

Bigot's Orthography.*)

By G. H. Verrall, Newmarket (England).

I notice a letter in the last page of the Wien. Ent. Ztg. VIII, Heft IV, upon which I should like to make a few observations. To begin with, let me say that I do not think it any discourtesy, and I certainly do not intend it as such, to use no prefix to any scientific man's name, and I use the name Bigot precisely as on the same page are used Loew and Rondani, and as I should use Linnaeus, Fabricius Meigen or Osten-Sacken.

Bigot's letter protests against my having written (according to him) „Bigot with his habitual (sic) disregard of the simplest Orthography“. In what I wrote I did not use the mysterious word „(sic)“; is it possible that Bigot with his „habitual disregard of the simplest Orthography“ would like to spell „habitual“ in some other way?!

Let me now show that I was not exercising „un jugement péremptoire“. I have for some years past been collecting materials for a „Nomenclator Dipterologicus“, in which I have noted all the various spellings used, and it was mainly an extract from this that I used in my remarks on *Ozirhincus*. At present I have revised this list only at the beginning of the alphabet, and I will now take only the letter A.

I find that Bigot has sent forty (40) communications to Scudder's Nomenclator Zoologicus; these are:

1. „*Ablautatus* Loew.“; the vol. XVIII might well be mentioned, although of course the date 1874 suffices.
2. „*Acanthipeza* Rondani. Musc. Exot. Frag. III, pag. 21, $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\theta\iota\upsilon\omega\varsigma$, $\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ “; there is no such Greek word as $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\theta\iota\upsilon\omega\varsigma$, and even if there were, it has nothing to do with Rondani's *Acanthipeza*, which comes from $\acute{\alpha}\alpha\alpha\alpha\theta\alpha$ $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$; the more correct reference is Ann. Mus. Genov. VII. 437.

*) Wir haben diesen Artikel, welcher geeignet erscheint, eine weitere Polemik hervorzurufen, nur deshalb aufgenommen, weil er sich durch die Corrigenda zu Scudder's Nomenclator Zoologicus in der That als nützlich erweist. Doch müssen wir erklären, dass wir aus Rücksicht für unseren wohl zumeist deutschen Leserkreis eine fernere Polemik in dieser Richtung für diese Zeitung nicht geeignet haben, wengleich wir uns wissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen gegenüber, in welcher Cultursprache sie immer geschrieben sein mögen, nicht verschliessen.

Die Redaction.

3. „*Accanthomera* Wiedemann. Dipt. Exot. I, pag. 60, ἀκανθαμερος“; there are two mistakes here, the first is of course a bad spelling of *Acanthomera*, which Wiedemann expressly says comes from ἀκανθα μηρός.
4. „*Achorhychus*“. I have already dealt with this wonderful word derived from the two wonderful words in Greek type υἷς ῥύγχος; I cannot tell what language they really belong to.
5. „*Acrotichus* Macquart. Dipt. Exot. IV^e suppl., pag. 121, ακρειος θρυξ“. I suppose this last word should be θρίξ.
6. „*Acrochordonodes* Bigot. Ann. Soc. Ent. France, Bull. mens. (5), VIII, pag. 97 (131), ακροχορδωνωδης“; my Lexicon gives ἀκροχορδωνώδης.
7. „*Acrophthalmia* Bigot. Ann. Soc. Ent. France. (2), VI, pag. 569, ακρος; οφθαλμος; μυια. 1857“; in Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. (3), VI, 573 and 583 (1858) I find *Acrophthalmida*, therefore apparently both spellings are wrong.
8. „*Acroptilus* Mik. Dipt. Untersuch. Wien, pag. 6, ακρος; πτιλον.“ Ingenious to discover this derivation, only Mik's genus happens to be *Acropsilus*.
9. „*Acrotaenia* Loew. North Amer. Trypet., pag. 274, ακρος τηρια“; of course this is derived from ἀκρος ταινία, and a better reference would be Mon. N.-Am. Dipt. III. 274 and 328.
10. „*Actinophora* Rondani. Bull. Soc. Ent. Ital. pag. 25, ακτις, φερων. 1870“. Unfortunately Rondani's genus in Bull. Ent. Ital. III. 162 (1871) is *Actinoptera*.
11. „*Acydogona* Loew. North Amer. Trypet. pag. 285, οξυς; γων“. A curious derivation for this curious word; Loew's genus is *Acidogona*.
12. „*Acyphona* Osten Sacken. Monogr. N. Amer. Dipt., IV, pag. 151, οξυς; φονος“. Again a curious derivation; I would rather take it from ἀ κύφω.
13. „*Acyrhynchus?* Rondani. Dipt. Ital. Cecidomyd. Not. XI, οξυς; ῥύγχος, rostrum“. I find this spelling in Att. Soc. Ital. Milano, II, 288, possibly the same reference, and I think it kind of Bigot to explain that ῥύγχος means rostrum as otherwise we might not have recognised ῥύγχος.
14. „*Adelinia* Costa. Il Giambattista Vico, Giorn. Napoli, II, Nom. propr. 1857.“ I cannot trace thus.
15. „*Aerotoxa* Loew. North Amer. Trypet., pag. 227, αηρος;

