during the brief interregnum of the page precedence rule; since only five main works have been found to have adopted it; and since the re-validation of the name *aglaja* has now been widely publicised.

12. For the Pierid, as early as 1893 it was pointed out by Mitis that it should be known as *Delias aglaja* on priority. Overlooking the primary homonymy in *Papilio*, all the many works on oriental Lepidoptera in the past 75 years have followed him. Talbot (1937 : 317–318) gives many useful references for the species; most earlier than 1893 called it *pasithoe* and all since *aglaja*. My present concern is to conserve this well-known name *Delias aglaja*, now invalidated through the change in the Code. It is most misleading to say that stability and universality will be defeated if this is achieved (dos Passos and Warren, paragraph 9).

13. It is also utterly misleading to suggest that chaos will ensue if Linnaeus' 12th edition of *Systema Naturae* is considered a revision. Certainly the other early authors' works were " replete with changes of names, synonyms and homonyms ". But such name-changers were making invalid names, not acting as first revisers within the narrow confines of Article 24 (a).

14. In conclusion, I submit that dos Passos' and Warren's requests are each either ill-founded or irrelevant; and my original requests to the International Commission (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **24** (3) : 188–189) stand unaltered.

References

To the admirable list compiled by dos Passos and Warren (1968) the following are relevant additions:

Dos Passos, Cyril Franklin, and Warren, Brisbane Charles Somerville. 1968. The Homonymy of *Papilio aglaja* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Lepidoptera, Pieridae and Nymphalidae); Request for validation. Memorandum in opposition. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **25** (2/3) : 68–71

Hemming, Arthur Francis. 1967. The Generic Names of the Butterflies and their Type-Species. *Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist.* (Ent.) Suppl. **9** : 509 pp.

Mitis, Heinrich Ritter von, 1893. Revision des Pieriden-Genus Delias. *Dt. ent. Z. Iris* **6** : 97–153, pls. 2, 3 (p. 120 and note refer)

Talbot, George. 1937. *A Monograph of the Pierine Genus Delias* (6) : pp. 261–656, 48 pls. London (in 6 parts, 1928–1937).

AN APPLICATION FOR THE RETENTION OF *PAPILIO AGLAJA* AS THE VALID NAME OF THE NYMPHALID SPECIES

By N. D. Riley and L. G. Higgins

Until C. F. Cowan's application under the above main title was published in the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature (24 : 186) we had hoped that the conclusions reached by Francis Hemming in respect of this issue and published posthumously in his *Generic Names of the Butterflies* (1967 : 287) would have been accepted as valid, and that the question as to whether or not the name *aglaja* was the valid name for the Nyphalid butterfly known in Britain as the Dark Green Fritillary would no longer have been in dispute. The present application is submitted in the hope that it will enable the International Commission to reach a final decision on this issue.

2. The passage referred to above, in Hemming's work, occurs under the entry *Mesoacidalia* and runs as follows:—" The situation was completely changed by the introduction into the current revised Code of 1961 of the First Reviser principle for dealing with cases of this kind (Article 24 (a)). In the present case Linnaeus himself was the first reviser when . . . he rejected and replaced the name *Papilio aglaja* as applied to the Pierid species and retained that name for the present Nymphalid species.

Thus, under the Code the name *Papilio aglaja* Linnaeus 1758 (: 481) is the correct name for the type species of the present (Nymphalid) genus [*Mesoacidalia*] ".

3. In our view Hemming's conclusions are perfectly correct and cannot be challenged. However, they have been challenged, in the first instance by Cowan in the application referred to above, and more recently by dos Passos and Warren (B.Z.N. 25 : 68).

4. With Cowan's proposal, which would validate both homonyms, we confess we have some sympathy, if only on account of its imaginative ingenuity. We oppose its acceptance because it flouts one of the basic principles of the Code, would make too large a breach in it and establish a precedent so dangerous that it hardly bears contemplation.

5. With the closely reasoned legalistic but tendentious arguments submitted by dos Passos and Warren, proposing a different solution, we find ourselves entirely out of sympathy. Their argument rests on two assumptions, first that Linnaeus was not a " first reviser " in the sense of the Code, and secondly that, if he was, he was wrong in replacing the " junior " of the two homonyms. In our view both these assumptions are false.

6. The contention that Linnaeus, when he published the 12th edition of his Systema Naturae, was not the " first reviser " of his own 10th edition seems to us to be sheer casuistry: the title page alone, which bears the words " Editio duodecima reformata " belies the suggestion. How can Linnaeus not be a reviser of a work that he himself revised? There is the possibility that between 1758 and 1767 some other author may have taken action that could be interpreted as that of a first reviser in respect of these two homonyms, but we have failed to find one. References of any kind to the 10th edition are extremely scarce in entomological literature prior to about 1870 because, until then, the 12th edition had almost universally been accepted as the starting point of zoological nomenclature and the 10th edition ignored. The authors' further contention that the 1767 *Systema Naturae* " is in effect a catalogue " is unlikely to mislead anybody; so to describe such a massive, erudite and critical work, much of it new and original, is utterly unjustified.

