

(2) Additional comments have been received from Professor B. J. Kaston (*Department of Zoology, College of Science, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA 92182, U.S.A.*) and Professor Konrad Thaler (*Institut für Zoologie, Universität Innsbruck, Universitätstrasse 4, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria*). Professor Kaston supports Levi's application (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 42, pp. 81–84) with regard to both *Argyrodes* Simon, 1864 and *Robertus*. Professor Thaler agrees so far as *Argyrodes* is concerned, but prefers *Ctenium* Menge, 1871 to *Robertus* O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879 on the grounds of priority and because Menge described and illustrated *Ctenium* in detail whereas *Robertus* was described less precisely.

P. K. TUBBS  
Executive Secretary

FURTHER COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF  
*LASPEYRESIA* HÜBNER, [1825] (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA). Z.N.(S.)2421  
(see vol. 41, pp. 110–113; vol. 42, pp. 8–10)

(1) By I. M. Kerzhner & V. I. Kuznetsov (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Leningrad, U.S.S.R.*)

We are unable to interpret the figures in the comment by Bradley *et al.* It would be incorrect to judge from them that usage of *Cydia* predominated in 1973–1984, especially in the U.S.S.R.. From papers reviewed in 1973 in *Review of applied entomology* Series A (apparently the same as the CAB database) 64 used *Laspeyresia* and only 3 used *Cydia*. For 1983 corresponding figures are 41 and 46. From papers reviewed in 1983, *Laspeyresia* was used alone in the U.S.S.R. (8 papers), Poland (4), G.D.R. (2), Netherlands (2), Bulgaria (2), Sweden (2), Greece (2), Romania (1) and Israel (1). It was dominant also in F.R.G. (5:1) and France (3:1). Usage was equal in Italy, Switzerland, Hungary and Canada. *Cydia* was used alone in U.K. (6), Australia (4), India (4), Czechoslovakia (3), Nigeria (3), New Zealand (2), Finland (1), Yugoslavia (1) and Senegal (1) and was dominant in the U.S.A. (13:4). It seems that *Cydia* reached slightly preferential usage in 1982 or 1983 only.

(2) By J. D. Bradley (*c/o British Museum (Natural History)*) and C. J. Hamilton (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology*)

We give below the latest figures from the CAB database, i.e. everything in the *Review of applied entomology* Series A from January 1973 to May 1985. We give figures for citations:

- (a) anywhere in the work reviewed, i.e. a single count, whether in title or text
- (b) citations in the titles of papers only.



The second set of figures seems to support our case even more strongly than the first:

	Soviet (%)	Non-Soviet (%)	Total
<i>Laspeyresia</i>			
anywhere	74 (9.9)	671 (90.1)	745
in title	41 (15.8)	218 (84.2)	259
<i>Cydia</i>			
anywhere	253 (14.6)	1480 (85.4)	1733
in title	5 (3.3)	145 (96.7)	150
<i>Laspeyresia</i> and/or <i>Cydia</i>			
anywhere	254 (14.6)	1482 (85.4)	1736
in title	44 (11.1)	353 (88.9)	397
<i>Laspeyresia</i> and <i>Cydia</i>			
anywhere	73 (9.8)	669 (90.2)	742
in title	2 (16.7)	10 (83.3)	12
<i>Laspeyresia</i> not <i>Cydia</i>			
anywhere	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	3
in title	39 (15.8)	208 (84.2)	247
<i>Cydia</i> not <i>Laspeyresia</i>			
anywhere	180 (18.2)	811 (81.8)	991
in title	3 (2.2)	135 (97.8)	138

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *HYLA LACTEA*  
DAUDIN, 1803 (AMPHIBIA). Z.N.(S.)2341  
(see Vol. 41, pp. 122–124)

By Hobart M. Smith (*EPOB, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, U.S.A.*)

Despite Stimson's (Vol. 42, pp. 6–7) arguments to the contrary, a reasonable case exists for conservation of *Hyla lactea* Daudin, 1803. Stimson's case for suppression of *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768, solely for purposes of the Principle of Priority, and not of Homonymy, appears to be premised upon a key objective of the Code to promote stability of nomenclature. Failure of suppression of *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768, for purposes of the Principle of Homonymy, would eliminate Daudin's homonym, making its subjective junior synonym *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus* Rivero, 1969 the valid name for the species. On the contrary, suppressing Laurenti's *Hyla lactea* for purposes of the Principle of Homonymy (as well as of Priority, to which Stimson agrees), as proposed by Lynch and Duellman, would leave it as a valid name, of which both *Hyla aurantiaca* Daudin, 1803, and *S. eurhostus* Rivero, 1969, are invalid subjective junior synonyms.



Bradley, J. D. and Hamilton, C J. 1986. "Further Comment On The Proposed Conservation Of *Laspeyresia* Hubner," *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 43, 8–9. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.354>.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/45868>

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.354>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/354>

#### **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>.