- τοξον". I wonder what *αηρος* means. Loew's genus in Mon. N. Am. Dipt. III. 227 and 327 is *Acrotoxa*.
16. „*Aleurodes* Frauenfeld. 1868. Dipt. Agromyzid.“ I thought every naturalist knew the *Hemipterous* genus to which Frauenfeld referred!
 17. „*Alloeoneurus* Mik. Dipt. Untersuch. Wien, pag. 8, *αλλος*?; *νευρος*“. Mik himself when naming the genus gave it as from *αλλοιος νευρον*.
 18. „*Allograpta* Osten-Sacken. Bull. Buff. Soc. Nat. Sc., III, pag. 49, *αλλος γραφειν*“. I prefer to derive it from *αλλος γραπτός* but the meaning is the same.
 19. „*Alloneura* Rondani. Dipt. Ital. Prodrum., pag. 140, *αλλως*; *νευρα*“. I have as my derivation *αλλος νευρον*. „Pepunculid“ I suppose is a mis-print.
 20. „*Amphicnephus* Loew. Monogr. Dipt. N. Amer., III, pag. 83, *αμρικνεφης*“. Loew's genus is *Amphicnephes*.
 21. „*Anacampta* Loew. Zeitschr. ges. Naturw. 1868, pag. 7, *ανακαμπτα*, 1868 (1867?)“. I think there is no such word as *ανακαμπτα*. I have it Lw. Ztschr. ges. Nat. XXXII. 7. (1868) *ανακάμπτω*.
 22. „*Ananta* Meigen. Syst. Besch. VII, pag. 283, *ανανθης*“. The derivation is from *αναντα*, a very different meaning.
 23. „*Anaplomerus* Rondani. Dipt. Ital. Prodrum., pag. 1841, *ανοπλος*; *μερος*“. I think this should be *Anoplomerus* Rond. D. It. Pr. I. 141. *ανοπλος μηρός*.
 24. „*Anastoechus* Osten-Sacken“. Derived from *ανά στοιχος* and not from *αναστειχω*.
 25. „*Andrenomylia* Rondani“. The derivation is not from *ανδρετις* (whatever that may mean), but obviously from the Hymenopterous genus *Andrena*. Rondani's spelling in 1850 was *Andrenomylia*.
 26. „*Aneurina* Lioy. Att. Ist. Veneto (3), IX, pag. 78, *ανευρα*“. My reference is Att. Ist. Venet. (3). X. 77. (1864) *α-νεύρινος*.
 27. „*Anisomyia* Walker“. All right except omission of volume and page = IV. 135.
 28. „*Anomoea* Loew. Germar. Zeitschr. Ent. II, pag. 327, 1862“. This is a simple correction of *Anomoia* Walker (1835) which had been made in Walker's Ins. Brit. Dipt. III. XVII. (1856).

