was collected in the vicinity of his home town, Montpellier. Radoman did not offer any evidence that the syntypes originated from this locality, nor did he examine any. In para. 6 the applicants state '... whether they [the two specimens figured by Dollfus, 1912 and taken to be syntypes by Boeters, 1984] were actually original specimens is impossible to determine'. Dollfus (1912) stated that he obtained 'des échantillons types, de sa [Draparnaud's] collection ... de la manière la plus aimable, par les soins des conservateurs du Musée de Vienne'. In fact, the number of syntypes given by Locard (1895) agrees with the numbers viewed by the applicants (para. 4 of the application) if the two shells illustrated by Dollfus (1912) and Boeters (1984) are included.

The name of the type species of *Ventrosia* Radoman, 1977 should be corrected as proposed in the application (see para. 10) as the species intended and described by Radoman (1977) is evidently *Hydrobia ventrosa* (Montagu, 1803). Radoman (1977) used the senior name '*Helix*' *stagnorum* Gmelin, 1791 because it was not known prior to the paper of Bank, Butot & Gittenberger (1979) that this nominal species was not conspecific with *H. ventrosa*.

It should perhaps be noted that, in placing *Ventrosia* Radoman, 1977 on the Official List, *Ecrobia* Stimpson, 1865 (p. 42) is likely to be its senior subjective synonym. The type species of *Ecrobia* by original designation, *Turbo minutus* Totten, 1834 (p. 369) (non Brown, 1818, p. 463, pl. 10, fig. 13; Michaud, 1828, p. 122, pl. [1], figs. 7–9; and Woodward, 1833, pp. 28, 44, pl. 3, fig. 20), replaced as a junior primary homonym by *Hydrobia totteni* Morrison, 1954 (p. 26), is, according to Davis, McKee & Lopez (1989), very closely related to *H. ventrosa*, and therefore *H. totteni* and *H. ventrosa* are in all probability congeneric even if the genera are defined in a narrow sense.

I fully support the action proposed to remove the homonymy between the mollusc and insect family-group names HYDROBIIDAE for the reasons stated by the applicants.

Additional references

Brown, Th. 1818. Appendix. Pp. 427–452 *in* Allan, T., Sketch of the geology of the environs of Nice. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, **8**: 453–464.

Michaud, A.L.G. 1828. Description de plusieurs espèces de coquilles vivantes de la Méditerranée. *Bulletin d'Histoire Naturelle de la Société Linnéenne de Bordeaux*, **2**(10): 119–122.

Morrison, J.P.E. 1954. *Hydrobia totteni*, new name for *Turbo minuta* [sic] Totten, 1834 (Gastropoda: Hydrobiidae). *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences*, **44**(1): 26.

Stimpson, W. 1865. Researches upon the Hydrobinae and allied forms; chiefly made upon materials in the Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*, **7**, No. 210: 1–59.

Totten, J. 1834. Descriptions of some new shells belonging to the coast of New England. *American Journal of Science*, **26**(2): 366–369.

Woodward, S. 1833. *An outline of the geology of Norfolk*. 60 pp., 6 pls. Norwich.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Papilio sylvanus* Esper, [1777] (currently *Ochlodes venata* or *Augiades sylvanus*; Insecta, Lepidoptera)

(Case 3046; see BZN **54**: 231–235; **55**: 105–106, 169–171)

Alexey L. Devyatkin

Department of Entomology, Faculty of Biology, Moscow State University, 119899 Moscow, Russia

de Jong & Karsholt (BZN **55**: 169–171) have opposed the conservation of the specific name of *Papilio sylvanus* Esper, [1777] and found two 'reasons' for this arising from my proposal. I feel that there is misrepresentation in their comment, the situation being far more complicated than they portray, and I would like to clarify the matter.

The fact that the specific name *sylvanus* Esper 'has appeared in many guides and lists' is not the most important reason for the request for its conservation, as was erroneously stated by de Jong & Karsholt. More significant is the fact that the specific name was well-established and consistently used for more than 150 years, and there has never been any confusion with its senior primary homonym, the name of an African lycaenid, neither species having been placed in *Papilio* since the 18th century. On the other hand, the name *Ochlodes venata faunus* (Turati, 1905) appeared in the literature only after the revisional work of Evans (1949), and only due to confusion at the species level with the Chinese *Ochlodes venata* (Bremer & Grey, 1853). And even since 1949 the adoption of the name *faunus* has not been unanimous. In view of this I cannot agree with de Jong & Karsholt that 'the combination *Ochlodes venata faunus* is well established'.

Since the 'European subspecies of *Ochlodes venata*' has proved to be a Trans-Palaearctic species distinct from the Asian *O. venata* (Bremer & Grey, 1853), two other names are available for it, *hyrcana* Christoph, 1893 and *similis* Leech, 1893, both older than *faunus* Turati, 1905 (para. 5 of the application). Which of the three should be adopted? The problem is that all the nominal taxa to which these three names are applied may eventually prove to be distinct species, and the solution to this taxonomic and nomenclatural problem requires a long-term biological study, partly in barely accessible localities.

Ochlodes (or *Augiades*) *sylvanus* (Esper), a most common and highly variable species, was very well known at the time of the description of *O. faunus*; Turati (1905) described the latter in comparison with *O. sylvanus*, and the fact that the type of *O. faunus* has been destroyed is not the second reason for my proposal (as stated by de Jong & Karsholt), but it adds to the complexity of the problem.

The statement of de Jong & Karsholt that 'Rondou (1932) and all the subsequent authors agree that Turati's name pertains to the same taxon as Esper's name' is not a strong argument because nobody (including de Jong himself) has ever studied the problem of European *Ochlodes venata faunus* since Evans's (1949) work. The Lepidoptera of the Pyrenees, a distinctive area with many endemic taxa at both specific and subspecific levels, cannot be regarded as 'rather well known' (as stated by de Jong & Karsholt), since the facts confirm the opposite. Descriptions of new taxa from the Iberian Peninsula (*Agrodiaetus ainsae* Forster, 1961, *A. agenjoi* Forster, 1965, *A. violetae* Gomez Bustillo & Borrego, 1979 and *Leptidea reali* Reissinger, 1989, for example), as well as numerous changes in the taxonomic status of butterflies of Western Europe (see, for example, Tolman, 1997), give clear evidence in favour of this view. Moreover, de Jong himself discovered an unrecognized species of *Carcharodus* in the Iberian Peninsula (de Jong, 1978) and found problems in the definition of the rank of *Pyrgus* (*malvae*) *malvoides* (Elwes & Edwards, 1897) (see de Jong, 1972, 1987).

Therefore, until an intensive biological study is conducted, I personally can accept the existence of two species or subspecies of *Ochlodes* in the Pyrenees, notwithstanding the statement of de Jong & Karsholt that 'it is highly unlikely that one of them has always escaped the attention of all people' who collected there; this was just the case