
Recently, SAMA & SUDRE (2009) published a comment on the relationship of the nominal genus Cerosterna Dejean, 1835, and its incorrect subsequent spelling, Celosterna Blanchard, 1845, which was originally attributed to Dejean.

Sama and Sudre’s explanations of the history and usage of Cerosterna and its variants are justified and correct until the last paragraph, where they attribute Celosterna to Dejean, stating: “Being in prevailing usage, it should be maintained and attributed to the original author [Dejean] and publication (ICZN, art. 33.3.1) as a subsequent incorrect spelling in prevailing usage.”

However, article 33.3.1 states: “when an incorrect subsequent spelling is in prevailing usage and is attributed to the publication of the original spelling, the subsequent spelling and attribution are to be preserved and the spelling is deemed to be a correct original spelling” [my emphasis]. In the same paragraph, some lines above, the authors state: “Modern authors (…) used the name Celosterna usually in combination with Blanchard as the author. However, the combination [?] Celosterna Blanchard, 1845, is incorrect and cannot be used further.”

Thus, they show that the usage of the spelling Celosterna is not attributed to Dejean by modern authors, but (correctly) to Blanchard, and thus does not meet the requirements of art. 33.3.1, as emphasized above. There is no possibility of using Celosterna Dejean as a valid name in Cerambycidae. Instead, the valid name for this genus is Cerosterna Dejean, 1835, with synonyms Celosterna Thomson, 1860 (who made Blanchard’s misspelling available), Toxosterna Thomson, 1868 and Coelosterna Gemminger & Harold, 1873. Celosterna Blanchard is not even a synonym, since it is not an available name; only available names, once typified, can be considered synonyms. As an aside, SAMA & SUDRE (l. c.) used the term “combination” in a different way from usually in nomenclature, i.e., the union of a specific epithet with a generic name.

In summary, as SAMA & SUDRE demonstrated in their own work, Celosterna is attributed to Blanchard and not to Dejean, and thus even if it is in prevailing usage, art. 33.3.1 cannot be used to modify the original spelling. This can only be done by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature using its Plenary Power.

I thank my friend Christopher H. C. Lyal for his linguistic revision.
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