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THEBINI Wenz, 1923, MONACHAINAE Wenz, 1930 (1904), and SPHINCTEROCHILIDAE Zilch, 1960 (1910): proposed conservation (Mollusca, Gastropoda)
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Abstract. The purpose of this application is to conserve the family-group names thebini Wenz, 1923, monachainae Wenz, 1930 (1904) and sphincterochilidae Zilch, 1960 (1910) for several West Palearctic helicoid land snails. The family-group names involved have a complex nomenclatural history due to a misidentified type genus, a misidentified type species, homonymy and synonymy. Issues raised in the present application had been partly resolved in Opinion 431 by placing the names Helicella, Monacha, and Theba on the Official List, and the names Euparypha, Jacosta, and Xerophila on the Official Index. However, the consequences of these rulings on family-group names had not been addressed.
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1. Theba Risso, 1826 and thebini Wenz, 1923

1.1. Risso (1826, p. 73) established the name Theba for a genus of helicoid land snails based on a manuscript name by Leach (1820, A synopsis of the Mollusca of Great Britain, unpublished). Ten species were originally included, of which Helix pisana O.F. Müller, 1774 (p. 60) was subsequently designated as the type species by Gray (1847, p. 173) but not recognised until 1927 (Lindholm, 1927, p. 119). Leach's manuscript name was also published with the spelling 'Teba' by Turton (1831, pp. 36-43) and by Beck (1847, p. 132) (see Giannuzzi-Savelli & Gentry, 1990, p. 263, on how Leach's names were subsequently made available by his contemporaries). Caziot (1910, pp. 84, 529) treated Theba Risso, 1826 as etymologically incorrect and used 'Teba Leach, 1820' in the sense of the genus Hygromia Risso, 1826, but he did not designate a type species. After Caziot, use of the spelling 'Teba' was discontinued. The name Teba was listed in Neave's Nomenclator Zoologicus as 'pro The- Risso, 1826' (Leach MS) Turton, 1831, ...' and in Sherborn's Index Animalium it was attributed to 'H. Beck, 1846 (1847) ...' without reference to Leach MS, and additionally to 'W.E. Leach, ... 1847, ... (non 1820, MS)'. The name 'Teba' is an incorrect subsequent spelling and, therefore, an unavailable name under Article 33.3 of the Code.

1.2. The name Theba Risso, 1826 was in general use during the 19th century (see also para. 2 below). Moquin-Tandon (1855, p. 102) used it for species currently classified in the genus Trochoidea Brown, 1827 and Cochlicella Féruussac, 1821 (and placed H. pisana in the genus Heliomanes Brown, 1844). Westerlund (1889, p. 71)
used it in the sense of Monacha Fitzinger, 1833 (and placed H. pisana in Euparypha Hartmann, 1843).

1.3. Pilsbry (1895, p. 265), in apparent ignorance of Gray’s earlier type designation, designated Helix cartusiana O.F. Müller, 1774 (also an originally included species) as type species of Theba. Such was the magnitude of Pilsbry’s reputation that this taxonomic concept was used for several decades.

1.4. Following the usage established by Westerlund (1889) and Pilsbry (1895), Wenz (1923, p. 381) introduced the family-group name thebini (as Thebea) as a substitute name for Carthusianini Kobelt, 1904 (based on Carthusiana Kobelt, 1871, type species by tautonymy Helix cartusiana [sic] O.F. Müller, 1774). This usage was followed by Hesse (1931, 1934, who cited ‘Germain, 1929’ as the author) but not subsequently. The family-group name thebini is a senior objective synonym of Euparyphinae Perrot, 1939 (the type species of Euparypha Hartmann, 1843, p. 204, Helix pisana O.F. Müller, 1774, is the valid type species of its type genus Theba) (see Schileyko (1972)). The genus name Theba is in prevailing use (see Gittenberger & Ripken, 1987). The name Euparypha was placed on the Official Index in Opinion 431 (Opinions and Declarations rendered by the ICZN, 14, p. 351). Lindholm (1927, p. 119) recognised that the first valid designation of a type species for Theba was by Gray (1847). From that time Theba has consistently been used for a genus including Theba pisana (O.F. Müller, 1774). Theba Risso, 1826 was placed on the Official List in Opinion 431 (Opinions and Declarations rendered by the ICZN, 14, p. 350) with Helix pisana O.F. Müller, 1774 as the type species. Thus the family-group name thebini Wenz, 1923 was based on an overlooked earlier type species fixation for the misidentified type genus. Therefore, we propose that the name thebini Wenz, 1923 is ruled not invalid by the discovery that the type genus was misidentified (i.e. interpreted in a sense other than that defined by its type species) and that fixation of the type species had been overlooked. Accordingly, this case is referred to the Commission for a ruling under Articles 65.2.1, 65.2.2 and 70.2 of the Code.

