

	Soviet (%)	Non-Soviet (%)	Total
<i>Laspeyresia</i>	63 (9.0)	635 (91.0)	698
<i>Cydia</i>	219 (14.0)	1345 (86.0)	1564
<i>Laspeyresia</i> and/or <i>Cydia</i>	220 (14.0)	1347 (86.0)	1567
<i>Laspeyresia</i> and <i>Cydia</i>	62 (8.9)	633 (91.1)	695
<i>Laspeyresia</i> not <i>Cydia</i>	1 (33.3)	2 (67.7)	3
<i>Cydia</i> not <i>Laspeyresia</i>	157 (18.1)	712 (81.9)	869

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *ZYGAENA*  
*ANTHYLLIDIS* BOISDUVAL, [1828]. Z.N.(S.)2442  
 (see vol. 41, pp. 73–76)

Support for the proposals put forward by Naumann & Tremewan has been expressed by: Professor E. Aistleitner (*Pädagogische Akademie, Feldkirch, Austria*), Dr B. Alberti (*Mengershausen, Germany*), Dr J. S. Dabrowski (*Cracow*), Dr P. Léraut (*Bonneuil-sur-Marne, France*), J. J. de Freina (*Munich*), Dr M. R. Gómez Bustillo (*SHILAP, Madrid*), A. Hofmann (*Freiburg-im-Breisgau, Germany*), H. Holzinger (*Vienna*), Dr T. Racheli (*Università degli Studi, Rome*), Dr G. Reiss (*Stuttgart*), Dr G. Tarmann (*Tiroler Landkundliches Museum, Innsbruck*), H. de Toulgoët (*Muséum national d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*), Dr K.-H. Wiegel (*Munich*), W. Wipking (*University of Cologne*) and T. J. Witt (*Munich*).

Among these, Dr Reiss makes the following points: (1) *Zygaena anthyllidis* Boisduval, [1828] has been the name exclusively used for over 150 years; (2) Boisduval's description and illustrations are exceptionally accurate, as is his mention of the type locality; (3) to introduce *Zygaena erebus* Meigen, 1829 now would cause great confusion, not only because the type locality is not accurately known, but because of other uncertainties surrounding the name.

R. V. MELVILLE

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT CONCERNING  
 INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE,  
 ARTICLE 51c. Z.N.(S.)2474  
 (see vol. 41, pp. 149–150)

- (1) By James C. Cokendolpher (*Department of Entomology, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409, U.S.A.*), Oscar F. Francke (*Department of Biological Sciences, Texas Tech University*), and Diomedes Quintero Jr. (*Museo de Invertebrados, Universidad de Panama, Estafeta Universitaria, Panama*)

We are opposed to the proposed amendment by Gagné *et al.*, 1984, to delete Article 51c from the third edition of the Code. Their arguments that: (a) new combinations are in the majority, (b) the use of parentheses is expensive and time

consuming, and (c) parentheses are superfluous and serve a negligible purpose in nomenclature, are at best weak and unsubstantiated and do not justify the deletion.

First, nominal taxa of some groups such as certain families of Diptera might indeed approach having 100% new combinations, but certainly this is not the case in many groups: for example, only 99 of 355 (28%) Scorpiones from the Ethiopian region (Lamoral & Reynders, 1975), 25 of 50 (50%) Palpigradi (Rowland & Sissom, 1980), and 14 of 54 (26%) of the New World Schizomida (Rowland & Reddell, 1978) are recombinations.

Second, typesetting of parentheses is no more expensive than using periods after abbreviations (e.g., II B III, versus I.I.B.I.I.I., or USDA versus U.S.D.A.) or accent marks (e.g., Gagné) because typesetting is charged by the keystroke. The use of italics in scientific names is considerably more expensive than the parentheses in question, and we are glad that Gagné *et al.* are not also proposing elimination of that rule. If The Insect Identification and Beneficial Insect Introduction Institute (= II B III) branch of the SEA, AR, USDA checks all insect names, including spellings of the taxa and the author's names, we cannot imagine how the parentheses would require that much more time or effort. The alleged expense and complications arising during computerised retrieval of names might depend on the program used, but the software packages we are familiar with enable retrieval of an author's name whether it is used with or without parentheses, or both.

