



N° 14

2002

SOMMAIRE

Editorial	3
Minutes of the General Assembly (Szombathely, 2002)	4
Composition of the new council	8
Prizes awarded at last colloquium	10
Announcements	
Next European Colloquium	10
International Congress of Arachnology	12
Proposals for ESA publications	14
Article	
Arachnological dragons	15
Arachnological notes	17
Recent publications	18
Membership application form	19

Editorial

Up till now the European Society of Arachnology has seen its main role as being the organizational framework for the European Colloquia of Arachnology. These meetings already have a long history, starting in 1972, several years before the society was officially founded. In 2003 we held the 20th colloquium in Szombatheli, Hungary. The colloquia are attended not only by a crowd of old-timers that see the opportunity to meet friends and colleagues on a regular basis. As a matter of fact, young postgraduate students make up an increasing fraction of delegates. Along with this development, the scientific level of the presentations has increased considerably, and the topics and questions addressed in the presentations track the trends in contemporary science. All the meetings have resulted in a proceedings volume that forms a significant contribution to the arachnological literature in Europe. Therefore, the colloquia have become the most important regular events for arachnologists in Europe and will continue to be the most important activity of the society, whatever other initiatives we may take.

At several recent general assemblies, held during the colloquia, members have requested that the society maintains a higher and more up-to-date level of information to the members and otherwise widen its activities. Basically, several members felt that they received little benefit from paying the society fee. In my personal opinion this is true for members that never attend the colloquia. I agree that it is clearly unsatisfactory that we have nothing to offer these members. Presently, only approximately one fifth of active European arachnologists are members of this society. This is also unsatisfactory for a society that aims to be continent-wide.

We have taken a few initial steps to improve the situation. First, I am happy to be able to announce a new ESA web site (www.european-arachnology.org). When you receive this Bulletin, it will still be under construction, but we hope that before summer the basic layout will be established. I encourage everybody to send us suggestions for further development of this web site.

At the general assembly in Szombatheli 2002, the ESA Council (through Ferenc Samu) proposed to establish a journal or a book series, based in either case on the colloquium presentations, that could serve as a membership publication. No final decision was taken on the issue (read the minutes of the meeting on pp. 4–8 for details of the discussion), but it continues to be on the council's agenda for the next general meeting in St Petersburg (2003). In a separate note of this Bulletin (p. 14), different proposals are outlined and results of financial calculation relating to various scenarios concerning production, postage costs, etc. are presented. One of the main purposes of the financial calculations was to determine how many members the society would need to have and how high the membership fee should be in order to be able to produce a viable publication. It turns out that we need at least double the present number of members (now ca. 120) with a moderate increase of the membership fee to about 25–30 €. Whether this is realistic remains to be seen. The main challenge at present is to make ESA so attractive that European arachnologists will not want to stay outside.

Søren TOFT

Minutes of the GENERAL ASSEMBLY of the SEA
20th European Colloquium of Arachnology
Szombathely, Hungary (Thursday 25th July 2002)

Held in the Berzsényi College Main Building, with 44 people in attendance.

The meeting was opened at 16.00 by Alain CANARD who proposed to act as chairperson with Christine ROLLARD and Jason DUNLOP as secretaries. These proposals were accepted.

1. President's report

The President (Alain CANARD) stated that the main activity of the society is the support of the colloquia, but that there are problems in obtaining financial support. The two possible ways of achieving this are internal support (via members) and external support (via national or regional bodies). Currently most of our money comes from internal sources. Alain CANARD stated that the role of the President was to secure external funding and as an example of this drew attention to a € 5000 grant from REFTAX (MNHN, Paris) for compiling a Europe-wide spider taxon list, which would be available to members on the Society's homepage. PETER VAN HELSDINGEN noted that he would talk about a similar project for compiling taxa lists later in the colloquium. ALAIN CANARD presented the society homepage in its current state, noting the aim of making it multilingual and appealing for assistance in making translations – especially of the introductory page – from French. Examples of how searches by species will bring up printable distributional data covering the whole western Palearctic were given and the possible use of the list for detailing bioindicator species was mentioned. Alain CANARD noted that the list is currently incomplete, but that accepting the € 5000 grant to complete it would be equivalent to several years worth of membership fees.

Discussion

Joachim HAUPT asked if the homepage was currently accessible and Alain CANARD provided the web site address. Gernot BERGTHALER asked if this address is in the current Bulletin but according to Samuel ZSCHOKKE it is not. PETER VAN HELSDINGEN again mentioned an alternative project with similar aims to the SEA database to which Alain CANARD commented that the SEA project was not obligatory, but would bring money into the society. The President's report was then accepted by general consent.

