



<https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/>

The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature.

London, International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature.

<https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/bibliography/51603>

v.57:pt.1-4 (2000:Mar.-Dec.):

<https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/45022>

Page(s): Page 110, Page 111

Holding Institution: Natural History Museum Library, London

Sponsored by: Natural History Museum Library, London

Generated 4 November 2018 7:33 PM

<https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/pdf4/085241900045022>

This page intentionally left blank.

All this becomes unnecessary when the Code is followed. The only changes then would be *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 substituted by *Trochulus* Alten, 1812, and the family-group name TRICHIINAE Lozek, 1956 substituted by TROCHULINAE Lindholm, 1927.

The question is, is all the trouble to conserve *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 justified? So far as I know the genus is not of any importance in medicine or applied science and is best known only to taxonomists and amateur malacologists. The fact that *Trichia* Hartmann was recognized the type of a family group as late as 1956 also does not speak for a great importance of the genus. Furthermore, there is no long-standing uniformity in the use of *Trichia* for the molluscs. The name *Fruticicola* Held, 1837 was for a long time used for the type species of *Trichia* and I have always known the taxon as *Fruticicola hispida* (Linnaeus, 1758), a name used certainly beyond the middle of the 20th century (cf. para. 4 of the application). The name *Trichia* Hartmann has always been rather controversial because of the simultaneous use of *Trichia* De Haan, 1839 in Crustacea. Furthermore, *Trochulus* is not an entirely unknown name and has been used during the 20th century. The family-group name based on it (TROCHULINAE Lindholm, 1927) long before that based on *Trichia* Hartmann demonstrates this.

Concluding, I wish to remark that the discovery of *Trichia* Hoffman, 1790 as the oldest homonym, invalidating both *Trichia* De Haan, 1839 and *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840, is more or less a blessing, wiping away the controversy over priority between the crustacean and molluscan names. It means that there is no longer ambiguity over whether the crustacean or the molluscan name *Trichia* is meant, and no numerous and complicated manoeuvres by the Commission are needed to save the least deserving of the three names. In Crustacea the disappearance of the name *Trichia* has been accepted by all the workers that I contacted, and the replacement by *Zalasius* Rathbun, 1897 will not cause much confusion, especially when accepted immediately. I would expect that in Mollusca the disappearance of *Trichia* Hartmann will not do much harm, especially as the name of the genus has changed several times in its history, and a period of stability can be expected with the introduction of *Trochulus*. The latter name has not been used for other genera and there is no question of switching it from one genus to another. The only argument for starting the complicated machinery of the Commission for saving *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 is its frequent usage in the last ten years, but in Myxomycetes (or Mycetozoa) *Trichia* has clearly been used unambiguously for a much longer period of time. My plea is that in this case the Code should be strictly applied, this being the most simple and least time consuming procedure.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Polydora websteri* Hartmann in Loosanoff & Engle, 1943 (Annelida, Polychaeta) by a ruling that it is not to be treated as a replacement name for *P. caeca* Webster, 1879, and designation of a lectotype for *P. websteri*

(Case 3080; see BZN 55: 212–216; 57: 43–45)

Vasily I. Radashevsky

Institute of Marine Biology, Vladivostok 690041, Russia

Jason D. Williams

Department of Biological Sciences, University of Rhode Island, 100 Flagg Road, Kingston, RI 02881-0816, U.S.A.

In a recent paper in *Ophelia* (October 1999) we described a new spionid polychaete as *Polydora neocaeca*. The new nominal species, a boring mudworm, was based on material from Rhode Island and has its own holotype, description and type locality (see paras. 6 and 10 of the application; Williams & Radashevsky, 1999; and comments by Drs Geoffrey B. Read and Mary E. Petersen in BZN 57: 44 and 45, March 2000). We believe this to be the same taxon as *P. caeca* Webster, 1879, the name for which is a junior secondary homonym of *P. coeca* (Örsted, 1843), a tube-dwelling spionid.

