

The reasons for this are: (1) the short pronotal process; no imago has such a short process. (2) Hind wings are not drawn in the figure; if an imago they must have been visible in the space between the process and the abdomen. (3) Larvae of *Tetrix* have a shorter pronotal process and always an arched carina. Only the small brown spot at the place of the elytra as figured in the plate suggests otherwise. Sowerby, however, is not always so exact in the details. The downwardly-bent margin of the pronotal process in larval specimens may easily be taken for an elytron by one not sufficiently acquainted with its morphology, especially when a small spot of different colour occurs on the same place; such specimens occur in coll. K.A. Such an error was made by the experienced orthopterist Fr. X. Fieber, when describing his *Tetrix schrankii*. The question cannot be decided with certainty.

In the light of my examinations of a number of Sowerby's descriptions, my investigation of his three *Acrydium* species leads me to the following interpretation of the three species: (1) *A. subulatum* is *Tetrix subulata* Linn. f. *macroptera*, female. (2) *A. undulatum* is most probably *Tetrix subulata* Linn. f. *attenuata* Sélys, male. (3) *A. nigricans* is probably a larval specimen which cannot be determined specifically; both *subulata* and *vittata* being possible. As Sowerby has got all the specimens from W. Kirby it might be that all have been captured at the same occasion and belong to the same species.

The descriptions of Sowerby do not give any support to the proposal of Kevan, as I have shown above. The proposed change of name is not justified.

In his paper in *Entom. Gaz.* 43, 1953, Kevan deals with the present nomenclatural question. From it I cite: "This (the change of the name) is perhaps a little unfortunate since *Tetrix vittata* has now come to be more or less accepted as the name of the species The case for invoking the plenary powers in this instance is, to my mind, not strong enough . . .". And later he writes about the characteristics of *undulatum* "a short, strongly keeled pronotum is emphasized . . .". As I have revealed above this is not at all the case, rather the contrary.

On Kevan's proposal in *Bull. zool. Nom.* 18, 1961, pp. 380-82, I have a few remarks to make. On point 4. Compare with my investigation given above, and note especially the differences in Sowerby's description of *undulatum* and of *nigricans* concerning the pronotal carina. On point 6. Kevan only compares *undulatum* with *bipunctata* Linn., and not with *subulata* f. *attenuata* or *T. tenuicornis* J. Sahlb. It is true that the figure of *undulata* gives a more slender body-form, as Kevan remarks, but this fits well with the f. *attenuata* male. *T. tenuicornis* has never been reported from England but it occurs in northern France, Belgium and Holland. However, as late as in 1940, *T. ceperoi* I. Bol. was discovered in Britain and in 1930, *Chorthippus vagans* Eversm. was found there, both unexpected and until then overlooked. On point 8: Kevan will select as a neotype a specimen from the Dale collection. This specimen must be about 150 years old, and the antennae are lacking. I find it very unwise to select such an old, mutilated specimen which has nothing to do with Sowerby's specimen, as a neotype. **This must be rejected as erroneous in principle.**

REPLY TO K. ANDER

By D. K. McE. Kevan (*Department of Entomology, Macdonald Campus of McGill University, Ste Anne de Bellevue, Quebec, Canada*)

I have a high regard for Dr. Ander's expertise in respect of the western European TETRIGIDAE, and I agree with him that Sowerby's figure is poor. This latter point is not only mentioned by me in the 1961 application, but also a little earlier in the same year (Kevan, 1961, *Ent. Gaz.* 4 : 216-17) when the reasons for regarding Sowerby's species as having priority over *Tetrix vittata* (Zetterstedt, 1821) were quite fully given. I cannot, however, agree with Dr. Ander that Sowerby's description

(such as it is) applies to a form of *Tetrix subulata* (Linnaeus, 1761)—according to Dr. Ander, of f. *attenuata* Sélys, 1862, which is a junior subjective synonym of [f.] *bifasciata* Herbst, 1786. The description of *A. undulatum* mentions that the pronotum is short ("of the length of the body") and *strongly keeled* ("arched with a red keel"). The point is stressed in Sowerby's discussion of *A. subulatum*. As the specimen seems to have been an adult, the latter character, especially, rules out *T. subulata*, the pronotal keel of which is low. As I no longer have available to me the original Sowerby illustration, I can say no more, except that, as I recall it, it is not such that the nature of the pronotal keel (as mentioned in Sowerby's text) is very evident. Thus I cannot accept Dr. Ander's view (which is not strongly adhered to even by him as he uses the expression "more likely"). I am still convinced that *vittata* is a junior synonym of *undulata*. Whatever the shortcomings of Sowerby's work, I am not moved to change my opinion.

I do agree with Dr. Ander that Sowerby's *Acrydium subulatum* = typical (macrop-
terous) *T. subulata* (Linnaeus). He applies the "form" name *macroptera* Haij, 1909, to this (presumably for clarity only, as this is the typical form and therefore a form name is redundant).

I might concede that Dr. Ander may be correct in believing that Sowerby's *A. nigricans* was a nymph (and thus could conceivably be regarded as a *nomen dubium*), but it also has a high pronotal crest. Nymphs of the only other British species, *T. subulatum* and *T. ceperoi* Bolívar, 1887, indeed have pronotal crests considerably higher than in the adults, but not so high as in *T. undulata* (= *T. vittata*). In any event I am not convinced that the specimen was immature as my sketch (from Sowerby) seems to show small tegmina. As I have no reason to believe that Sowerby's specimens were not British (he got them from W. Kirby), I see no reason to quibble over synonymizing *nigricans* with *undulata* (and *vittata*). To reopen the question could cause upset in nomenclatural stability, for, if *undulata* is not a senior synonym of *vittata*, then *nigricans* probably is so, and action would have to be taken to suppress (or recognize) the latter.