29. „*Anthraxia* Meigen. Syst. Besch. VI, pag. 267, ανθραξ.“
More correctly Meig. Syst. Besch. VII. 268. ανθρακία.
30. „*Apatemyia* Macquart. Dipt. Exot. supplement, pag. 197, απτειν; μυια, 1826“. I make it Mcq. Dipt. Ex. (Sep.) Sup. I. 197. (1845) άπάτη μυια.
31. „*Aphoebantes* Loew. Centur. X, pag. 39, αφηβω?“ I suppose this refers to *Aphoebantus* Loew. Berl. Ent. Zeitschr. XVI. 77. άφοίβαντος.
32. „*Apospasmica* Loew. North Amer. Ortalid., pag. 52, αποσπασμος? μικη?“ Well may he query his derivation, when there is a simple Greek word άποσπασμός; for reference I prefer Loew Mon. N. Am. Dipt. III. 131.
33. „*Apostrophus* Loew. Syst. Besch. bekann. europ. Ins. pag. 310, αποστροφος, 1862“. My reference is Loew. Besch. Europ. Dipt. II. 311 (1871) άπόστροφος.
34. „*Aspilota* Loew“. Nothing incorrect; I would prefer the reference to be Mon. N. Am. Dipt. III. 286 and 328.
35. „*Asyndetus* Loew. Centur. VIII, pag. 58.“ Nothing incorrect, but I prefer the reference to be Berl. Ent. Zeitschr. XIII. 34.
36. „*Atmobia* Bigot. Ann. Soc. Ent. France (3), IV, 1856.“ It is characteristic of Bigot that he cannot refer to himself, correctly in the leading scientific work of his own country. I make this genus founded in Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. (3). V. 519 (1857).
37. „*Atracta* Loew. Bernst. Fauna.“ An obvious error for *Ataracta* Loew. Ueb. d. Bernst. 36. (1850) ά-τάρακτος.
38. „*Atractia* Macquart.“ Quite correct.
39. „*Atylotus* Osten-Sacken.“ The page should be 426 and the derivation ατύλωτος.
40. „*Axysta* Haliday“. Derivation άξυστος not αξυστις.

Thus of these forty names, eleven or twelve are wrongly spelled, one is not Dipterous at all, and only about seven are fairly correct (besides *Adelinia* about which I know nothing), the result is that Bigot is wrong five out of six times!

If additional proof be required as to Bigot's „habitual disregard of the simplest Orthography“ let me mention:

Acanthocnemis Guér. Bigot, Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. (3). V. 522 (1857) = *Acanthocnemis* Blanch.

Acanthodelphia Big. Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. (3). V. 532 (1857) = *Acanthodelphia* Bigot.

- Aedipsilopus* Big. Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. (3). VII. 215 (1859) = *Oedipsilopus* Bigot.
Andrenomia Rond. Big. Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. (5). XI. 18 (1881) = *Andrenomyia* Rond.
Aneropsis Big. Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. (5). XI. 373 (1881) = *Anaeropsis* Bigot.
Anthomia and *Anthomuia* Big. Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. (5). VII. CLXXXIII. (1877) = *Anthomyia* Mg.
Apogon Hal. Big. Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr.
Apomera Westwood. Big. Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. (2). X. 481 (1852) = *Apiocera* Westw.
Arthenia Hal. Big. Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. (3). V. 521 (1857) = *Asthenia* Westw.? or *Arthria* Kirby?

Since writing the above I have examined the French „Annales“ for 1887, and I note:

- on page 20 *Notachanta* for *Notacantha*.
 „ „ 27 *puntifer* for (I suppose) *punctifer*.
 „ „ 28 *Saphireus* for (I suppose) *sapphirinus*.
 „ „ 29 *Myochrisa* for *Myochrysa* or *Myiochrysa*.
 „ „ 30 *Pachycephala* for *Physocephala*.
 „ „ 30 *Sphyxotoma* for *Sphyxosoma*.
 „ „ 30 *Conopejus* for *Conopaeus*.
 „ „ 30 *Spariglossa* for (I suppose) *Spaziglossum*.
 „ „ 30 *Conopsoides* for (I suppose) *Conopoideus*.
 „ „ 30 *Leucopsila* for possibly *Leopoldius*!
 „ „ 31 *Bambilia* for *Bombibia*.
 „ „ 31 *Spariglossum* for *Spaziglossum*.
 „ „ 31 *Conopsoidea* for (I suppose) *conopoideus*.
 „ „ 39 *ochreiceps* for *ochriceps*.
 „ „ 39 *Conops* is feminine, but Bigot treats it as masculine.
 „ „ 205 *flavocaudatum* for *flavicaudatum*.
 „ „ 208 *Bombidia* as a correction for *Bombilia* on page 31 = *Bombibia*.
 „ „ XVIII *Panophthalmia*? for *Pantophthalmus*?
 „ „ CLXXXII *Curtoneura* is surely better *Cyrtoneura*.
 „ „ CCV *Stratomyia* for *Stratiomyia*.
 „ „ CCLIX Even in the Index errors follow Bigot; there is a reference to him CXCI which I cannot trace, and 303—308 should be 203—208.

