Calopteryx demoiselles have a long history in the European literature. They were first illustrated in medieval manuscripts from the 14th and 15th centuries. The oldest known depiction is in Jean Pucelle's *Bréviaire de Belleville* dating from 1323-1326. Surprisingly, even this earliest of damselfly illustrations can be identified quite reliably as the male of *Calopteryx santhostoma*. Identifiable illustrations of *C. splendens* males appeared in some manuscripts in the following century. Subsequently *Calopteryx* demoiselles also became illustrated in many early books on insects in the 17th and 18th centuries; for instance in Thomas Moffett's *Insectorum Theatrum* (1634, p. 68).

In spite of, or perhaps because of this long and enduring interest in these beautiful insects, the nomenclature and taxonomy of the European *Calopteryx* taxa was formerly very confused, starting with Carolus Linnaeus' first attempt to classify them in his *Fauna svecica* (1746). Even today their taxonomy and systematics is far from being fully resolved. During the last 250 years around 50 species-group names have been introduced for taxa in the *splendens*, *virgo* and *haemorrhoidalis* groups. Most of the oldest were ranked as synonyms long ago, but surprisingly, new nomenclatorial discoveries can still be made by browsing through old literature.

The species name *splendens*, was introduced by Moses Harris in his book *An exposition of English Insects*, first published in 1776-1780 (see below). It became established as the name of the Banded Demoiselle only after Edmond de Selys Longchamps had presented this species under the name *Calopteryx splendens* (Harris) in his *Revue des Odonates ou Libellulés d'Europe*, coauthored by H.A. Hagen, in 1850. In earlier major publications of European dragonflies *C. splendens* was known by the species names *lodoviciana* (in E. de Selys Longchamps' (1840) *Monographie des Libellulides d'Europe*, see below) and *parthenias* (in T. de Charpentier's (1840) *Libellulinae Europaea descriptae ac depictae*). Early authors did not place much emphasis on the priority of taxonomic names. The first attempt to lay down some ground rules for nomenclatoric practice was made in 1842, when Hugh Strickland presented a Code of nomenclature to the British Association for the Advancement of Science.

**Incorrect date.**

Amazingly, in the odonatological literature, an incorrect date - the year 1782 - is still traditionally linked to the name *Calopteryx splendens* (Harris). In some publications the date is given as 1776, but this is also incorrect for this species. According to data presented by Arthur A. Lisney (1960) in *A Bibliography of British Lepidoptera 1608-1799* (pp. 170-175) and by Neal L. Evenhuis (1997) in *Litteratura taxonomica dipterorum* (1758-1930) (Vol. 2, pp. 341-343), the first edition of Moses Harris' book was published and distributed in parts between 1776-1780. The book is divided into five decades, each with 10 plates and corresponding text. The first decade was published separately in 1776, the second apparently in 1778. According to Lisney the third decade (including the description of *C. splendens*) contains four dated plates, two for 1779 and two for 1780, and in the fourth decade one plate is dated 1780. Lisney concluded that decades 3-5 were issued together, probably in 1780, but Evenhuis claims that decades 3-4 were issued together, earlier than the fifth decade. However, in both cases we have a good reason to conclude that 1780 is the correct date of the description of *C. splendens*. In any case, the second issue of the first edition of the complete book was already published in 1781, and the second (most widely known) edition, with a slightly different title, in 1782.

In catalogues of other insect groups (such as Syrphidae and various other families in Diptera and Hymenoptera), Harris' species are usually correctly dated, either as 1776, 1778 or 1780. Therefore, now almost 50 years after Lisney's conclusions, odonatologists also should finally start writing *Calopteryx splendens* (Harris, 1780)!

Moses Harris' colour plate (Tab. XXX) showing *Libellula splendens* and *L. splendeo (= virgo)* can be viewed on the internet; for example at http://special.lib.gla.ac.uk/images/exhibitions/ecology/spcollq512_table30.jpg.

