

OPINIONS RENDERED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the Commission

VOLUME 2

(pp. 13-20)

OPINION 136

Opinion supplementary to Opinion 11 on the interpretation of Latreille's *Considérations générales sur l'ordre naturel des animaux composant les classes des Crustacés, des Arachnides et des Insectes avec un tableau méthodique de leurs genres disposés en familles*, Paris, 1810

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature

Sold at the Secretariat of the Commission

British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, S.W.7

1939

Price one shilling

(All rights reserved)

NOTE:—Opinions One to One Hundred and Thirty-Three (Opinions 1-133) rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature were not published by the Commission itself, owing to lack of funds. Through the intermediary of Dr. C. W. Stiles, at that time Secretary to the International Commission, the Smithsonian Institution very kindly came to the aid of the Commission and agreed to publish the Opinions of the Commission in the *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*. Unfortunately, all except a few of the most recent of the above Opinions are now out of print, and are therefore no longer obtainable by working zoologists. In order to remedy the serious position so created, it is proposed, as soon as funds are available, to reprint Opinions 1 to 133 as Volume 1 of *Opinions Rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*.



OPINION 136.

OPINION SUPPLEMENTARY TO OPINION 11 ON THE INTERPRETATION OF LATREILLE'S *CONSIDERATIONS GENERALES SUR L'ORDRE NATUREL DES ANIMAUX COMPOSANT LES CLASSES DES CRUSTACES, DES ARACHNIDES ET DES INSECTES AVEC UN TABLEAU METHODIQUE DE LEURS GENRES DISPOSES EN FAMILLES*, PARIS, 1810.

SUMMARY.—Opinion 11 of the International Commission, which directs that the “table des genres avec l'indication de l'espèce qui leur sert de type”, which is attached to Latreille's *Considérations générales* of 1810, should be accepted as constituting a designation, under Article 30 of the Code, of the types of the genera in question, applies only to those genera there cited by Latreille in which he placed one only of the species included in the genus by the original author thereof.

I.—THE STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

This question was first brought forward by Commissioner Francis Hemming who, in 1935, submitted the following statement to the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature at their Meeting held in Madrid during the Meeting of the Sixth International Congress of Entomology:—

“I found considerable difficulty in interpreting Opinion 11 rendered by the International Commission when I came to consider Latreille's *Considérations générales* in the course of preparing the first volume of my *Generic Names of the Holarctic Butterflies* (published in July, 1934). In Part I of that volume I pointed out (on page 14) that without further explanation it was not possible strictly to apply the provision in that Opinion that the ‘table des genres avec l'indication de l'espèce qui leur sert de Type’ appended by Latreille at the end of his *Considérations générales sur l'ordre naturel des animaux composant les classes des Crustacés, des Arachnides et des Insectes avec un tableau méthodique de leurs genres disposés en familles*, Paris 1810, are to be accepted as ‘designation of types of the genera in question.’ Of the seventeen butterfly genera given by Latreille on page 440 of his work a single species is given for six genera, two or more species are given for eight genera, while a special form of notation (referred to below) was employed by Latreille for the three remaining genera. Opinion 11 of the International Commission is clearly applicable to the seven genera for which a single species only is given, except in such cases as the type may have already been fixed by some previous author (e.g. *Thais* Fabricius, 1807, where the type was fixed from the date of first publication through the action of Fabricius in placing

a single species only in the said genus). The three genera for which Latreille adopted the special notation referred to above are *Cethosia* Fabricius, 1807, *Argynnis* Fabricius, 1807, and *Papilio* Linnaeus, 1758. In these cases Latreille, after indicating the type species, added a second species preceded by the word 'ejusd.' by which he appears to have intended to indicate that the said second species also belonged to the genus but was not the type.

"The eight genera for which Latreille specified no one species as type but to which he allotted two or more species are in an entirely different position. Opinion 11 of the Commission (published in July, 1910) is not applicable to such names and, indeed, in relation to them has no meaning, since obviously it is impossible for both of two (often only distantly related) species to be the type of any given genus.

"I feel sure that the present ambiguity in the wording of Opinion 11 is the result of inadvertence only, but clearly the position must be clarified. I consider that this could best be done by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature rendering an Opinion supplementary to Opinion 11 directing that the provisions of Opinion 11 apply only to those genera there cited by Latreille in which he placed one only of the species included in the genus by the original author thereof. An Opinion so worded would have the great advantage that it would provide a clear-cut decision in every type of case which could arise in the interpretation of Latreille's *Table des genres*, namely:—

"(i) Cases where Latreille placed in a genus in his *Table* one species only, and that species is one of the species included in the said genus by the original author thereof.

