

## OPINION 89

SUSPENSION OF THE RULES IN THE CASE OF GRONOW 1763, COMMERSON 1803, GESELLSCHAFT SCHAUPLATZ 1775 TO 1781, CATESBY 1771, BROWNE 1789, VALMONT DE BOMARE 1768 TO 1775

SUMMARY.—Under suspension of the rules, in any case where such suspension may be considered necessary according to the interpretation now or hereafter adopted by the Commission, the following works or papers are declared eliminated from consideration as respects their systematic names as of their respective dates: Gronow 1763, Commerson 1803, Gesellschaft Schauplatz 1775 to 1781, Catesby 1771, Browne 1789, Valmont de Bomare 1768 to 1775.

STATEMENT OF CASE.—Commissioner David Starr Jordan has submitted the case in the following letter to the Secretary:

There are certain writers in ichthyology who did not accept the Linnaean system, usually because they had not heard of it, but whose papers saw the light after the date of 1758. There are others whose pre-Linnaean work was reprinted with additions. After the date (1758) of the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*, many of the genera thus proposed were in due time adopted by binomial authors and have found their way into the system. Those not so fortunate remain as stumbling blocks, some of them extremely annoying, and it is the consensus of all the ichthyologists I have consulted that it is very desirable in some way to eliminate from consideration all non-binomial authors on fishes whose works are printed since 1758. Even more confusing is the legalization of the names, non-binomial, quoted by Lacépède in footnotes but not adopted, from the field naturalists, Commerson and Plumier.

In order definitely to settle the status of certain generic names which in one form or another have been at times before the Commission, I propose, on the advice of the Secretary to the Commission, that the cases in question as noted below be settled by the use of the "Plenary Power" method on the ground that the application of the Rules as interpreted by the opinions and as applied to these "binary" but not "binomial" combinations will produce confusion rather than uniformity.

I therefore propose that under Suspension of Rules under Plenary Power, the Commission definitely reject the works named below from consideration under the Law of Priority. Under this action it is to be understood that no generic name proposed as new or reprinted in non-binomial form from or in any of the following works shall have nomenclatorial status under the Rules (as of the date in question), but that such names shall receive nomenclatorial status only through later publication and adoption by some author whose writings, under the Rules, are unchallenged.

## LIST OF WORKS UNDER CONSIDERATION

- GRONOW, 1763, *Museum Ichthyologicum* [better *Zoophylacium*<sup>1</sup>], 1763.  
 COMMERSON, 1803, (as footnotes in Lacépède *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons*, 1803 mostly.)  
 GESELLSCHAFT SCHAUPLATZ, 1775 to 1781. An anonymous dictionary accepting the pre-Linnaean genera of Klein.  
 CATESBY, 1771, *Natural History of Carolina, Florida and the Bahamas* (1731 to 1750), revised reprint by Edwards (1771).  
 BROWNE, 1789, *Civil and Natural History of Jamaica*, 1766, revised reprint 1789.  
 VALMONT DE BOMARE, 1768-75, *Dictionnaire Raisonné Universelle d'Histoire Naturelle*. Ed. II. 1768-1775: several names accidentally binomial.

In support of the foregoing I may report that I have made an exhaustive study of the cases in question and I feel certain that the adoption of this rule will avoid much regrettable confusion. Except the names of Gronow, none of the others has yet been brought into general use and two at least of the names drawn from Gronow (*Amia* and *Scarus*) have proved most unwelcome as displacing names in almost universal use.

Gronow himself was an excellent systematist, who adopted the Linnaean system as soon as he heard of it. Most of the genera in his "*Museum Ichthyologicum*" of 1763, had previously appeared in earlier papers and most of them also have been stabilized through their adoption in 1777 by Scopoli (*Introductio*), a binomial author, those not preoccupied being now in general use.

A few of the others, revived at one time or another, have been sources of great inconvenience to systematists. For which reason, I now recommend that the Commission should reject the names of Gronow (accepted under Opinion 20) but not adopted by subsequent authors, before other names had been given to the same groups.

The unwelcome changes resulting under Opinion 20 are the following:

*Amia* Gronow (1763) for *Apogon* Lacépède, 1803. This necessitates the change of *Amia* Linnaeus (1766) to *Amiatus* Rafinesque, 1814. The name *Amia* as applied by Linnaeus is in a way classical, the fish in question being of especial interest to anatomists and paleontologists. The name *Apogon* for a large group of fishes is also well established. In any event, I would recommend that *Amia* Gronow be set aside in favor of *Amia* Linnaeus, even if other names of Gronow are allowed.