2. Monacha Fitzinger, 1833 and monachinae Wenz, 1930

2.1. Fitzinger (1833, p. 95) established the genus Monacha with three included species, one of which, Monacha carthusianella Mihi (= Helix cartusiana O.F. Müller, 1774), was subsequently designated as the type species by Herrmannsen (1847 [17 July], p. 51). The generic name Monacha was placed on the Official List in Opinion 431 (Opinions and Declarations rendered by the ICZN, 14, p. 350) with Helix cartusiana O.F. Müller, 1774 as the type species by subsequent but invalid designation by Gray (1847 [November], p. 173). The type species designation by Herrmannsen is valid. We propose that the Official List be emended accordingly.

2.2. As a consequence of Lindholm’s (1927) discovery of Gray’s type species designation for Theba (see para. 1.1 above), Wenz (1930, p. 3027) introduced the substitute name monachini (as Monachea) and abandoned the name thebini. This action was implicit under Articles 26–30 of the Rules then in force (1926) and correct under Article 23.3.5 of the current Code. Following Wenz, monachini was used as the valid name of a tribe or a subfamily and is in current use. Nordsieck (1987, p. 31) noted that because monachini was a replacement name for thebini, itself a replacement name for Carthusianini, it takes priority from 1904, the date of publication of the earlier name (= monachini Wenz, 1930 (1904); see Article 40.2.1 and
Recommendation 40A of the Code). Nordsieck also pointed out that monachinae Wenz is a homonym of monachinae Gray, 1869, based on Monachus Fleming, 1822 (Mammalia). monachinae / -ini Gray, 1869 is in current use for a subfamily and tribe of the family phocidae (see McKenna & Bell, 1997, p. 258). Therefore, the case must be referred to the Commission for a ruling under Article 55.3.1. Accordingly, we propose that homonymy between the two family-group names is removed by emending the stem of the junior name from monach- to monacha-, thereby changing the gastropod family-group name to monachainae / monachaini with the mammalian family-group name remaining unchanged (see Article 29 and Recommendation 29A).

3. Leucochroa Beck, 1837 and leucochroidae Westerlund, 1886

3.1. Beck (1837, p. 16) established the name Leucochroa for a subgenus of Helix and included 15 species of which Helix albella Linnaeus, 1758 (p. 768) was validly designated as the type species by Herrmannsen (1847a, pp. 585–586), but Herrmannsen’s action was not noticed until 1925. Martens (1860, p. 78) designated Helix candidissima Draparnaud, 1801 (p. 75), also an originally included species, as type species. Subsequent authors followed this use of the name Leucochroa for large, rounded, unbanded helicoids and Westerlund (1886, p. 82) established the family name leucochroidae for this taxonomic concept. Thus, the family-group name leucochroidae is a senior objective synonym of sphincterochilidae Zilch, 1960 (see para. 6.4 below). However, despite Lindholm (1925, p. 164) and Pallary (1909, p. 12), use of the name leucochroidae was continued in that sense by Germain (1921, p. 99; 1931), Ihering (1929) and Hesse (1931, p. 105), but not subsequently.