7. As to the issue of homonymy between the two names, there can be no argument. The only question here is as to which, if either, of the two simultaneously published names, can be said to be junior or senior to the other. Here again the position under the Code is perfectly clear. Article 24 states that " If . . . identical names for different taxa are published simultaneously . . . their relative priority is determined by the action of the first reviser ". Nothing could be clearer. Linnaeus himself established the relative priorities of the two names when he re-named the Pierid *aglaja* of p. 465 (which he called *pasithoe*) and left the *aglaja* of p. 481 as the valid name of the Nymphalid. This he was at perfect liberty to do, and would have been equally free to do had the current 1961 Code been in operation at that time, for Recommendation 24A of the Code is not mandatory but only a recommendation as to what a first reviser *should* do in precisely those circumstances in which Linnaeus found himself. It still leaves him a choice.

8. It cannot be claimed that either of the two homonyms under discussion attaches to an insect of economic or other special importance. On the other hand the Nymphalid butterfly has been known to innumerable amateur entomologists under the name of *aglaja* from 1758 to the present day. The Pierid *aglaja* was universally known by its replacement name *pasithoe* until 1877 when Kirby (*Syn. Cat.*, Supplement: 795) listed *aglaja* as a senior synonym of the latter name, following the adoption of the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* as the starting point of zoological nomenclature, thereby introducing the element of confusion that has persisted ever since. It is of interest that Kirby had previously (1871, *Syn. Cat.* : 472) listed the Pierid *aglaja* of the 10th edition as a synonym of *pasithoe* of the 12th edition.

9. For the reasons set forth above we ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to take the following action, in accordance with the Code, and in order to restore stability to the nomenclature of the two species involved:

(1) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the specific name *aglaja* Linnaeus 1758 (Lepidoptera, Nymphalidae) as published in the binomen *Papilio aglaja* Linnaeus, 1758, *Systema Naturae* ed. 10, p. 481;
(2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the specific name *pasithoe* Linnaeus, as published in the binomen *Papilio pasithoe* Linnaeus, 1767, *Systema Naturae* ed. 12, p. 755;
(3) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology the specific name *aglaja* Linnaeus 1758 *Systema Naturae* p. 465, an invalid homonym of *Papilio aglaja* Linnaeus, 1758, *Systema Naturae* ed. 10, p. 481.

AU SUJET DE LA GRAPHIE DE *LIPHISTIUS* (ARANÉIDE) (CONTRE LE RÉTABLISSEMENT DES NOMS FAUTIFS). Z.N.(S.) 1828

Par Pierre Bonnet (*Toulouse, France*)

La remarque de Beatrice R. Vogel au sujet de *Liphistius*, remarque parue dans le dernier " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " (25, 2–3, p. 27) est, pour moi, très surprenante.

Il est regrettable, en effet, que le Dr. Levi ait senti la nécessité de demander la validation de *Liphistius*; car il est certain qu'il ne l'aurait pas demandée si certains Arachnologistes ne s'étaient pas mis ces derniers temps, à la suite de Roewer (1942), à utiliser la graphie originale mais incorrecte de *Lipistius*.

Mais ce qui, à mon avis, et plus regrettable encore, c'est de voir Mrs. Vogel profiter de cette demande de Levi pour demander à son tour à la Commission de valider la graphie erronée de *Lipistius*! De plus, notre contradicteur admet que l'on peut maintenir deux noms écrits de façon différente " since there was no confusion about the animals involved no matter what they were called ". Pour quelque'un qui, comme moi, s'est battu pendant cinquante ans pour la regularité, la correction, l'uniformisation et la stabilité des noms utilisés en Nomenclature zoologique, le propos de Mrs. Vogel est vraiment extraordinaire.

D'autre part, en ce qui concerne *Liphistius*, ce qui est curieux aussi, c'est que notre aimable collègue reconnaît elle-même " I have not been able to examine the original publications concerning this name, chances are they do not discuss their reasons ". Eh bien! non, Madame, quand on n'a pas la possibilité de faire les vérifications nécessaires, on n'affirme pas que les raisons d'un changement de nom n'existent pas!

Voici exactement de quoi il retourne: le genre *Liphistius* a été créé par Schiødte en 1849 (p. 621) sous le nom de *Lipistius*, l'auteur donnant l'etymologie du nom qu'il formait (*λείπω, ίστός*). Aussi, dès 1869, Thorell (helléniste et Latiniste de premier ordre) rétablissait dans ses " On European Spiders ", p. 13– et à son époque il était d'usage de corriger les fautes—Thorell, donc, rétablissait la graphie correcte *Liphistius* en rappelant l'étymologie greque (et non germanique) donnée par Schiødte.

Je précise, pour Mrs. Vogel, que dans la transliteration latine des mots grecs, il est de règle que le *i* (*ι*, avec un esprit rude) soit toujours précédé de la lettre *h*; le mécanisme de la transformation est le suivant:
λείπω ίστος, —→ leipo istos —→ leipohistos —→ leiphistos —→ liphistius
ce qui veut dire: séparation des filières.

Ce qui est un comble, c'est que Mrs. Vogel se moque de ce " more learned scientist " qui corrige les fautes des autres! Mais que ferait cette dame si, en lui dédiant une espèce d'Araignee, on écrivait *vogueli*, ou *vogelli*, ou *voegeli*? Nul doute qu'elle se dépêcherait de rectifier en *vogeli*, seule orthographe valable en utilisant son nom.

Maintenant, sur quoi se base Mrs. Vogel pour maintenir l'orthographe erronée de *Lipistius*, alors qu'elle avoue ne pas avoir vu la publication originale? Elle ne le dit pas, mais j'ai tout lieu de croire qu'elle adopte les noms tels qu'ils sont écrits dans le " Katalog der Araneæ " de Roewer (1942–1954); une bien mauvais référence!