2. Treasurer's report

Léon BAERT reported that he had been treasurer for two years (2000-2001). In 2000 the society began with assets of [ca.] € 904, had an income of € 3819 and an expenditure of € 4043, giving a deficit of income over expenditure for the year of € 224. Thus, in 2001 (an international congress year with no European colloquium to support) the society began with € 680, had an income of € 496 and expenses (due to tax) of € 16, giving an overall balance € 1065 in credit. Figures for up to July 2002 were also provided with an income so far of € 688 and expenses of € 1065, but with expected costs of postage and Bulletin production of € 735, the predicted end of year assets will only be about € 48. The treasurer reminded members of the importance of paying their dues.

Discussion

Samuel ZSCHOKKE raised a question about expenses paid for the administration of the society's homepage, given that money was paid in 2002 while the last update was in 2000. Alain CANARD confirmed that previously a student had been paid to administer the homepage, but that this arrangement proved ineffective and agreed that this would have to change in future. There were no further questions.

3. Auditors' report

Peter VAN HELSDINGEN reported on behalf of himself and Christian KROPP and began by stating that in future this job should *not* be carried out by members of council. Peter VAN HELSDINGEN confirmed that the bank accounts had been checked and were in agreement with the Treasurer's report. Hand-written documents had been examined, but original invoices were not available to the auditors; though adding that there had been only three payments made since 2000. Peter VAN HELSDINGEN made three recommendations for the future: (1) Council members should not audit their own accounts, (2) a computer-based spreadsheet should be used to facilitate the financial administration, and (3) cheque numbers should be included in the accounts. Peter VAN HELSDINGEN confirmed that, in the auditors' opinion, the accounts for 2000-2001 were in order (with the exception of a € 0.08 discrepancy) and recommended that the Treasurer's report be accepted. The Treasurer's report was duly accepted by general consent.

4. Elections to council

Christine ROLLARD reported the election results. Six people had been proposed as council members of the SEA, based on nominations from council. Of 131 eligible members, 51 voted with up to six votes per person. Three people from outside the council counted the votes and all six nominated candidates were returned with votes of: Léon BAERT (46), Maciej BARTOS (47), Alain CANARD (36), Mark JUDSON (42), Christine ROLLARD (45) and Ferenc SAMU (47). All six remain on, or join (BARTOS, SAMU), the council. Other candidates nominated during the election process did not receive sufficient votes.

5. New members

The President welcomed Siegfried HUBER (Oberuhldingen), Beatrice LÜSCHER (Bern), Stoyan LAZAROV (Sofia), Ivan LUKASHEVICH (Minsk) and Boris STRIFFLER (Bonn) as new members of the society.

6. Proposed changes to colloquium proceedings

The President invited Ferenc SAMU to present a proposal to develop the colloquium proceedings into either a journal or a book series. Ferenc SAMU reported on previous discussions between council and the colloquium organisers in which a desire was expressed to move away from colloquium proceedings which are published locally in different places and formats and only sent to conference attendees. The basic proposal was for the SEA to develop a scientific journal sent to all members through which the quality and stability of the publication would be improved along with its chances of being included in literature databases and by which it would become more widely available through libraries and other institutions. A second argument in favour of the proposal is that a niche clearly exists, namely the current colloquium proceedings, which the proposed journal would effectively replace. Ferenc SAMU noted that most previous colloquium volumes run to ca. 320 pages and have improved in quality over the years.

The proposal was to turn the current proceedings into a serial publication, the name of which is not of critical importance, and which to begin with would not necessarily have to be specified as either a journal or a book series. Søren TOFT's use of the name *European Arachnology 2000* for the Århus proceedings was noted as something which could be adapted and numbered serially. Such a publication could have both ISBN (book) and ISSN (journal) numbers allowing it to evolve into either a full journal or a stable colloquium proceedings series. Financially this may mean raising membership fees slightly to,

say, € 20, such that ca. 100 members would contribute € 2000. Ferenc SAMU presented a quote from a Hungarian publisher of € 3600 + postage + tax for 400 copies. He noted that previous colloquium proceedings were subsidised by registration fees and in this example the journal would only be viable if printing was subsidised from the colloquia by some € 2000. In this proposal membership fees need not be raised much and the benefit would be a regular journal with an editorial board and good future potential.

The President then invited Peter VAN HELSDINGEN to outline an alternative suggestion already hinted at in the previous proposal. Peter VAN HELSDINGEN pointed out that a high-aiming journal would require many subscribers and there is a problem with intervening International Congress years. A book series, like the current colloquium publications, could include all presentations allowing students to get papers published. Costs for a book series would be about the same as for the current proceedings, but would become more uniform and all members of the SEA would receive this publication. Most institutions can ill afford a new journal subscription.