**A forgotten name of royal origin.**

A much greater surprise was to discover that there is a correctly introduced, available scientific name for the Banded Demoiselle, which has remained unnoticed, or at least neglected, by the taxonomic revisers of the European dragonflies since 1840. The name, which was published only a few years after Harris' *splendens*, is absent also from all catalogues of the world odonate fauna, including those available on the internet. This curiosity is *Libellula ludovicea Fourcroy*, 1785.

Etienne-Louis Geoffroy published a book *Histoire abrégée des insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris, dans laquelle ces animaux sont rangés suivant un ordre méthodique* in 1762. In this two volume publication numerous new insect species collected from the Paris region were described. Geoffroy provided each species with a brief Latin diagnosis as a heading followed by a more detailed French description. Unfortunately in his new species descriptions, Geoffroy did not use the new binomial nomenclature introduced by Linnaeus only a few years earlier, although references
to the Linnaean binomial names where given where available. On the other hand, Geoffroy provided for all species a French name. All 16 dragonfly species listed received feminine names. The first two of them were 'La louise' and 'L'ulrique', which represent our present Calopteryx splendens male and C. virgo female. A reference to the Linnaean name Libellula virgo was correctly given in the caption of 'L’ulrique. It should be noted however, that the author considered that La Louise and L’Ulrique may have represented male and female of the same species, as he had only found males of the former and females of the latter. Apparently he was still prepared to provide a separate vernacular name to what could have been male and female of the same species!

'It seems likely that Geoffroy had adopted these names from Linnaeus’ Fauna svecica (1746). In this publication 'Lovisa' was given as the popular (vulgo) name for species Nr 757, which refers to the present C. virgo (mature) male. The name 'Ulrica' was presented for species Nr 758, which is a female of C. virgo, but no popular name was given to species Nr 759, our present C. splendens male (Fig. 1). Interestingly, Linnaeus did not give vulgar names to any other dragonfly species, but he listed many amongst the European butterflies. Undoubtedly, Linnaeus had selected the names 'Lovisa' and 'Ulrica' for these beautiful and delightful demoiselles to honour Her Royal Highness Louise Ulrique (Luise Ulrike; Lovisa Ulrika), Princess of Prussia, who was married with the Swedish Crown Prince Adolf Fredrik in July 1744. Lovisa Ulrika was received with great enthusiasm by the Swedes. Later as the Queen of Sweden (1751-1771) she favoured and endorsed cultural and scientific activities and was a great supporter of Linnaeus himself. However, in the second edition of Fauna svecica (1761) these two vulgar names were no longer included.

In order to make Geoffroy’s new species descriptions valid, his compatriot Antoine Francis Fourcroy introduced formal binomial scientific names for these insects in his book Entomologia parisiensis in 1785. In other respects Fourcroy’s two-volume book was basically just a summary of Geoffroy’s work. The Latin descriptions were copied verbatim et litteratim, but French descriptions were not included. Habitats of each species were described with a few words. The Demoiselle ‘La louise’ was named as Libellula ludovica (a new name) and ‘L’ulrique’ as Libellula virgo, using the Linnaean name (Fig. 2). Ludovica is a Latin version of the feminine personal name Louise.

Fig. 1. Extracts of text from (a) Fauna svecica by Carolus Linnaeus (1746, p. 228) indicating the use of the names Lovisa and Ulrica for Demoiselles.
References to Fourcroy’s name ‘ludovicea’ can be found only in a few early publications. These include George Samouelle’s (1819) *The Entomologist’s useful Compendium or an Introduction to the Knowledge of British Insects* (where two species of the genus *Calepteryx*, ‘Virgo’ and ‘ludovicia’ [sic] were listed on p. 410), J.F. Stephen’s (1829) *Systematic Catalogue of British Insects* (where the names ‘Ca. Ludovicia’ and ‘Li. splendens’ were listed as synonyms of ‘Ludoviciana Leach MSS’) and H. A. Hagen’s (1840) thesis *Synonymia libellularum Europaeorum* (p. 65), where the name appears in the wrongly spelled form ‘L. loudovicca’ in references under the misspelled species name ‘Callepteryx Loudoviciana Leach’. Thereafter Fourcroy’s name fell in oblivion, and not even W.F. Kirby listed it, although he recorded some other names introduced by Fourcroy (see below).

