CLYPEASTER SURARUI (ECHINOIDEA, EOCENE) A NEW NAME FOR CLYPEASTER TRANSYSYLVANICUS (ŞURARU, GÁBOS & ŞURARU, 1967) PREOCCUPIED NAME
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INTRODUCTION

Vadász (1915, p. 170) described Clypeaster transsylvanicus from the Miocene of Felsőorbó (locality known today as Gárbova de Sus, Alba, Romania). Later, Şuraru et al. (1967) described Clypeaster (Palaeanthus) transsylvanicus n. sp. from the Middle Eocene of Turnul-Roșu (Sibiu, Romania). This is a case of primary homonymy (ICZN, Article 53.3). According to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN, Article 52.1) “when two or more names are homonyms, only the senior, as determined by the Principle of Priority (see Article 52.3), may be used as a valid name”. The exceptions provided by the Code do not apply here. Therefore, the replacement of Clypeaster (Palaeanthus) transsylvanicus Şuraru, Gábos & Şuraru, 1967 by Clypeaster surarui is proposed.

The paleontological material mentioned here is hosted by the Babeș-Bolyai University Palaeontology and Stratigraphy Museum (BBUPSM) of Cluj Napoca (Romania).

The concept of "tipoid" is equivalent to the one of syntype, according to Richter (1948). However, the ICZN in the “Recommendation 73D. Labelling of paratypes” states: “After the holotype has been labelled, any remaining specimens of the type series [Art. 72.4.5] should be labelled “paratype” to identify the components of the original type series.”. Thus, we recognize that Şuraru et al., 1967 “tipoids” should better be considered paratypes, not syntypes. ICZN (Articles 73.1. Holotypes and 73.2. Syntypes) clearly states that the existence of a holotype excludes the consideration of the syntypes for the rest of the specimens of a type series. The designation of a holotype implies that the rest of the specimens of the type series are paratypes.

The Palaeanthus subgenus Lamb [in Mortensen, 1948; p. 23, fig. 23a-d] ( = Paleanthus Lambert, 1912) used by Şuraru et al. (1967) is assimilated to the Clypeaster genus Lambert, 1912 (see Mortensen, 1948; Durham 1955, 1966; Smith & Kroh, 2011). Furthermore, ICZN Article 57.4 states that “The presence of different subgeneric names placed in parentheses between the same generic
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Fig. 1 Clypeaster surarui new name, Holotype BBUPSM 15391: a, b, c, d and Clypeaster surarui; paratype BBUPSM 15392a: e, f, g, h; paratype BBUPSM 15392b: i, j, k, l; paratype BBUPSM 15392c: m, n, o, p; In a, c, f, i, m, apical view; b, f, j, n, adoral views; c, g, k, o, lateral (right) views; d, h, l, p, posterior views.
name and identical species-group names is irrelevant to the homonymy between the names concerned". The species was named in recognition of the main author of the work describing the Eocene species, Dr. Nicolae Șuraru. As the illustrations of the species in the original article are of a particulary poor quality, we considered it appropriate to illustrate here again the holotype and the three best preserved paratypes (namely BBUPSM 15392a, 15392b and 15392c).

For each specimen in Șuraru et al., 1967, we also present below a synthetic table (Table 1) that summarizes data like: the present systematic status, register number, original sample number, original figure number and figure number and letters in the present paper. We suggest that specimen BBUPSM 15393a, which was not figured by Șuraru et al., (1967), considering that it was collected in the same locality where the original type was obtained, be considered a topotype. The specimen is being kept with the rest of the material mentioned and the label clearly indicates that it was collected by N. Șuraru, L. Găbos and M. Șuraru from Turnu Roșu, Sibiu.

Table 1. Synthetic data summarizing the present systematic status of the mentioned material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systematic status</th>
<th>Inventory number</th>
<th>Original sample number</th>
<th>Original figure number</th>
<th>Figure in present work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holotype</td>
<td>BBUPSM 15391</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fig. 2, 3, 6</td>
<td>a, b, c, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratype</td>
<td>BBUPSM 15392a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fig. 10, 11</td>
<td>e, f, g, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratype</td>
<td>BBUPSM 15392b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fig. 7</td>
<td>i, j, k, l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratype</td>
<td>BBUPSM 15392c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fig. 4, 5</td>
<td>m, n, o, p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topotype</td>
<td>BBUPSM 15393a</td>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>Not figured</td>
<td>Not figured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratype</td>
<td>BBUPSM 15393b</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fig. 9</td>
<td>Not figured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratype</td>
<td>BBUPSM 15393c</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fig. 12, 13</td>
<td>Not figured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratype</td>
<td>BBUPSM 15393d</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fig. 8</td>
<td>Not figured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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