

Corrigendum to '*Psychoglypha* (*Monophylax*) new subgenus (Trichoptera, Limnephilidae, Limnephilini), Proc. 5th Int. Symp. Trich., Series Entomologica 39:53-54. 1987'.

Andrew P. Nimmo

It has just, over a year later, come to my notice that the title of the above paper contains a rather embarrassing typographical error (which originates solely with me).

It had been my intention to indicate, in the title of the paper, the assignment of *Psychoglypha* Ross to the subfamily Limnephilinae, not to the tribe Limnephilini. The genus is currently assigned to the tribe Chilostigmini.

Comments on 'A preliminary study of the subfamily Hydropsychinae (Trichoptera: Hydropsychidae) in China, Proc. 5th Int. Symp. Trich., Series Entomologica 39:125-129., by Tian & Li. 1987'.

Andrew P. Nimmo

These comments are concerned only with the second part of the paper in question - that part which lists the known Hydropsychinae of China.

This list is such for the strictly practical reason that the original paper, as read at the Symposium, had to be greatly condensed to meet the page limit for papers in the Proceedings. This compression has given rise to several nomenclatorial problems which are the bases for these comments.

Firstly, the naming of new taxa - one genus and 23 species. These are simply listed, with the designation 'sp. nov.' or 'gen. nov.' as the case may be. They lack the mandatory descriptions and recommended illustrations. Therefore, according to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (1985), Article 13, none of these names is available for use elsewhere, being considered as *nomina nuda*.

The authors' statement to the effect that descriptions and figures are to be published later has no effect with respect to the names under consideration. If indeed these names are properly published at a later date, they will have effect (as regards priority) from the later date.

Additionally, 18 nomenclatorial combinations are given as new, without indication of the original combination from which they derive. It will be difficult enough to track down the original combinations if published prior to 1961, but it will be next to impossible, at present, for post-1960 combinations, except that the paper 'References' should hopefully narrow the field considerably. The Code appears not to consider this point, therefore the validity of these new combinations is uncertain at this time. I think that they are probably acceptable (especially if clarified at a later date), but the procedure is undesirable.

Finally, in two instances, new synonymies are mentioned, again with no indication, in this instance, of the identities of the new synonyms. Unless these new synonymies are revealed at a later date there would seem to be no way of tracing them.

These difficulties arise, as mentioned, due to the need for compression of the text. And, also, it seems, to an unfamiliarity, on all sides, with the relevant parts of the Code.

The presence of new species can, in a preliminary list, be simply indicated by use of the genus name followed by n. sp. 'A', 'B', etc, and of new genera by use of n. gen. 'A', 'B', etc.

# ZOBODAT - [www.zobodat.at](http://www.zobodat.at)

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Trichoptera Newsletter](#)

Jahr/Year: 1988

Band/Volume: [15](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Nimmo Andrew [Andy] Peebles

Artikel/Article: [Corrigendum to 'Psychoglypha \(Monophylax\) new subgenus \(Trichoptera, Llimnephilidae, Limnephilini\), Proc. 5th Int. Symp. Trich., Series Entomologica 39:53-54.1987'. 20](#)