Herrmannsen (1849) had designated *Obliqiiaria subrotunda* Rafinesque, 1820 (currently *Obovaria subrotunda*) as the type species. They established the new genus *Cyclonaias* for *Obliqiiaria tuberculata*. It is surprising that Ortmann & Walker (1922) cite Herrmannsen’s type designation for *Rotimdaria* but not his designation for *Obovaria* (pp. 407, 132 in the same volume). However, in this case, Herrmannsen was not the first to select a type. Valenciennes (1827) reported *Obliqiiaria tuberculata* specimens from Rafinesque, which he says were identified as the type of a new genus, *Rotimdaria*. Thus, *Rotimdaria* is a senior objective synonym of *Cyclonaias*. *Cyclonaias tuberculata* occurs phylogenetically within *Quadrula* as currently used (Campbell et al., 2005; the result of Serb et al., 2003, reflects a mixing of tissue clips with *Potamillus alatus*) and so *Rotimdaria* is not available for species currently placed in *Obovaria*.

**Additional references**


**Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of Hydroploropus discretus** Fairmaire & Brisout de Barneville, 1859 (Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 3337; see BZN 64: 87–89)

(1) R. Angus

President of the Balfour-Browne Club (water beetle society). Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey, TW20 0EX, U.K.
(e-mail: r.angus@rhul.ac.uk)

The proposed application to have *Hydroploropus neuter* placed on the Official Index of Rejected Names in Zoology has my fullest support. It is wrong that the application to conserve *H. discretus* was rejected, and appears quite outside the norm in recent cases. I gather that the application was rejected because it attracted insufficient favourable comment. My own view is that it appeared such an overwhelmingly compelling case that comment was superfluous. I very much hope that this second attempt succeeds. It would be wrong to lose such a well-known and well-established name as *Hydroploropus discretus*, which must be conserved.
I have now studied the case in detail; it had only briefly passed me before. I think that the authors have had very bad luck, the case is almost enough for the new nomen oblitum (Article 23.9.2 of the Code), apart from this list by Adam. I think that the case was not presented strongly enough and that not enough people have sent positive comments. I strongly agree that the ruling should be reversed and that Hydroporus discretus must be conserved as a valid name for a species we have always known as discretus — I had never really considered the name neuter before.

I agree with the need to conserve the name Hydroporus discretus by the Commission revising their views and setting aside the name Hydroporus neuter. Otherwise the Commission will bring itself into disrepute for failing in its primary duty to stabilise nomenclature.

I totally agree that the name Hydroporus discretus Fairmaire & Brisout de Barneville should be conserved to avoid ‘sinking’ a century of work accessed through that name.

The proposed change of name appears to contradict all zoological and nomenclatural sense and I wholeheartedly support your endeavours to have the name Hydroporus discretus conserved.

Systematics of the genus Hydroporus has been the main focus of my research for more than ten years. In numerous papers on taxonomy, faunistics, ecology, phenology and larval morphology Hydroporus discretus was always treated by me under this name. A very important reason to conserve the name H. discretus is that recently it has been published as a valid name in two very important catalogues (Nilsson, 2001, 2003). If H. neuter is used as a valid name, it would cause considerable nomenclatural confusion.
Angus, Robert B. 2007. "Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of Hydroporus discretus Fairmaire & Brisout de Barneville, 1859 (Insecta, Coleoptera) 1 (Case 3337)." The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature 64, 120–121.
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