

OPINION 2274 (Case 3455)***Pseudobagrus* Bleeker, 1859 (Osteichthyes, Siluriformes, BAGRIDAE):
conservation by suppression of a senior synonym not approved**

Abstract. An application to conserve the generic name *Pseudobagrus* Bleeker, 1859 for a group of bagrid catfishes (order Siluriformes) by suppressing the senior name *Tachysurus* La Cepède, 1803, was not approved by the Commission.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; BAGRIDAE; *Pseudobagrus*; *Tachysurus*; *Pseudobagrus fulvidraco*; *Tachysurus sinensis*; catfish; China.

Ruling

- (1) It is hereby ruled that the following names are not suppressed:
 - (a) *Tachysurus* La Cepède, 1803;
 - (b) *sinensis* La Cepède, 1803, as published in the binomen *Tachysurus sinensis* (specific name of the type species of *Tachysurus* La Cepède, 1803).
- (2) No names are placed on Official Lists or Indexes and the issue is left open for subsequent workers to follow the precepts of the Code or to make new proposals to the Commission.

History of Case 3455

An application to conserve the generic name *Pseudobagrus* Bleeker, 1859 for a group of bagrid catfishes (order Siluriformes) by suppressing the senior name *Tachysurus* La Cepède, 1803, was received from J. Andrés López (*Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, U.S.A.*), E. Zhang and J-L. Cheng (*Institute of Hydrobiology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan, Hubei Province, China*) on 13 March 2008. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 65: 202–204 (September 2008). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. An adverse comment was published in BZN 67: 68–71.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2010 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 65: 203–204. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2011, the results were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 5: Bouchet, Grygier, Halliday, Papp and Yanega.

Negative votes – 18: Ballerio, Brothers, Fautin, Harvey, Kojima, Kottelat, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Lim, Minelli, Pape, Patterson, Rosenberg, Štys, van Tol, Winston and Zhang.

Bogutskaya and Zhou abstained. Alonso-Zarazaga, Ng and Pyle were on leave of absence.

Voting AGAINST, Brothers said that requesting the suppression of one of two names, both of which are stated to be widely used for different taxa, would seem to

defeat any aim to promote stability, and result in a solution little different from that supposedly being countered, merely favouring the other name. Also voting AGAINST, Kojima commented that the identity of *Tachysurus sinensis* La Cepède, 1803 is now unambiguous, as its neotype has been designated by Ng & Kottelat (2007), and therefore the genus *Tachysurus* is well defined. Štys, voting AGAINST, said he agreed with the arguments provided in the comment by Ng & Kottelat (2010).

Voting FOR, Yanega said that this case asked the Commission, in effect, to weigh which of two actions is more important to nomenclature; the fixation via type designation of a single previously extremely ambiguous name based solely upon an illustration, versus the generic placement of a large number of species. Clearly, the less disruptive alternative is to eliminate the name *Tachysurus*, rather than resurrecting it and giving it priority over other long-established and well-characterised names. *Tachysurus* may well be the correct name, following the Code, but sometimes stability takes precedence; while the scholarship and argumentation behind it is commendable, the end result of resurrecting *Tachysurus* is unfavourable, and thus contrary to the overall aims of the Code.