With regard to the usage of the name *T. undulata*; this seems to have been accepted by most orthopterists. Before the publication of the application, in 1961, and following the suggestion of Kevan, 1952 (*Trans. Soc. Brit. Ent.* 11 : 173) and the formal synonymizing by Kevan, 1953 (*Ent. Gaz.* 4 : 217), it was applied in the following general works by orthopterists:

HINCKS, W. D. 1956. Dermaptera and Orthoptera. *R. ent. Soc. Lond. Handb. Ident. Brit. Ins.*, 1 (5) (revised ed.) : 19

HARZ, K. 1957. Die Geradflügler Mitteleuropas : 280

— 1960. Geradflügler oder Orthopteren *Tierwelt Deutschlands*, 46 : 143

KEVAN. 1961. A Revised Summary of the Known Distribution of British Orthopteroids. *Trans. Soc. Brit. Ent.*, 14 (8) : 175

Subsequent to the submission of 1961, the following general works by orthopterists are among those that have used *T. undulata* instead of *T. vittata*:

HOFFMAN, J. 1962. Les Orthoptères du Luxembourg (2). *Arch. Inst. Sci. Luxemb.* (N.S.) 28 : 194

BEĬ-BIENKO, G. Ya. 1964. Opreditel' Nasekomŭkh Evropeĭskoĭ Chasti SSSR 1 : 249

GÖTZ, W. 1965. Orthoptera: Geradflügler. *Tierwelt Mitteleuropas*, 4 (2) [VI] : 42

RAGGE, D. R. 1965. Grasshoppers, Crickets and Cockroaches of the British Isles : 226

HOLST, K. T. 1970. Kakerlakker, Græshopper og Ørentviste. *Danmarks Fauna*, 79 : 139

There are also various less comprehensive works that have followed this course, but without a thorough search of the literature, I would not like to say how many. There seem to be relatively few works of any sort (again I have made no thorough search), especially by orthopterists, that have reverted to *T. vittata*. An exception is the popular work by L. Chopard, 1965. *Atlas des Aptérygotes et Orthoptéroïdes de France*, *Nov. Atlas d'Ent.*, 2 (ed. 2) : 68, but this does not bring nomenclature in general up to date.

With regard to a neotype designation for *A. undulatum*, I can see no reason, after all this time, for "rocking the boat". The designation I think conforms to the letter of the law of Article 75 of the International Code (being a 1961 designation in terms of publication date, although the application was actually written earlier), no retro-active action is needed. It may be argued that some of the requirements are rather scantily met, but met they are (at least in my opinion). I can see some objection to the designation of a rather elderly [British] specimen without data and lacking antennae, but this is (or was) otherwise in good shape. That it has no data actually agrees with the original (lost) type! That it lacks antennae does not place its taxonomic identity in jeopardy (cf. Kevan, 1953, above). I doubt very much if a specimen more closely resembling Sowerby's figure would be readily found. I failed to find one at the time, which was the main reason for choosing the one that I did.

COMMENT ON *CORNUFER* TSCHUDI, 1838. Z.N.(S.) 1749
(see volume 32, pp. 53-56)

by Ernst Mayr (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, U.S.A.*)

1. There is neither synonymy nor homonymy between *Hylodes vitianus* Duméril and *Halophila vitiensis* Girard. The frogs to which these names refer belong to two very different genera and both species are currently recognized.

2. The type-species of *Cornufer* Tschudi was *unicolor* Tschudi. This species name, as Zweifel pointed out correctly, was based on two specimens, neither of which is a ranid. One is a leptodactylid of the genus *Eleutherodactylus*, and Zweifel was right to ask the Commission to suppress *unicolor* Tschudi to preserve *Eleutherodactylus*. There is no justification, however, for suppressing the universally known generic name *Cornufer*. All that is needed (having suppressed *unicolor*) is to designate a suitable type-species for *Cornufer* (see Darlington and others, *Bull.*, 24 : 192) and it can then present no threat to the stability of *Eleutherodactylus*.

3. Zweifel justified his proposal by saying that the "transfer of a generic name from the species and family with which it originally was associated to another species and family is a major exception to the rules of nomenclature" (*Bull.*, 24 : 328). But this misrepresents the situation. It overlooks the consistent use of *Cornufer* for over 100 years for ranid frogs. It was never used for a leptodactylid frog and, in spite of the misidentification of the type-species, there was never a transfer of the name *Cornufer* from one family to another. The proposal made by Darlington *et al.* would legitimize this usage.

4. Zweifel claims that "retention of *Cornufer* would be defensible only if the genus were of great importance in the literature or if there was the likelihood of serious confusion among workers using the specialized segment of the literature in which *Cornufer* assumes some importance; there is no evidence that either of these conditions obtains". This may be true for the strictly herpetological literature, but he forgets that *Cornufer* is celebrated in the zoogeographical literature as pointed out by Darlington, *et al.* Its preservation is of the broadest importance in zoology.

5. Furthermore, there are important reasons for not replacing *Cornufer* by *Platymantis*. Many authors, perhaps the majority, in the last 50 years have recognized both as valid genera and the species (at least 27) included in them have never been monographed by modern methods. When such a revision is made, there are strong reasons for thinking that both genera will be recognized.

6. Zweifel, when he fixed the type-species of *Platymantis*, chose the Philippine species *plicatus* (= *corrugatus*), which does not seem particularly close to the *vitiensis* group of Fijian frogs. If *Cornufer* is suppressed, this zoogeographically important group is likely to need a new name at the next revision. This change of name can



Kevan, D. Keith McE. 1975. "Reply to K. Ander." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 32, 76–78. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.26940>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44474>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.26940>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/26940>

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>.