In a single place in our paper (Williams & Radashevsky, 1999, p. 116) we unfortunately noted that '*Polydora neocaeca* is described to replace the permanently invalid name *P. caeca*'. This might indicate that we proposed *neocaeca* as a replacement name (nomen novum) for *caeca* Webster (and, in this situation, *neocaeca* would automatically have had the same type material as *caeca*).

To avoid any ambiguity we should like to clarify the nomenclatural status of *Polydora neocaeca* Williams & Radashevsky, 1999. The name was established as that of a new nominal species, and not as a replacement (nomen novum) for *P. caeca* Webster. We believe that *P. neocaeca* represents the same taxon as Webster described, but the synonymy is subjective and not objective.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Hybognathus stramineus* Cope, 1865 (currently *Notropis stramineus*; Osteichthyes, Cypriniformes)
(Case 3131; see BZN 56: 240-246)

(1) David A. Etnier

*Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee,
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1610, U.S.A.*

I have read and am familiar with the application to conserve the specific name of *Notropis stramineus* (Cope, 1865) for the common North American minnow called the sand shiner.

Wayne Starnes and I (Etnier & Starnes, 1993) were aware of Mayden & Gilbert's (1989) recognition of the obscure and unused *Notropis ludibundus* (Girard, 1856) as an earlier name for the sand shiner, and had learned by personal communication with Prof R.M. Bailey that applications were in preparation to conserve both *Notropis topeka* (C.H. Gilbert, 1884) (mentioned in para. 10 of the current application) and *N. stramineus*. This information was made generally available to North American ichthyologists in the fifth edition of the checklist of *Common and scientific names of fishes from the United States and Canada* (Robins et al., 1991) (para. 5 of the application). In 1993 we followed Article 23b of the 1985 Code and retained the use of *Notropis stramineus* while the case was in preparation, as did Jenkins & Burkhead (1994) for the same reason.

In my view a very few uninformed or deliberate recent uses of *Notropis ludibundus* as the name for the sand shiner (para. 7 of the application) should not be a concern in the Commission's decision. Nomenclatural stability is best served by retaining the name *N. stramineus* (Cope, 1865) and rejecting *N. ludibundus* (Girard, 1856).

The following text is generated from uncorrected OCR.

[Begin Page: Page 110]

no Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature 57(2) June 2000

All this becomes unnecessary when the Code is followed. The only changes then would be *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 substituted by *Trichulus* Alten, 1812. and the family-group name *trichiinae* Lozek, 1956 substituted by *trichulinae* Lindholm, 1927.

The question is, is all the trouble to conserve *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 justified? So far as I know the genus is not of any importance in medicine or applied science and is best known only to taxonomists and amateur malacologists. The fact that *Trichia* Hartmann was recognized the type of a family group as late as 1956 also does not speak for a great importance of the genus. Furthermore, there is no long-standing uniformity in the use of *Trichia* for the molluscs. The name *Fruticicola* Held, 1837 was for a long time used for the type species of *Trichia* and I have always known the taxon as *Fruticicola hispida* (Linnaeus, 1758), a name used certainly beyond the middle of the 20th century (cf. para. 4 of the application). The name *Trichia* Hartmann has always been rather controversial because of the simultaneous use of *Trichia* De Haan, 1839 in Crustacea. Furthermore, *Trochilus* is not an entirely unknown name and has been used during the 20th century. The family-group name based on it (*trichulinae* Lindholm, 1927) long before that based on *Trichia* Hartmann demonstrates this.

Concluding, I wish to remark that the discovery of *Trichia* Hoffman, 1790 as the oldest homonym, invalidating both *Trichia* De Haan, 1839 and *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840, is more or less a blessing, wiping away the controversy over priority between the crustacean and molluscan names. It means that there is no longer ambiguity over whether the crustacean or the molluscan name *Trichia* is meant, and no numerous and complicated manoeuvres by the Commission are needed to save the least deserving of

