OPINION 2025 (Case 3191)

Pareiasaurus karpinskii Amalitzky, 1922 (currently Scutosaurus karpinskii; Reptilia, Pareiasauria): specific name conserved

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the specific name and typification of Pareiasaurus karpinskii Amalitzky, 1922, an abundant fossil pareiasaurian reptile from the Russian Permian, are conserved. The specific name was threatened by a different spelling that had inadvertently been published five years earlier when the full description was delayed by war and by Amalitzky’s death.
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Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power the specific name karpinskyi Watson, 1917, as published in the binomen Pariasaurus [sic] karpinskyi, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The name Scutosaurus Hartmann-Weinberg, 1930 (gender: masculine), type species by monotypy Pareiasaurus karpinskii Amalitzky, 1922, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

(3) The name karpinski Amalitzky, 1922, as published in the binomen Pareiasaurus [sic] karpinski, an incorrect spelling of Pareiasaurus karpinskii, (specific name of the type species of Scutosaurus Hartmann-Weinberg, 1930) and defined by the holotype in the Palaeontological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow PIN 2005/1532, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

(4) The name karpinskyi Watson, 1917, as published in the binomen Pariasaurus [sic] karpinskyi and as suppressed in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3191

An application for the conservation of the specific name and typification of the taxon currently known as Scutosaurus karpinskii (Amalitzky, 1922) was received from Michael S.Y. Lee (The South Australian Museum, Adelaide, Australia) on 2 February 2001. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 58: 220–223 (September 2001). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. No comments on the case were received.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 September 2002 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 58: 221.

At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2002 the votes were as follows: 25 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, no Commissioners voted AGAINST, no votes were received from Böhme and Dupuis, Ng was on leave of absence.
Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion: