D. fimbriata and (para. 13) that George & Petersen (1991) also concurred in that synonymy. Pleijel & Mackie are of the opinion that 'a correct historical interpretation will be less likely to cause confusion for future workers'. That is for the Commission to decide. If that is agreed, we believe that all available names for the sexually reproducing species must fall either as junior synonyms of *D. concharum* Örsted or as nomina dubia, and a new name for 'form A' will have to be proposed. On the other hand, we believe that, as two names are in general use for the segregates and the application of those names to the segregates has been consistent, the best solution to this problem is to fix the name *D. concharum* to 'form A' by means of the proposed neotype.

Additional references

- Eliason, A. 1962b. Die Polychaeten der Skagerak-Expedition 1933. *Zoologiska Bidrag från Uppsala*, 33: 207–293.
 Friedrich, H. 1938. Polychaeta. *Die Tierwelt der Nord- und Ostsee*, Teil VIb (Lief. 32). Pp. 1–201.
 Hartmann-Schröder, G. 1971. Annelida, Borstenwürmer, Polychaeta. *Die Tierwelt Deutschlands*, 58: 1–594.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Xerophila geyeri* Soós, 1926 (Mollusca, Gastropoda)

(Case 2870; see BZN 51: 105–107, 336–338; 52: 176–178)

Gerhard Falkner

*Bayerische Staatssammlung für Paläontologie und historische Geologie,
 Richard-Wagner-Strasse 10/11, D-80333 Munich, Germany*

Ted von Proschwitz

*Avdelningen för entomologi och malakologi, Naturhistoriska Museet, Box 7283,
 S-40235 Göteborg, Sweden*

Gittenberger (BZN 51: 105–107) has asked the Commission to use its plenary powers to conserve the specific name of *Trochoidea geyeri* (Soós, 1926) by suppressing five specific names which he considers to be senior subjective synonyms and which are hence threatening the name. This proposal was objected to by Bouchet (BZN 51: 336–338), who suggested that the principle of priority and, with respect to the two simultaneously-published oldest names, the principle of the first reviser, should be applied. He referred to the yet unstabilized taxonomy and nomenclature of the Alpine and Mediterranean HYGROMIIDAE and especially of the forms grouped in '*Trochoidea*' s.l.

Our intention is not to recommend any one decision. Whatever the Commission may decide, we should like to point out that the action proposed by Gittenberger is not sufficient. There are also several facts which, from our point of view, make the suggested action questionable.

1. The name *geyeri* has a further senior subjective synonym, *minor* Geyer, 1917 (p. 65, pl. 2, figs. 58–60), which was published in the combination *Xerophila striata* f. *minor*.

The (1926) paper by Soós does not make it clear whether he intended to introduce a replacement name or to describe a new species. Grounds for a possible interpretation of *geyeri* as a replacement name can be found in the discussion (Soós, 1926, pp. 97–97) of the identity and availability of *Xerophila striata* f. *minor* Geyer and Soós's statement that Geyer's 'Rasse' had to be renamed ('... mit einem neuen Namen zu bezeichnen'). The name *minor* had been published as *Helix* (*Helicella*) *ericetorum* Müller forma *minor* by Westerlund (1889, p. 338), and used in the combination '*Xerophila ericetorum* Hartm. forma *minor* West.' by Lindholm (1907, p. 84), although not made available by either Westerlund or Lindholm. Up to now the publication by Soós (1926) has rightly been considered to contain an original description of a species and the name *minor* Geyer, 1917 has not been replaced as a junior homonym.

In his application Gittenberger refers to his (1993) revision of *Trochoidea geyeri* and similar taxa. This contains (pp. 304–305) a synonymy list in which he places, in addition to the five names proposed for suppression, *Xerophila striata* f. *minor* Geyer, 1917. Gittenberger sees no need to suppress this name as he considers it to be a junior homonym of both *Xerophila pyramidata* var. *minor* Monterosato, 1892 (p. 19) and *X. mexensis* var. *minor* Pallary, 1909 (p. 29). However, no homonymy exists in either of these cases. Inspection of the publications shows that Monterosato's and Pallary's names are not available. In Richardson's (1980) reference work there is no mention of a 'var. *minor*' in the genus *Xerophila* before that of Geyer (1917). It therefore seems highly probable that *Xerophila striata* f. *minor* Geyer is not preoccupied by a senior primary or secondary homonym and must be added to the names proposed for suppression as a further senior synonym of the name *X. geyeri* Soós, 1926.

2. In our view there is still some uncertainty whether the five names listed by Gittenberger (1993 and his application) should be placed in the synonymy of *Trochoidea geyeri*. When dealing with a group of species exhibiting large intraspecific conchological variation, and where overlapping with conchologically similar species (of which some belong in other genera) exists, the proposed suppression of these names, which is based only on the one or two shells preserved as syntypes (or topotypes) in the Bourguignat collection (see Gittenberger, 1993, pp. 303–307), seems hazardous. We think it is desirable to confirm the conspecificity of these taxa with *T. geyeri* by anatomical studies on topotypical material. Gittenberger himself (1993, p. 306) remarked: 'Whenever the identification of *T. geyeri* can be verified anatomically, that opportunity should be used'.

3. The statement made by Gittenberger (para. 3 of his application) on Bourguignat's 'Nouvelle École' bears no relevance to the case. The disciples of the 'Nouvelle École' used a species concept very different from that accepted today and did, indeed, introduce an enormous number of often ill-conceived new species. From the nomenclatural point of view, however, the specific names are available and must be treated equally with all other available names, as no action has ever been taken to reject the works of Bourguignat and his co-workers. In this respect we support the views of Bouchet in his comments on this case (BZN 51: 336–337, paras. 3 and 5). We are also opposed to the general trend of neglecting revisory systematic studies in favour of more modern techniques. In particular a much-needed re-evaluation, which is far from complete, of names introduced by 19th-century authors requires a

Falkner, Gerhard and Proschwitz, Ted von. 1995. "On the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Xerophila geyeri* Soos, 1926 (Mollusca, Gastropoda)." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 52, 331–332.

<https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.6813>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44798>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.6813>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/6813>

Holding Institution

Natural History Museum Library, London

Sponsored by

Natural History Museum Library, London

Copyright & Reuse

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

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>.