Discussion

Samuel ZSCHOKKE asked about the essential difference between a book and a journal, to which Peter VAN HELSDINGEN responded that the layouts of both could be similar and uniform, but a book would not need additional manuscripts outside colloquium years. A journal would need such outside manuscripts, but a book title could convert to a full journal later. Alain CANARD added that a book series could accept all manuscripts whereas a journal would be expected to reject weaker papers and asked whether the initial scientific level would be too high and what would happen to these weaker papers. Ambros HÄNGGI asked whether the editorial board would be stable and who would serve on it. Alain CANARD replied that it would be stable and Peter VAN HELSDINGEN added that potential names had been mentioned, but no decisions had yet been taken. Ferenc SAMU volunteered to act as one editor, but stressed the need for co-editors with expertise in other fields of research and the need for external referees, and raised the possibility that an editorial board could change over time. Joachim HAUPT suggested that the question of external referees was not so important, but that this is easier with a journal, which has continuity.

Christian KROPF noted that the journal could come out annually, whereas a book could come out twice in three years. Joachim HAUPT pointed out that some journals are irregular. Alain CANARD raised the question of non-payment by members and the possibility that receiving the proposed book/journal could be linked to payment of subscriptions. Joachim HAUPT noted a previous criticism that SEA members get little for their money and encounter practical difficulties in paying and Peter VAN HELSDINGEN reiterated the point that paid-up members would get the book/journal. Kirill MIKHAILOV raised doubts about the proposal, noting that there are numerous arachnological journals and that local sponsors of colloquia might prefer to support a locally-produced publication rather than a European journal. He asked whether the present system should be retained to encourage local editors from among colloquium organisers, with the SEA continuing to produce the newsletter.

Karin SCHÜTT commented that a book should not accept all manuscripts and said that she would prefer one with a stronger scientific content. Jakob WALTER questioned the strict division into a book or journal and asked whether it would only be for colloquium papers and whether we need another arachnid journal, drawing comparisons with limnological societies. Joachim HAUPT pointed out that data from a new journal would not necessarily go into Current Contents or Biological Abstracts, which cover some 60% of the literature. Alain CANARD replied that we do not know how the situation will develop in future and that the BAS Bulletin was not accepted in such databases, to which Joachim HAUPT added that only the *Journal of Arachnology* has an Impact Factor rating among arachnological journals. Peter VAN HELSDINGEN reminded the meeting that a final decision could be postponed, that we would be taking a risk and, citing an example from a faunistic journal, that a book series containing all colloquium papers is the lower risk option, whereas if we get external interest we could gradually move towards a journal.

Konrad THALER asked about responsibilities and pointed out that colloquium organisers might like

the job of putting a proceedings volume together, while external editors could introduce delays in publication. Ambros HÄNGGI raised criticisms that the prospective editors will have to do a lot of work, that the finances of the proposal seem unclear and supported the earlier point that local funding may only be available for locally produced colloquium proceedings. He also asked if previous colloquium proceedings could be made available and/or stocked somewhere. He suggested that the proposal of a more 'centralised' publication offers less incentive for local organisers and that they should go onto the editorial board. Léon BAERT agreed that local organisers and prospective editors should work together. Jakob WALTER noted that future volumes should be homogenous in presentation and would thus need a single editor/publisher. Alain CANARD added that people should want to join the society in order to receive the proposed publication and that the costs would be about the same as in the current system; Theo BLICK reiterated that all members would get the volume.

Alain CANARD proposed putting the matter to a vote and THEO BLICK clarified the four options: (1) the status quo, (2) a colloquium proceedings which all members receive, (3) a book series or (4) a full-blown journal. The votes were 29 in favour of all members receiving the colloquium proceedings in some form with two votes against. Further attempts to vote on the subsequent form of the proceedings became confused. Vlastimil RŮŽIČKA asked for clarification about an editor, Christian RIEGELSEN was unsure about how things should proceed, Gunnar ALROTH asked what the new volume would look like and Alain CANARD replied that details would be decided later. Elke JANTSCHER stated that colloquium organisers should join the editors for each new volume and Søren TOFT replied that editing is hard work and that organisers may be more willing to host colloquia if there is editorial assistance. Konrad THALER asked who would serve on the editorial board and Ambros HÄNGGI suggested that the committee was not currently fully prepared for Ferenc SAMU's idea and suggested that they return to the next colloquium with more concrete proposals.

Ferenc SAMU conceded that the idea could wait until the next colloquium and that in the meantime the Hungary proceedings could be given to all current SEA members while additional copies could be printed to try to attract new members. Christian KROPF felt that a year was too long to delay a decision, but that the council should prepare a detailed proposal. This was met with general approval. Ambros HÄNGGI felt it was important that all members be involved in the decision-making via a postal vote; although Gunnar ALROTH noted this gave no opportunity for discussion. Kirill MIKHAILOV asked Ferenc SAMU who would be responsible for future distribution, Ferenc replying that at this stage this was not crucial.

6. Subscriptions

Alain CANARD proposed that SEA membership subscriptions should be raised to € 20 for normal members and € 10 for students. This was accepted by general agreement from the membership and Ferenc SAMU added that the increase should relate to receiving the proceedings, with Robert BOSMANS commenting that only paid-up members should get it.

