OPINION 1526

**Nanophyes Schoenherr, 1838 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved**

**Ruling**

1. Under the plenary powers the name *Nanodes* Schoenherr, 1825 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

2. The name *Nanophyes* Schoenherr, 1838 (gender: masculine), type species designated by Schoenherr (1825; for *Nanodes*) *Curculio lythri* Fabricius, 1787 (a junior subjective synonym of *Curculio marmoratus* Goeze, 1777) is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

3. The name *marmoratus* Goeze, 1777, as published in the binomen *Curculio marmoratus*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology (valid name at the time of this ruling of the type species of *Nanophyes* Schoenherr, 1838).

4. The name *Nanodes* Schoenherr, 1825, as suppressed in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

5. The name *Nanodes* Stephens, 1826 is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology (a junior homonym of *Nanodes* Schoenherr, 1825).

**History of Case 2555**

An application for the conservation of *Nanophyes* Schoenherr, 1838 was received from Drs M. A. Alonso-Zarazaga (Carretera de Cadiz 89, Málaga, Spain) and L. Dieckmann (Leibnizstr. 17, Eberswalde, D.D.R.) on 31 January 1986. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 44: 15–16 (March 1987). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals. An opposing comment was received from Dr D. E. Bright (Biosystematics Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada) and published in BZN 44: 195. A supportive comment from Dr M. G. Morris (Institute of Terrestrial Ecology, Wareham, Dorset, U.K.) was published in BZN 44: 195. A further supportive comment was received from Ing. Karel Schon (Litvinov, Czechoslovakia).


**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 September 1988 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 44: 16, together with the additional proposal as above. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 1988 the votes were as follows:

**Affirmative votes** — 12: Bayer, Cocks, Corliss, Hahn, Halvorsen, Kabata, Kraus, Melville, Mroczkowski, Ride, Starobogatov, Uéno

**Negative votes** — 5: Heppell, Lehtinen, Savage, Schuster and Willink.

No votes were returned by Dupuis, Gruchy and Trjapitzin.

Cogger, Holthuis and Thompson were on leave of absence.
Bayer and Kabata commented that as 411 nominal species were involved the conservation of *Nanophyes* Schoenherr, 1838 was justified. Heppell and Willink agreed with Dr Bright’s comment that priority should apply.

**Original references**

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:


