COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED REJECTION OF COLUBER CHIAMETLA
SHAW, 1802. Z.N.(S.) 1704
(see volume 22, pages 235–236)


I would like to be placed on record as in opposition to this proposal. If H. M. Smith is convinced that C. chiametia is identical with Drymobius margaritiferus, as he seems to be, he should apply the Law of Priority and use the older name. I know of no reference to the snake Drymobius margaritiferus outside the systematic herpetological literature, and there are comparatively few references to the species within that literature. The name margaritiferus is not a widely known, widely used name, familiar to non-herpetologists, and no basic confusion would result from the change to chiametia, so the basic reasons for use of the plenary powers do not exist.

In addition, there would be no major changes in names if priority were followed. If chiametia is used, the names of the two subspecies within the species would be Drymobius chiametia chiametia and D. c. margaritiferus, thus retaining the latter name. The only name to be lost would be D. margaritiferus fistulosus, which would become a synonym of chiametia. All of the names involved would still be available for a later investigator who might not agree with Smith's interpretation of the plates, figures, comments, and Latin. I suggest that the Commission reject this petition, and recommend standard procedures using the Law of Priority.

ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF NEOTYPES FOR ANTHOCORIS NIGRELLUS ZETTERSTEDT, 1838, ANTHOCORIS NIGRICORNIS ZETTERSTEDT, 1838 AND LYGAeus PYGMAEUS FALLÉN, 1807 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA). Z.N.(S.) 1732
(see volume 23, pages 121–123)

By I. M. Kerzhner (Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Leningrad, USSR)

Some additions and corrections should be made to the proposition of J. Péricart.


This description is in a complete disaccordance with the "types" from Lund Museum studied by J. Péricart, one male (!) and one female of Anthocoris minki Dohrn, 1860, a species with body more slender and parallel-sided, than in Anthocoris nemorum, head and pronotum reddish, elytrae distally black or brownish, membrane greyish with a white fascia or 2–3 large white spots and antennae shorter than in Anthocoris nemorum. According to Péricart (1966, p. 189) the single label of these specimens is "L. lucorum Fall." (sic!) in the handwriting of Zetterstedt (!).

It is absolutely evident, that the "types" discussed are only specimens misidentified by Zetterstedt, which have no value for interpretation of Fallén's species. The original description of Lygaeus pygmaeus corresponds perfectly to Acompocoris pygmaeus (Fallén) of Reuter and others and the correct modern concept of this species should not be changed because of the discovery of specimens misidentified by Zetterstedt. If it should be proved, that the true types of Lygaeus pygmaeus Fallén are lost, a designation of neotype for this species is possible, but not obligatory, because it is a well defined species with a unanimously agreed identity.

2. Anthocoris lucorum Fallén, 1829 (p. 67) and Lygaeus pygmaeus Fallén, 1807, are both described from female specimens collected by Gyllenhall in Vestrogothia. These names are however not objective but only subjective synonyms; it is clear from
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