Errata

p. 167, alin. 6, ligne 2, lire:... entrepris des recherches...
p. 168, note 2 en bas de page, ligne 2, lire:... mononymique’, qui parut...

ibid., note 3 en bas de page, ligne 1, lire:... plus ou moins les cymbales;
p. 171, alin. 15, derniere ligne, lire: divagatoire.
p. 173, alin. 20, ligne 12:... affirmations non fondées.
p. 174, note 7 en bas de page: supprimer la derniere phrase.
p. 176, alin. 28, ligne 2, lire:... un an plus tôt...

Références omises:


1804. Ibid., vol. 12, pp. 293–337.

(3) By P. Lauterer (Jišlová 33, CS–639 00 Brno, Czechoslovakia)

In the Cicadoidea the nomenclature of the best-known genera and of the higher categories based on them has for long presented a problem. The existence of the generic names *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827 (type species *Cicada plebeja* Scopoli, 1763) and *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847 (type species *Cicada haematodes* Scopoli, 1763) caused misunderstandings because the subfamily name *Tibicinae* can be derived from each of them. Monsieur Boulard has carefully analysed the various possible solutions to this problem with ample citations from the literature.

I prefer the solution offered in Alternative A because: (1) it is not hostile to stability of nomenclature because many specialists currently use the names in this sense; (2) it removes the misunderstandings that arise from the co-existence of *Tibicen* and *Tibicina* and the homonymous family-group names based on them. I believe most specialists in Homoptera will prefer Alternative A.

PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *APHELINUS MYTILASPIDIS* LE BARON, 1870: REPLY TO AUSTIN ET AL. Z.N.(S)2320

(see vol. 39, pp. 73–76; vol. 40, pp. 70–71)

By David Rosen (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Levi Eshkol School of Agriculture, Faculty of Agriculture, Rehovot 76–100, P.O. Box 12, Israel)

I am not convinced by the arguments of Austin et al. I am afraid that their lack of appreciation of the problems of field biologists, typical of many museum
scientists, would result, if adopted by the Commission, in far more than ‘a slight amount of inconvenience’, or even ‘some initial inconvenience’.

The name *mytilaspisdis* has been used in hundreds of biological, ecological and applied biological control papers. Systematists, myself included, would of course not find it difficult to adapt to its replacement by an obsolete name such as *albidus*. However, numerous field biologists all over the world, who do not read taxonomic papers unless they are forced to do so, would be confused. It would take them years to realise that the enormous amount of practical information on *mytilaspisdis* should now be referred to *albidus*. How on earth would this ‘undoubtedly stabilise the nomenclature’? What would be gained, except for the upholding of the Principle of Priority?

So, it is not out of sentimentality that I favor the junior (100-year-old) synonym in this case. It is only out of my concern for the users of systematic information, and for the respect that they may or may not have for the science and practice of systematics, that I recommend the suppression of *albidus* in favor of *mytilaspisdis*. In my opinion the careless replacement of well-established names by long-forgotten senior synonyms would only serve to deepen the unfortunate rift between field biologists and some systematists. For the sake of systematics, let us not alienate those who depend on us for a stable nomenclature.

**COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL THAT THE GENERIC NAME CHROMIS CUvier, 1814 (OSTEICHTHYES) SHOULD BE MASCULINE.**

Z.N.(S.)2329
(see vol. 37, pp. 247-255)

(1) By Sven O. Kullander *(Swedish Museum of Natural History, Stockholm S-104 05, Sweden)*

I object to the proposal by Bailey and others because I consider it directed against stability of nomenclature and totally unwarranted. The case is of interest to me as a specialist working on South American *Cichlidae*. Most of the genera with names ending in *-chromis* are in this family. My opinion is based on the following considerations:

(1) Emery, 1975, has shown that (a) the gender of the Greek noun *chromis* is variable, at least in usage; (b) Cuvier treated the generic name *Chromis* as feminine when he established it, and (c) the gender of generic names ending in *-chromis* is to be determined from authors’ statements or indications. He pointed out that almost uniform treatment of this name as masculine in the ichthyological literature does not make it necessary to refer the name to the Commission; *Chromis* is a major genus of the *Pomacentridae*, where the nomenclature is already confused.

I agree with (a), (b) and (c) above and consequently feel that the problem has already been solved by Emery’s 1975 paper, which has guided usage in the matter of the gender of *Chromis* for nearly ten years. Acceptance of the proposal by Bailey *et al.* would have a negative effect on stability and cast doubt on the ability of active working taxonomists to take nomenclatural decisions in accordance with the Code.

(2) Bailey *et al.* ask that *Chromis* be ruled to be masculine in line with prevalent usage, and that names ending in *-chromis* be ruled to be masculine because most such names are so treated. They say that unless unity is imposed, authors and