The question of the status of *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847 and *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926 in relation to *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827 was first raised as an issue before the Commission by Dr R. G. Fennah in 1946 but was not then pursued. In 1961 he stated that he did not wish to pursue the case. In 1963 the problem surrounding the family-group names involved was raised separately (reference Z.N.(S.) 1626) by the late Dr China and his paper was published in April 1964 (*Bull. zool. Nom. vol. 21, pp. 154–160*). The Commission voted on this application from March to June 1966, but though a two-thirds majority gave a favourable vote, Dr Holthuis pointed out that *TIBICENIDAE* [sic] Van Duzee, 1916 could not be suppressed unless the name of its type genus (*Tibicen*) was first suppressed; this would require a use of the plenary powers that had not been announced. No Opinion was accordingly then written.

2. In 1980 one of us (R.V.M.) noticed the connexion between the cases presented by Dr Fennah and Dr China and invited R.W.S. to coordinate them and canvass the views of hemipterists on the course of action best calculated to promote stability of nomenclature. The names principally involved are:

(a) *Cicada* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 434. The type species of this genus, by subsequent designation by Van Duzee, 1912, p. 491, is *Cicada tibicen* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 436. Until then, *Cicada plebeja* Scopoli, 1763 had been treated by most authors as the type species, following an invalid designation by Latreille, 1810. The confusion caused by Van Duzee’s nomenclaturally valid action persists to this day.

(b) *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827, p. 424. The type species of this genus, by monotypy, is *Cicada plebeja* Scopoli, 1763, p. 117. In 1843 Amyot & Audinet-Serville stated wrongly that *Cicada haematodes* Scopoli, 1763 is the type species, and this was generally accepted because Latreille (from whose French vernacular of 1825 Berthold had taken *Tibicen*) included *C. haematodes* in *Tibicen* in 1829 but not *C. plebeja*. Moreover, the true *C. plebeja* has not the generic
characters given by Latreille (1825, 1829) and Berthold, 1827 to the genus.

(c) *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847, p. 154. Type species, by subsequent designation by Distant, July 1905, p. 22, *Cicada haematodes* Scopoli, 1763, p. 118. It was wrongly treated as a junior objective synonym of *Tibicen* by those who regarded *C. haematodes* as the type of both genera.

(d) *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926, p. 95. Type species, by original designation, *Cicada plebeja* Scopoli, 1763. Horváth accepted an invalid designation by Van Duzee, 1914, of *Cicada orni* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 436 as type species of *Cicada* Linnaeus, 1758, but believed that *C. haematodes* should be retained as type species of *Tibicen*. He proposed *Lyristes* for the genus typified by *C. plebeja*, left without a name.

(e) TIBICININAE Distant, 1905, p. 22 (type genus *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847).

(f) TIBICENINAE [sic; recte TIBICININAE] Van Duzee, 1916, p. 488 (type genus *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827).

(g) CICADINAE Berthold, 1827, p. 424 (as 'Cicadariae') (type genus *Cicada* Linnaeus, 1758).

3. China, 1964, sought principally to remove the confusion caused by the coexistence of TIBICININAE and TIBICENINAE. However, as Dr Holthuis has pointed out (in litt. 9 April 1981) the genitive of *Tibicen* is tibicinis, so that the family-group names are homonyms under Article 55a and the Commission must resolve this homonymy.

4. R.W.S. collected the facts about these names and outlined two alternative solutions to the problems. The first entailed the suppression under the plenary powers of *Tibicen* with the consequent invalidation of TIBICININAE Van Duzee, 1916; the replacement names would be *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926 and LYRISTINAE Gomez-Menor, 1957, pp. 28, 30. The second entailed the use of the plenary powers to designate *Cicada haematodes* Scopoli as type species of *Tibicen*. *Lyristes* would, as in the first alternative, become the valid name for the genus of which *Cicada plebeja* is the type species, and *Tibicina* would become a junior objective synonym of *Tibicen*. If this solution was adopted, the species hitherto included in *Tibicen* would pass into *Lyristes* and those included in *Tibicina* would pass into the revised concept of *Tibicen*, and confusion might then arise. These proposals were circulated to 16 specialists in CICADOIDEA;

