confirmed until 1990, I consider that there are strong reasons for retaining the well-known name Nahecaris.

(8) Bruce S. Lieberman

Department of Geology, University of Kansas, 1475 Jayhawk Blvd.,
120 Lindley Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045, U.S.A.

I support Briggs & Bartels’s application and their arguments and hope that the Commission will approve their proposals. In particular, I believe that the use of Dilophaspis over Nahecaris would cause considerable taxonomic confusion. Nahecaris is probably the best and most completely known fossil phyllocarid. I have worked with fossil phyllocarid crustaceans and in the course of this work I have dealt with the definition of the genus Nahecaris (Rode & Lieberman, 2002). Based on Briggs & Bartels’s suggestions I think it would make perfect sense to give Nahecaris precedence over Dilophaspis. This would considerably aid and facilitate my taxonomic work with this group, and also likely that of my colleagues.

Additional reference


Comment on the proposed conservation of usage of the specific names of Libellula aenea Linnaeus, 1758 (currently Cordulia aenea) and L. flavomaculata Vander Linden, 1825 (currently Somatochlora flavomaculata; Insecta, Odonata) by the replacement of the lectotype of L. aenea with a newly designated lectotype (Case 3253; see BZN 60: 272–274)

Klaas-Douwe B. Dijkstra

Gortestraat 11, 2311 MS Leiden, The Netherlands

I fully support the conservation of usage of the name Cordulia aenea (Linnaeus, 1758) which is crucial for me as editor of a forthcoming field guide to the Western Palaearctic dragonflies, illustrated by the well known natural history illustrator Richard Lewington. Such publications stimulate public interest and rely heavily on the stability of names.

Comments on the proposed precedence of Bolboceras Kirby, 1819 (July) (Insecta, Coleoptera) over Odontea Samouelle, 1819 (June) (Casc 3097; see BZN 59: 246–248, 280–281, 60: 303–311, 61: 43–45)

(1) Frank-Thorsten Krell

Department of Entomology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.
Alberto Ballerio  
Museo Civico di Scienze Naturali "E. Caffi", Piazza Cittadella 10, I-24129 Bergamo, Italy

Stefano Ziani  
Via S. Giovanni 41, I-47014 Meldola (Forlì), Italy

The reply from Jameson & Howden (BZN 61: 43–45) to our comment on the proposed precedence of Bolboceras Kirby, 1819 (July) over Odontus Samouelle, 1819 (June) contains several crucial errors which we would like to rectify.

Jameson & Howden claimed that Bolboceras Kirby is the name in prevailing use. This is only true for North America. In Europe, as we have shown (BZN 60: 303–311), Odontus is in prevailing use. In fact, we have two geographically limited prevailing usages, a case not dealt with in Articles 80 and 82.1 of the Code. Contrary to Jameson & Howden’s claim, all references for Odontus Samouelle provided by us (BZN 60: 304) have to be considered for determining the prevailing usage, because the present case falls under Article 23.9.3 and not under Article 23.9.1. According to Article 23.9.6, the stated categories of publications which are irrelevant for determining the prevailing usage relate only to Article 23.9.1.

The publications listed by us (BZN 60: 303–311), as references for the prevailing usage of Odontus Samouelle, do not fall within the categories mentioned by Article 23.9.6 anyway, none of them is either an abstracting publication, a nomenclator, an index or a list of names. All are genuine scientific publications providing specific information about the distribution or conservation status of Odontus armiger (Scopoli). Jameson & Howden were probably misled by the category ‘list of names’, which means a list of scientific names without further information beyond the names (like a nomenclator or an index), and not ‘Red Lists’ or annotated checklists. If we want to determine the overall prevailing usage by sheer numbers of authors and publications, Odontus Samouelle is unequivocally the prevailing usage (and the senior synonym) which has to be maintained until the ruling of the Commission is published (Article 82.1). Following this course of action, Jameson (2002, pp. 23–25) was in breach of Article 82.1 by using Bolboceras. As Ratcliffe correctly stated (BZN 61: 43) the monograph in which Jameson’s (2002) paper was included will serve as reference for nomenclature and classification of North American beetles, but, as mentioned previously (BZN 60: 304), so do the European standard works (that use Odontus) for nomenclature and classification of European beetles (e.g. Krell & Fery, 1992; Silfverberg, 1992; Carpaneto & Piattella, 1995; Alexandrovich et al., 1996; Hansen, 1996; Telloni et al., 1997; Köhler & Klausnitzer, 1998; Martín-Piera & Lopez-Colón, 2000). Since, in Europe at least, Odontus is the prevailing usage, the references published after the announcement of the present case in December 1998 documenting the usage of Odontus should also be considered. We here add two further papers of world-wide scope in which the authors followed (the latter explicitly) our argument in BZN 60: 303–311 (Grebennikov et al., 2004; Verdú et al., 2004).

Jameson & Howden (BZN 61: 43–45) are right that Bolboceras has been in continuous use since its description. However, Bolboceras was rarely considered to
be the valid name for *Odontesus* before Cartwright (1953) transferred the name *Bolboceras* to the genus formerly known as *Odontaeus* Dejean, 1821 (an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Odontaeus*) (see BZN 60: 304–305). The names *Bolboceras* and *Odontaeus* have mostly been used for different genera (Klug, 1845, p. 37; Horn, 1870, pp. 49–50; Reitter, 1893, pp. 4–5; Schaeffer, 1906, p. 250; Boucomont, 1912, p. 7 [Bolboceras], p. 15 [Odontaeus]; Paulian, 1988, pp. 157, 541, 544 [Odontaeus], 490, 582 [Bolboceras]) sometimes explicitly with reference to *Bolboceras quadridens* Fabricius, 1781 as the type species of *Bolboceras* (Westwood, 1855; Boucomont, 1911). We proposed (BZN 60: 307) to conserve the name *Bolboceras* in this sense.

