



<http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3963.4.6>

<http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:8265782B-BD41-48C2-90BC-0D0028C62B8B>

The authorships and dates of the specific nomina *Megophrys shuichengensis* and *Pseudohynobius shuichengensis* (Amphibia)

ANNEMARIE OHLER^{1,3}, THIERRY FRÉTEY² & ALAIN DUBOIS¹

¹Institut de Systématique, Évolution, Biodiversité, ISYEB – UMR 7205 – CNRS, MNHN, UPMC, EPHE, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Sorbonne Universités, 57 rue Cuvier, CP 30, F-75005, Paris, France

²Association RACINE, 5, allée des cygnes, 35750 Saint Maugan, France

³Corresponding author. E-mail: annemarie.ohler@mnhn.fr

Two amphibian species from China are designated by the specific nomen *shuichengensis*, which refers to the Shuicheng County (26°34'N, 104°51'E), south of the city of Liupanshui in the province of Guizhou: *Megophrys shuichengensis* (Amphibia, Anura) and *Pseudohynobius shuichengensis* (Amphibia, Urodela). The holotypes (holophoronts) of both species were deposited in Department of Biology of the Liupanshui Teachers Higher College (LTHC below). Both species share the particularity of having been described as new twice, at different dates, in different journals and with different authorships. Although this has been acknowledged for the salamander, it has not yet been so for the frog.

Presumably, in both cases the species was redescribed as new in a well-known journal because the original description had been published in a journal considered 'obscure', the *Journal of Liupanshui Teachers College (Natural Science)* (*JLTC* below). However, the latter journal bears an ISSN (1671-055X) and is available in several international libraries, and now also online for its volumes published from 1985 to 2014 [<http://www.oriprobe.com/journals/lpssfgdzkxxb.html>]. Starting in 1990 this journal published 4 issues annually, changing to 6 yearly issues in 2004. Furthermore, the two papers in this journal discussed below are part of a collection of PDFs distributed under the label '1995–2005 Tsinghua Tongfang Optical Disc Co., Ltd'. The *JLTC* is a recognized scientific publication and the papers published in this journal must be considered technically published according to the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature*. So in both cases the valid nomina of the species at stake are those published in this journal and not those of the 'redescriptions'. The situations are slightly different in the two cases, so we will treat them separately.

Pseudohynobius shuichengensis

This species was first described by Tian Yingzhou, Gu Xiaomin, Sun Aiqun & Li Shong (1998) in the *JLTC*. In the original description, the holotype was stated to be the adult male LTHC 9460080 (total length 195.7 mm, snout-vent length 103.0 mm) collected on 11 June 1994 at an elevation of 1820 metres in the Shuicheng County. The original description also mentioned an 'allotype' female LTHC 9460084 collected at the same time and place, and 100 other paratypes (10 males, 10 females, 80 young) collected from 1994 to 1997 between 1800 and 1850 metres in the Shuicheng County. Dubois *et al.* (2005: 48) noted that the specific epithet appeared under three different spellings in the original publication (*shuichengensis*, *xhuichengensis*, *shuichenensis*), and, acting as first revisers, they chose the spelling *shuichengensis* as the 'correct original spelling' of the nomen. Frost (2014) credited in error this original description to 'Tian, Li & Gu, 1998' and stated that the holotype was LTHC 9460084, but this is the number of the 'allotype'.

Tian, Li & Gu (2006) redescribed this species in *Acta Zoologica Sinica* under the same nomen, without mentioning the original description. They therefore created a new nomen, having a different authorship and date and being an invalid junior homonym of the original nomen (for details see Dubois 2012). They gave the same information for the type specimens, including their numbers and measurements (except for the total length of the holotype, given as 197.5 mm), but they changed the figures for the elevations of the collection of the holotype and 'allotype' (1970 metres) and of the other paratypes (1910–1970 metres). Frost (2014) gave the latter figures for the original description, although they seem to be a 'correction' (without explanation) of the original data. Frost (2014) stated that the holotype mentioned in the redescription (LTHC 9460080) was a different specimen from the original one, which would make both nomina subjective synonyms (doxisonyms). In fact, the nomen *Pseudohynobius shuichengensis* Tian, Li & Gu, 2006 is simply an