

**OPINION 2067 (Case 3188)**

***Nemotois violellus* Herrich-Schaeffer in Stainton, 1851 (currently *Nemophora violella*; Insecta, Lepidoptera): specific name conserved by the designation of a neotype for *Tinea cupriacella* Hübner, 1819 (currently *Nemophora cupriacella*)**

**Abstract.** The Commission has ruled that the names *Nemotois violellus* Herrich-Schaeffer in Stainton, 1851 and *Tinea cupriacella* Hübner, 1819 are conserved by designating a neotype for *T. cupriacella*.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Lepidoptera; ADELIDAE; *Nemophora*; *Nemophora violella*; *Nemophora cupriacella*; fairy moths; Europe.

---

**Ruling**

- (1) Under the plenary power all previous type fixations for the nominal species *Tinea cupriacella* Hübner, 1819 are hereby set aside and the female specimen: ♀, POLAND: Glogów; 'Scab. succisa, Torfwiesen, Glogau, Zeller 1/ [18]53'; Stainton Coll., Brit. Mus.1893-134, in The Natural History Museum, London, is designated as the neotype.
- (2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
  - (a) *cupriacella* Hübner, 1819, as published in the binomen *Tinea cupriacella* and as defined by the neotype designated in (1) above;
  - (b) *violellus* Herrich-Schaeffer in Stainton, 1851, as published in the binomen *Nemotois violellus*.

**History of Case 3188**

An application to conserve the specific name of *Nemotois violellus* Herrich-Schaeffer in Stainton, 1851 for a common and widely distributed European bisexual fairy moth (family ADELIDAE) associated with several *Gentiana* species was received from Mikhail V. Kozlov (*University of Turku, Turku, Finland*) on 24 January 2001. The name was threatened by the senior synonym *Tinea cupriacella* Hübner, 1819 that (although originally based on a male specimen of what has long been called *Nemophora violella*) for almost 150 years has been used for another (apparently parthenogenetic) species and its suppression was proposed. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 59: 30-33 (March 2002). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. Comments opposed to the proposal to suppress *T. cupriacella* were published in BZN 60: 54-58. An alternative proposal to designate a neotype for *T. cupriacella* by Erik J. van Nieuwerkerken (*National Museum of Natural History, Naturalis, Leiden, The Netherlands*) was published in BZN 60: 56.

**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 September 2003 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 59: 32 and BZN 60: 56. At the close of the voting period

on 1 December 2003 the votes were as follows: 4 Commissioners voted FOR the original proposals and 18 Commissioners (Alonso-Zarazaga, Bouchet, Brothers, Calder, Evenhuis, Fortey, Kerzhner, Lamas, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Minelli, Ng, Nielsen, Papp, Rosenberg, Song, Štys and van Tol) voted AGAINST. Of those who voted against, 16 voted FOR the alternative proposals, no vote was received from Eschmeyer. Böhme and Patterson were on leave of absence.

### Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

- cupriacella*, *Tinea*, Hübner, 1819, *Sammlung Europäischer Schmetterlinge* Lepidoptera VIII. Tineae, pl. 67, fig. 445.
- violellus*, *Nemotois*, Herrich-Schaeffer in Stainton, 1851, *Systematische Bearbeitung der Schmetterlinge von Europa*, Band 5 (Die Schaben und Federmotten). Tineides, p. 19.