all aspects of the biology of protists. There is an urgent need to provide a taxonomically sound database of molecular sequences to bring the advantages realised in prokaryotic systematics to the protistan realm. It is, in our view, highly desirable that this takes place in parallel with the deposition of voucher specimens for morphological studies.
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The case caused unusual excitement among nomenclaturally minded coleopterists. We believe that probably everything relevant has already been written, and all the errors and misleading statements contained in the original application by Jameson & Howden (BZN 59: 246–248) have been amended, particularly by Krell et al. (BZN 60: 303–311) and Smetana (BZN 61: 171–173).

We feel unhappy that a nomenclatural problem, which could have been solved by direct application of the Articles of the Code, developed into a kind of unnecessary transatlantic battle. It was clear from the beginning that either the Nearticans (should Odontes be accepted as valid) or Palaearcticans (should the proposed
Bolboceras win) must lose, and the generic component of their cherished binomina must be changed, since in the opinion of all the specialists the names involved are subjective synonyms, more or less equivalent in frequency of usage. What to do in such a case? To count the number of species? There are ten New World and two Old World species of the genus (not one, as stated in BZN 59: 246). Odontaeus orientalis Mittal, 1998 (as Odontaues) described from the Uttar Pradesh province (India) has to be added to the list (Mittal, 1998). To toss a coin? To manipulate the facts? Or, perhaps, to use a simple and unequivocal, but for some probably too old-fashioned Principle of Priority? The latter is, in our opinion, the only acceptable arbiter in this and similar cases.

Therefore we unconditionally support the suggestions formulated by Krell et al. (BZN 60: 309) resulting in acceptance of Odonteus Samouelle, 1819 as a valid name of the genus. We also cannot see any reason for continuation of this debate.
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Comment on the proposed precedence of Nematois australis Heydenreich, 1851 (currently Adela australis; Insecta, Lepidoptera) over Tinea aldrovandella Villers, 1789 (Case 3271; see BZN 60: 290–292)
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I write in support of the application to give the name Nematois australis Heydenreich, 1851 precedence over Tinea aldrovandella Villers, 1789 whenever the two are considered to be synonyms. I agree with the opinion of the authors that the identity of the nominal species T. aldrovandella Villers, 1789 cannot be established with certainty. The name T. aldrovandella Villers, 1789 should be considered a nomen oblitum.