HOMONYMS OF AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN LEIOBUNUM
(OPILIONES, PALPATORES, LEIOBUNINAE)

The subject of homonyms is a difficult topic when dealing with the harvestman genus *Leiobunum*. Unfortunately, the generic name *Leiobunum* C. L. Koch, 1839, has been unjustifiably emended twice: *Liobunum* Agassiz, 1846, and *Leiobunus* Meade, 1855. Although these emended names are not considered homonyms they are junior objective synonyms (International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, Articles 33a [ii] and 56a). Even so, a specific name described in combination with one of these generic names can be considered a homonym of an identical name that is either transferred to or described in combination with one of the other generic names (I.C.Z.N., Art. 57b).

In 1957, Roewer proposed the replacement name "*Leiobunum*" elegans Weed, 1889 (not 1890), for *Phalangium bicolor* Wood, 1871 (not 1870) = *Liobunum bicolor* (Wood) Weed, 1887. Apparently, subsequent authors either failed to note this name change or ignored it, as *L. bicolor* has been consistently used in recent publications. As noted by Roewer (1957), *Phalangium bicolor* Wood, 1871, is a primary homonym of *Phalangium bicolor* Fabricius, 1793 [= *Gyas annulatus* (Olivier, 1791) Simon, 1879], and as such must be replaced by the oldest available synonym, *L. elegans* Weed.

Even though *Liobunum longipes* Weed, 1890, and the Baltic amber species *Leiobunum longipes* Menge in C. L. Koch and Berendt, 1854, were described in combinations with two different spellings of the same generic name they are considered primary homonyms (I.C.Z.N., Art. 57b). As *L. longipes* Weed is the younger of the two homonyms it must be replaced. The only available synonym is that of the subspecific name "*Leiobunum*" longipes aldrichi Weed, 1893. Although some authors (Roewer 1923, Davis 1934, Bishop 1949) have mentioned the two subspecies of *L. longipes* Weed, no new material has been reported from the Dakotas since Weed's original description. Furthermore, it should be noted that the illustrations cited in the original description of *L. longipes aldrichi* ("pl. 14" in Weed 1892) are identical to the illustrations (pl. 24, fig. 2 in Weed 1890) published with the original description of the nominal subspecies. As I believe the two "subspecies" of *L. longipes* Weed are not deserving of separate names, I propose "*Leiobunum*" aldrichi (Weed, 1893) as the replacement name for *L. longipes* Weed, 1890.
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