3.2. Lindholm (1925, p. 164) realised that valid type species designations by Herrmannsen had been overlooked, and listed ‘Helix albella Drap. fide Herrmannsen, 1847’ as the type species of Leucochroa. He then treated Leucochroa as an objective synonym of Jacosta Gray, 1821 (type species ‘Helix albella Draparnaud’ [= H. albella Linnaeus, 1758] by monotypy). Forcart (1965, p. 255) found that the nominal species H. albella was composite, being based on a juvenile albino specimen of a species currently known as Helicigona lapicida (Linnaeus, 1758) and an indication to an illustration in Gualtieri (1742, pl. 3, fig. Q) currently recognised as Theba pisana (O.F. Müller, 1774). He selected the latter as the lectotype of H. albella Linnaeus, 1758, and Leucochroa then became an objective synonym of Theba. Forcart also treated ‘Helix albella Draparnaud, 1801’ and ‘Leucochroa Lindholm, 1925, non Beck, 1837’ as separate nomenclatural entities, which he considered to be synonyms of Helix explanata O.F. Müller, 1774 (currently Xerosecta explanata) and of Xerosecta Monterosato, 1892 respectively.

3.3. The family-group name leucochroidae Westerlund, 1886 was thus based on a misidentified type genus [Article 65.2.2], Leucochroa Beck, 1837, which itself was based on a misidentified type species [Article 70.2]. With this interpretation of the nominal genus Leucochroa, leucochroidae would be the same as thebini, but the family-group name leucochroidae has never been used in this sense. Accordingly, this case is referred to the Commission for a ruling under Article 65.2.

4. Xerophila Held, 1838 and xerophilidae Mörch, 1864

4.1. Held (1838, p. 913 [for date of publication, see Pilsbry 1934]) established the new genus Xerophila including 13 species of which H. pisana was subsequently
designated as the type species by Herrmannsen (1849, p. 712). Xerophila is a junior objective synonym of Theba and was placed on the Official Index in Opinion 431 (Opinions and Declarations rendered by the ICZN, 14, p. 351). The family-group name based on Xerophila was not then discussed.

4.2. Mörch (1864, p. 281) established the family xerophilidae (as Xerophilae). The type genus is Xerophila Held, 1838 (p. 913), by inference, but Mörch did not cite the name and it remains conjectural. Mörch included the genera Jacosta (with ‘Teba Leach’ given as a synonym) and Eulota Hartmann, 1841 in this family. Authors who subsequently used xerophilinae (as a subfamily) applied it in the sense of helicellinae (Kobelt, 1904, pp. 67, 132; Wagner, 1927, p. 366). After the influential works of Hesse (1926) and Pilsbry (1939) use of xerophilidae / -inae was discontinued and helicellidae / -inae came into prevailing use.

5. Euparypha Hartmann, 1843 and euparyphinae Perrot, 1939

5.1. The monotypic genus Euparypha was introduced by Hartmann (1843, p. 204) for Helix rhodostoma Draparnaud, 1801, including H. pisana O.F. Müller, 1774 in synonymy. Based on his work on the caryology of H. pisana, Perrot (1939, p. 35) segregated the genus Euparypha and established the subfamily euparyphinae. Although Euparypha is a junior objective synonym of Theba and was placed on the Official Index in Opinion 431 (Opinions and Declarations rendered by the ICZN, 14, p. 351) the family-group name euparyphinae is in current use.


6.1. The nominal genus Calcarina was established by Moquin-Tandon (1848, p. 375) for Helix candidissima Draparnaud, 1801 and several additional species were questionably referred to it. Calcarina was treated as a synonym of Leucochroa following Martens’s (1860, p. 78) invalid designation of H. candidissima as the type species of Leucochroa (see para. 3.1 above).

6.2. Pallary (1909, p. 12) recognised that the type species of Leucochroa Beck, 1837 was H. albella (see para. 3 above). He therefore abandoned the use of Leucochroa and adopted Calcarina, for which he established the new family Calcarinidae. Soon after, he (Pallary, 1910a, unpaginated addendum) realised that Calcarina Moquin-Tandon, 1848 was a junior homonym of Calcarina d’Orbigny, 1821 (Foraminifera) and proposed the substitute name Albea. In the ‘additions and corrections’ to his 1909 paper Pallary (1910b, p. 178) established the new family name Albeidae.

6.3. Ancey (1887, p. 23) established the genus Sphincterochila with two included species, Helix filia Mousson, 1861 and H. boissieri Charpentier, 1847 (p. 133) for which Pilsbry (1895, p. 234) selected the latter as the type species.

