

OPINION 2194 (Case 3356)***Schizechinus* Pomel, 1869 (Echinodermata, Echinoidea): usage not conserved and designation of *Psammechinus serresii* Desor, 1856 as the type species not accepted**

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the current usage of the name *Schizechinus* Pomel, 1869 (Echinodermata, Echinoidea) for a genus of toxopneustid echinoids from the Miocene of the Mediterranean region and possibly the Neogene of Australia is not conserved. The name *Echinus serresii* Des Moulins, 1837 is maintained and designation of *Psammechinus serresii* Desor, 1856 as the type species of *Schizechinus* Pomel, 1869 is not accepted.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Echinodermata; Echinoidea; TOXOPNEUSTIDAE; *Schizechinus*; *Echinus serresii*; *Schizechinus serresii*; Neogene; Miocene; Mediterranean.

Ruling

- (1) It is hereby ruled that:
 - (a) the name *serresii* Des Moulins, 1837, as published in the binomen *Echinus serresii*, is not suppressed;
 - (b) the designation of *Psammechinus serresii* Desor, 1856 as the type species of *Schizechinus* Pomel, 1869 is not accepted.
- (2) No names are placed on the Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling.

History of Case 3356

An application to conserve the current usage of the name *Schizechinus* Pomel, 1869 (Echinodermata, Echinoidea) by suppression of *Echinus serresii* Des Moulins, 1837, and to designate *Psammechinus serresii* Desor, 1856 as the type species of *Schizechinus* Pomel, 1869 was received from Andreas Kroh (*Natural History Museum, Vienna, Austria*) and Andrew B. Smith (*Natural History Museum, London, U.K.*) on 2 April 2005. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 63: 259–266 (December 2006). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. No comments on this case were received.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 September 2007 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 63: 264. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2007 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 9: Alonso-Zarazaga, Bouchet, Brothers, Halliday, Krell, Mahnert, Papp, Patterson and van Tol.

Negative votes – 12: Bogutskaya, Fautin, Grygier, Kerzhner, Kottelat, Kullander, Lamas, Lim, Mawatari, Pape, Rosenberg and Štys.

Zhang abstained.

Minelli, Ng and Pyle were on leave of absence.

Voting against, Kerzhner and Bogutskaya commented that it would be much simpler and more logical to designate under the plenary power *Anapesus tuberculatus* Pomel, 1887 (a junior synonym of *Echinus duceiei* Wright, 1855; currently *Schizechinus duceiei*) from the Miocene of Malta and Algeria and doubtlessly in the genus *Schizechinus* as the type species of *Schizechinus* Pomel, 1869. Also voting against, Grygier observed that although the citation by Des Moulins (1837) of two earlier-published illustrations was an indication making his species *Echinus serresii* available, Des Moulins's own material from Martigues, which might not or might belong to either of the illustrated species, is also part of the type series. If any of this material exists, a lectotype of confirmed identity could be selected from it (or the whole lot suppressed if need be). The application did not mention whether this material was extant or not (qualifying conditions of Article 75.3.4); the neotype designation in BZN 63(4): 261 was thus invalid. Grygier also commented that it was not clear from the text of the application if Clansayes had been mentioned by Des Moulins (1837), although the application stated that material of Des Moulins (1837) was both from Martigues and Clansayes, and whether the specimens used by Desor (1858) were newly collected, or were Des Moulins's, possibly syntypic. Grygier also noted that it was not clear why the neotype had to be chosen for *Psammechinus serresii* Desor, 1856 and for *Echinus serresii* Des Moulins, 1837, as presumably Clansayes (the locality of the proposed neotype) is sufficiently close to Martigues (the type locality of *Echinus serresii* Des Moulins, 1837), and if some of Des Moulins's material came from Clansayes, there should have been no problem in attributing the species to its original author. A similar concern about the possibly surviving syntypes was raised by Kottelat. Voting against, Rosenberg noted that the neotype designation in para. 9 of the application was invalid, because *Psammechinus serresii* Desor, 1856 was not an available name, being a subsequent reference to Des Moulins's taxon. Also voting against, Štys commented that the relevance of invoking Recommendations 69A.3 and 69A.10 was not clear and the case lacked important information on why the three extant species of *Schizechinus* were not included in the discussion, and the case was limited to the extinct taxa only. Štys also noted that from the text of the application he had to assume that there was formally no such species as *Psammechinus serresii* Desor, 1856.

No names are placed on the Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling.