

Comments on the proposed precedence of *Procynosuchus* Broom, 1937 (Therapsida, Cynodontia) over *Cyrbasiodon* Broom, 1931 and *Parathrinaxodon* Parrington, 1936 (Case 3431; see BZN 66: 64–69, 188)

(1) Liu Jun

Institute of Vertebrate Paleontology and Paleoanthropology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100044, China (e-mail: liujun@ivpp.ac.cn)

I have been working on cynodonts for several years. The name *Cyrbasiodon* is long forgotten and only *Procynosuchus* is widely used by all known researchers. I support the use of *Procynosuchus* instead of *Cyrbasiodon*.

(2) Jennifer Botha-Brink

Karoo Palaeontology, National Museum, P.O. Box 266, Bloemfontein, South Africa, 9300 (e-mail: jbotha@nasmus.co.za)

This comment is sent for the purpose of offering complete support for the conservation of the generic name *Procynosuchus* Broom, 1937 (Case 3431) for a well-known group of basal non-mammalian cynodonts, instead of using the older, poorly known names *Cyrbasiodon* Broom, 1931 or *Parathrinaxodon* Broom, 1936. As someone who has worked on non-mammalian cynodonts, I can vouch that the name *Procynosuchus* is well established in the literature and publications on this taxon continue to appear on a regular basis. In contrast, *Cyrbasiodon* and *Parathrinaxodon* are obscure taxon names and have only rarely appeared in the literature since their inception. Formally recognising that *Procynosuchus* is a junior synonym of *Cyrbasiodon* or *Parathrinaxodon*, although following the Code, would cause extreme confusion, not only for those working in the field, but particularly for non-specialists such as science writers and textbook authors. I thus give my strong support for the conservation of the generic name *Procynosuchus* Broom, 1937.

Comment on the proposed conservation of usage of *Cuvieronius* Osborn, 1923 (Mammalia, Proboscidea)

(Case 3479; see BZN 66: 265–270)

Michael R. Pasenko

Environmental Planning Group (EPG), 4141 North 32nd Street, Suite 102, Phoenix, Arizona 85018, U.S.A. (e-mail: mpasenko@epgaz.com)

I agree with Lucas's arguments for establishing *Mastotherium hyodon* as the type species for *Cuvieronius*. The two original teeth described in Cuvier (1806) are difficult to place in two separate taxa, and probably represent one taxon. Also, it is impossible to distinguish isolated teeth of *Cuvieronius* and *Haplomastodon*. It is also apparent that the late 19th and early 20th century distinction of two separate species, *Mastodon andium* and *Mastodon humboldtii*, based on geography, was flawed. *Mastotherium hyodon* is indeed the oldest binomen, although Osborn (1923, 1926)