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Rosacea Quoy & Gaimard, 1827: proposed conservation of usage (Cnidaria, Siphonophora); Desmophyes annectens Haeckel, 1888 and Rosacea plicata Bigelow, 1911: proposed conservation
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Abstract. The purpose of this application is to conserve the names Desmophyes annectens Haeckel, 1888, under Article 23.9.3 of the Code, and Rosacea plicata Bigelow, 1911, under Article 23.9.5, for two widely distributed (but rare in the former case) species of calycophoran prayid siphonophores. D. annectens is a junior synonym of Rosacea plicata Quoy & Gaimard, 1827. Bigelow used the name R. plicata for a different taxon. The name R. plicata is in prevailing use for the species described by Bigelow and introduction of a new name for this species would cause nomenclatural confusion, as would use of the name R. plicata Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 for the species currently known as D. annectens. Conservation of the names D. annectens Haeckel, 1888 and R. plicata Bigelow, 1911 and of the usage of the generic name Rosacea Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 by the designation of R. plicata Bigelow, 1911 as the type species of Rosacea Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 is proposed.
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1. Quoy & Gaimard (1827, pp. 176–177, pl. 4B, figs. 2–4) introduced the generic name Rosacea for two new species of prayid siphonophores, R. ceutensis (p. 176) and R. plicata (p. 177), from the Strait of Gibraltar, which they briefly figured and described. R. ceutensis has not been positively identified since. The specific name R. plicata was used again as valid only by Schneider (1896, p. 632; 1898, p. 78; 1899, p. 22, figs. 18–23), by Kawamura in two taxonomic reviews of Japanese siphonophores (1915, p. 319, pl. 7, figs. 6–8; 1954, p. 102), and by Margulis (1994) in a recent revision of the genus Rosacea. A number of synonyms of R. plicata Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 have been recognised. These nominal species include Diphyes brajae Vogt, 1851 (p. 140, figs. 130–131), (invalid under Article 23.9.1, not used as valid since 1899 = nomen oblitum), Praya diphyes Kolliker, 1853 (p. 33, pl. 9), (non Blainville, 1834), P. diphyes Vogt, 1854 (p. 99, pls. 16, figs. 1–2, pl. 17), (non Blainville, 1834), and P. filiformis Keferstein & Ehlers, 1860 (p. 260), 1861 (p. 20, pl. 5, figs. 8–11), (invalid =
Rhizophysa filiformis Chiaje, 1829, a junior primary homonym of R. filiformis Forskal, 1775. The name P. diphyes auct. (non Blainville, 1834) has also been used for other praya species.

2. Haeckel (1888a, p. 36) established the name Desmophyes for a genus with up to six swimming bells and included two nominal species without descriptions. Later the same year he established the species D. annectens with an extensive description and figures (Haeckel, 1888b, p. 170, pl. 30). Schneider (1896, p. 630) assigned Haeckel’s species to the genus Praya. Chun (1897, p. 68, fig. 9) used the name D. annectens in a general review of siphonophore body plans, and reproduced Haeckel’s figure (Haeckel, 1888b, pl. 30, fig. 1). D. annectens is a rare species and was not considered in detail again until Totton (1965, p. 128, pl. 22, figs. 4–6; pl. 24, figs. 1–9) included it in his monograph on siphonophores. He indirectly recognised that D. annectens was the same taxon as Rosacea plicata Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 by including the name as ‘R. plicata: Kawamura, 1915’ in his synonymy and reproducing Kawamura’s figures (Kawamura, 1915, pl. 7, figs. 6–8) of R. plicata Quoy & Gaimard (Totton, 1965, pl. 22, figs. 4–6). However, the name D. annectens has been used consistently for this species since 1965 (see Pugh, 1974, p. 39; Kirkpatrick & Pugh, 1984, p. 62; Margulis, 1987, p. 25; Pugh & Harbison, 1987, p. 86; Dallot et al., 1988, p. 197; Gibbons & Thibault-Botha, 2002, p. 803; and 17 additional references held by the Commission Secretariat).

