

I do not agree with Tams' conclusion, that is to solve also, in the same artificial way and against the legal reasons, the case of Erste Zuträge; we must logically conclude that within 15 years we shall regret a wrong action, because of further changes, in the same way that we are now doing for Opinion 97 concerning the Tentamen. If we regret a first mistake, why make another?

The present problem posed by Nye is "Was Erste Zuträge published?". The Commission must solve it according to the rules and not against the rules, using its plenary powers. Otherwise, all nomenclatorial problems will be solved according to convenience: the Code and its laws will be absolutely useless. At least in the Noctuidae, the names of Erste Zuträge have been used for more than 15 years by many authors; there is a reason for preserving it in order that nomenclature is not like the waves in the sea.

The legal reasons which support Erste Zuträge, which I reported in a recent paper (Mem. Soc. Entomol. Ital., vol. 93, 1964) cannot be published in the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, being too bulky; however, at my own expense, I sent to all the Commissioners the reprints of the former paper. I will be glad to send complimentary copies to all people who may request them. Lastly, the validation of Erste Zuträge may emphasize the necessity of revising the "problem of Tentamen" and reversing Opinion 97; such action will settle for ever the basic generic nomenclature of Lepidoptera, if—as I wish—the Commission will be able to do so.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *MULLUS*  
*AURIFLAMMA* FORSSKÅL, 1775 (PISCES). Z.N.(S.) 1714  
(see present volume, pages 263–264)

By E. Tortonese (*Museo Civico di Storia Naturale, Genova, Italy*)

These proposals deserve to be fully supported not only because the case seems perfectly clear but also because it implies:

- (a) the conservation in its traditional meaning of the well-known name *barberinus*, combined with the generic name *Parupeneus*;
- (b) the substitution of the name *flavolineatus* for *auriflamma*, a procedure from which no unpleasant upset of nomenclature will arise. In the lists of references for *Mulloidichthys auriflamma* given by Fowler (1933, *U.S. nat. Mus. Bull.* 100, 12: 263–264) and by A. W. Herre (1953, *Check List of Philippine Fishes*: 458), it appears that this species has been named *flavolineatus* by a good number of authors.

Considering the present status of the above quoted fishes, Nielsen's and Klauswitz's proposals seem well acceptable.



Tortonese, Enrico. 1966. "Comment on the proposed suppression of *Mullus auriflamma* Forsskal, 1775 (Pisces), Z.N. (S.) 1714." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 22, 342. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.11132>.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44464>

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.11132>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/11132>

#### **Holding Institution**

Natural History Museum Library, London

#### **Sponsored by**

Natural History Museum Library, London

#### **Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.