

Entomologische Notiz

Nomenclatural note on the correct name for *Antheraea roylei* MOORE, 1859 (Lepidoptera: Saturniidae)

Dr. Wolfgang A. NÄSSIG¹, Entomologie II, Forschungsinstitut und Museum Senckenberg, Senckenberganlage 25, D-60325 Frankfurt am Main, Germany; wolfgang.naessig@senckenberg.de

Dr. Jeremy D. HOLLOWAY, Department of Entomology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, United Kingdom; j.holloway@nhm.ac.uk

For about 140 years (between ca. 1860 and 2000), the taxon *roylei* MOORE, 1859 was more or less constantly written in this variant, ending with “-ei”. There were only few exceptions, many of which were probably just accidental misspellings without intent. This spelling is clearly based on the description by MOORE in HORSFIELD & MOORE (1860 [“1858–1859”]), where the spelling indeed is *roylei*. However, this publication probably appeared only in 1860, although finished as a manuscript and obviously already circulating, probably in proof form, amongst museum researchers (including MOORE himself) in London before the publication of the 1859 paper by MOORE. This publication date is supported by a handwritten note by COWAN on the copy of the HORSFIELD & MOORE catalogue in the BMNH library (stating “[1860 – June]”) and see COWAN (1975); this dating of MOORE’s catalogue was also confirmed by FLETCHER & NYE (1982: see their entry for the genus *Loepa* MOORE, 1860 [recte: 1859 – for that part see also the clarification by NÄSSIG 2007]).

Only rather recently, U. PAUKSTADT et al. (2000: 21) looked into the original description by MOORE (1859) when preparing their “Preliminary checklist” of the genus *Antheraea* and revised the spelling to “*roylii*”, following MOORE (1859: 256). In subsequent publications citing this taxon, most German authors (including, e.g., BECK & NÄSSIG 2008 or BRECHLIN 2009) followed this act.

When reading MOORE’s synopsis of 1859 from the first to the last page one will find the name of the man who obviously lends his name to the new *Antheraea* species described on p. 256: “Dr. ROYLE” is cited for the first time on p. 238 in the introduction to the text for *Bombyx mori* as author of a “Report on the Paris Universal Exhibition”, and his name is also found on several other pages, for example also in the text for *Antheraea paphia* on p. 247. Based on the modern name ROYLE, a patronym would result (according to Article 31.1.2 of the Code, ICZN 1999) in the scientific name *roylei*. There is no hint that in this case the modern name ROYLE was first intentionally latinised to “ROYLIUS” and, only after that step, used for forming a patronym by MOORE, and none of the other new names based on modern names published by MOORE within the same paper (1859) is latinised: *Antheraea frithi* (p. 256, just above *A. “roylii”!*), *Antheraea helferi* (p. 257), *Saturnia grotei* (p. 265), *Attacus guerini* (p. 269). We argue below that MOORE always intended that the catalogue should contain the formal original description, and this, in using “*roylei*”, excludes any hypothesis of latinisation. Thus, in our opinion Art. 32.1.1 of the Code is not applicable here, and we interpret the spelling “*roylii*” to be based on an inadvertent error by the printer. It is cited as such only twice in MOORE (1859): in the species heading; and one line below in the citation of MOORE’s catalogue of 1860. The second instance can be considered an erroneous transcription of *roylei*.

For such cases of “incorrect original spellings” (Art. 32.5), the following emendation rule exists:

“32.5.1. If there is in the original publication itself, without recourse to any external source of information, clear evidence of an inadvertent error, such as a lapsus calami or a copyist’s or printer’s error, it must be corrected. Incorrect transliteration

or latinization, or use of an inappropriate connecting vowel, are not to be considered inadvertent errors.”

The sentence is, as has been demonstrated above, fulfilled; the name ROYLE is published several times in MOORE (1859), and no latinisation to “ROYLIUS” is found anywhere.

Firm indications of MOORE’s intention that the HORSFIELD & MOORE account should be definitive for the species description is that this is flagged as being for a new species and lists material. The 1859 paper does neither of these things. The 1859 paper makes reference to pagination and plate numbers in HORSFIELD & MOORE, but there is no reciprocity. This would appear to confirm that, when MOORE was drafting his 1859 paper, he must have had to hand at least page-proofs of the HORSFIELD & MOORE work.

So, in our opinion, the correct spelling of the specific name of *Antheraea (Antheraea) roylei* MOORE, 1859 is the one with “-ei”, as used consistently over about 140 years.

References

- BECK, J., & NÄSSIG, W. A. (2008): Diversity and abundance patterns, and revised checklist, of saturniid moths from Borneo (Lepidoptera: Saturniidae). – Nachrichten des Entomologischen Vereins Apollo, Frankfurt am Main, N.F. 28 (3/4): 155–164.
- BRECHLIN, R. (2009): *Antheraea rubicunda rubioientalis* n. ssp., ein neues Taxon der Gattung *Antheraea* HÜBNER 1819 [„1816“] (Lepidoptera: Saturniidae). – Entomo-Satsphingia, Pasewalk, 2 (2): 25–29.
- COWAN, C. F. (1975): HORSFIELD, MOORE, and the catalogues of the East India Company Museum. – Journal of the Society for the Bibliography of Natural History, London, 7 (3): 273–284.
- FLETCHER, D. S., & NYE, I. W. B. (1982): Bombycoidea, Castnioidea, Cossioidea, Mimallonoidea, Sesiioidea, Sphingoidea, Zygaenoidea. – In: NYE, I. W. B. (ed.): The generic names of moths of the world, vol. 4. – London (Trustees of the BMNH), xiv + 192 pp.
- HORSFIELD, T., & MOORE, F. ([1860] “1858/59”): A catalogue of the lepidopterous insects in the Museum of Natural History at the East-India House, vol. 2. – London (Wm. H. Allen), here: pp. 383–410 + pls. 18–20.
- ICZN [INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE] (1999): International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, fourth edition, adopted by the International Union of Biological Sciences. – London (International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, BMNH), xxix + 306 pp. – Available in the WWW under www.iczn.org/iczn/index.jsp.
- MOORE, F. (1859): Synopsis of the known Asiatic species of silk-producing moths, with descriptions of some new species from India. – Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London 27: 237–270, pls. Annulosa LXIV–LXV.
- NÄSSIG, W. A. (2007): Assessment of the proper nomenclature of *Loepa* MOORE, 1859 and its type species (Saturniidae). – Nota lepidopterologica, Dresden, 30 (1): 175–178.
- PAUKSTADT, U., BROSCHE, U., & PAUKSTADT, L. H. (2000): Preliminary checklist of the names of the worldwide genus *Antheraea* HÜBNER, 1819 (“1816”) (Lepidoptera: Saturniidae). Part I. – Galathea. Berichte des Kreises Nürnberger Entomologen e. V., Nürnberg, Suppl. 9: 1–59.

¹ = 74th contribution to the knowledge of the Saturniidae.

ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Nachrichten des Entomologischen Vereins Apollo](#)

Jahr/Year: 2010

Band/Volume: [31](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Nässig Wolfgang A., Holloway Jeremy D.

Artikel/Article: [Entomologische Notiz: Nomenclatural note on the correct name for *Antheraea roylei* Moore, 1859 \(Lepidoptera: Saturniidae\) 92](#)