Third, for certain groups of organisms such as Palaearctic Diptera and U.S.A. Hymenoptera, recent synoptic and synonymic catalogues exist. Any competent zoologist can look up a specific epithet in those catalogues and easily know its nomenclatural history. Under these circumstances, and provided one has ready access to such catalogues, the information otherwise conveyed by the parentheses around an author's name can be easily retrieved. In other groups, such as the arachnid orders Opiliones, Scorpiones, and Amblypygi in which we specialise, respectively, there are few catalogues and those offer limited geographical coverage. In other groups, and undoubtedly all those other animal taxa which remain uncatalogued, the information conveyed by the parentheses is critical. If the authors of Z.N.(S.)2474 had ever had to search through the Zoological Record, and some earlier catalogues, to retrieve the published literature on a given specific name they would certainly have acquired an appreciation for the 'non-superfluous' nomenclatural information conveyed by the use of parentheses. If there are no parentheses one can initially restrict the search to a more general level of indexing, i.e., generic names; if there are parentheses then one must search at a less general level of indexing, i.e., that of specific names! What if the specific name has been transferred from a masculine combination (e.g., *californicus*) to a feminine one (e.g., *californica*); can one rely on an index to search the literature? Are *Protophthalmus jenseni* Lawrence and *Opisthophthalmus jenseni* Lawrence different species of scorpion? If not, under which binominal combination will the original description be found? Of course, the 'negligible' information conveyed by *O. jenseni* (Lawrence) gives us a strong indication about the nomenclatural history of that nominal taxon.

If the information conveyed by parentheses 'is of no interest to the writers or readers' as stated by Gagné *et al.*, why then assume they are interested in the author's name? Many journals devoted to non-taxonomical studies of insects do not require the use of authors' names when listing specific taxa.

Perhaps some non-taxonomical zoologists fail to appreciate the amount of critical nomenclatural information conveyed by the use of parentheses, but that does not mean that parentheses do not serve a useful function. For the reasons given above we oppose the deletion of Article 51c. We also oppose the reduction of this

article to a recommendation. If the use or disuse of parentheses is reduced to a recommendation, confusion will result. The deletion of the date from the citation of a specific name does not convey any particular information, but the deletion of parentheses can be misinterpreted to represent a specific name in its original combination.

## REFERENCES

- LAMORAL, B. & REYNDERS, S. 1975. A Catalogue of the scorpions described from the Ethiopian region. *Ann. Natal Mus.*, vol. 22, pp. 489–576.
- ROWLAND, J. M. & REDDELL, J. R. 1979. The Order Schizomida (Arachnida) in the New World. I. Protoschizomida and *dumitrescoae* group (Schizomidae, *Schizomus*). *J. Arachnol.*, vol. 6, pp. 161–196.
- ROWLAND, J. M. & SISSOM, W. D. 1980. Report on a fossil Palpigrade from the Tertiary of Arizona, and a review of the morphology and systematics of the order (Arachnida, Palpigradida). *J. Arachnol.*, vol. 8, pp. 69–86.

- (2) By Gerhard Hahn (*Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitäts-Gebiet Lahnberge, D-355 Marburg (Lahn), BRD*)

I do not agree with the proposal of Drs Gagné, Thompson and Knutson. Parentheses are a useful indication and I have never found them 'expensive and time consuming', neither in preparing my *Fossilium Catalogus* on Carboniferous and Permian trilobites, nor in preparing my volume on multituberculates. Article 51c should stay unchanged, in my opinion.

## COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 70b

Z.N.(S.)2477

(see vol. 41, pp. 156–158)

By C. W. Wright (*The Old Rectory, Seaborough, near Beaminster, Dorset DT8 3QY U.K.*)

I do not believe that the illegal behaviour by entomologists that Sabrosky seeks to justify by amending the Code does, as he asserts, maintain stability and universality of nomenclature, since any subsequent author may well find reasonable grounds for disagreeing with some of the assumptions behind the behaviour. Moreover the notion of recognition of the species actually involved seems to me of doubtful validity and unlikely to produce stability.

2. If an author Smith establishes a new genus *X-us* with designated type species *A-us b-us* Jones and in the same work describes as *X-us b-us* (Jones) certain specimens now held not to belong to that species, it does not necessarily mean that he has misidentified the type species of *X-us*; he may have misidentified his specimens as *A-us b-us* Jones, quite a different matter, or, commonly, he is less of a splitter than later authors who take the view that his described specimens represent a



Cokendolpher, James C. et al. 1985. "Comments On The Proposed Amendment Concerning International Code Of Zoological Nomenclature, Article 51C. Z.n.(S.) 2474 (1.)." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 42, 10–12.  
<https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.845>.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44484>

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.845>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/845>

#### **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>.