

OPINION 2197 (Case 3341)***Cardium egmontianum* Shuttleworth, 1856 (currently *Trachycardium egmontianum*; Mollusca, Bivalvia, CARDIIDAE): current usage conserved**

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the current usage of the specific name *egmontianum* for a common and widespread western Atlantic bivalve *Trachycardium egmontianum* (Shuttleworth, 1856) of the family CARDIIDAE is conserved by setting aside all lectotype designations for *Cardium mindanense* Reeve, 1844 prior to that by Vidal (1998).

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Mollusca; Bivalvia; CARDIIDAE; *Trachycardium*; *Cardium mindanense*; *Cardium egmontianum*.

Ruling

- (1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that all lectotype designations for *Cardium mindanense* Reeve, 1844 prior to that by Vidal (1998) are set aside.
- (2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
 - (a) *mindanense* Reeve, 1844, as published in the binomen *Cardium mindanense* and as defined by the lectotype designated by Vidal (1998);
 - (b) *egmontianum* Shuttleworth, 1856, as published in the binomen *Cardium egmontianum*.

History of Case 3341

An application to conserve the usage of the specific name of *Cardium egmontianum* Shuttleworth, 1856 was received from Harry G. Lee (*Jacksonville, FL, U.S.A.*) and Richard E. Petit (*North Myrtle Beach, SC, U.S.A.*) on 2 March 2005. This requested setting aside a lectotype designation by Voskuil & Onverwagt (1992) that made *Cardium mindanense* a senior synonym of *C. egmontianum* and removing the name *C. mindanense* from usage for an Indo-Pacific species. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 64: 12–14 (March 2007). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. One supportive comment on this case was published in BZN 64(3): 185.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2007 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 64: 14. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2008 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 16: Alonso-Zarazaga, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Fautin, Halliday, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Mawatari, Pape, Papp, Patterson, Rosenberg, van Tol and Zhang.

Negative votes – 4: Grygier, Kottelat, Ng and Štys.

No vote was received from Lim. Kerzhner, Minelli and Pyle were on leave of absence.

Voting against, Grygier commented that if the ‘type designation’ of Voskuil & Onverwagt was not valid (as certainly appears to be the case), then there was no reason to invoke the plenary power, which pertains to suspension of the application of some provision of the Code (Article 78.1). He says that in this application the applicant simply wants the Commission to declare the type designation in question not valid ‘to remove any question’. This should be done under the specific power to ‘interpret or apply the provisions of the Code to any question of zoological nomenclature’ granted to the Commission by Article 78.2.3, not under the plenary power. He suggested that following the vote, an Opinion of the sort described in Article 80.2.1 should be issued. Kottelat concurs, saying that although he has not been able to examine the original description and the ‘lectotype’ designation, the way the application describes the ‘lectotype’ designation by Voskuil & Onverwagt makes it clear that it is not a lectotype designation and that the lectotype designation by Vidal is valid. Therefore no decision by the Commission is needed and the use of plenary powers is not justified. Ng had similar sentiments, saying that while it may be argued that this case pertains to interpretation of what Voskuil & Onverwagt actually did, the arguments suggest that the supposed lectotype designation was invalid and was made as a passing comment. As the Code stands, this lectotype designation has no validity and as such, this case is unnecessary. Štys brings a similar set of observations, saying that Lee & Petit’s solution to the situation is of course correct. However, he does not see any reason to invoke plenary power for cases in which normal application of the Code is sufficient. Voskuil & Onverwagt’s (1992) designation of holotype for *Cardium mindanense* was invalid (Article 73.1.3) and was insufficient for fixation of a lectotype by inference of a ‘holotype’ (Article 74.6).

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

mindanense, *Cardium*, Reeve, 1844, *Conchologia Iconica*, vol. 2. Pl. 4, fig. 19.
egmontianum, *Cardium*, Shuttleworth, 1856, *Journal de Conchyliologie*, 5: 172–173.

The following is the reference for the designation of the lectotype for *Cardium mindanense* Reeve, 1844:

Vidal, J. 1998. *Apex*, 13: 115.