*Scarus*. Scarcely less undesirable is the application of the names *Scarus* and *Callyodon* of Gronow. *Scarus* Gronow is a synonym of *Labrus* Linnaeus

<sup>1</sup> The references given by Commissioner Jordan (cf. also Jordan & Evermann, 1917a, *The Genera of Fishes*, pp. 17-22) make it obvious that a slight confusion has occurred in the bibliographic citation.

Gronow's *Museum Ichthyologicum* bears the date of 1754 (vol. 1), [and 1756 (v. 2) not verified by Secretary], and as this is prior to Linnaeus' *Syst. nat.*, 10th edition, there would be no object in bringing it to the attention of the Commission; the Secretary has thus far been unable to find any later edition.

Gronow's *Zoophylacium* bears the dates: fasc. I, 1763; fasc. II, 1764. The fishes are given on pp. 27-137, fasc. I, and this is the paper discussed by Jordan & Evermann in 1917 and in Opinion 20.

(1758). It antedates and, if accepted, nullifies *Scarus* Forskål (1775), for one of the most important groups of fishes. *Callyodon* Gronow (1763) in this case supersedes *Scarus* Forskål. It is, however, not identical with *Calliodon* of Cuvier (1829), a name also in general use. (*Calliodon* Schneider, 1801, is a variant spelling of *Callyodon*, as is also the case with Cuvier's *Calliodon*.)

If *Scarus* and *Callyodon* of Gronow are set aside, *Scarus* Forskål would be adopted, *Callyodon* or *Calliodon* of later writers becoming a synonym of it.

*Cyclogaster* Gronow (1763) was replaced by *Liparis* Scopoli (1777), the latter name being used by nearly all subsequent authors.

*Enchelyopus* Gronow (1763) (rejected by Scopoli as a synonym of *Blennius* L.) is equivalent to *Zoarces* Cuvier, 1817. *Euchelyopus* (borrowed from Klein, 1744) was also used by Schneider (1801) as the equivalent of *Rhinonemus* Gill (1863), and by Agassiz (1844) for a fossil genus of eels (*Paranguilla* Bleeker, 1864).

*Coracinus* Gronow (not of Pallas, 1811) is equivalent to *Dipterodon* Cuvier (1829), which, however, is preoccupied, and is replaced by *Dichistius* Gill (1888).

*Hepatus* Gronow corresponds to *Acanthurus* Forskål (1775), and is based on the same species as *Tenthis* Linnaeus, 1766.

COMMERSION AND PLUMIER.—The action of the Commission in the case of Gronow will again raise the question partially touched in Opinions 23 and 24.

In Lacépède's *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons* (1798-1803) a number of manuscript names of field workers are mentioned in footnotes. These are drawn from notes of one or the other of two active workers, Philibert Commerson, a traveler, and Charles Plumier, a priest stationed on Martinique. For both cases the specific names quoted are polynomial, although Commerson, at least, had a clear idea of the meaning of genus. Omitting names already preoccupied or negligible as synonyms, the following are left as available in case of acceptance:

<i>Alticus</i>	Commerson = <i>Rupiscartes</i>	Swainson	1839
<i>Cheloniger</i>	Plumier = <i>Conodon</i>	Cuvier	1829
<i>Chromis</i>	Plumier = <i>Umbrina</i>	Cuvier	1817
<i>Enchrasicolus</i>	Commerson = <i>Anchoziella</i>	Fowler	1911
<i>Pagrus</i>	Plumier = <i>Neomaenis</i>	Girard	1859
<i>Sarda</i>	Plumier = <i>Ocyurus</i>	Gill	1862

In case these names are allowed as eligible, the names *Pagrus*, *Sarda*, and *Odax* Cuvier must be replaced. *Odax* Commerson is a synonym of *Scarus*.

I propose that the generic names of Commerson and Plumier, not adopted by binomial authors, be regarded as ineligible, being (a) not binomial, (b) not accepted by the author who published them, and (c) as likely to produce more confusion than uniformity.

The case of *Antennarius* vs. *Histrion*, considered in Opinion 24, is not quite parallel, as *Histrion* Fischer, 1813, seems (by tautonymy) not synonymous with *Antennarius* (Commerson) Lacépède, 1798, and of Cuvier, 1877, but rather of *Pterophryne* Gill, 1863.

THE "GESELLSCHAFT SCHAUPLATZ."—I ask the Commission also to consider the generic names found in a dictionary entitled "Neuer Schauplatz der Natur, nach den richtigsten Beobachtungen und Versuchen, in alphabetischer Ordnung; Durch eine Gesellschaft der Gelehrten": Weidmann, Leipzig: 10 volumes, 1775 to 1781.

