

OPINION 2145 (Case 3255)***Macropodus spechti* Schreitmüller, 1936 (Osteichthyes, Perciformes):
priority maintained**

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that priority is maintained for *Macropodus spechti* Schreitmüller, 1936, the specific name of the Black Paradise Fish (family OSPHRONEMIDAE). A proposal to conserve the specific name of its junior objective synonym *Macropodus concolor* Ahl, 1937 was not approved.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; OSPHRONEMIDAE; *Macropodus concolor*; *Macropodus spechti*; Black Paradise Fish; Southeast Asia.

Ruling

- (1) It is hereby ruled that priority is maintained for *Macropodus spechti* Schreitmüller, 1936.
- (2) The name *spechti* Schreitmüller, 1936, as published in the binomen *Macropodus spechti*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3255

An application to conserve the specific name of *Macropodus concolor* Ahl, 1937, for the Black Paradise Fish, (family OSPHRONEMIDAE), by suppression of the senior objective synonym *Macropodus spechti* Schreitmüller, 1936, was received from Ingo Schindler (*Warthestr. 53a, Berlin, Germany*) and Wolfgang Staeck (*Auf dem Grat 41a, Berlin, Germany*) on 26 September 2002. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 206–207 (September 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. Comments in support of the application were published in BZN 60: 220–221 and BZN 61: 173. Comments opposing the application were published in BZN 61: 114–116, to which the authors reply was published in BZN 61: 256–257. Additional comments opposing the application were published in BZN 61: 173–174 and BZN 62: 87–89.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 September 2005 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 207. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2005 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 6: Bock, Bouchet, Fortey, Mahner, Nielsen and Papp.

Negative votes – 15: Alonso-Zarazaga, Brothers, Calder, Halliday, Kerzhner, Lamas, Macpherson, Mawatari, Minelli, Ng, Patterson, Rosenberg, Song, Štys and van Tol.

Voting against, Ng commented: 'I must argue that while the proponents have a sort of case, the fact is that the older name, *spechti*, is now being used by a fair number of practising ichthyologists and even aquarists after the fact that it was a senior synonym was published. As such, to reverse now and support its suppression

makes very little sense, especially considering how unstable the taxonomy of this genus and its allies are. I know this fish, and as far as I am concerned, the need to change its name is not a problem. That is what the Code was designed to do. The fact that the fish has minimal if no economic, medical or otherwise major scientific significance also makes me vote against keeping a junior name like *concolor*'.

Original references

The following is the original reference to the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

spechti, *Macropodus*, Schreitmüller, 1936, *Das Aquarium*, **10**: 181.