

A REJOINDER TO KUDRNA AND GEIGERs REVIEW OF EITSCHBERGERs BOOK ON THE PIERIS NAPI-BRYONIAE-COMPLEX

by

TORBEN B. LARSEN

Intemperate language should not be used in the discussion of zoological nomenclature, which should be debated in a courteous and friendly manner — Difficult problems are most readily resolved by respecting the rules of courtesy in discussing the views of others. This admirable sentiment is expressed in the code of ethics put forward by the International Code for Zoological Nomenclature. It is ironical indeed that KUDRNA & GEIGER (1985) should choose to ignore this recommendation in a review where their main weapon is that very Code. Sitting in India, with no library resources, I am a prime candidate for reviews. I would not touch EITSCHBERGERs book with a bargepole on the basis of this review. But I happen to have bought it, and read it, and compared it to the review. "The work is not only without value, it is irresponsible" say the reviewers. Not only a value judgment, but a judgment of the mental state of the author. Irresponsible EITSCHBERGER is not though he follows a typological approach that most consider outdated. Volume II contains about 10.000 illustrations, but "it is therefore safe to conclude that the illustrations in their vast majority serve no useful purpose" Let us look at the "therefore": "The specimens are not figured on the same scale, with the upperside normally being figured at a different magnification than the underside of the same specimen This is admitte in a casual reference" This is the casual reference in question on the first of two text pages in volume two: "NOTES ON THE VOLUME OF PLATES." All drawings, pictures and photos, unless otherwise indicated were made by me. The size of butterfly uppersides are roughly natural size, the undersides are roughly 10 percent smaller. In a few cases this has been reversed which will be obvious to the reader." Is this a casual reference? A second complaint is that the antennae are crudely drawn in, in one case (out of perhaps 5000) resulting in a "lapsus calami", a specimen with three antennae (well two and a half, actually, since the outer portion of a real antenna overlapping the forewing costa survived the penalty of electronic scanning used for the book). I would personally have decided not to redraw the antennae, but to explain their loss, since they have no taxonomic significance in the genus. But does one tri-antennaed specimen out of 5000 represent "perfunctory work"? Some specimens appear to be fakes (my italics). One case (out of 5000) is advanced which I am not in a position to check and that is used to suggest "at least unbelievable sloppiness" with its implication of worse. Finally there is no indication "whatsoever" concerning the scale of magnification in colour plates 579-599" I for one know that Prof. LORKOVIC is larger than the egg of *Pieris napi*. In fact the plates depict a vast number of specimens from places so obscure and remote that the mind boggles, and this consti-

tutes a very valuable source, irrespective of one's views on the taxonomic conclusions drawn.

KUDRNA and GEIGER relegate twelve EITSCHBERGER names to the status of nomen nudum for failing to comply with article 13 (a) of the code. For many practising entomologists the code is more or less terra incognita and for those in the know it is often terra infirma. The relevant section says: "A name must be accompanied by a statement that purports to give characters differentiating the taxon" This criterion is fully met by EITSCHBERGER. KUDRNA and GEIGER interpret 13 (a) to mean that a description is invalid unless it differentiates that taxon in relation to another one, and that the characters of the taxon described is not enough. This cannot be correct. If so, brace for an avalanche of nomina nudii. Good bye *Euriphene kiki* BERNARDI & LARSEN. You were so singular that we did not compare you to anything else! The holotype is unique, the habitat has vanished, the species is (probably) extinct in nature. Now KUDRNA and GEIGER would have it extinct in taxonomy as well.

The book in question is EITSCHBERGERs life and no one has the right to treat it in his way. I count both EITSCHBERGER and KUDRNA as good colleagues and personal friends of long standing. I know that EITSCHBERGER will remain my friend despite the fact that I agree with the reviewers' main contention that *Pieris napi* is too plastic to fit into conventional taxonomic categories. I hope KUDRNA will remain my friend despite this rejoinder. I admire the editor for letting me end with yet a quote from the code of ethics: Editors and others responsible for the publication of zoological papers should avoid publishing any paper that seem to them to contain a breach of the above principles.

Literature

- EITSCHBERGER, U. (1984): Systematische Untersuchungen am *Pieris napi-bryoniae*-Komplex (s.l.) – Two vols., Marktleuthen.
- KUDRNA, O. & H. GEIGER (1985): A critical review of Systematische Untersuchungen am *Pieris napi-bryoniae*-Komplex ... by ULF EITSCHBERGER. – J. Res. Lepid. 24: 47-60.

Anschrift des Verfassers

Dr. TORBEN B. LARSEN
29 C Snoghøj Alle
DK-2770 Kastrup, Denmark

ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Atalanta](#)

Jahr/Year: 1985

Band/Volume: [16](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Larsen Torben B.

Artikel/Article: [A rejoinder to Kudrna and Geigers review of Eitschbergers book on the Pieris Napi-Bryoniae-Complex 413-414](#)