OPINION 1291

ANTILOPE ZEBRA GRAY, 1838 (MAMMALIA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:
(a) the specific name *zebrata* Robert, 1836, as published in the binomen *Antilope zebrata*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;
(b) it is hereby ruled that the specific name *zebra* Gray, 1838, as published in the binomen *Antilope zebra*, is to be given precedence over the specific name *doria* Ogilby, 1837, as published in the binomen *Antilope doria*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
(a) *zebra* Gray, 1838, as published in the binomen *Antilope zebra*, with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the specific name *doria* Ogilby, 1837, as published in the binomen *Antilope doria*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2919);
(b) *doria* Ogilby, 1837, as published in the binomen *Antilope doria*, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *zebra* Gray, 1838, as published in the binomen *Antilope zebra*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2920).

(3) The specific name *zebrata* Robert, 1836, as published in the binomen *Antilope zebrata*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1138.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1908

An application for the conservation of the name *Antilope zebra* Gray, 1838 as the name of the zebra duiker was first received from Mr W. F. H. Ansell (then of Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and National Parks, Zambia) on 10 November 1969. It was sent to the printer on 10 March 1970 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 27, p. 104 on 10 August 1970. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and to two mammalogical serials. A critical comment by Dr Hans-Jürg Kuhn (*Anatomisches Institut, Frankfurt, Germany*) was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 28, pp. 14-15 on 10 August 1971. Mr Ansell's reply was published in vol. 30, p. 136 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* on 6 July 1973.
In the light of these exchanges it was decided to put forward a fresh application, and this was published on 25 September 1980 in Bull. zool. Nom. vol. 37, pp. 152–153 (the delay at this stage was largely due to the difficulty of procuring a copy of the original reference to *Antilope zebrata* Robert). Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and two mammalogical serials. No comment was received.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on voting Paper (1984)16 for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nom. vol. 37, p. 153. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

**Affirmative Votes** — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Sarobogatov, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen

**Negative Votes** — two (2): Holthuis, Cogger.

Dupuis returned an invalid vote against proposals other than those presented for a vote. No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

**Holthuis:** ‘The difference between zebra and zebrata is so minor that it seems to me not worth while to use the plenary powers to get rid of the latter. Strict adherence to the Code solves the problem most easily and elegantly; moreover, *A. doria* then offers no problem.’

**Cogger:** ‘If *Antilope doria* is indeed a junior objective synonym of *A. mhorr*, as the applicant contends, then the application is redundant. If the converse, then taxonomic resolution should precede the nomenclatural.’

**ORIGINAL REFERENCES**

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