

(3) P.G. Jupp

Arbovirus Unit, National Institute for Virology, University of the Witwatersrand, Private Bag X4, Sandringham, 2131 South Africa

I would like to support this application, particularly the conservation of the names of *Ae. (N.) circumluteolus* and *Ae. (N.) mcintoshii*. Both these species are important vectors of arboviruses and it would cause unnecessary ambiguity if their names were changed.

Ae. circumluteolus has been incriminated as vector of several arboviruses, notably Wesselbron, Bunyamwera, Pongola, Spondweni and Rift Valley fever viruses. I have given the Commission Secretariat a list of six references.

Comment on the proposal to conserve *Oecothoa* Haliday in Curtis, 1837 and to designate *Helomyza fenestralis* Fallén, 1820 as the type species (Insecta, Diptera)
(Case 2836; see BZN 50: 44–47)

Neal L. Evenhuis

Department of Entomology, Bishop Museum, P.O. Box 19000 A, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817, U.S.A.

Wayne N. Mathis

Department of Entomology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

F. Christian Thompson

Systematic Entomology Laboratory, USDA, c/o Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

We support the basic intent of this application, but some corrections and comments are needed.

1. The Commission need not use its plenary powers to rule on what is already true under the Code. Hence proposal (1)(a) is superfluous and should be deleted from the application. Thompson & Mathis (1980, p. 86) clearly documented that the name *Oecothoa* Haliday is available from Curtis (1837) under the provisions of Article 11d of the then current Code (11e of the present edition).

2. While Thompson & Mathis (1980) did use the word 'lapsus' in association with the spelling *Aecothea*, they did so only after declaring the name 'an unjustified emendation of *Oecothoa*'. Their conclusion was the same as Woźnica & Zatwarnicki's suggestion (their para. 2).

3. The statements by Woźnica & Zatwarnicki (para. 1) that 'it is not clear that the four species ... were originally included' and '... *Oecothoa* Haliday was proposed without any clearly included species' are disputed in Curtis's own words, as was clearly outlined by Thompson & Mathis (1980, p. 82). The only thing that is not explicit, but in retrospect is now obvious to us, is the association of the specific name *fenestralis* Fallén with *Oecothoa*. Clearly, the four species that immediately follow *Oecothoa* in the Addenda were associated with that name by Curtis. The key phrase in Curtis's own words (p. vi) is '... although many of the former [= synonyms] which intersect long genera will most probably be eventually adopted, and it may often

happen that *all* the species following such generic names would not be considered by the Author who proposed the name as belonging to his group, the one *immediately* following is always a typical species ...'. In his Addenda Curtis placed the name *Oecothoa* after species 17, which meant that *Oecothoa* was inserted immediately in front of species 18, *fenestralis* Fallén. Hence, as *fenestralis* Fallén is the one immediately following *Oecothoa*, it was a 'typical species'.

4. Woźnica & Zatwarnicki say that 'the absence of the species numbered between 18 and 23 meant that the precise position at which *Oecothoa* related to the main text was not indicated'. However, as stated in his introduction, Curtis dealt with large Diptera genera by using the numbers of Meigen. There are gaps as there were many species in Meigen that were not known from Britain.

5. In conclusion, we endorse the application to establish formally what Curtis originally intended, which was to credit the name *Oecothoa* to Haliday and to have *Helomyza fenestralis* Fallén, 1820 as the type species.

Comments on the proposed designation of a neotype for *Coelophysis bauri* (Cope, 1887) (Reptilia, Saurischia)

(Case 2840; see BZN 49: 276–279; 50: 147–151)

(1) Hilde L. Schwartz

Earth and Environmental Sciences, M.S. D469, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, U.S.A.

I would like to express my support for the purpose of the application by Colbert et al., that is, to conserve the name *Coelophysis bauri* and to reject *Rioarribasaurus colberti* Hunt & Lucas, 1991. My own research on New Mexican Triassic rocks reveals no stratigraphic justification for the new genus *Rioarribasaurus*, and the additional considerations of priority and widespread current usage I believe make the name *Rioarribasaurus colberti* a source of taxonomic confusion rather than clarification.

(2) R.E. Molnar

Queensland Museum, P.O. Box 3300, South Brisbane, Queensland 4101, Australia

I wish to present an argument distinct from, and more philosophical than, those presented by Colbert et al. in their application, which I support. To me there seems a basic philosophic and methodologic difference between the approach of Colbert to the taxonomy of *Coelophysis* and that of Hunt & Lucas. Colbert seems to subscribe to the school of taxonomy very largely influenced by G.G. Simpson and E. Mayr in which fossils are recognized as only examples which have been 'selected' from a population of living organisms. These living organisms varied among themselves, and hence recognition of diagnostic characters of a taxon, and referral of future discoveries to the taxon, depend on the character states as exhibited by the hypodigm, of which the type specimen is the name-bearer. In organisms exhibiting marked sexual dimorphism, for example, the holotype might be a male specimen and yet females have the same operational significance as males.



Evenhuis, Neal L., Mathis, Wayne N., and Thompson, F. Christian. 1993.
"Comment On The Proposal To Conserve *Oecothoa* Haliday In Curtis, 1837
And To Designate *Helomyza fenestralis* Fallen, 1820 As The Type Species." *The
Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 50, 235–236.
<https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.1857>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44546>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.1857>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/1857>

Holding Institution

Natural History Museum Library, London

Sponsored by

Natural History Museum Library, London

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.