I think that enumerates a fair number of errors for one man to make in one Society's Transactions in one year, and surely justifies my asserting, that Bigot has an „habitual disregard of the simplest Orthography“.

L I T E R A T U R.

Allgemeines.

Riley C. V. Report of the Entomologist for the year 1888. (Author's Edition, from the Annual Report of the Depart. of Agriculture for the year 1888. Washington 1889, pag. 53—144, with Plat. I—XII.)

Dieser Jahresbericht enthält an Originalartikeln: 1. The Plum Curculio (*Conotrachelus nenuphar* Hbst.) von Riley und Howard (57); 2. The Fluted Scale (*Icerya Purchasi* Mask.) von Riley (80); 3. The Hop Plant-Louse (*Phorodon humuli* Schrnk.) von Riley (93); 4. Silk-Culture: Report of the year's Operations von Ph. Walker (111). Hierauf folgen die „Reports of Agents“, und zwar: „Verschiedene Methoden zur Vertilgung der Schildläuse“ von D. W. Coquillet (123); „Entomolog. Notizen aus dem Jahre 1888“ von Mary E. Murtfeldt (133), handelnd über *Aspidiotus uvae* Comst., *Ceutorhynchus napi* und *Elaphidion ocellata* Hald.; „Bericht über Nebraska-Insecten“ von L. Bruner (139); „Versuche über die Vertilgung von *Heliothis armigera*“ von S. M. Tracy (141). Von diesen Abhandlungen erscheint uns besonders jene über die Hopfen-Blattlaus (*Phorodon humuli*) bemerkenswerth, da sie eine umfassende Biologie des genannten Insectes enthält und von 3 sehr instructiven und schönen Farbendrucktafeln begleitet ist. J. Mik.

Thysanura.

Bertkau Ph. Entomologische Miscellen. (Correspondenzblatt Nr. 2 der Niederrheinischen Gesellsch. in Bonn. 1888, pag. 91—93.)

Es wird ein neues Vorkommen einer *Japyx*-Art constatirt. Der Verf. fand bei Bonn auf einem Erbsenfelde beim Umwühlen des Bodens aus einer Tiefe von 2—3 cm zwei Exemplare einer *Japyx*-Art, welche er vorläufig für eine Var. von *Japyx solifugus* zu halten geneigt ist. (Vergl. Wien. Ent. Ztg. 1888, pag. 76, Artikel *Thysanura*.) J. Mik.

Lepidoptera.

„Fauna“, Entomologischer Verein zu Leipzig. Die Gross-Schmetterlinge des Leipziger Gebietes. (Leipzig 1889, Selbstverlag des Vereines. 48 Seiten.)

Ein Verzeichniss, welches eine Fortsetzung und Ergänzung des von diesem Vereine bereits früher (vide Zeitschr. f. d. ges. Naturw. Bd. LIII, 1880, Heft 5) publicirten Berichtes über die Gross-Schmetterlinge der Umgebung Leipzigs ist. Das Vorwort (I—VI) enthält eine eingehende Schilderung der oro- und hydrographischen, der geologischen und Bodenculturverhältnisse des

ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Wiener Entomologische Zeitung](#)

Jahr/Year: 1889

Band/Volume: [8](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Verrall George Henry

Artikel/Article: [Bigot's Orthography. 265-270](#)