The work is anonymous, its compilation being doubtfully ascribed to Philip Ludwig Stäuss Müller, professor at Erlangen. In it all the generic names used by Jacob Theodor Klein of Jena in his *Historia Piscium Naturalis* (1740 to 1744) are reproduced and accepted, the species still left polynomial in designation, the generic diagnoses being rewritten and much condensed. The *Schau-platz* contains also a special list of genera of fishes, comprising all those of Linnaeus and of Klein. The objections to the adoption of the genera of the *Gesellschaft Schauplatz* are mainly two: (a) they are published in an anonymous dictionary and (b) as to species the Linnaean Code is not adopted.

Their rejection is foreshadowed in Opinion 21 by which the genera of Klein (1744) as revised and reprinted, but *without* adoption, by Walbaum (1792) are not accepted. They are, however, adopted by Garman (*Plagios-tomia*).

Their acceptance would necessitate certain changes, mostly unwelcome, in current nomenclature, as follows:<sup>1</sup>

<i>Brama</i>	for <i>Abramis</i> Cuvier 1817
<i>Cestracion</i>	for <i>Sphyrna</i> Rafinesque 1810
<i>Dasybatus</i>	for <i>Dasyatis</i> Rafinesque 1810
<i>Glaucus</i>	for <i>Cæsiomorus</i> Lacépède 1803
<i>Labrax</i>	for <i>Dicentrarchus</i> Gill 1860
<i>Leuciscus</i>	for <i>Leuciscus</i> Cuvier 1817
<i>Macnas</i>	for <i>Macna</i> Cuvier 1817
<i>Narcacion</i>	for <i>Torpedo</i> Duméril 1806 and <i>Narcobatus</i> Blainville 1816
<i>Pristis</i>	for <i>Pristis</i> Linck 1790
<i>Prochilus</i>	for <i>Amphiprion</i> Schneider 1801
<i>Pseudopterus</i>	for <i>Pterois</i> Cuvier 1817
<i>Rhina</i>	for <i>Squatina</i> Duméril 1806
<i>Rhombus</i>	for <i>Bothus</i> Rafinesque 1810 ( <i>Rhombus</i> Cuvier 1817)
<i>Rhinobatus</i>	for <i>Rhinobatus</i> Schneider
<i>Sargus</i>	for <i>Diplodus</i> Rafinesque 1810 ( <i>Sargus</i> Cuvier 1817)

A new name would be required for *Cichla* Schneider 1801, *Cichla* Klein being a synonym of *Labrus*.

CATESBY AND BROWNE.—The generic names of Catesby (1771) and of Browne (1789) are apparently ineligible under Opinion 21, which rejects the pre-Linnaean generic names of Klein as reprinted with diagnosis in condensed form but not adopted by Walbaum in 1792.

CATESBY'S "NATURAL HISTORY OF CAROLINA, FLORIDA AND THE BAHAMAS" (1731-1750) was reprinted in French, German, and English, two editions at least, since 1758. The one published by George Edwards in 1771 shows some revision, but none which affects nomenclature. Under Opinion 13, the question of the eligibility of the Edward's edition is decided adversely.

BROWNE'S "CIVIL AND NATURAL HISTORY OF JAMAICA," an excellent work, was published in 1756 and reprinted with some revision in 1789. There were,

<sup>1</sup> See Jordan, *Genera of Fishes*, part I, pp. 34 and 148, 1917, for a full discussion of the matters involved.

however, no changes affecting nomenclature. Although his twelve new genera in addition to those of Artedi are well founded, I think that they should be regarded as ineligible as occurring in a slightly revised post-Linnaean reprint in which the Linnaean Code is not adopted. The argument of Opinion 13 adverse to the acceptance of the names given in the reprint of Catesby applies equally to Browne.

VALMONT DE BOMARE.—In his recent monograph of the living sharks (*Plagiostomia*, Cambridge, Mass., 1913) Mr. Samuel Garman has adopted as generic names certain appellations in binomial form, found in Valmont's "Dictionnaire Raisonné Universelle d'Histoire Naturelle," in four editions, 1764-1791. In the first edition the few Latin names are plainly vernaculars. In the "Nouvelle Edition," 1768, and in "Edition II" in 1775, a few names, all of sharks, assume a distinctly binomial form. It is apparently plain, however, that the author regards these as Latin translations of the vernacular, especially as in his fourth edition (1791), he gives a list of the genera of fishes, including all of those of Linnaeus but adding no names of his own.

