



Clarification of the type status of *Macropsalis fabulosa* Phillipps & Grimmett 1932

CHRISTOPHER K. TAYLOR

Dept of Environment and Agriculture, Curtin University of Technology, GPO Box U1987, Perth, WA 6845, Australia.
E-mail: Chris.Taylor@curtin.edu.au.

The type status of *Macropsalis fabulosa* Phillipps & Grimmett 1932 was reviewed in Taylor (2011), under the current combination of *Forsteropsalis fabulosa*. As recorded therein, Forster (1944) designated a neotype for this species to replace the original, destroyed holotype. Unfortunately, Forster's (1944) neotype was recognisably not a representative of the same species as the holotype illustrated by Phillipps & Grimmett (1932), but was identified by Taylor (2011) as a male of *Forsteropsalis inconstans* (Forster 1944) (described by Forster 1944 from the female only). Taylor (2011) stated that an application would be submitted to the ICZN in order to clarify the status of *Macropsalis fabulosa* by setting aside Forster's neotype in favour of one that was conspecific with the lost holotype.

The submission was accordingly prepared by C.K. Taylor and M.S. Harvey (Western Australian Museum) and submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN). The application was reviewed by three anonymous commissioners who each came to the conclusion that it was unnecessary, on the basis that Forster's (1944) neotype designation can be declared invalid under the current provisions of the code (ICZN 1999). To be valid, a neotype designation must satisfy the provisions of Art. 75: it must be designated with the express purpose of clarifying the taxonomic status or the type locality of a nominal taxon (Art. 75.3.1), and not as a matter of curatorial routine (Art. 75.2); it must be accompanied by an adequate indication that the original holotype is truly lost or destroyed, including steps taken when attempting to locate it (Art. 75.3.4); and it must be shown to be consistent with what is known of the former name-bearing type from the original description and from other sources (Art. 75.3.5). Article 75 contains no grandfather clause protecting neotype designations published prior to the publication of the current code.

Forster's (1944) neotype designation does not satisfy the above requirements. Forster's published description is a paraphrase only of Phillipps & Grimmett's (1932) original description, and contains no differing details or indication that the identity of *Macropsalis fabulosa* was in question. The original holotype was claimed to have been destroyed, but Forster gave no account of which collections had been searched for it. The proposed neotype differed from the original holotype in carapace armature and cheliceral form, characters that Forster (1944) himself regarded as indicative of taxonomic distinctiveness. As it does not fulfil all the requirements of Art. 75, Forster's (1944) neotype has no nomenclatural status.

Phillipps & Grimmett's (1932) holotype has not been recovered. It is not present in the collection of Te Papa Tongarewa, Wellington (MONZ), where W. J. Phillipps was based, nor has it been found in any other museum collection in New Zealand (including the Auckland, Canterbury and Otago Museums and the New Zealand Arthropod Collection). However, there is no current need to designate a neotype for *Macropsalis fabulosa* as Phillipps & Grimmett's (1932) original description and illustration are quite adequate to allow it to be distinguished from all other species currently assigned to the genus *Forsteropsalis*. Taylor (2011) was able to identify specimens in MONZ from Rimutaka and Karori Hills, Wellington, as representing *F. fabulosa*. Unless one of the as-yet-undescribed species of *Forsteropsalis* present in the New Zealand fauna should prove indistinguishable from *F. fabulosa* by the original description alone, the current provisions of the ICZN indicate that it should remain without a neotype.

Acknowledgements

My thanks go to Mark Harvey, who guided the composition of the original ICZN application. Thanks are also due to Svetlana Nikolaeva, editor of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, who arranged the application's review and gave permission for the reviewers' judgements to be made public, and to the ICZN reviewers themselves. The current paper itself was improved by the advice of Axel Schönhofer and Phil Sirvid.