

OPINION 2201 (Case 3352)***Productus compressus* Waagen, 1884 (currently *Compressoproductus compressus*; Brachiopoda): specific name not conserved**

Abstract. An application to conserve the specific name *Productus compressus* Waagen, 1884 for the type species of the Permian brachiopod genus *Compressoproductus* Sarytcheva in Sarytcheva et al., 1960 by suppression of *Productus compressus* Say in James, 1823 has not been approved.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Brachiopoda; *Productus*; *Compressoproductus*; *Compressoproductus compressus*; *Compressoproductus morahpressus*; Permian.

Ruling

- (1) It is hereby ruled that the application for the proposed conservation of *Productus compressus* Waagen, 1884 is not approved.
- (2) No names are placed on the Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling.

History of Case 3352

An application to conserve the specific name *Productus compressus* Waagen, 1884 for the type species of the Permian brachiopod genus *Compressoproductus* Sarytcheva in Sarytcheva et al., 1960 by suppression of *Productus compressus* Say in James, 1823 was received from Masatoshi Sone (*University of New England, Armidale, Australia & Niigata University, Niigata, Japan*) on 5 May 2005. After correspondence the case was published in *BZN* **63**: 255–258 (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**: 256. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2007 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 7: Alonso-Zarazaga, Brothers, Halliday, Kullander, Mahnert, Mawatari and Papp.

Negative votes – 15: Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Fautin, Grygier, Kerzhner, Kottelat, Krell, Lamas, Lim, Pape, Patterson, Rosenberg, Stys, van Tol and Zhang.

Minelli, Ng and Pyle were on leave of absence.

Voting against, Kerzhner commented that both valid and invalid names could be cited as senior homonyms and such citations did not necessarily constitute their usage as a valid name and did not provide an obstacle to the application of Article 23.9.1.1 of the Code.

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