

Zootaxa 3700 (3): 499–500 www.mapress.com/zootaxa/

Copyright © 2013 Magnolia Press

Correspondence



http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3700.3.10 http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:090D8EBE-2A7C-432E-9B6F-A7B9C7267CDA

Crossodactylodinae Fouquet, Blotto, Maronna, Verdade, Juncá, de Sá & Trefaut Rodrigues, 2013 is an invalid junior synonym of Paratelmatobiinae Ohler & Dubois, 2012 (Amphibia, Anura)

ALAIN DUBOIS

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

Among the results of their survey of the phylogenetic relationships among over 2800 species of recent amphibians, Pyron & Wiens (2011) identified a new clade of frogs including the genera *Paratelmatobius* Lutz & Carvalho, 1958 and *Scythrophrys* Lynch, 1971. Both these genera were previously placed in the family Leptodactylidae Werner 1896 (1838), whether conceived as a large (e.g., Frost *et al.* 2006) or a more restricted family (e.g., Grant *et al.* 2006). Pyron & Wiens (2011) erected a subfamily "Paratelmatobiinae" for these two genera. Unfortunately, as they provided no diagnostic character for this new taxon, their nomen is a *nomen nudum*. Ohler & Dubois (2012) pointed this out and provided a diagnosis, thus making the nomen Paratelmatobiinae available.

More recently, Fouquet *et al.* (2013) stated that the genera *Crossodactylodes* Cochran, 1938 (placed in the Cycloramphidae Bonaparte, 1850 by Frost *et al.* 2006) and *Rupirana* Heyer, 1999 (unallocated to family by Frost *et al.* 2006) were members of the same clade as *Paratelmatobius* and *Scythrophrys*, and they introduced the new nomen Crossodactylodinae for this taxon. This nomen is just an invalid junior subjective synonym of Paratelmatobiinae Ohler & Dubois, 2012, and it should not be used for a taxon consisting in these four genera.

An additional comment is in order here regarding the justification given by Fouquet *et al.* (2013) for changing the nomen of this taxon. They were aware of Pyron & Wien's nomen Paratelmatobiinae, which they repeatedly mentioned in their paper. They had realised that it is a *nomen nudum* but not that it had been made available by Ohler & Dubois (2012). The simplest and most straightforward approach would then have been to simply provide a diagnosis aiming at making the nomen available, which they did, but they also replaced it by the new nomen Crossodactylodinae. Their reason for doing so was stated as being "the anteriority of *Crossodactylodes* over *Paratelmatobius*" (p. 452). However, although this argument had already been used (see e.g. Darst & Cannatella 2004: 468), this anteriority is irrelevant to fix the valid familial or subfamilial nomen, as priority works independently in the different nominal-series (see e.g. Dubois 2006: 17). In fact, if the nomen Paratelmatobiinae had not already been made available, the best choice would have bee to coin a subfamilial nomen based on the generic nomen *Rupirana*, as this would have resulted in a much shorter, euphonious and palatable nomen than those based on the other three genera of the taxon (see Dubois & Raffaëlli 2009, Dubois 2010). But, as soon as a nomen is already available for a taxon, it is not appropriate to create a junior synonym for it, as it increases the synonymy load of taxonomy (Dubois 2008).

References

Darst, C.R. & Cannatella, D.C. (2004) Novel relationships among hyloid frogs inferred from 12S and 16S mitochondrial DNA sequences. *Molecular Phylogenetics & Evolution*, 31, 462–475. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2003.09.003

Dubois, A. (2006) Incorporation of nomina of higher-ranked taxa into the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature*: some basic questions. *Zootaxa*, 1337, 1–37.

Dubois, A. (2008) A partial but radical solution to the problem of nomenclatural taxonomic inflation and synonymy load. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 93, 857–863.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.2007.00900.x

Dubois, A. (2010) Describing new species. *Taprobanica*, 2 (1), 6–24. http://dx.doi.org/10.4038/tapro.v2i1.2703