7. Next Colloquium (2003)

Alain CANARD invited Yuri MARUSIK to present a proposal for hosting the next colloquium. The proposed location was St. Petersburg in Russia, which will celebrate its 300th anniversary next year with various special events. The proposed venue is at the university, which is close to the historical centre, the Hermitage, etc. It would be held in July or August. YURI MARUSIK explained that St. Petersburg is easy to reach, offers easy access to Moscow and that accommodation could range from student hostels at € 10 a night to hotels from € 30+ a night. The meeting was assured that St. Petersburg is a safe city and that Kirill MIKHAILOV, Dimitri LOGUNOV and Vladimir OVTSHARENKO have offered to help with organisation. Local, technical organisation would be by a professor of entomology from St. Petersburg with experience of conference organisation and a team of students to assist him.

In a lighter note of support, Christian KROPF commented that if the arachnologists could survive Chicago they should have no fear of St Petersburg and Peter VAN HELSDINGEN added that the city had been developed by Dutch architects. Yuri MARUSIK pointed out that St. Petersburg boasts beautiful architecture. Ferenc SAMU raised concerns about local organisation, adding that Csaba SZINETAR's local connections allowed the organisers in Szombathely to get much for free, while pointing out that in terms of financial calculations less than half of the Szombathely delegates paid the full conference registration fee. Yuri MARUSIK noted that both he and Kirill MIKHAILOV regularly visit St. Petersburg. Konrad THALER asked if the proceedings could be published in Arthropoda Selecta and Kirill MIKHAILOV confirmed that this is possible. No other proposals were for 2003 were received. Konrad THALER asked about an earlier proposal from Portugal, which Karin SCHÜTT said could only have been held in May. The Portugal offer is apparently still active for some stage in the future. Alain CANARD asked about the exact dates of the St. Petersburg proposal and Yuri MARUSIK said this could be early August and promised to consult people about dates. St. Petersburg was then accepted as the host of the 2003 colloquium to general acclaim and Yuri was thanked for his offer.

Other business

The President invited any other business to which Konrad THALER proposed a vote of special thanks to the editors of the various proceedings volumes over the years. This was greeted with general applause.

The President closed the meeting at about 18.00.

Jason DUNLOP,
Berlin, 29th July, 2002

Composition of the New Council

Following the General Meeting, the new council met and elected the officers of the bureau. The composition of the new council is as follows:

President	Søren TOFT Department of Zoology University of Aarhus, Bldg. 135 DK-8000 Århus C, Denmark	soeren.toft@biology.au.dk www.biology.au.dk/zoology/
Vice-president	Jason A. DUNLOP Museum für Naturkunde Institut für Systematische Zoologie Invalidenstraße 43, D-10115 Berlin, Germany	jason.dunlop@museum.hu-berlin.de
Secretary	Christine ROLLARD Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle	chroll@mnhn.fr

Département Systématique et Évolution
61 rue de Buffon, F-75005 Paris, France

Treasurer

Léon BAERT
Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences
Department of Entomology
Vautierstraat 29, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium

leon.baert@natuurwetenschappen.be

Vice-treasurer

Christian KROPF
Natural History Museum Bern
Bernastrasse 15, CH-3005 Bern, Switzerland

christian.kropf@nmbe.unibe.ch

Maciej BARTOS
University of Lodz
Laboratory of Teaching Biology and Studies of
biological Diversity
Banacha Street 1/3, P-90-237 Lodz, Poland

Bartos@taxus.biol.uni.lodz.pl

Theo BLICK
Heidloh 8
D-95503 Hummeltal, Germany

Theo.Blick@t-online.de
<http://Theo.Blick.bei.t-online.de/Start.htm>

Alain CANARD
Laboratoire de Zoologie et d'Ecophysiologie
UMR 6553, Université de Rennes
Avenue du Général Leclerc
F-35042 Rennes Cedex, France

Alain.Canard@univ-rennes1.fr

Peter J. VAN HELSDINGEN
National Museum of Natural History
Darwinweg 2, NL-2333 CR Leiden, Netherlands

Helsdingen@naturalis.nnm.nl

Mark JUDSON
Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle
Département Systématique et Évolution
61 rue de Buffon, F-75005 Paris, France

judson@mnhn.fr

Torbjörn KRONESTEDT
Swedish Museum of Natural History
Box 50007, S-10405 Stockholm, Sweden

torbjorn.kronestedt@nrm.se

Ferenc SAMU
Plant Protection Institute
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
P.O. Box 102, H-1525 Budapest, Hungary

arachnol@julia-nki.hu

**Prizes Awarded at
Last Colloquium**

20th Colloquium, Szombathely (Hungary), 2002

Best Paper

First Prize: Anne GASKETT
Second Prize: Maria CHATZAKI
Third Prize: Boris STRIFFLER

