after plants which are known to be hosts of monophagous or oligophagous species. Each of these tephitids has subsequently been interpreted as a species that attacks a different plant family to the plant genus from which the Fabrician name clearly derives. Fabricius described a *Musca onopordinis*, now interpreted as a synonym of *Euleia heraclei* (Linnaeus), which attacks *Heracleum* and related genera; conversely, his *Musca heraclei* is now interpreted as *T. postica* which attacks *Onopordon*. The description of *M. onopordinis* even refers to 'Carduis', presumably meaning a thistle such as *Onopordon* sp. This apparent reversal of Fabrician names suggests that even when specimens exist in the Fabricius collection it is likely that they have been placed against the wrong names by some post-Fabricius worker (this is known to have happened to the Linnaean collection). As there is no way of proving what Fabricius was describing, the simplest course is to assume that Fabricius was re-describing the Linnaean *heracleii* but with a modified spelling.

(c) There is evidence of the Latin derivation used by Linnaeus, as he clearly states 'Habitat in folius, Heraclii; subcutanea', meaning below the leaf cuticle of 'Heraclii'. Although it is possible for 'Heraclii' to refer to the city Herculea or to the personage of Hercules, they are unlikely candidates for leaf mining!

(d) We have not argued that Linnaeus incorrectly derived his name, only that the rule of original spelling being correct be set aside in the interest of stability.

(e) We accept that some other 18th century workers used the spelling *heraclei* before Fabricius (1794), in which case we need not worry about what Fabricius meant by *heraclei*.

The difference between the spelling *heracleii* and *heraclei* is minimal and the issue need not have been raised were it not for the confusion being caused by a recent catalogue which introduced an erroneous spelling 'heracleii'. Thompson refers to another economically important species in which a complete change of specific name occurred; we suspect that such a complete change of name is more readily accepted by applied entomologists than a small change in spelling.

We do not wish to change our application as a result of Thompson's comments.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Physcus* Howard, 1895 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) by the suppression of *Coccobius* Ratzeburg, 1852
(Case 2629; see BZN 45: 288–291; 46: 132–134)

(1) Gary Gibson & John Huber
*Biosystematics Research Centre, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6, Canada*

We are writing to support the comment by LaSalle & Bouček (BZN 46: 132–134) opposing the suppression of *Coccobius* Ratzeburg, 1852 in favour of *Physcus* Howard, 1895, as requested by Rosen, Rivnay & Viggiani (BZN 45: 288–291).

We can add little to the logical argument presented by LaSalle & Bouček for retention of *Coccobius*. We feel strongly that nomenclatural stability and universality are achieved through the Principle of Priority based on sound taxonomic reasoning and compliance with the rules established in the Code. Gahan & Fagan (1923) validly
designated *Coccobius annulicornis* Ratzeburg as the type species of *Coccobius*, and the designation of a neotype for *C. annulicornis* by LaSalle & Bouček definitively clarifies the application of this name. Suppression of *Coccobius* in favour of *Physcus* would disrupt stability in nomenclature that has been achieved since Hayat (1983). For these reasons we do not support the application of Rosen, Rivnay & Viggiani to suppress *Coccobius*.

(2) Gennaro Viggiani
*Dipartimento di Entomologia e Zoolgia Agraria, Università degli Studi di Napoli, Via Università 100, 80055 Portici, Italy*

Here are my reactions to the comment by LaSalle & Bouček (BZN 46: 132-134). The above comment by Gibson & Huber adds nothing new to the case.

1. LaSalle & Bouček say that the proposed conservation of *Physcus* Howard, 1895 (BZN 45: 288-291) ‘would do more to disrupt stability than to promote it’. This is not true. Hayat (1984) stated ‘The genus *Coccobius* Ratzeburg (till recently as *Physcus*; but see Hayat, 1983) contains 58 species’. *Coccobius* Ratzeburg, 1852 was absolutely ignored in taxonomy and in applied entomology until 1983. Bouček had himself used *Physcus* and not *Coccobius*.

2. The Principle of Priority ‘is to be used to promote stability and is not intended to be used to upset a long accepted name in its accustomed meaning through the introduction of an unused name that is its senior synonym’ (Article 23b of the Code). The proposal by LaSalle & Bouček would cause just such an upset.

3. All the arguments by LaSalle & Bouček in favour of the resurrection of *Coccobius* are based on ‘personal communications’ and on a specimen in the Natural History Museum, London, from Novitzky’s collection said to have been compared long ago with the type of *Coccobius annulicornis*. When Hayat (1983) studied this specimen it ‘was on a card with the antennae missing and the head partly eaten by psocids’. Now, according to LaSalle & Bouček, the same specimen ‘fortunately’ is accompanied by one of the antennae.

4. The subsequent action by LaSalle & Bouček to sink in synonymy (just in their comment) a well-known species, *Physcus testaceus* Masi, 1910, treated in a great number of papers, demonstrates how they produce ‘stability’. They use the rather satisfactory description of a well-known species to recognize in a specimen, or rather the remains of a specimen, a senior synonym. They do not give a redescription, but simply replace *Physcus testaceus* with a newly defined ‘*Coccobius annulicornis* Ratzeburg’. The purported designation by LaSalle & Bouček of a ‘neotype’ of *Coccobius annulicornis* is completely contrary to Article 75b of the Code.

5. LaSalle & Bouček say (BZN 46: 133, para. 10) ‘As the name *Coccobius* is shown to have both its usage and its identity established, and as Rosen et al. have not provided sufficient evidence to support their proposal to suppress *Coccobius* in favour of *Physcus...’’. This gives a completely false impression. LaSalle & Bouček (para. 8) give only five references for the use of *Coccobius*, three of which are by Hayat. On the other hand, *Physcus* has been used by many aphelinid workers, including Annecke, Compere, De Bach, De Santis, Ferrière, Flanders, Howard, Masi, Nikol’skaya, Silvestri and Yasnosh. [The Commission Secretariat has a list of 85 references besides those cited in the application.]