



Correspondence

urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:100893AA-53BB-4F6B-BEF9-D24A31D9A6F2

New synonymies in the order Urodela Duméril, 1805 (Amphibia, Batrachia), with comments on the use of the formula “new taxon” to designate new nomina

ALAIN DUBOIS

Reptiles & Amphibiens, UMR 7205 OSEB, Département Systématique & Evolution, Muséum national d’Histoire naturelle, CP 30, 25 rue Cuvier, 75005 Paris, France. E-mail: adubois@mnhn.fr

Dubois & Raffaëlli (2012) recently published a new comprehensive taxonomy and nomenclature of the recent salamanders and newts of the world. Almost coincidentally, Wake (2012) published a revised classification of the salamander family *PLETHODONTIDAE*. Three family-series (or family-group) nomina (scientific names) were proposed as new in both papers. According to the date appearing in *Zootaxa*, the latter paper was published on 18 September 2012, whereas, according to the printer Frédéric Paillart (personal communication), the former was mailed to subscribers of *Alytes* on 24 October 2012. Therefore the new nomina that are common to both papers are valid in the latter, and invalid junior synonyms and homonyms in the former. I here present complete synonymic lists for these three nomina, as well as a few additional comments.

The three nomina at stake, and the taxa they designate, already have a rather complex history. The taxa were first recognized, with their current contents, by Vieites *et al.* (2007: Online Supporting Information), under the following nomina: genus *Aneides*, genus *Batrachoseps* and “supergenous *Hydromantes*”. Dubois (2008: 70–75) showed in detail why this nomenclature was incorrect under the *Code* (Anonymous 1999), which does not recognize a rank “supergenous”, and poorly informative for being pseudoranked: different ranks were afforded to taxa that were considered parordinate (“sister-taxa”) under the phylogenetic hypothesis adopted. It was shown that different nomenclatures could be used to account for this phylogenetic hypothesis, and to make this quite clear three examples of possible nomenclatures for this family were provided. These three nomenclatures included taxa that were then still unnamed. However, Dubois (2008: 71) refrained from providing available nomina for these taxa under the Rules of the *Code*, leaving this opportunity to the authors working on this group, and wrote: “Tribal nomina between quotation marks are informal nomina without availability in zoological nomenclature. They are mentioned here just to show what the nomenclature of this family could be if the erection of these tribes was judged useful by specialists of this group. If it were the case, these nomina should be formally published with a diagnosis and a statement of intention of creating a new nomen, as, for the time being, no available nomina exist to name these tribes.”

Vieites *et al.* (2011: 633) followed the latter advice, but only partially: they used these three nomina (*ANEIDINI*, *BATRACHOSEPINI* and *HYDROMANTINI*) as valid and showed their intention of creating new nomina by adding the formula “new taxon” after them. However, they failed to follow the second part of the advice: as they did not provide any diagnosis for these “new taxa”, the three nomina remained *nomina nuda* (*gymnomyns*) in their work. Subsequently, Jockush *et al.* (2012: 1) used again the nomen *BATRACHOSEPINI*, but still as a *gymnomyn*, as they still did not diagnose the taxon.

When they prepared their ergotaxonomy of the salamanders, Dubois & Raffaëlli (2012) were again confronted to the absence of available nomina for these three taxa and had no choice, although it was not their original intention (Dubois 2008), but to propose formal nomina and diagnoses for these taxa – thus hoping to put an end to an uncomfortable nomenclatural situation. The publication by Wake (2012) of the same three nomina with formal diagnoses did the same and has priority.

The rather complex nomenclatural history of these three nomina appears in their formal synonymies given below. In these, the following terms are used: *hoplonym* (Dubois 2000) for available nomen (concept without technical designation in the *Code*); *anoplonym* (Dubois 2000) for unavailable nomen (concept without technical designation in the *Code*); *gymnomyn* (Dubois 2000) for *nomen nudum* in the *Code* (nomen unavailable for failing to follow Articles 12 and/or 13); *atelonym* (Dubois 2011) for nomen unavailable under the *Code* for failing to follow Articles 1, 3, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 24, 32, 33, 34, 50 and/or 79 (concept without technical designation in the *Code*); *nucleogenus* (Dubois 2005a) for *type genus* under the *Code*; and *isonym* (Dubois 2000) for *objective synonym* in the *Code*.