Best Poster

First Prize: Benjamin SURESH
Second Prize: Tamas SZÜTS
Third Prize: Marija BITENIEKYTE

First Announcement
XXI European Colloquium of Arachnology
St. Petersburg, Russia, 4–9 August 2003

I am pleased to invite you to the XXIst European Arachnological Colloquium which will be held at *St. Petersburg State University*—the oldest University in Russia—and will be dedicated to the memory of the late Prof. Viktor P. Tyshchenko (1937–1989), the former head of the Department of Entomology, Leningrad (St. Petersburg) University, and held on the occasion of the 65th anniversary of his birth and the 40 years that have elapsed since the publication of his first paper in the field of arachnology. Prof. V. P. Tyshchenko published the first *Key to the Spiders of the European Part of the USSR* in 1971 and genuinely inspired new generations of Russian arachnologists.

The colloquium will take place soon after the official celebrations of the 300-year jubilee of St. Petersburg city scheduled for May–June 2003. The participants would, therefore, have a chance to enjoy the sights of St. Petersburg—the second capital of Russia—in the most beautiful and reconstructed state since the end of XIX century. The colloquium venue will be the University Conference Centre which is situated next to the main building of the University just in the historical centre of St. Petersburg near Neva river and houses the conference hall, the restaurant, bar, cafe and student canteen.

The colloquium will cover all aspects of arachnology. The main form of presentation will be oral papers, but a poster session will be also arranged. The official language of the colloquium will be English.

The regular colloquium fee will be € 230 (€ 250 for non-members of the European Arachnological Society), the reduced fee for accompanying persons, students and the participants from Eastern European countries will be € 150 (€ 170 for non-members). The colloquium fee will include besides ordinary expenses the costs of the official invitation from Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is obligate to obtain Russian visa, of passport registration required after arrival and of bus transportation from the airport to the hotel and from the hotel to the symposium venue each morning, which is rather vital for a foreigner who can't speak and read Russian. Special everyday programme for accompanying persons will also be organised and paid from colloquium fees.

Accommodation will be possible in the city hotels at a price of € 60–120 for a room per night depending on the class of the hotel. The accommodation in the student hostel at a price of 20 Euro per night for a bed in 2 or 3-person room will be also available. Lunches and dinners will be served for the participants at their request in the University Centre restaurant at a price of € 15–20 per day. The information on the costs will be confirmed in the *Second Announcement*, which is to be issued in January 2003.

I would be very much obliged if you pass this announcement on to any colleagues who may be interested in coming to the meeting. I would be also grateful for any suggestion concerning the colloquium, e.g. invited speakers, session names, themes to discuss, publication of the proceedings, etc. If you wish to receive further information please ensure that you register your interest by contacting me through any of the routes indicated below. Communication via e-mail is greatly preferable for me. The colloquium website will also be organised soon.

Prof. Dr Vladilen E. Kipyatkov

Colloquium Organiser

Department of Entomology, Faculty of Biology and Soil Sciences, St. Petersburg State University, 7/9 Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, RUSSIA.
Tel: (+7) 812 5347335; Fax: (+7) 812 4277310.

E-mail: arachno@vk1280.spb.edu

Members of Organising Committee:

Dr. Yuri Marusik, Institute of Biological Problems of the North, Magadan.
Dr. Kirill Mikhailov, Zoological Museum, Moscow State University.

Joint E-mail address of Yu. Marusik & K. Mikhailov: **21colloquium@mail.ru**

16th International Congress of Arachnology
12-17 July 2004, Ghent - Belgium

First Circular, February 2003

Location of the Congress Venue

The congress will take place in the HIKW-building of Ghent University in the K.L. Ledeganckstraat 35, 9000 Gent. The venue at the Faculty of Sciences is situated about twenty minutes walking distance from the old city centre and about ten minutes walk from the railway station. It has a nice botanical garden and a park of about 40 hectares in its immediate vicinity. Maps showing the location of the venue are to be found on the website.

Scientific programme

There will be possibilities for oral as well as poster presentations. Overhead projectors, slide projectors and digital equipment for Power Point presentations will be available. Oral presentations will be limited to 20 minutes, including five minutes for discussion. The official language of the congress is English. The Proceedings will be published as a special volume of the *Journal of Arachnology*. More detailed information about "author instructions" will be given with the second circular.

Accommodation

A wide range of accommodation possibilities will be available: e.g. hotels, student hostels, youth hostels, camping. If you desire low budget accommodation, please indicate on the registration form.

Registration

Registration fees will be kept as low as possible and are estimated below:

Members of the ISAabout 200 €; Non members of the ISAabout 240 €; Accompanying persons.....about 150 €, Studentsabout 100 €

Possibilities to obtain grants will be available.