the three names. In Crustacea the disappearance of the name *Trichia* has been accepted by all the workers that I contacted, and the replacement by *Zaiasius* Rathbun, 1897 will not cause much confusion, especially when accepted immediately. I would expect that in *MoUusca* the disappearance of *Trichia* Hartmann will not do much harm, especially as the name of the genus has changed several times in its history, and a period of stability can be expected with the introduction of *Trocnilus*. The latter name has not been used for other genera and there is no question of switching it from one genus to another. The only argument for starting the complicated machinery of the Commission for saving *Trichia* Hartmann. 1840 is its frequent usage in the last ten years, but in *Myxomycetes* (or *Mycetozoa*) *Trichia* has clearly been used unambiguously for a much longer period of time. My plea is that in this case the Code should be strictly applied, this being the most simple and least time consuming procedure.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Polydora websteri* Hartmann in Loosanoff & Engle, 1943 (Annelida, Polychaeta) by a ruling that it is not to be treated as a replacement name for *P. caeca* Webster, 1879, and designation of a lectotype for *P. websteri*

(Case 3080; see BZN 55: 212-216; 57: 43-45)

Vasily L Radashevsky

Institute of Marine Biology. Vladivostok 690041. Russia

Jason D. Williams

Department of Biological Sciences. University of Rhode Island. 100 Flagg Road.

Kingston, RI 02881-0816. U.S.A.

[Begin Page: Page 111]

Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature 57(2) June 2000 111

In a recent paper in *Ophelia* (October 1999) we described a new spionid polychaete as *Pohdora neocaeca*. The new nominal species, a boring mudwomi, was based on material from Rhode Island and has its own holotype. description and type locality (see paras. 6 and 10 of the application; Williams & Radashevsky, 1999; and comments by Drs Geoffrey B. Read and Mary E. Petersen in BZN 57: 44 and 45, March 2000). We believe this to be the same taxon as *P. caeca* Webster, 1879. the name for which is a junior secondary homonym of *P. coeca* (Orsted, 1843), a tube-dwelling spionid.

In a single place in our paper (Williams & Radashevsky, 1999. p. 116) we unfortunately noted that '*Polydoni neocaeca* is described to replace the permanently invalid name *P. caeca*'. This might indicate that we proposed *neocaeca* as a replacement name (*nomen novum*) for *caeca* Webster (and, in this situation, *neocaeca* would automatically have had the same type material as *caeca*).

To avoid any ambiguity we should like to clarify the nomenclatural status of *Pohdora neocaeca* Williams & Radashevsky, 1999. The name was established as that of a new nominal species, and not as a replacement (*nomen novum*) for *P. caeca* Webster. We believe that *P. neocaeca* represents the same taxon as Webster described, but the synonymy is subjective and not objective.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Hybognathus stramineus* Cope, 1865 (currently *Notropis stramineus*; Osteichthyes, Cypriniformes)

(Case 3131; see BZN 56: 240-246)

(I) David A. Etnier

Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. University of Tennessee,
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1610. U.S.A.

I have read and am familiar with the application to conserve the specific name of *Notropis stramineus* (Cope, 1865) for the common North American minnow called the sand shiner.

Wayne Starnes and I (Etnier & Starnes, 1993) were aware of Mayden & Gilbert's (1989) recognition of the obscure and unused *Notropis ludibundus* (Girard, 1856) as an earlier name for the sand shiner, and had learned by personal communication with Prof R.M. Bailey that applications were in preparation to conserve both *Notropis topeka* (C.H. Gilbert. 1884) (mentioned in para. 10 of the current application) and *A[^]. stramineus*. This information was made generally available to North American ichthyologists in the fifth edition of the checklist of Common and scientific names of fishes from the United States and Canada (Robins et al., 1991) (para. 5 of the application). In 1993 we followed Article 23b of the 1985 Code and retained the use of *Notropis stramineus* while the case was in preparation, as did Jenkins & Bulkhead (1994) for the same reason.

In my view a very few uninformed or deliberate recent uses of *Notropis ludibundus* as the name for the sand shiner (para. 7 of the application) should not be a concern in the Commission's decision. Nomenclatural stability is best served by retaining the name *N. stramineus* (Cope, 1865) and rejecting *A[^]. ludibundus* (Girard, 1856).