We consider *Odontaeus* Dejean, 1821 to be an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Odontaeus* Samouelle, 1819 because in the early 1800s, before any nomenclatural rules were established, authors were not generally attributed to names according to the Principle of Priority, but according to other criteria such as reputation of an author, importance of a monograph, usage, tradition, personal preferences and relationships. Many names had circulated widely *in litteris* amongst the authors of the time before they were published occasionally at some point by someone or, as happened here, by several authors. *Odontaeus* and *Odontaeus* refer to the same species. As we said before, giving the same name to a genus containing the same species is unlikely to be sheer coincidence. Samouelle (1819) did not include as many species as were in Dejean’s (1821) catalogue because the geographical scope of the former is restricted to Britain where only one species (*Odontaeus armiger*) occurs. Hence, we have no indication that the taxonomic concept behind *Odontaeus* Samouelle differs from that of *Odontaeus* Dejean. Jameson & Howden’s belief that ‘if these names were the same, then the authors would have attributed the name to the same individual’ does not take into consideration how nomenclature and authorship were handled at that time and is wrong.

The replacement of *Odontaeus* Agassiz, 1838 by *Odontoceras* Krell, 1991, has been accepted in the relevant literature (Bellwood & Sorbini, 1996, p. 161; Bellwood, 1999, p. 211) and, contrary to Jameson & Howden’s belief, no confusion has emerged from this replacement.

If the Commission designates *Scarabeaeus quadridens* as the type species of *Bolboceras*, we will be able to refer to *Bolboceras* Kirby, 1819 as the type genus of *Bolboceratinia* and *Bolboceratinia*. This outcome is also favoured by Ratcliffe in his comment on the present case (BZN 61: 43). If we were to accept Curtis’s type species designation (*Bolboceras mobilicornis* Marsham, 1802 = *armiger* Scopoli, 1772), then either *Bolboceras* disappears as a valid name, as a junior objective synonym of *Odontaeus* Samouelle, or the name *Bolboceras* would take precedence over *Odontaeus* Samouelle disregarding the prevailing usage in Europe. If the Commission considers the latter solution, we would like to ask for an explanation as to why the prevailing usage in Europe (which is in accordance with the Code) should be disregarded in preference for the prevailing usage in North America (which does not follow the Principle of Priority).
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(Teleostei: Labroidae) with a description of a new genus and species from the Eocene of
Boucomont, A. 1912. Scarabaeidae: Taurocerastinae, Geotrupinae. Coleopterorum Catalogus,
Ceratocanthinae and Hybosoridae (Coleoptera: Scarabaeoidea): study of morphology,
phylogenetic analysis and evidence of paraphyly of Hybosoridae. Systematic Entomology,
29.
analysis of Geotrupidae (Coleoptera, Scarabaeoidea) based on larvae. Systematic
Entomology, 29.

(2) Andrew B.T. Smith
W436 Nebraska Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588–0514, U.S.A.

I support the application to give Bolloceras Kirby, 1819 (July) precedence over
Odanteus Samouelle, 1819 (June). This action is necessary to preserve the prevailing
usage of the former generic name for the North American species Bolloceras
alabamensis (Wallis, 1929), B. corningus Melsheimer, 1846, B. darlingtoni (Wallis,
1928), B. falli (Wallis, 1928), B. filicornis (Say, 1823), B. floridensis (Wallis, 1928),
B. liebecki (Wallis, 1928), B. obesus (LeConte, 1859), B. simii (Wallis, 1928), and
B. thoracicicornis (Wallis, 1928). These species have been universally placed in the
genus Bolloceras for over 50 years. B. armiger (Scopoli, 1772), the one remaining
species in the genus, has been placed in Bolloceras, Odanteus, and Odontaeus Dejean,
1821 by various authors during the same time period. I assert that the generic
placement of B. armiger has been so contradictory that no prevailing usage can
be discerned for any of these generic names with regard to this species. The Code
promotes the stability and prevailing usage of names (for example, see Articles 23.2,
81.1, and Appendix B-1 of the Code). B. armiger is already a nomenclatural mess; the
same problems should not be inflicted on the other ten species in the genus by
invalidating a generic name with a 50-year tradition of use.

The following discrepancies regarding this case have caused confusion and
inconsistencies in the use of generic names within the group. Explicit clarification of
each of the following points should be made by the Commission in their ruling on this
case to stabilize the use of names in this group:

1. Jameson & Howden (BZN 59: 247) stated that the gender of Bolloceras is
masculine; however, Article 30.1.2 (and especially the example following this Article)
clearly indicates that the gender should be neuter. The name ends in a Greek word
transliterated into Latin without other changes (-ceras = kera). An explicit statement
from the Commission regarding the gender of Bolloceras is required in their ruling
on this case and possibly emendations of some of the species names is desirable to
clear up this discrepancy.

2. Krell et al. (BZN 60: 304) discuss the use of Odanteus and Odontaeus and state
that these names are ‘in fact’ the same and one is an incorrect subsequent spelling of
the other. However, Odanteus Samouelle was originally attributed to Köppe (perhaps
by Leach through letters or personal communication) and Odontaeus Dejean
was originally attributed to Megerle. Samouelle and Dejean apparently established the