

Callip teroma : is it really feminine ?

Hirashima, Yoshihiro

<https://doi.org/10.5109/2496>

出版情報 : ESAKIA. 25, pp.140-140, 1987-01-31. Entomological Laboratory, Faculty of
Agriculture, Kyushu University

バージョン :

権利関係 :

Callipteroma : is it really feminine ?

Y OSHIHIRO HIRASHIMA

In regard to the gender of the encyrtid genus *Callipteroma* Motschulsky, 1893, Dr. Zdenek Boucek recently (1986, Chalcid Forum, No. 7, p. 8) remarked that "the name apparently was meant to be '*Callipteromma*' because the wasp has "beautiful dark wings with white eye-spots". He also expressed the opinion that "Putting it with one -m- can be regarded either as an intentional latinization or a misspelling. In either case, under our Code, because the last part is not exactly the Greek spelling (in transliteration), it is regarded as 'latinized' and takes the gender from the ending -a as *feminine*".

I do not agree with Dr. Boucek and I believe his interpretation is rather tricky. I believe that the last part of *Callipteroma* is the exact Greek spelling, i. e., the Greek neuter noun *pterōma*, and should be accepted as such.

I wish to propose here *Eupteroma bouceki*, gen. n. and sp. n., for a wasp which has "beautiful dark wings with white eye spots". Dr. Boucek may then believe that *Eupteroma* is of the feminine gender because it was meant to be *Eupteromma* (key syllables : **eu-**, good ; *pteron*, wing ; *pterōma*, that which is feathered, i. e., winged creature ; *omma*, eye). However, I would treat *Eupteroma* as of neuter gender because it was formed from eu- and *pterōma*, according to Article 30 of the Code.

I would also like to propose here *Callisteroma motschulskyi*, gen. n. and sp. n., for a beautiful beetle which has hard integument and solid eyes (key syllables : *kallos*, beauty ; *stereos*, solid ; *sterōma* (= *stereōma*), solid body ; *omma*, eye). Dr. Boucek may consider that *Callisteroma* is of feminine gender because it was intended to be *Callisteromma* or *Callistereomma*. However, *Callisteroma* is neither an intentional Latinization nor a misspelling of *Callisteromma* or *Callistereomma*. In Dr. Boucek's way of thinking, one can easily alter the gender of a genus which ends in Greek neuter nouns such as -*coeloma* (koiloma), -*hyboma* (hyboma), -*leucoma* (leukoma), etc., in addition to -*pteroma*, -*steroma* or -*stereoma*. **This is not only ridiculous but is also dangerous to the Code.**

To my knowledge, again, *Callipteroma* is not an intentional Latinization or a misspelling of *Callipteromma* but a good compound word of *kallos* and *pterōma*. Dr. Boucek further remarks that Motschulsky certainly has a knowledge of the Greek (and Latin) language. I agree with him, and, therefore, I believe that Motschulsky did not intend the genus to be *Callipteromma*, a rather awkward compound word of three components. He undoubtedly meant to be *Callipteroma*, a fine name combining two words, but he changed its gender **intentionally** to feminine (he was lucky to be free from the Code!).

It should be noted here that, in establishing a new genus, classical authors like Motschulsky often *intentionally* designated the opposite gender from the original one of the word adopted from Greek or Latin, as in the case of *Callipteroma*. Even Linnaeus did this: for example, he treated his genus *Sphex* as feminine although it was taken from a Greek masculine noun *sphex* (wasp). Today, we treat *Sphex* Linnaeus as of masculine gender according to the Code. Why not for *Callipteroma*?

Finally, I would like to recommend to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature that the following sentence be added to the 'Examples' of Article 30 (a) : Names ending in -*coeloma* (koiloma), - *hyboma* (hyboma), -*leucoma* (leukoma), - *pteroma* (pterbma), - *steroma* (*sterōma*) or -*stereoma* (stereoma) are neuter.