M. Boulard, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris
J. Dlabola, Narodni Muzeum, Prague
H. Duffels, Zoologisch Museum, Universiteit, Amsterdam
J. S. Dugdale, DSIR Entomology Division, Auckland
W. della Giustina, Laboratoire de Zoologie du CNRS, Versailles
K. G. A. Hamilton, Biosystematics Research Institute, Ottawa
M. Hayashi, Saitami University, Urawa 338, Japan
The first responses to R.W.S.'s invitation consisted of 10 replies, of which six preferred to retain both Tibicen and Tibicina, with subfamilies TIBICENINAE (sic) and TIBICININAE. Four preferred the suppression of Tibicen and the rejection of TIBICENINAE, with the adoption of the replacement names Lyristes and LYRISTINAE. Among these replies that from M. Boulard examined the issues involved in great depth and is reproduced in full here. Although the text is not correct on every point of nomenclatural detail, it has not been edited from that point of view. It is hoped that our final proposals will be found to be correctly framed.

M. Boulard circulated his contribution to the specialists already named. As a result, three of the six who had voted to retain Tibicen now voted for its suppression. Two additional replies were received, one in favour of retaining Tibicen, the other its suppression. The final totals were thus four for the retention of Tibicen and eight for its suppression.

The replies showed some misunderstanding on two points:

(a) The status of Tibicina Amyot, 1847. This appeared in what was evidently an instalment of Amyot's Entomologie française, and that work began with an essay on the 'Méthode mononymique'. It was apparently the presence of that essay that led the Commission to reject the work in Opinion 686 (1963, Bull. zool. Nom. vol. 20, p. 423), but the ruling omitted to specify the instalment in which Tibicina appeared. The name is therefore available from Amyot, 1847 under Article 78e. If it were not available from that work, it would date from Kolenati, 1857, with implications for the method of fixation (but not for the identity) of the type species.

(b) the status of TIBICENINAE Van Duzee, 1916. Some of those who wished to see this name conserved overlooked the fact that, as the genitive of Tibicen is tibicinis, the name must be spelled TIBICININAE and is then a junior homonym of TIBICININAE Distant, 1905 (type genus Tibicina Amyot, 1847) and that this homonymy must be dealt with under Article 55a. Of those who understood that fact, some wanted PLATYPELURINAE Schmidt, 1909 to be used in replacement, while others preferred LYRISTINAE Gomez Menor, 1957 (type genus Lyristes Horvath, 1926). It is clear
that there are taxonomic objections to the adoption of PLATYPLEURINAE.

8. M. Boulard's contribution now follows:

ARGUMENTS POUR LA SUPPRESSION DU NOM DE GENRE TIBICEN ET DE SES DERIVES DANS LA NOMENCLATURE DE LA SUPERFAMILLE DES CICADOIDEA


A. INTRODUCTION

1. En 1912 et 1914, la nomenclature et la classification supérieure alors en usage pour les 'CICADIDAE' depuis plus d'un demi-siècle, furent bouleversées dans leurs éléments fondamentaux par Van Duzee. En dépit d'efforts répétés de la part de plusieurs auteurs, elles n'ont pas, aujourd'hui encore, retrouvé la stabilité statutaire aux niveaux des trois sous-familles principales.

2. Les trois sous-familles en question ont été fondées sur trois types de Cigales paléarctiques très connues et décrites à l'aube de la taxinomie entomologique dans le même genre Cicada Linne 1758: la Cigale de l'Orne, C. orni Linne, 1758; la Cigale plébéienne, C. plebeja Scopoli, 1763; et la Cigale rouge, C. haematodes Scopoli, 1763. Des différences, considérées comme essentielles et résidant chez les mâles, font que ces trois Cigales représentent trois taxa assez éloignés pour être chacun le taxon-type d'une sous-famille distincte.

3. Pendant plus de 100 ans, Cicada eut pour espèce-type 'C. plebeja'. Mais C. orni ayant été finalement reconnue type du genre linnéen en 1914, les auteurs ne sont pas accordés, depuis, sur les statuts généraux des deux espèces scopoliennes: le même nom Tibicen étant donné:

(a) ou bien à C. haematodes [Tibicen haematodes (Scopoli, 1763), Amyot et Audinet-Serville, 1843] par les uns, qui nomment alors la Cigale plébéienne: Lyristes plebeius (Scop.) Horváth, 1926,
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