Actually the name *ludoviciana* appears merely to be an emendation of the name *ludovicea* created by W.E. Leach and intended to be used for the Banded Demoiselle, but since he never published it himself it remained a manuscript name until J.F. Stephens formally described it (see below). The name ‘ludoviciana Leach’ first appeared as a nomen nudum in J.F. Stephens (1829) *Systematic Catalogue of British Insects* and in John Curtis (1829 [-1831]) *A Guide to an Arrangement of British Insects*. In both publications only two British species (*virgo* and *ludoviciana*) were listed in the genus *Calepteryx*. Then in his *Illustrations of British Entomology* (Vol. 6, Mandibulata), published in 1835, Stephens created an unfortunate nomenclatoric confusion in the first actual description of the species *ludoviciana*. Rather than describing the Banded Demoiselle, he described three variants of the Beautiful Demoiselle under this name. An obvious male of the Banded Demoiselle was described as ‘Var. a’ of *Calepteryx virgo*. Thus Stephens made the name *ludoviciana* formally a synonym of ‘a wrong species’. He also introduced another synonymic name for *virgo*, *Calepteryx anceps*.

On the other hand, in his *Monographie des Libellulides d’Europe*, E. de Selys Longchamps (1840) recognised and described ‘ludoviciana (Leach)’ as ‘the species presently known as splendens’, following Leach’s original idea of this insect. To summarize, *Libellula ludovicea* Fourcroy, 1785 is a synonym of *Calopteryx splendens* (Harris, 1780), but *Calepteryx ludoviciana* Stephens, 1835 is a synonym of *C. virgo* (Linnaeus, 1758). However ‘Calepteryx ludoviciana sensu Selys, 1840’ [also sensu Rambur (1842)] refers to *C. splendens*.

Fig. 2. Extracts of text from *Entomologia parisiensis (Pars secunda)* by Antoine Francis Fourcroy (1785, pp. 343-344) indicating the use of the names Louise and Ulrique with proper scientific names for Demoiselles.

**Puzzling Parisiennes.**

Geoffroy’s and Fourcroy’s books still contain many other synonymies yet to be resolved. Thanks to W.F. Kirby’s *A synonymic catalogue of Neuroptera Odonata, or dragonflies* (1890) we must now use the species name *Ophiogomphus cecilia* (Fourcroy, 1785) instead of the more traditional *O. serpentinus* (Charpentier, 1825), the name by which I first learned to know this fine species. Kirby placed Fourcroy’s *Libellula victoria* as synonym of *Sympertrum flavescens*, but later some authors considered it to be synonym of *Crocothemis erythraea*. It was perhaps fortunate for all of us
that he was not able to determine what taxa hide behind the names *dorothea*, *sophia*, *adelais*, *philintha* and *sylvia*. The first three are zygopterans, which Kirby listed as 'valid' species in his genus *Coenagrion*.* Ludovicea*, *philintha* and *sylvia* were not listed at all. Undoubtedly some of Fourcroy's new dragonfly names were the first to be introduced for the species in question. Whatever, these species might be, it is fortunate that the present Code of Zoological Nomenclature does not allow any further changes in names based on *nomina oblita* like these. However, for curiosity and for the sake of building complete synonymic lists, it might be worth trying to find out what these 'Parisienes' really are - something for those odonatologists fluent in French and Latin to do. The relevant publications are available on the internet:

For dragonflies, see pp. 217-229 and 713-714.