OPINION 1651

Mytilus anatinus Linnaeus, 1758 (currently Anodonta anatina; Mollusca, Bivalvia): neotype designation confirmed

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary powers all previous fixations of type specimens for the nominal species Mytilus anatinus Linnaeus, 1758 are hereby set aside and the neotype designation by Mordan & Woodward (1990) is confirmed.

(2) The following endorsements are hereby made to the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) the words ‘as defined by the neotype designated by Mordan & Woodward (1990)’ are added to the entry for Mytilus anatinus Linnaeus, 1758;

(b) the words ‘as defined by the lectotype designated by Bloomer (1938)’ are added to the entry for Mytilus cygneus Linnaeus, 1758.

History of Case 1643

An application for the designation of a neotype for Mytilus anatinus Linnaeus, 1758 was received from Dr H. Lemche (University of Copenhagen, Denmark) in 1964 and published in BZN 21: 432–434. The subsequent history of this proposal was summarised in BZN 47: 111–112. A new application was received from Dr P.B. Mordan (The Natural History Museum, London, U.K.) & Mr F.R. Woodward (Art Gallery and Museum, Kelvingrove, Glasgow, U.K.) on 6 March 1990. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 47: 110–113 (June 1990). The application was supported by a number of molluscan specialists (see BZN 47: 112, para. 11). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals. No comments were received.

Decision of the Commission

On 6 March 1991 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 47: 112–113. At the close of the voting period on 6 June 1991 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes — 26: Bayer, Bock, Cocks, Cogger, Corliss, Hahn, Halvorsen, Heppell, Holthuis, Kabata, Kraus, Lehtinen, Macpherson, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Minelli, Mroczykowski, Nielsen, Nye, Ride, Savage, Schuster, Thompson, Trijapitzin, Ueno, Willink

Negative votes — 2: Dupuis and Starobogatov.

Starobogatov commented: ‘I vote against Dr Mordan’s and Mr Woodward’s proposal because the [taxonomic] problem is not solved by the decision of the Commission. The adult shells of some Unionidae differ from each other less than their glochidial shells. When the neotype is based only on the adult shell we are not sure to what species it belongs. It would have been better to establish the neotype on a shell for which the glochidial shell is precisely described’. Dr Starobogatov’s comment and accompanying information was sent to Dr Mordan and Mr Woodward, who replied that at present it was not feasible, and in their taxonomic view not necessary, to use glochidial material in the typification of Mytilus anatinus and M. cygneus.
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