3. Bigelow (1911a, pp. 341–343) identified material he collected in the Bay of Biscay as Rosacea plicata Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 and in the same year published an extensive description of similar material together with three excellent figures of specimens from the tropical east Pacific (Bigelow, 1911b, pp. 201–203, pl. 2, figs. 7–9). These figures have been used by many workers to identify this species. Bigelow’s species is different from that of Quoy & Gaimard because the somatocyst is arranged differently, as pointed out by Totton (1965, p. 115) and Pugh & Harbison (1987, p. 86), and it is a common and well known praya species (see Bigelow & Sears, 1937, p. 11; Totton, 1954, p. 88; 1965, p. 116; Stepanjants, 1967, p. 145; Daniel, 1974, p. 84; Xu & Zhang, 1978, p. 36; Alvarín, 1981, p. 401; Kirkpatrick & Pugh, 1984, p. 54; Pagès & Gili, 1992, p. 76; Pugh, 1999, p. 486; Gao et al., 2002, p. 86). To avoid future confusion, Totton (1965, p. 116) referred to Bigelow’s species as ‘R. plicata sensu Bigelow, 1911’ and treated it as a new species. However, the name is invalid, under Article 57.2 of the Code, as a junior primary homonym of R. plicata Quoy & Gaimard, 1827.

4. Pugh & Harbison (1987) reviewed all genera and species in the praya subfamily prayinae, noting (p. 86) that the original specimen (holotype) of Rosacea plicata Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 was no longer in existence, and therefore designated as the neotype a pair of nectophores from material described by Bigelow (1911a) from the Bay of Biscay. However, the specimens from which Pugh & Harbison (1987) designated their neotype are here recognised as syntypes and the neotype should now be identified as the lectotype of a then new nominal species Rosacea plicata Bigelow, 1911 (non Quoy & Gaimard, 1827). The lectotype is a pair of nectophores described by Bigelow (1911a) and held in the collections of The Natural History Museum, London, as BMNH Reg. No. 1939.6.10.1. The syntypes were collected by H.M.S. Research on 25-vii-1900 at 47°03′N, 7°55′W, from 300–0 fm (see Pugh & Harbison, 1987, p. 87).

6. The names *Rosacea plicata* Bigelow, 1911 and *Desmophyes annectens* Haeckel, 1888 for the two species are well established in the literature (see paras. 2 and 3 above). Stability would not be maintained by adopting the changes introduced by Margulis (1994). Therefore, in the interests of nomenclatural stability we propose that *Rosacea plicata* Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 is suppressed for both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy and that *Rosacea plicata* Bigelow, 1911 is designated as the type species of *Rosacea* Quoy & Gaimard, 1827.

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

(1) to use its plenary power:
   (a) to suppress the name *plicata* Quoy & Gaimard, 1827, as published in the binomen *Rosacea plicata*, for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy;
   (b) to set aside all previous fixations of type species for the nominal genus *Rosacea* Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 and to designate *Rosacea plicata* Bigelow, 1911 as the type species;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the following names:
   (a) *Desmophyes* Haeckel, 1888 (gender: feminine), type species by monotypy *Desmophyes annectens* Haeckel, 1888;
   (b) *Rosacea* Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 (gender: feminine), type species by designation in (1)(b) above *Rosacea plicata* Bigelow, 1911;

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the following names:
   (a) *annectens*, Haeckel, 1888, as published in the binomen *Desmophyes annectens* (specific name of the type species of *Desmophyes* Haeckel, 1888);
   (b) *plicata*, Bigelow, 1911, as published in the binomen *Rosacea plicata* and defined by the lectotype cited in para. 4 above (specific name of the type species of *Rosacea* Quoy & Gaimard, 1827);

(4) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the name *plicata* Quoy & Gaimard, 1827 as published in the binomen *Rosacea plicata* and as suppressed in (1)(a) above.
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