It seems to me a fair ruling that Valmont's names are binomial only by accident, and not accepted as genera by their author. The only new names of Valmont\* are the following:

<i>Galeus</i>	= <i>Prionace</i> Cantor 1849
<i>Ulpacula</i>	= <i>Alopias</i> Rafinesque 1810
<i>Catulus</i> (preoccupied)	= <i>Scylliorhinus</i> Blainville 1816
<i>Mustellus</i>	= <i>Cynias</i> Gill 1903
(Not <i>Mustelus</i> of Linck, Leach, Fischer or Cuvier, all of these based on <i>Squalus mustelus</i> L.)	

DISCUSSION.—Opinion 20, issued by the Commission, has given rise to considerable discussion which thus far has not led to definite results. Commissioner Jordan has suggested a middle ground which will enable the Commission to obtain the results generally desired and without respect to the merits or demerits of Opinion 20. Namely, he proposes that the Commission declare as nomenclatorially invalid the six papers in ichthyology which have produced confusion under Opinion 20.

Commissioner Jordan and the Secretary held prolonged discussion on the matter at Leland Stanford University and they concur in the wisdom of this move.

In accordance with the prescribed routine governing Suspension of Rules, notice of the consideration of this suspension has been published as follows:

MONITORE ZOOLOGICO ITALIANO 1922, Anno 33 (N. 12), p. 203.

NATURE, October 14, 1922, p. 523.

SCIENCE, December 15, 1922, p. 690.

\* For a further account of Valmont's work, see Jordan, Genera of Fishes, part I, p. 24, 1917.



No protest from any source has been received against the action suggested.

Commissioner Jordan and the Secretary join in recommending that under Suspension of the Rules the Commission definitely reject the papers named from consideration as respects their systematic names, as of their respective dates, under the Law of Priority.

The effect of the foregoing proposition is to reject as unavailable (as of the dates in question) all systematic (chiefly generic) names published as new in the foregoing works, but to leave them as *available* as of the dates when they were later adopted by authors whose nomenclatorial practice is unquestioned by zoologists. Thus, a *modus operandi* is suggested to solve in a practical way the impasse which has existed for about 20 years in the views respecting the use of the words "binary" and "binomial". While neither side concedes the principle it supports, both sides unite on another principle, namely, that the important end in view is to obtain, not to delay, results, and that the "plenary power," used judiciously and discreetly, offers us a practical method to solve the problems upon which there is such conscientious difference of opinion as to interpretation that consensus of opinion seems hopeless.

Opinion prepared by Stiles and Jordan.

Opinion concurred in by 15 Commissioners: Apstein, Bather, Handlirsch, Hartert, Horvath, Hoyle, Jordan (D. S.), Jordan (K.), Kolbe, Loennberg, Monticelli, Skinner, Stejneger, Stiles, Warren.

Opinion dissented from by no Commissioner.

Not voting, two (three ?) Commissioners: Dabbene, Dautzenberg, and ? Hartert.

Commissioner Bather concurred with the following reservations—"That the Opinion read as follows:

"Under suspension of the rules in any case where such suspension may be considered necessary according to the interpretation now or hereafter adopted by the Commission, the following works or papers are declared eliminated, etc., etc.

"I understand from Dr. E. Hartert (letter 20 Feb., 1924) that he and Dr. K. Jordan both agree to the above."

Commissioner Hartert states that he concurs "with the reservation that Opinion 20 must afterwards be revoked!"

Commissioner K. Jordan states that he concurs "with the proviso that the present vote is not taken as prejudicing a possible future vote on the reversal of Opinion 20."

Commissioner Stejneger concurs "with the express proviso that the rejection of Catesby 1771 does not involve the concordance of the Editor of this edition, in which the equivalent Linnaean names are given. This concordance is appended to the second volume and has the following title:

'A / Catalogue / of the Animals and Plants / represented in Catesby's Natural History of Carolina: / With the Linnaean Names.' /

"About the legitimacy of these names there can be no dispute. The editor realizing that Catesby's names—even when consisting of one generic and one trivial name only—had no nomenclatorial standing, deliberately and successfully set about to remedy this defect.

"As I understand the present "Opinion" its intention is only to eliminate the names given by Catesby."

REMARKS BY SECRETARY: Commissioner Bather's suggestion involves only editorial revision and has been complied with.

As respects Commissioner Hartert's reservation, Opinion 20 is not before the Commission in this vote. As he does not specifically vote against the Opinion, his name is carried with a ? both under the concurring and the not voting Commissioners. In either case this does not influence the ultimate result.

Commissioner Stejneger's reservation is interpreted by the Secretary as limiting the unanimous vote of the Commission in the case of Catesby 1771 so that the suspension does not include the concordance.