Comments on the proposed conservation of *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 (Mollusca, Gastropoda), and the proposed emendation of spelling of TRICHIINAE Ložek, 1956 (Mollusca) to TRICHIAINAE, so removing the homonymy with TRICHIIDAE Fleming, 1821 (Insecta, Coleoptera)
(Case 2926; see BZN **57**: 17–23, 109–110, 166–167)

(1) David Heppell
RR10, 1293 Gower Point Road, Gibsons, B.C., Canada V0N 1V3

I support the proposal by Edmund Gittenberger to conserve the name *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 in Mollusca. Contrary to the statement by Holthuis that the genus is not of any importance in applied science (BZN **57**: 109–110, June 2000), the common *Trichia striolata* (Pfeiffer, 1828), mentioned in para. 3 of the application, is known in Britain as the 'strawberry snail' because of its pest status in strawberry fields and generally in gardens, having been widely spread by human activity.

After a period of instability because of uncertainty about its nomenclatural status, the use of *Trichia* as the name of the gastropod genus has stabilized during the last four decades. Watson (1922, p. 278) defended *Trichia* against *Capillifera* Honigmann, 1906 (p. 190, a replacement name for *Trichia* Hartmann), which had been favoured by Gude & Woodward (1921). Then, after the use of the name *Trochulus* 'Chemnitz, 1786' for the same genus by Lindholm (1927), the key papers in which the validity of *Trichia* was re-established were Boettger (1928), Watson (1943, pp. 66–67) and Forcart (1958). Their arguments, however, have been undermined by the subsequent inclusion of Article 11d in the 1964 Code (Article 11.6.1 of the current Code) and by the discovery of the earlier date of publication for the brachyuran homonym *Trichia* de Haan, 1839 (paras. 5 and 1 respectively of the application). As stated in the application, the junior synonym *Zalasius* Rathbun, 1897 has had considerable usage for the few, rare species assigned to the crab taxon and that name is acceptable to carcinologists working with it.

Gittenberger (para. 3) gave the type species of *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 as *Helix hispida* Linnaeus, 1758 by subsequent designation by Herrmannsen (1849). This is probably historically correct but is contrary to the conclusion of Boettger (1928, p. 2) that the type species is *T. filicina* Hartmann, 1841 by monotypy. This conclusion has been accepted by several later authors (for example, Likharev & Rammel'meier, 1952, p. 448; Forcart, 1958, who synonymized *T. filicina* with *T. plebeia* (Draparnaud, 1805)). Hartmann's work was published in eight Hefte between 1840 and 1844 and the correct type fixation depends on whether p. 41 (on which the genus and the new nominal species *T. filicina* were described) was published before or after p. xiii (on which the nominal species *T. hispida* and *Helix sericea* Draparnaud are mentioned). I discussed in detail (Heppell, 1966) the question of the relative dates of Hartmann's work and consequent effect on the type fixation and concluded, from available evidence, that p. xiii was published not in 1844 (as believed by Boettger) but in 1840, in which case Herrmannsen's (1849) designation is valid. It must be admitted, however, that a certain amount of doubt remains and I believe it would be better if the matter were resolved by the Commission setting aside all previous fixations and ruling under the plenary power that the type species of *Trichia* Hartmann is *Helix hispida* Linnaeus, 1758.

Gittenberger noted (para. 8) a further homonym, *Trichia* Hong, 1981, but did not mention two other homonyms: *Trichia* Nietner, 1861 and *Trichia* Reuter, 1875. Nietner (1861, p. 3) included the new genus and species *T. exigua* under Lepidoptera in a *List of the enemies of the coffee tree and their parasites* and gave a description (p. 20) of the caterpillar and moth. Hampson (1892, p. 494) stated that the description was not recognizable, and included it under the heading 'Species formerly recorded as Indian which are omitted'. I know of no subsequent use of this name in Lepidoptera. *Trichia* Reuter (1875, pp. 81–82), monotypic for the new species *T. punctulata*, was introduced for a Texan bug (Heteroptera). The genus was renamed *Tiryus* by Kirkaldy (1903, p. 14) and both *Trichia* Reuter and *Tirgus* Kirkaldy were synonymized with *Ceratocapsus* Reuter, 1875 (MIRIDAE) by Carvalho (1958, p. 43). Both the homonyms *Trichia* Nietner, 1861 and *Trichia* Reuter, 1875 should be added to the Official Index, as should *Capillifera* Honigmann, 1906 (type species *Helix hispida* Linnaeus, 1758).

Gittenberger briefly refers to the wide use of the name *Trichia* in Myxomycetes. The existence of homonymous names in Myxomycetes and names in use elsewhere in zoology is far wider reaching than the present case and I think, therefore, that a decision must be taken with respect to *Trichia* without prejudice to other cases of homonymy. Thus I support the simple request by Gittenberger (paragraph 11 (1b)) for a ruling that *Trichia* (Mollusca) is not rendered invalid by *Trichia* (Myxomycetes).

