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Supportive evidence for the conservation of *Emys* is overwhelming. Entries for that generic name (in its present sense, e.g. excluding *Emydoidea* Gray, 1870, formerly regarded as a junior synonym of *Emys*) in the ten most recent subannual issues of the Reptilia section of the *Zoological Record* list 198 different publications, and there must be many more in the relevant period which mentioned the name. Furthermore, *Emys* is the type genus of the long-recognized family name *Emydidae* Gray, 1825. Clearly, *Emydes* Brongniart, 1805, which has never been accepted as valid, should not replace Dumeril’s generic name.
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In their comment on our application to conserve the name of *Catharacta skua lonnbergi* (Mathews, 1912), Bourne and his co-authors expressed the opinion (BZN 50: 295) that the identity of the type specimen of *Stercorarius antarcticus madagascariensis* Bonaparte, 1856 is still rather doubtful because ‘a tarsus length as long as 85 mm ... is only found in [the New Zealand area], whilst a wing length near 370 mm is only to be found in [the Falklands area]’. Unfortunately, this argument cannot be used as both the longest primaries of the type are broken (para. 3 of the application) and an estimated 20 mm, at least, is missing. This brings the wing length of this bird to at least 390 mm, and well within the range of males of *C. s. lonnbergi* as well as that of several other populations (Furness, 1987). The same is true for its culmen length (56.5 mm), and only its tarsus length shows a discriminating value. The most logical solution is to consider this bird as a small specimen of *C. s. lonnbergi,*
and since it is agreed that the name *madagascariensis* should be rejected there is no need to examine the specimen’s DNA (cf. Bourne et al.).

As noted in our application (para. 4), the taxonomy of the skuas is most difficult and has taken considerable effort to clarify. The use of the name *madagascariensis* instead of the well known *lonnbergi* would add confusion to this difficult taxonomic situation, and for this reason we proposed the suppression of the earlier name. Even if we agree with the proposal of Bourne et al. to place the name *hamiltoni* Hagen, 1952 (published as a subspecies of *Catharacta skua*) on the Official List we think that the taxonomic status of this nominal subspecies deserves a special study; there is however no nomenclatural problem with this recent name.
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