

designated *Coccobius annulicornis* Ratzeburg as the type species of *Coccobius*, and the designation of a neotype for *C. annulicornis* by LaSalle & Bouček definitively clarifies the application of this name. Suppression of *Coccobius* in favour of *Physcus* would disrupt stability in nomenclature that has been achieved since Hayat (1983). For these reasons we do not support the application of Rosen, Rivnay & Viggiani to suppress *Coccobius*.

(2) Gennaro Viggiani

Dipartimento di Entomologia e Zoologia Agraria, Università degli Studi di Napoli, Via Università 100, 80055 Portici, Italy

Here are my reactions to the comment by LaSalle & Bouček (BZN 46: 132–134). The above comment by Gibson & Huber adds nothing new to the case.

1. LaSalle & Bouček say that the proposed conservation of *Physcus* Howard, 1895 (BZN 45: 288–291) ‘would do more to disrupt stability than to promote it’. This is not true. Hayat (1984) stated ‘The genus *Coccobius* Ratzeburg (till recently as *Physcus*; but see Hayat, 1983) contains 58 species’. *Coccobius* Ratzeburg, 1852 was absolutely ignored in taxonomy and in applied entomology until 1983. Bouček had himself used *Physcus* and not *Coccobius*.

2. The Principle of Priority ‘is to be used to promote stability and is not intended to be used to upset a long accepted name in its accustomed meaning through the introduction of an unused name that is its senior synonym’ (Article 23b of the Code). The proposal by LaSalle & Bouček would cause just such an upset.

3. All the arguments by LaSalle & Bouček in favour of the resurrection of *Coccobius* are based on ‘personal communications’ and on a specimen in the Natural History Museum, London, from Novitzky’s collection said to have been compared long ago with the type of *Coccobius annulicornis*. When Hayat (1983) studied this specimen it ‘was on a card with the antennae missing and the head partly eaten by psocids’. Now, according to LaSalle & Bouček, the same specimen ‘fortunately’ is accompanied by one of the antennae.

4. The subsequent action by LaSalle & Bouček to sink in synonymy (just in their comment) a well-known species, *Physcus testaceus* Masi, 1910, treated in a great number of papers, demonstrates how they produce ‘stability’. They use the rather satisfactory description of a well-known species to recognize in a specimen, or rather the remains of a specimen, a senior synonym. They do not give a redescription, but simply replace *Physcus testaceus* with a newly defined ‘*Coccobius annulicornis* Ratzeburg’. The purported designation by LaSalle & Bouček of a ‘neotype’ of *Coccobius annulicornis* is completely contrary to Article 75b of the Code.

5. LaSalle & Bouček say (BZN 46: 133, para. 10) ‘As the name *Coccobius* is shown to have both its usage and its identity established, and as Rosen et al. have not provided sufficient evidence to support their proposal to suppress *Coccobius* in favour of *Physcus*...’. This gives a completely false impression. LaSalle & Bouček (para. 8) give only five references for the use of *Coccobius*, three of which are by Hayat. On the other hand, *Physcus* has been used by many aphelinid workers, including Annecke, Compere, De Bach, De Santis, Ferrière, Flanders, Howard, Masi, Nikol’skaya, Silvestri and Yasnosh. [The Commission Secretariat has a list of 85 references besides those cited in the application.]

6. I invite those interested in the APHELINIDAE and in biological control to give their views to the Commission.

(3) David Rosen

Faculty of Agriculture, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Rehovot 76-100, P.O. Box 12, Israel

I should like to reply to the objection to the conservation of *Physcus* Howard, 1895, as proposed by Rivnay, Viggiani and myself, which has been made by LaSalle & Bouček (BZN 46: 132-134).

LaSalle & Bouček 'contend that the suppression of the name *Coccobius* would disrupt stability rather than promote it'. I am afraid that this statement is entirely incomprehensible to me. All they tell us is that a damaged specimen has been found, that one of its missing antennae has been located, and that 'a reasonable assumption' can be made as to its identity, and that this, in the absence of type material, should be regarded as sufficient grounds for synonymizing the well-known generic name *Physcus* under *Coccobius*. They conveniently ignore the fact, clearly demonstrated in our application, that the name *Coccobius* was misinterpreted — and unused — for nearly a century and a half, whereas the name *Physcus* was clearly interpreted and in constant use for most of that period. Even if *Coccobius* is unequivocally recognized as a senior synonym of *Physcus*, how on earth would its resurrection promote nomenclatural stability?

LaSalle & Bouček claim that the name *Coccobius* 'has been used in systematic and biological control literature', but in support of this statement they cite only five publications, all of them subsequent to Hayat's resurrection of *Coccobius*, and three of them by Hayat himself. Where was this name from, say, 1895 to 1983? We, on the other hand, have presented the Commission Secretariat with a partial list including scores of publications — some biological, many systematic, several dealing with biological control — that have all used the name *Physcus*, and this list can be easily doubled.

LaSalle & Bouček go on to state that 'Hayat's (1983) work in which he re-established the name *Coccobius* is the first modern treatment of the APHELINIDAE...'. With all due respect, I have to disagree. Hayat's is a fine paper, but one cannot simply dismiss the earlier, excellent revisional work of De Santis, Nikol'skaya, Yasnosh, Compere, Ferrière and others, all of whom have used the generic name *Physcus*!

LaSalle & Bouček are, in effect, trying to take us back to a time when the Principle of Priority reigned supreme and the favorite pastime of some taxonomists was to unearth long-forgotten senior synonyms. The present Article 23b, emphasizing stability, was adopted for precisely this type of situation!

Of course, when a case is so ambiguous, one can always resort to a gimmick: Take the damaged specimen in question and designate it as neotype. This unnecessary proposal is not justified by the evidence, does not solve any systematic or nomenclatural problem, and does not serve any purpose but for winning an argument. For the sake of nomenclatural stability, the Commission is hereby requested to reject it and let *Coccobius* rest in peace.

Finally, a word about 'sentimentality'. This is not the first time that I have been accused of advocating 'the maintenance of previously used names for sentimental reasons'. Why should the conservation of a well-known name be considered more



Bouchet, Philippe et al. 1990. "Further Comment On The Proposed Suppression For Nomenclature Of Three Works By R.w. Wells And C.r. Wellington." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 47, 139–140.
<https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.2683>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44488>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.2683>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/2683>

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>.