In conclusion, I strongly support the application to conserve *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 with the following additional or alternative proposals:

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary power to set aside all previous fixations of type species for the nominal genus *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 and to designate *Helix hispida* Linnaeus, 1758 as the type species;

(2) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the following names:

   (a) *Capillifera* Honigmann, 1906 (a junior objective synonym of *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840) (Mollusca);

   (b) *Trichia* Nietner, 1861 (a junior homonym of *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840) (Lepidoptera);

   (c) *Trichia* Reuter, 1875 (a junior homonym of *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840) (Heteroptera).

Additional references

Boettger, C.R. 1928. Nochmals der Genotyp der Landschneckegattung *Trichia* Hartmann. *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, **77**: 1–4.

Carvalho, J.C.M. 1958. Catálogo dos Mirídeos do mundo. Parte III. Subfamília Orthotylinae. *Arquivos do Museu Nacional*, **47**: 1–161.

Forcart, L. 1958. *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 nomenklatorisch gültig. *Archiv für Molluskenkunde*, **87**: 153–154.

Gude, G.K. & Woodward, B.B. 1921. On *Helicella*, Férussac. *Proceedings of the Malacological Society of London*, **14**: 174–190.

Hampson, G.F. 1892. Moths. Vol. 1. *In*: Blanford, W.T. (Ed.), *The Fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma*. Pp. xxiii, 1–527.

Honigmann, H. 1906. Beitrag zur Molluskenfauna von Bernburg a.S. *Abhandlungen und Berichte. Museum für Natur- und Heimatkunde zu Magdeburg*, **1**: 188–195.

Kirkaldy, G.W. 1903. Einige neue und wenig bekannte Rhynchoten. *Wiener Entomologische Zeitung*, **22**: 13–17.

Likharev, I.M. & Rammel'meier, E.S. 1952. Nazemnye mollyuski fauny SSSR. *Opredeliteli po faune SSSR*, **43**: 1–512.

Nietner, J. 1861. Observations on the enemies of the coffee tree in Ceylon. *Ceylon Times*. 31 pp.

Reuter, O.M. 1875. Capsinae ex America boreali in Museo Holmiensi asservatae, descriptae ab O.M. Reuter. *Öfversigt af Kongl. Vetenskaps-Akademiens Förhandlingar. Stockholm*, **32**(9): 59–92.

Watson, H. 1922. Notes on the nomenclature of *Hygromia*, *Helicella*, etc. *Journal of Conchology*, **16**: 277–285.

Watson, H. 1943. Notes on a List of the British non-marine Mollusca. *Journal of Conchology*, **22**: 53–72.

(2) Gary Rosenberg

The Academy of Natural Sciences, Department of Malacology,
1900 Benjamin Franklin Parkway, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103, U.S.A.

The issue raised by the application of whether names in an ambiregnal group such as Myxomycetes should compete in homonymy with names that are strictly zoological has implications far beyond the status of the name *Trichia*.

Taxa such as Myxomycetes (or Mycetozoa) that are subject to the provisions of both the zoological and botanical Codes of nomenclature can be problematic because the Codes may conflict. For example, in botany the criterion of consistent use of binominal nomenclature applies only to the availability of species-group names, whereas in zoology it applies to all names regulated by the Code. *Trichia* illustrates this problem: botanists attribute the name to van Haller (1768), but his work is non-binominal, with phrases such as 'Trichia brevissime petiolata purpurea' (p. 115), so zoologists must attribute *Trichia* to Hoffman (1790).

Corliss (BZN **52**: 11–17, March 1995) has reviewed the broad issues raised by ambiregnal taxa, so I will restrict myself here largely to the status of names of slime molds. Two provisions of the zoological Code are relevant: Article 1.1.1 states '. . . the term 'animals' refers to the Metazoa and also to protistan taxa when workers treat them as animals for the purposes of nomenclature . . .'. Slime molds are typically studied by mycologists who follow the botanical Code; for that reason they could be considered to be outside the scope of zoological nomenclature. However, Article 2.2 states 'Any available name of a taxon that has at any time been classified as animal continues to compete in homonymy in zoological nomenclature even though the taxon is later not classified as animal'.

Keller (in Parker, 1982, p. 165) classified slime molds as Division Myxomycota of subkingdom Thallobionta within Kingdom Plantae. He stated that they may be 'classified with fungi, following the rules of botanical nomenclature . . . or in the kingdom Protista at various taxonomic ranks, following zoological nomenclature'. The Protozoa (= Protista) have also been classified as a subkingdom within the Kingdom Animalia (for example, Parker 1982). Cavalier-Smith (1997) ranked slime molds as phylum Mycetozoa within the Sarcodina, together with phyla Amoebozoa and Rhizopoda, which fall under the zoological Code.

Myxomycetans are generally included in works that index the zoological literature. Of 132 genus-group names that I have found in Myxomycetes, mostly those recorded