The registration fee includes congress participation, mid-week excursion, abstract volume, Proceedings, get-together party (with a selection of Belgian beers) and several receptions. Registration can be done by providing the necessary information on the preliminary registration form, which can be downloaded from the website (<http://allserv.rug.ac.be/~jpmaelfa/index.htm>), and sending it before March 31 by e-mail or regular mail to the Secretary: Léon Baert, Royal Belgian Institute for Natural Sciences, Vautierstraat 29, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium (16ICA@naturalsciences.be). Those who have registered properly will receive a second circular with more detailed information.

Organising Committee

Jean-Pierre Maelfait (president), Léon Baert (secretary), Mark Alderweireldt, Dries Bonte, , Robert Bosmans, Rudy Jocqué, Shirley Gurdebeke, Frederik Hendrickx, Danny Vanacker, Jeroen Vanden Borre, J. Bosselaers, H. Deconinck, M. Janssen, R. Kekenbosch, J. Lambrechts, M. Ransy, J. Van Keer, K. Van Keer.

Preliminary Registration for the 16th International Congress of Arachnology
Gent, Belgium, 12-17 July 2004

Name

.....

Address

.....

.....

.....

e-mail :.....

Fax:

I plan to attend YES / NO

I will be accompanied bypersons (.....children)

I prefer low budget accommodation (e.g. youth hostel, student room) YES / NO

I plan to present an oral presentation YES / NO

I plan to present a poster presentation YES / NO Number:.....

I plan to give another kind of presentation (video, film,...)

.....

Provisional title or subject

.....

.....

Please return to:

Léon Baert
 Royal Belgian Institute for Natural Sciences
 Vautierstraat 29
 B-1000 Brussels
 Belgium
 (16ICA@naturalsciences.be)

Proposals for ESA Publications

At the general assembly in Szombathely 2002, the ESA Council was asked to prepare a detailed budget for a membership publication—either a journal or a book series—based mainly or fully on presentations from the colloquia. Unfortunately, we still do not have all the information needed for a detailed account. The following is based on very rough calculations. I assume that the production and postage costs of a publication for all members should be paid by the membership fees. At present these costs are paid by the colloquium fees.

We can consider the following options:

1. Continue as now, i.e. colloquium organizers edit the proceedings and pay the production costs from the colloquium fees (+ a symbolic contribution from ESA). Only colloquium participants receive the proceedings. ESA membership fee remains low (at present 20 €).
2. Colloquium organizers edit the proceedings and are responsible for the production of the proceedings (as now), but ESA buys a certain number of the proceedings at a preset price; these are given to all members as a membership benefit. The colloquium fee should be reduced by the amount now used for the proceedings.

This option calculates two books every three years. With assumed production costs of 7000 €, postage of 12 € per copy, and an annual society fee of 30 €, we will need ca. 200 members. Reducing the fee to 25 € increases the number of members required to 275.

3. Future colloquium proceedings are edited by colloquium organizers + a permanent ESA editorial board. ESA is responsible for the production, printing and distribution costs. Same calculations as for (2).
4. A true ESA journal with an annual volume, edited by a permanent ESA editorial board and published by ESA. The articles would comprise the presentations from the colloquia. Since we have only two meetings per three years, the third volume could take manuscripts that missed the proceedings deadline + eventually additional manuscripts.

Assuming the same costs as in (2), the required number of members would be 400 and 550 for a high and low society fee, respectively. The required number of members can be reduced considerably if colloquium fees continue to partly finance a publication that is sent to all members. This may be needed as an interim solution until members have increased sufficiently.

A final possibility as an interim solution is to go on as we do now (option 1), in which colloquium delegates will receive the printed proceedings, but make the articles available for all paying members via the ESA web site as PDF files (maybe open to everybody after a number of years). This is a low-cost option that will require little (if any) fee increase and make no immediate requirements for increase in members.

Søren TOFT

Article

Arachnological Dragons

Mark L. I. JUDSON

Département Systématique et Évolution, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle,
61, rue de Buffon, 75005 Paris, France (e-mail judson@mnhn.fr)

Ingi AGNARSSON

Department of Biological Sciences, George Washington University, 2023 G Street NW, Washington, D.C.
20052, U.S.A. (e-mail ingi@gwu.edu)

Chelonethi (or Pseudoscorpiones) have long been a group without a satisfactory vernacular name. This is perhaps not surprising, given that most non-biologists have never seen one of these cryptic animals. Almost all the names proposed have been based on the superficial similarity to scorpions, starting with the French *faux-scorpions* (de Geer, 1778), which was later Latinized as Pseudoscorpiones and translated into English as false-scorpions. Apart from being sibilant cacophonies, these names suffer from their negative connotations; it is hardly surprising that no other ordinal name in the animal kingdom uses the prefix pseudo-, which tells us more about what the animal isn't than what it is. These names are also confusing for those who are only familiar with the true scorpions. Simon (1879) tersely dismissed the name pseudoscorpion as 'défectueux', but it has stuck for want of a suitable alternative.

