

ing, as he makes a convoluted argument about the fact that the “date printed on the bottom of the cover of the reprint (August 30, 1949) cannot refer to acceptance date, as the acceptance date is clearly given in Japanese as July 25, 1949” [July 25, 1949 is stated in English to be the date received for publication]. He proceeds to state that “Azuma’s paper *as issued in reprint form* has been deliberately pre-dated [italics in original]. Brown further states that “in a letter by Yasumatsu inquiring about the date of publication of the part of *Hyogo Biology* in question, the editor of the journal, Mr. Yutaka Murai of Koyo High School, stated it was issued precisely on January 10, 1950.” No mention is made of having asked the editor about preprints.

Brown then states that “in a letter from Azuma to Brown, dated 24 November 1950, Azuma reaffirmed the date August 30, 1949 as that on which *Polyhomoa itoi* first appeared in print, and suggested that *Kyidris mutica* Brown was a synonym. We take this statement of synonymy to be correct, but insist that *K. mutica* is the *senior* synonym, as we cannot accept Azuma’s statement of the publication date in the face of the evidence to the contrary.” Brown then continues his diatribe, stating that “the authors deplore the great amount of aberrant publications on ant taxonomy issued in the recent past by several authors who, in our opinion, should not have access to scientific journals under any circumstance.” He states his position that the Commission should take steps to nullify “the works of authors publishing in bad faith or in extreme naiveté, and should certainly be ready to condemn the publication of those suffering strong mental aberration.”

At this point Brown is just warming to his subject and we suggest that interested readers obtain his paper. We will repeat only one more section: “In the past, entomological specimens have often continued to flow to authors long after their ‘eccentricity’ (often amounting to sheer, indisputable dementia) had been noted and passed over in discreet silence. ... Mental aberrants have a way of being extremely prolific writers, and they have often wrecked the taxonomy of entire families while saner, but overcautious fellow-specialists have stood aside, sadly shaking their heads and withholding [*sic*] their pens.”

An important point here is that the earliest name for this species was published in 1948 and was available

from the publication date until the appearance of the third edition of the Code in 1985. Also, it is unbelievable that Brown could neither recognize a preprint for what it was nor accept Azuma’s word that the preprint date was correct. It is distressing that a systematist would stoop so low to retain his name for a species. Available data indicate that the species under discussion is now placed in the genus *Pyramica* but Brown’s species name *mutica* is in current use. Not being myrmecologists, we have no idea what effect the resurrection of Azuma’s species name (as of August 30, 1949) would have, and no application for such action is being made. However, we implore myrmecologists who have a sense of justice to resurrect the earliest name and thereby atone, in some small way, for the outrageous remarks of Dr. Brown.

References

- Azuma, M. 1948. [Description of *Strumigenys (Cephaloxys) itoi* n.sp.]. *Yume-hamaguri* **30**: 26 (195)–27 (196). [September 5, 1948; in Japanese]
- Azuma, M. 1949. On the myrmecological-fauna of Tomogashima, Kii Prov., with the description of new genus and new species. *Hyogo Biology* **1** (4): 1–4 [Preprint, pp. 1–4, issued August 30, 1949; Journal pp. 34–37, issued January 10, 1950; in Japanese with English title.]
- Brown, W.L., Jr. 1949. Revision of the ant tribe Dacetini. I. Fauna of Japan, China and Taiwan. *Mushi* **20**: 1–25 [September 20, 1949.]
- Brown, W.L., Jr. & Yasumatsu, K. 1951. On the publication date of *Polyhomoa itoi* Azuma. *Mushi* **22** (16): 93–95.
- Creighton, W. S. 1950. *Polyhomoa* Azuma, a synonym of *Kyidris* Brown (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). *Psyche*, **54**: 93–94.
- International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. 1985. *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. Third Edition*. I.T.Z.N., London. xx + 338 pp.
- International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. 1999. *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. Fourth Edition*. I.T.Z.N., London. xxix + 306 pp.
- Petit, R.E. 2008. ICZN Article 9.1 – Why? *Conchologia Ingrata* **1**: 1–4.