



Epinnula rex nom. nov., a replacement name for *Epinnula pacifica* Ho, Motomura, Hata & Jiang, 2017 (Teleostei: Gempylidae)

HSUAN-CHING HO^{1*}, HIROYUKI MOTOMURA², HARUTAKA HATA³ & WEI-CHUAN CHIANG⁴

¹National Museum of Marine Biology & Aquarium, Pingtung, Taiwan

²The Kagoshima University Museum, Kagoshima University, Kagoshima, Japan

³Center for Molecular Biodiversity Research, National Museum of Nature and Science, Tsukuba, Japan

⁴Eastern Marine Biology Research Center, Fishery Research Institute, Taitung, Taiwan

*Corresponding author. [✉ ogcoho@gmail.com](mailto:ogcoho@gmail.com); <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1154-601X>

Ho *et al.* (2017) described *Epinnula pacifica* for the Pacific population of what had been traditionally recognized as *Epinnula magistralis* Poey, 1854, a species that has long been considered to have a circumglobal distribution. They also designated a neotype for the latter species. Grey (1953) described *Epinnula orientalis pacifica* from Japan, which was placed in the synonymy of *Neoepinnula orientalis* (Gilchrist & von Bonde, 1924) by Nakamura & Parin (1993:34). *Epinnula* differs from *Neoepinnula* in having lower lateral line branching off under fifth to sixth dorsal-fin spines and two small spines on lower angle of preopercle, whereas the latter has both lateral lines originating at one point, at upper edge of opercle, and no spines on preopercle (Nakamura & Parin 1993: in Key). Consequently, the two species/names are not congeneric and are also homonyms.

Under Article 45.2 of International Code on Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN 1999), the names of a species or subspecies are subject to the same rank (e.g., species level). Therefore, *Epinnula o. pacifica* Grey is a primary senior homonym of *Epinnula pacifica* Ho, Motomura, Hata & Jiang. Under Article 52.2, only the former can be used as valid and the latter from 2017 must be replaced despite the recognition of these two species currently in different genera. In addition, there are no available and potentially valid synonyms for *Epinnula pacifica* Ho *et al.*; as such, a new replacement name is proposed according to Article 60:

Epinnula rex Ho, Motomura, Hata & Chiang, nomen novum

urn:lsid:zoobank.org:act:689988A0-823E-4EFC-85A8-2D485860BC3B

Type series. As listed in Ho *et al.* (2017). **Other materials.** KAUM–I. 117161, 468.0 mm SL, Ishigaki Island, Yaeyama Islands, Okinawa Prefecture, Japan, 24 July 2018, coll. H. Hirasaka; KAUM–I. 141344, 820.0 mm SL, Ishigaki Island, 630–660 m depth, 5 Mar. 2017, H. Hirasaka; KAUM–I. 164522, 190.2 mm SL, Kumano-nada, off Kiinagashima, Kihoku, Mie Prefecture, Japan, 34°10'53"N, 136°21'16"E, 15 Dec. 2015; KAUM–I. 165071, 194.2 mm SL, Enshu-nada, off Omaezaki, Aichi Prefecture, Japan, 34°22'N, 138°11'E, 25 Dec. 2020, FRV *Daihachi-tokai-maru*; NMMB-P20645, 285 mm SL, Daxi, Yilan, 22 Oct. 2011, coll. H.-C. Ho. NMMB-P34200, 471 mm SL, Keelung fish market, 26 May 2020, coll. C.N. Tang; NSMT-P 143547, 736.9 mm SL, Ishigaki Island, 9 Dec. 2021, coll. H. Hirasaka.

Etymology. The specific name means “king” in Latin, used as a noun, as an homage to its Atlantic congener *Epinnula magistralis* which was named for “master” in Latin.

Remarks. Although being treated as a subspecies of what is now recognized as *Neoepinnula orientalis*, Grey (1953) pointed out the differences between *E. o. pacifica* (from Japan) and *E. o. orientalis* (from South Africa), which may be recognized as two different species after further study. The availability of *Epinnula o. pacifica* (now under *Neoepinnula*) requires that the 2017 *E. pacifica* have an amended name under the principle of homonymy. As such, a replacement name is provided.

The new replacement name will take the same type series, as well as the same authorship with one change. For this *nomen novum*, we would like to correct the name of the fourth author (WCC) whose surname should be changed to Chiang.

Acknowledgements

We sincerely appreciate Isaïc Isbrucker (formerly the Zoological Museum Amsterdam) for bringing the presence of two homonym names to our attention and Mark Grygier (National Museum of Marine Biology & Aquarium) and David G. Smith (Museum Support Center, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institutions) for useful discussion and information.

References

- Gilchrist, J.D.F. & von Bonde, C. (1924) Deep-sea fishes procured by the S.S. "Pickle" (Part II). *Report Fisheries and Marine Biological Survey, Union of South Africa*, 3 (7), 1–24. [1922]
- Grey, M. (1953) Fishes of the family Gempylidae, with records of *Nesiarchus* and *Epinnula* from the western Atlantic and descriptions of two new subspecies of *Epinnula orientalis*. *Copeia*, 1953 (3), 135–141.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1439918>
- Ho, H.-C., Motomura, H., Hata, H. & Jiang, W.-C. (2017) Review of the fish genus *Epinnula* Poey (Perciformes: Gempylidae), with description of a new species from the Pacific Ocean. *Zootaxa*, 4363 (3), 393–408.
<https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4363.3.5>
- Nakamura, I. & Parin, N.V. (1993) FAO species catalogue. Vol. 15. Snake mackerels and cutlassfishes of the world (families Gempylidae and Trichiuridae). *FAO Fisheries Synopsis*, 125, 1–136.
- Poey, F. (1854) Nuevo genero de peces Escombrideos, *Epinnula magistralis* Poey. In: Poey, F. (Ed.), *Memorias sobre la historia natural de la Isla de Cuba, acompañadas de sumarios Latinos y extractos en Francés. Vol. 1*. Impr. de Barcina, La Habana, pp. 1–441.