6.4. Zilch (1960, p. 663) established the family-group name sphincterochilinae and treated Albea as a subgenus of Sphincterochila implicitly replacing Albeidae because of the synonymy of its type genus (see para. 6.2 above). The name sphincterochilidae is now in prevailing use. Forcart (1965, p. 124) elevated the nominal subfamily sphincterochilinae to family level and then to superfamily status (Forcart, 1972, p. 161) citing Leucochroidae, Calcarinidae and Albeidae in its synonymy. The family-group name sphincterochilidae is maintained under Article 40.2 and takes the priority of the replaced name Leucochroidae Westerlund,
1886 (= CALCARINIDAE (1909); = ALBEIDAE (1910) of which it is deemed to be the senior synonym (see Article 40.2.1)). Following Recommendation 40A the family-group name is to be cited as SPHINCTEROCHILIDAE Zilch, 1960 (1886).

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

(1) to use its plenary power to rule:
   (a) that the name thebini Wenz, 1923 is not invalid by reason of its type genus being misidentified and that fixation of the type species had been overlooked;
   (b) that for the purposes of Article 29 of the Code the stem of the generic name Monacha Fitzinger, 1833 is Monacha-
   (c) that the generic name Leucochroa Beck, 1837, type species by subsequent designation by Herrmannsen (1847) Helix albella Linnaeus, 1758, is suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy;
   (d) that the family-group name LEUCOCROIDAE Westerlund, 1886, type genus Leucochroa Beck, 1837, type species Helix candidissima Draparnaud, 1801 (p. 75), is suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy, by reason of being based on a misidentified type genus, as suppressed in (1)(c) above, itself based on a misidentified type species;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name Sphincterochila Ancey, 1887 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by Pilsbry, 1895, H. boissieri Charpentier, 1847;

(3) to emend the entry on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology for the name Monacha Fitzinger, 1833 to record that Helix cartusiana O.F. Müller, 1774 is the type species by subsequent designation by Herrmannsen (1847 [17 July], p. 51) and that the stem of Monacha is Monacha -, as ruled in (1)(b) above;

(4) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology the following names:
   (a) thebini Wenz, 1923, type genus Theba Risso, 1826, type species by subsequent designation by Gray, 1847, Helix pisana O.F. Müller, 1774), with the endorsement that it is not to take the priority of Carthusianini Kobelt, 1904, not invalid by the ruling in (1)(a) above;
   (b) monachaini Wenz, 1930, type genus Monacha Fitzinger, 1833 (type species by subsequent designation by Herrmannsen, 1847, Helix cartusiana O.F. Müller, 1774), with the endorsement that it is to take the priority of Carthusianini Kobelt, 1904, and is to be cited monachaini Wenz, 1930 (1904);
   (c) sphincterochilidae Zilch, 1960 (1886), type genus Sphincterochila Ancey, 1887 (type species by subsequent designation by Pilsbry, 1895, H. boissieri Charpentier, 1847), with the endorsement that it is to take the priority of Leucochroidae Westerlund, 1886;

(5) to place on the Official Index of Generic Names in Zoology the following names:
   (a) Teba Turton, 1831 (an incorrect subsequent spelling of Theba Risso, 1826);
(b) *Teba* Beck, 1847 (an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Theba* Risso, 1826);
(c) *Leucochroa* Beck, 1837 (an objective synonym of *Theba* Risso, 1826 and suppressed in (1)(c) above);
(d) *Carthusiana* Kobelt, 1871 (an objective synonym of *Monacha* Fitzinger, 1833);

(6) to place on the Official Index of Family-Group Names in Zoology the following names:
(a) xerophilidae Morch, 1864 (based on a generic name placed on the Official Index by Opinion 431);
(b) leucochroidae Westerlund, 1886 (based on a misidentified type genus suppressed in (1)(c) above);
(c) carthusianini Kobelt, 1904 (replaced by monachainae under Article 40.2 and based on a genus placed on the official Index in (5)(d) above);
(d) calcarinidae Pallary, 1909 (based on a generic name which is a junior homonym);
(e) monachinae Wenz, 1930 (an incorrect original spelling of monachainae);
(f) euparyphinae Perrot, 1939 (based on a generic name placed on the Official Index by Opinion 431).
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