary power to set aside all previous type fixations for the nominal species *croesella* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen *Phalaena croesella*, and to designate the specimen proposed in para. 9 above as neotype;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *croesella* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen *Phalaena croesella* and as defined by the neotype designated in (1) above.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to E.J. van Nieukerken for discussion and to the SYS-RESOURCE and SYNTHESYS programmes for the support of research visits to the Natural History Museum, London.

References

- Charpentier, T. von & Zincken, J.L.T.F. 1821. *Die Zinsler, Wickler, Schaben und Geistchen des Systematischen Verzeichnisses der Schmetterlinge der Wiener Gegend, verglichen mit den in der Schiffermüllerschen Sammlung in Wien befindlichen*. 178 pp. Braunschweig.
- Denis, J.N.C.M. & Schiffermüller, I. 1775. *Ankündigung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wienergegend*. 323 pp., 3 pls. Wien.
- Duponchel, P.P.J. 1838. Nocturnes. In Godart, J.B. & Duponchel, P.P.J., *Histoire naturelle des Lépidoptères ou Papillons de France*. 720 pp., 8 pls. Paris.
- Esper, E.J.C. 1791. Beschreibung einiger der prächtigsten Schmetterlinge von den kleinsten Arten, nach ihrer vergrößerten Abbildung. *Naturforscher*, **25**: 39–51.
- Fabricius, J.C. 1775. *Systema entomologiae, sistens Insectorum classes, ordines, genera, species, adiectis synonymis, locis, descriptionibus, observationibus*. [32], 832 pp. Flensburgi et Lipsiae.
- Fischer von Röslerstamm, J.E. 1834–[1843]. *Abbildungen zur Berichtigung und Ergänzung der Schmetterlingkunde, besonders der Microlepidopterologie, als Supplement zu Treitschke's und Hübner's europäischen Schmetterlingen, mit erläuterndem Text*. 304 pp., 100 pls. Leipzig.
- Frey, H. 1880. *Die Lepidopteren der Schweiz*. xxvi, 454 pp. Leipzig.
- Goeze, J.A.E. 1783. *Entomologische Beyträge zu des Ritter Linne' zwölften Ausgabe des Natursystems*. Th. 3, Bd. 4. xx, 178 pp. Wiedmanns Erben und Reich, Leipzig.
- Heath, J. & Pelham-Clinton, E.C. 1976. Incurvariidae. Pp. 277–300 in Heath, J. (Ed.), *The moths and butterflies of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. 1. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Herrich-Schäffer, G.A.W. [1847]–1855. *Systematische Bearbeitung der Schmetterlinge von Europa*, 5. *Die Schaben und Federmotten*. 394 pp., 124 pls. Regensburg.
- Hübner, J. 1796–[1836]. *Sammlung europäischer Schmetterlinge*. VIII. *Tineidae—Schaben*. 78 pp., 71 pls. Augsburg.
- Linnaeus, C. 1758. *Systema Naturae*, Ed. 10, vol. 1. 824 pp. Salvii, Holmiae.

- Linnaeus, C.** 1767. *Systema Naturae*, Ed. 12, vol. 1, part 2. Pp. 533–1327. Salvii, Holmiae.
- Meyrick, E.** 1912a. *Lepidoptera Heterocera (Tineae). Fam. Adelidae*. 12 pp., 1 pl. Bruxelles.
- Meyrick, E.** 1912b. Adelidae, Micropterygidae, Gracilariidae [sic]. *Lepidopterorum Catalogus*, 6: 1–68.
- Razowski, J.** 1978. *Heteroneura, Adeloidea*. 137 pp., 11 pls. Warszawa [Monografie fauny Polski, T. 8. Motyle (Lepidoptera) Polski, Cz. III].
- Rebel, H.** 1901. *Catalog der Lepidopteren des palaearctischen Faunengebietes. Th. II: Fam. Pyralidae – Micropterygidae*. 368 pp. Berlin.
- Robinson, G.S. & Nielsen, E.S.** 1983. The Microlepidoptera described by Linnaeus and Clerck. *Systematic Entomology*, 8: 191–242.
- Scopoli, I.P.** 1763. *Entomologia Carniolica exhibens insecta Carnioliae indigena et distributa in ordines, genera, species, varietates. Methodo Linnaeana*. 36, 421 pp. Vindobonae.
- Treitschke, F.** 1833. *Die Schmetterlinge von Europa*, vol. 9. 294 pp. Leipzig.
- Villers, C. de.** 1789. *Caroli Linnaei Entomologia, Fauna Suecicae descriptionibus aucta . . .*, vol. 2. xvi, 656 pp., 6 pls. Lugduni.
- Werneburg, P.** 1864. *Beiträge zur Schmetterlingskunde. Kritische Bearbeitung der wichtigsten entomologischen Werke des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts bezüglich der darin abgehandelten Europäischen Schmetterlinge*. Vol. 1, viii, 600 pp.; vol. 2, iv, 350 pp. Erfurt.
- Wocke, M.F.** 1861. Microlepidoptera. Pp. 85–192 in Staudinger, O. & Wocke, M.F., *Catalogue des Lépidoptères d'Europe*. Dresden.
- Wocke, M.F.** 1871. Microlepidoptera. Pp. 201–346 in Staudinger, O. & Wocke, M.F., *Catalogue ou Énumération Méthodique des Lépidoptères qui habitent le territoire de la Faune Européenne*. Dresden.
- Wojtusiak, J.** 1996. Adelidae. Pp. 28–29 in Karsholt, O. & Razowski, J. (Eds.), *The Lepidoptera of Europe: a distributional checklist*. Apollo Books, Stenstrup, Denmark.
- Zaguljaev, P.K.** 1978. Fam. Adelidae – long-horn moths. Pp. 92–112 in Medvedev, G.S. (Ed.), *Opredelitel nasekomykh evropeiskoi chasti SSSR*. Tom IV. Cheshuekrylye. Pervaya chast. [Key for determination of insects of the European part of the USSR, vol. IV, Lepidoptera, part 1]. Leningrad. [In Russian].
- Zeller, P.C.** 1839. Versuch einer naturgemässen Einteilung der Schaben. *Isis von Oken*, 23: 167–219.
- Zeller, P.C.** 1853. Sieben Tineaceen – Gattungen. *Linnaea Entomologica*, 8: 1–87.

Acknowledgement of receipt of this application was published in BZN 62: 58.

Comments on this case are invited for publication (subject to editing) in the *Bulletin*; they should be sent to the Executive Secretary, I.C.Z.N., Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD (e-mail: iczn@nhm.ac.uk).



Kozlov, Mikhail V. 2006. "Phalaena croesella Scopoli, 1763 (currently Adela croesella; Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation of usage of the specific name." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 63, 118–121.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/107000>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/42655>

Holding Institution

Smithsonian Libraries and Archives

Sponsored by

Biodiversity Heritage Library

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.