

Comment on the proposed fixation of the feminine gender of the genus *Trachys* Fabricius, 1801 (Insecta, Coleoptera) and the form of derivation of family-group names based on *Trachys*

(Case 3335; see BZN 63: 172–176)

Charles L. Bellamy, Senior Insect Biosystematist (Supervisor)

Plant Pest Diagnostics Branch, California Department of Food & Agriculture, 3294 Meadowview Road, Sacramento, CA 95832–1448, U.S.A

(e-mail: Cbellamy@cdfa.ca.gov)

The request to fix the gender of *Trachys* Fabricius, 1801 goes beyond simply according the assumed opinion of the original author permanence. In addition to *Trachys*, the following genus-group names in BUPRESTIDAE have the same ending: *Brachys* Dejean, 1833, *Enbrachys* Fisher, 1935, *Neotrachys* Obenberger, 1923, *Taphrocerus* (*Parabrachys*) Cobos, 1979 and *Paratrachys* Saunders, 1873. Additionally, the family-group name BRACHYINA Cobos, 1979 would have to be altered to be consistent if TRACHYINI was altered to TRACHYDINI.

According to H. Don Cameron, Department of Classical Studies, University of Michigan, *Trachys* is a masculine stem adjective. The genitive case is *Trachyos*. The Code (Article 29) specifies that family names are formed by adding ‘idae’ to the stem of the type genus. Article 29.3.1 specifies that ‘the stem is found by deleting the case ending of the appropriate genitive singular’. The genitive singular is *Trachyos*, the case ending is *-os*, so the stem is *Trachy-* and the correct family name is TRACHYIDAE. Thus TRACHYINI and TRACHYINA are the correct spellings for tribe and subtribe, respectively. The past uses of TRACHINI and TRACHYDINI are incorrect.

I believe that if *Trachys* is fixed as feminine in gender and the spellings of the family-group names are altered in alignment with such a decision, we risk confusing current and future workers in BUPRESTIDAE or leave the fate of the other family- and

genus-group names in limbo. If these six genus-group names are technically masculine, fixation of that gender in the larger sense will assure consistency and clarity.

Thus, while I can appreciate the sentiments behind Case 3335, I feel that the consistency of a uniform, strictly technical, masculine definition for the entire group of generic names and the two derived family-group names is the best way to go.