Dissatisfaction with these names has led arachnologists to introduce alternatives. When all the species of the order were placed in a single genus, they were often referred to as 'chelifers', but the genus *Chelifer* now includes only a single species, *Chelifer cancroides* (L.). Schrank (1803) called them *Milbenwolf* (wolf-mites), a term that promptly fell into obscurity. Another German name, *Scheerenspinnen* (claw-spiders or claw-spinners), was proposed by Menge (1855), but this too failed to find favour. L. Koch (1873) adopted the name *Chernetiden*, based on the generic name *Chernes*, which aptly means 'one who lives by the labour of his hands' in Greek. He was followed in this by Simon (1879), who used the French form *chernètes*. However, this name became inappropriate when Chernetidae was adopted for a single family. Chamberlin (1929) suggested chela-spinners (probably based on Chelonethi, rather than *Scheerenspinnen*), but even he abandoned this soon afterwards.

There is, however, one name for the group that is short, euphonious and evocative. Remarkably, it comes from Iceland, a country that has only two species of pseudoscorpions, neither of which is common there (Agnarsson, 1998). This name is drekar (nominative singular *dreki*, genitive singular *dreka*), which has an interesting derivation. For reasons that are not entirely clear, the name *sporðdreki* had been adopted in Icelandic for a scorpion (and the astrological sign, *sporðdreka*) by the 12th century. This name later fell into disuse, but it was revived in the 18th century and is now commonly employed instead of the imported *skorpion*. *Sporðdreki* is formed from the words *sporður*, meaning a tail, and *dreki*, meaning a dragon. When Einarsson (1989) came to consider the question of a vernacular name for pseudoscorpions in Icelandic, it seemed quite natural to call them *drekar*, since they differ from *sporðdrekar* in lacking a tail. This eminently logical solution was adopted by Agnarsson (1998) in his treatment of the Icelandic pseudoscorpions.

Here, at last, we have a name that is short, euphonious, without negative connotations and no less appropriate in its derivation than any of the other mythology-based names of arachnids. The only obstacle

to adopting *dreki* directly into English is that the ending almost irresistibly suggests a plural, even though the 'k' is distinctly un-Latin. Although derived from the same stem (Latin *draco*, Greek *drakon*), it would be confusing to translate *dreki* as either 'dragon' or 'drake': it is widely accepted that the animal slain by St George had a tail and the term drake is widely applied to males of the genus *Anas*. We therefore suggest substituting *dreki* with the Middle English equivalent, *draca* (plural *dracas*).

We see no reason why the name *draca* should not be generally adopted as a popular name instead of pseudoscorpion. It would obviously be advantageous in the formation of vernacular names for species. Legg (2000) has proposed a list of common names for British pseudoscorpions, but these are pseudo-vernacular hybrids that employ the Latin form of the generic name (e.g. 'common tree-cherms' for *Chernes cimicoides*), which rather defeats the object of the exercise. Einarsson (1989) and Agnarsson (1998) used *mosadreki* for *Neobisium carcinoides* and *húsadreki* for *Chelifer cancroides*, which can be translated as moss-draca and house-draca. Applying this to the British fauna, the Chthoniidae, for example, could be called ground-dracas, with *C. ischnocheles* being the common ground-draca, *C. tenuis* the dark-handed ground-draca, and so on. Colleagues who are unwilling to use the term chelonethologist (no one has yet stooped to 'pseudoscorpionologist', which suggests a bogus scorpionologist) might welcome the opportunity to style themselves 'dracologists'.

Some arachnologists might find any association between pseudoscorpions and the *draca* of former times rather far-fetched, but it has a notable precedent. Schawaller *et al.* (1991) named their Devonian genus *Dracochela*, from the Latin *draco*. If these animals were dragon-like in the Devonian, there is no reason why they should not be considered so now, having changed little in the intervening 380 million years. Modern dracas are elusive, fearsome, clawed, poisonous animals, often with a scaly integument in primitive species, and some are even known to fly (albeit with a little help from insects). The time may have come for arachnologists to take them a little more seriously.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Agnar Ingólfsson for his help in obtaining information on the origin of the words *dreki* and *sporðdreki*, to Árni Einarsson for explaining his adoption of the word *drekar* for pseudoscorpions, and to the Dictionary Service of the University of Iceland for historical information about the use of *sporðdreki*.

