

## Nomina conservanda of Scolytoidea I

by

KARL E. SCHEDL

Contribution 105 to the taxonomy and morphology of the Scolytoidea

Dr K. W. DAMMERMAN, Ent. Ber. 13 : 12—13, proposed to place *Scolytus geoffroyi* Goeze on the Official List in preference of *Scolytus scolytus* Fabr., and confirms his suggestion by making use of tautonomy.

Considering the fact, that opinion on tautonomy is still divided, as Mr. DAMMERMAN remarks himself, and because the name of *Scolytus scolytus* Fabr. has been used consistently and nearly without exception in modern literature on bark beetle taxonomy as well as in the vast field of economic entomology, I do not see any advantage by changing this name once more and establishing a situation having been overcome a long time ago. *Scolytus scolytus* Fabr. is the name nearly exclusively used in our days, and should stand for ever, if any official establishment is aimed at at all. The same opinion was held by other outstanding bark beetle taxonomists, for instance by the late Forstrat EGGERS and by the late Mr. M. W. BLACKMAN, the latter referring to the case as follows: "Of course this does not alter the status of the specific name (*scolytus*) proposed by FABRICIUS in 1775" (1934, Techn. Bull. U.S. Dept. Agric. Nr. 431 : 4).

I do agree on the other hand with the proposition of Mr. DAMMERMAN concerning the generic name of *Scolytus* Geoff. in preference to *Eccoptogaster* Herbst and this point of view was shared by EGGERS and BLACKMAN.

With regard of the generic names *Blastophagus* Eichh. and *Myelophilus* Eichh. a final fixation is most desirable, especially because the genus is well marked, being of the greatest economic importance, and comprising a few species only, and there is certainly no need of using two names all the time. Concerning priority *Blastophagus* ranks first (1864, Berl. Ent. Zeitschr. 8 : 25), and the reason why EICHHOFF changed this name into *Myelophilus* (1878, Stett. Ent. Ztg. 39 : 400) has obviously become worthless as GRAVENHORST emended his name of *Blastophagus* into *Blastophaga* as Mr. DAMMERMAN stated himself. From my knowledge of taxonomic and economic literature of the subject it seems to be wiser to maintain priority and the commonly used name of *Blastophagus* Eichh. instead of the second *Myelophilus* for which the necessity has disappeared.

On new literature I also refer to SCHEDL, K. E., 1946, Bestimmungstabellen der palaearktischen Borkenkäfer II, die Gattung *Blastophagus* Eichh., Zentralblatt f. d. Gesamtgebiet der Entomologie 1 : 30—38, and the same author, 1948, Bestimmungstabellen der palaearktischen Borkenkäfer III, l.c., Monographie 1.

Lienz, Osttirol, Reufenfeldweg 4, February 1950.

[The question of tautonomy was definitely settled in art. 33 of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature. It emphatically states that names may not be rejected because of tautonomy. — Ed.]

---

Correctie. p. 66 r. 15 van onderen : EBSSEN moet zijn ESBEN.