

Comments on the proposed conservation of ARANEIDAE Clerck, 1758, *Araneus* Clerck, 1758 and *Tegenaria* Latreille, 1804 (Arachnida, Araneae)
(Case 3371: see BZN 64: 15–18)

(1) Peter Jäger

*Sektion Arachnologie, Forschungsinstitut und Naturmuseum Senckenberg,
Senckenberganlage 25, D-60325 Frankfurt, Germany*
(e-mail: Peter.Jaeger@Senckenberg.de)

I fully agree with the statements and proposals made in this application. I support the proposal, as the generic names *Araneus* and *Tegenaria* are very widely used and any other ruling would cause terrible and unnecessary confusion. Moreover, the solution proposed fully conforms to the presumed intentions of the original authors.

(2) O. Kraus

*Zoological Institute & Zoological Museum, University of Hamburg,
Martin-Luther-King-Platz 3, D-20146 Hamburg, Germany*
(e-mail: Otto.Kraus@zoologie.uni-hamburg.de)

I strongly support N.J. Kluge's application. This is in conformity with current usage. His proposals will prevent further useless digging in old works.

(3) Herbert W. Levi

*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, 26 Oxford Street,
Cambridge, MA 02138–2902, U.S.A.* (e-mail: levi@fas.harvard.edu)

Forty years ago I was unsuccessful finding a designated type species for the genus *Aranea* and designated *A. diadema* L. as type (Levi. 1971, p. 133). It was overlooked by Kluge (Kluge, personal communication). I think this type designation solves the hypothetical problem presented by Kluge (Case 3371). There is no objection to having similar generic names *Aranea* and *Araneus*, *Aranea* now a synonym of *Araneus*. The type species of both genera are much alike. Problems of hypothetical family names based on similar generic names have been solved in the past.

Latreille's type designation (and I have not checked on this), forgotten for 200 years, could be annulled, but both the Preamble of the Code and General Recommendations of the Code stress stability of Nomenclature, not searching for obsolete names, making the use of this old type designation unlikely. I do not think that there is a nomenclatural problem.

Additional reference

Levi, H.W. 1971. The *diadematus* group of the orb-weaver genus *Araneus* North of Mexico (Araneae: Araneidae). *Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology*, **141**(4): 131–179.

(4) Nikita J. Kluge

Department of Entomology, St. Petersburg State University, 195213 St. Petersburg, Russia (e-mail: kluge@FK13889.spb.edu)

The type designation made by Levi (1971) is invalid, because it ignores the earlier type designation made by Latreille (1810). Levi (1971) suggested that *Aranea diadema* be designated as the type species of *Aranea* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Araneus angulatus* is confirmed as the type species of *Araneus* Clerk, 1758. If this approach was followed, *Aranea* would become an older objective synonym of *Epeira* Walckenaer, 1805 and a junior subjective synonym of *Araneus* Clerk, 1758. The purpose of this action is unclear, as both species are considered to belong to the same genus. If in the future the recently accepted large genus *Araneus* is subdivided into smaller genera in such a manner that the species presently identified as *Araneus angulatus* and *Araneus diadema* will fall into different genera, these genera will get the hardly distinguishable names *Araneus* and *Aranea* respectively, instead of the distinct names *Araneus* and *Epeira*. If these taxa are elevated to the family-group rank, their names will become identical, and a new ruling by Commission will be necessary. The suggestion made by Levi (1971) does not clarify the situation with the recently used family name ARANEIDAE Latreille, 1806. When the family-group name ARANEIDAE was established, its type genus *Aranea* was interpreted as being based on *Aranea domestica* (which was subsequently designated as the type species by Latreille (1810)). This interpretation of *Aranea* is different from that based on the type species proposed by Levi (1971).

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Termes serratus* Froggatt, 1898 (currently *Microcerotermes serratus*) and *Termes serrula* Desneux, 1904 (currently *Microcerotermes serrula*) (Insecta, Isoptera, TERMITINAE)
(Case 3385; see BZN 64: 83–86, 185–187)

David T. Jones

Department of Entomology, Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e-mail: dtj@nhm.ac.uk)

The specific name *Microcerotermes serratus* (Froggatt, 1898) has been used since its publication to refer to an Australian termite, while the specific name *M. serrula* (Desneux, 1904) has been used since its publication to refer to a species from Southeast Asia. Because both names are invalid, Roisin & Pasteels (2000, p. 165) recommended the strict application of the Code to correct these names, which would necessitate the Southeast Asian species being called *M. serratus* (Haviland, 1898), and the Australian species being called *M. parviceps* Mjöberg, 1920. Roisin & Pasteels (BZN 64: 186) are correct in their assumption that I overlooked this recommendation (Roisin & Pasteels, 2000, p. 165), with the result that I continued to follow the prevailing trend and used the junior names. In 2006, on reading their correction, I applied for the conservation of both junior names (Case 3385; BZN 64: 83–86), an application that Roisin & Pasteels wish the Commission to reject (BZN 64: 185–187). My application cannot be described as ‘nomenclatural anarchy’ (Roisin & Pasteels, BZN 64: 187), as an application to the Commission asking for their ruling on this matter is the official method for resolving such disagreements over nomenclature.