OPINION 2371 (Case 3617)

Habroleptoides confusa Sartori & Jacob, 1986 (Insecta, Ephemeroptera, LEPTOPHLEBIIDAE): precedence given over Habroleptoides carpatica Bogosescu & Crăsnaru, 1930

Abstract. Under the plenary power the Commission has conserved the specific name Habroleptoides confusa Sartori & Jacob, 1986 for a well-known European mayfly (family LEPTOPHLEBIIDAE) by reversing precedence with the senior subjective synonym Habroleptoides carpatica Bogosescu & Crăsnaru, 1930, which has seldom been used since its first publication, while the junior synonym is very widely used.
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Ruling
(1) Under the plenary power the Commission has ruled that the name confusa Sartori & Jacob, 1986, as published in the binomen Habroleptoides confusa, be given precedence over the name carpatica Bogosescu & Crăsnaru, 1930, as published in the binomen Habroleptoides carpatica, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
(a) confusa Sartori & Jacob, 1986, as published in the binomen Habroleptoides confusa, with the endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the name carpatica Bogosescu & Crăsnaru, 1930, as published in the binomen Habroleptoides carpatica, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms;
(b) carpatica Bogosescu & Crăsnaru, 1930, as published in the binomen Habroleptoides carpatica, with the endorsement that it is not to be given priority over the name confusa Sartori & Jacob, 1986, as published in the binomen Habroleptoides confusa, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.

History of Case 3617

An application to conserve the specific name Habroleptoides confusa Sartori & Jacob, 1986 for a well-known European mayfly (family LEPTOPHLEBIIDAE) by reversing precedence with the senior subjective synonym Habroleptoides carpatica Bogosescu & Crăsnaru, 1930, which has seldom been used since its first publication, while the junior synonym is very widely used, was received from Éva Vâncs (Babes-Bolyai University, Department of Taxonomy and Ecology, Cluj-Napoca, Romania) and Michel Sartori (Museum of Zoology, Lausanne, Switzerland) on 3 March 2013. After correspondence the Case was published in BZN 70: 82–85 (June 2013). The title, abstract and keywords of the Case were published on the Commission’s website. No
comments were received on this case. The Case was sent for vote on 1 March 2015. A two-thirds majority of Commissioners voted FOR the Case (16 For, 8 Against).

**Decision of the Commission**

At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2015 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 16: Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Brothers, Fautin, Halliday, Harvey, Kojima, Kottelat, Krell, Lamas, Patterson, Rosenberg, Winston, Yanega, Zhang and Zhou.

Negative votes – 8: Alonso-Zarazaga, Bouchet, Grygier, Kullander, Ng, Pape, Štys and van Tol.

Pyle was on leave of absence.

Voting AGAINST, Alonso-Zarazaga said that since *Habroleptoides carpathica* was not a forgotten species (merely a poorly known species), and that both competing names were proposed during the 20th century, he considered that the Principle of Priority must be applied. Also voting AGAINST, Bouchet said that although Para. 5 of the application stated that ‘The species name [*Habroleptoides confusa*] is also widely used in European legislation and projects’, all the examples given are EU-funded projects, and none represents EU legislation, so he found that this was a one-sided presentation of the facts. *Habroleptoides carpathica* was listed as ‘valid / species inquirenda’ in another EU-funded project (Fauna Europaea, [http://www.faunaeur.org/full_results.php?id=193476](http://www.faunaeur.org/full_results.php?id=193476)) and at least one other database ([http://www.ephemeroptera.de](http://www.ephemeroptera.de)). A quick search on the internet revealed at least one additional reference to *Habroleptoides carpathica* as a valid species [Prisecaru et al., 2014, Universitatea ‘Vasile Alecsandri’ din Bacău, Studii ști Cercetări, Biologie, 23(2): 20–30], admittedly published after the original submission in BZN. He thought it was fair to give credit to Constantin Bogoescu for the recognition of *Habroleptoides carpathica* as a distinct species. He suggested that the holotype of *H. confusa* could be made the neotype of *H. carpathica*, which did not require a Commission’s ruling. Also voting AGAINST, Grygier said that the proposed solution could have been made tighter by naming one of the topotypic specimens studied by Vânsca et al. (2013) as the neotype of *H. carpathica*; otherwise the possibility remained that that those specimens were not true *H. carpathica*, but *H. confusa* dispersed into the region sometime after 1930. If the authors felt they could not designate such a neotype themselves because of possible conflict with Article 75.3.5 inasmuch as certain features of the topotypes were inconsistent with the original description, they could have included such a designation among the present proposals. In any event, he was not fully convinced that adopting the name *H. carpathica* for this nominal species would truly be disruptive. Ever since the original authors of *H. confusa* noted the possible synonymy with *H. carpathica*, this sword of Damocles had been ever-present; also, since the name in use for this species already changed once without great disruption, from *C. modesta* to *C. confusa*, why should another such change, especially one long-foreshadowed, be any different? Also voting AGAINST, Kullander noted that synonyms do occur, but the Principle of Priority would solve the problem.
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