References

- Agnarsson, I. (1998) Íslenskar langfætlur og drekar. *Fjölrit Náttúrufræðistofnunar*, 35: 1–34.
- Chamberlin, J.C. (1929) A synoptic classification of the false scorpions or chela-spinners, with a report on a cosmopolitan collection of the same. Part 1. The Heterosphyronida (Chthoniidae) (Arachnida-Chelonethida). *Annals and Magazine of Natural History*, (10) 4: 50–80.
- de Geer, C. (1778) *Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire des insectes*. vol. 7. Imprimerie P. Hesselberg, Stockholm.
- Einarsson, Á. (1989) Áttfætlur. In: *Pöddur, rit Landverndar, Reykjavík*, 9: 80–100.
- Koch, L. (1873) *Uebersichtliche Darstellung der Europäischen Chernetiden (Pseudoscorpione)*. Nürnberg: Bauer & Raspe.
- Legg, G. (2000) [Untitled: list of suggested common names for British pseudoscorpions.] *Galea* (Newsletter of the Pseudoscorpion Recorders Group, distributed by the British Arachnological Society and available at <http://www.britishtspiders.org.uk/srs/prg.html>), 3: 1.
- Menge A. (1855) Ueber die Scheerenspinnen, Chernetidae. *Neueste Schriften der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft* 5 (2): 1–43.
- Schawaller, W., Shear, W. A. & Bonamo, P. M. (1991) The first Paleozoic pseudoscorpions (Arachnida, Pseudoscorpionida). *American Museum Novitates*, 3009: 1–17.
- Schrank, F. (1803) *Fauna Boica. Durchgedachte Geschichte der in Baiern einheimischen und zahmen*

Thiere, vol. 3. P. Krüll, Landshut.

Simon, E. (1879) *Les Arachnides de France*, vol. 7. Paris, Librairie Encyclopedique de Roret.

Arachnological Notes

Dr A. de Barros Machado

It is with much regret that we learnt of the passing of Dr A. de Barros Machado last year. In addition to his work on spiders, Dr de Barros Machado published many papers on insects, particularly termites, and made important collections of invertebrates in Angola and Central Africa.

Emrik Strand's Arachnological Collection at the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris

In a recent paper, Aakra (2002) stated that the location of the types of Emrik Strand's linyphiid species was unknown and that they were probably lost. This suggests that many arachnologists may be unaware that Strand, in his will, donated his arachnological collection to the Zoological Society of France and the spiders, harvestmen and pseudoscorpions it contained, including types, now form part of the collections of these groups at the MNHN. They are available for study to qualified researchers, but anyone looking for 'Strand' species first should check that they were indeed described from material in his own collection, rather than being one of the many replacement names proposed for purely nomenclatural reasons!

Reference

- Aakra, K. (2002) Taxonomic notes on some Norwegian linyphiid spiders described by E. Strand (Araneae: Linyphiidae). *Bull. Br. arachnol. Soc.*, 12: 267–269.

Mark JUDSON & Christine ROLLARD

End of the Laboratoire de Zoologie-Arthropodes

The Laboratoire de Zoologie-Arthropodes of the MNHN ceased to exist as an administrative entity at the end of 2002, after a history stretching back as far as 1790 and Lamarck's chair of 'Histoire naturelle des Insectes et des Vers'. In future, the arachnid and myriapod sections will form part of the new department of 'Systematics and Evolution', reflecting a move away from taxon-based research at the

museum to a more thematic and multidisciplinary approach. This administrative change does not mean that the Muséum is abandoning these groups and current plans to modernize the collections will hopefully mean that they will more accessible in future. Nevertheless, it is difficult not to look back with nostalgia to the days when the 'labo' was one of the most dynamic centres of arachnological research in the world.

Mark JUDSON & Christine ROLLARD

Recent Publications

Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Arachnology (Badplaas, South Africa,)
The Journal of Arachnology, volume 30 (2), 2002, pages 181–451.

The Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Arachnology have been published as vol. 30 no. 2 of the *Journal of Arachnology*. Free access to the articles in this issue of the journal (pdf format) is available at http://www.americanarachnology.org/JoA_tocs/JOA_contents_v30n2.html and printed copies of the volume can be purchased by contacting Dr Patricia Miller, PO. Box 5354, Northwest Mississippi Community College, Senatobia, Mississippi 38668 USA (see also http://www.americanarachnology.org/JoA_replacements.html#oldies).

Membership Application Form

Return to:

Christine ROLLARD
Secretary of the Société Européenne d'Arachnologie
Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle
Département Systématique et Évolution
61, rue Buffon
75005 PARIS (France)

I would like to become a member of the Society:

NAME, First name:
Title (Dr, Prof...):

Address:
Institute:
Laboratory:
University:
Street:
Postal number/City:
Country:
Phone number:
Fax number:
E-mail:

Private address:
(optional)

Phone number:
Fax number:

Date: Signature:

Rédaction et Réalisation

Christine ROLLARD & Mark JUDSON

Société Européenne d'Arachnologie
Muséum National d'Histoire naturelle
Département Systématique et Évolution
61, rue de Buffon
75005 PARIS (France)

Couverture

Jacques REBIÈRE—MNHN