"In the above case the species placed in the genus by Latreille would, under the Opinion proposed, become the type of the said genus.

"(ii) Cases where Latreille placed in a genus in his *Table* (a) one only of the species included in the genus by the original author thereof, together with (b) one or more species not included in the said genus by the original author thereof.

"In the above case the species which was included in the genus by the original author thereof and which alone of those species was placed in the said genus by Latreille in his *Table* would, under the Opinion proposed, become the type of the said genus.

"(iii) Cases where Latreille placed in a genus in his *Table* two or more of the species included in the said genus by the original author thereof, either accompanied or not by one or more species not placed in the said genus by the original author thereof.

"In the above case no type determination would, under the Opinion proposed, have been made by Latreille in his *Table*, since in that *Table* he included more than one of the species included in the genus by the original author thereof.

"(iv) Cases where Latreille placed in a genus in his *Table* none of the species included in the said genus by the original author thereof, the only species (either one or more in number) placed in the said genus by Latreille being species not included in the said genus by the original author thereof.

"In the above case no type determination would, under the Opinion proposed, have been made by Latreille in his *Table*, since none of the species included in the genus by the original author thereof was included also by Latreille in the said genus.

"Finally it is of course to be understood that the provisions of the proposed Opinion would apply only to those genera in respect of which no valid type determination had been effected prior to the publication of Latreille's *Considérations générales* of 1810."

II.—THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CASE.

2. The International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature at their Madrid Meeting endorsed the views which Commissioner Hemming had laid before them on the subject, and agreed to submit to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature a recommendation supporting the proposals set out in the statement prepared by Commissioner Hemming set out in paragraph 1 above, and expressing the hope that the Commission at their next Meeting would agree to render an Opinion in the sense indicated above.

III.—THE CONCLUSION REACHED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.

3. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature gave consideration to this question later in September, 1935, at their Meeting held in Lisbon during the Meeting of the Twelfth International Zoological Congress. At this Meeting the International Commission approved the proposal submitted and unanimously adopted the following Resolution which was incorporated in their Report to the International Zoological Congress as paragraph 18 thereof :—

“ 18. *Supplementary opinion on the interpretation of Latreille's ' Considérations Générales ' of 1810.*—Opinion 11 of the International Commission, which directs that the ‘ table des genres avec l'indication de l'espèce qui leur sert de Type ’, which is attached to Latreille's *Considérations générales* of 1810, should be accepted as constituting a designation, under Article 30 of the Code, of the types of the genera in question, applies only to those genera there cited by Latreille in which he placed one only of the species included in the genus by the original author thereof.”

4. The Report of the International Commission containing the foregoing paragraph was unanimously adopted at the Meeting of the Commission held on the morning of Wednesday, 18th September, 1935; and by the Section on Nomenclature at their Meeting held on the afternoon of the same day. The Report was accordingly submitted to the International Zoological Congress by which it was unanimously adopted at the Concilium Plenum of the Congress held on the afternoon of Saturday, 21st September, 1935, the last day of the Congress.

5. The Opinion as set out in the extract from the Commission's Report quoted in paragraph 3 above was concurred in by the twelve (12) Commissioners and Alternates present at the Lisbon Meeting of the International Commission, namely :—

Commissioners :—Calman; Hemming; Jordan; Pellegrin; Peters; and Stejneger.

Alternates :—do Amaral *vice* Cabrera; Oshima *vice* Esaki; Bradley *vice* Stone; Beier *vice* Handlirsch; Arndt *vice* Richter; and Mortensen *vice* Apstein.

6. The Opinion referred to above was dissented from by no Commissioner or Alternate.

7. Subsequent to the Lisbon Meeting the following four (4) Commissioners who were neither present at that Meeting nor were represented thereat by Alternates indicated that they desired their names to be added to the list of Commissioners supporting the Opinion adopted at that Meeting :—Chapman; Fantham; Silvestri; and Stiles. Commissioner Bolivar y Peltain was neither present at the Lisbon Meeting nor represented thereat by an Alternate; nor did he subsequently address any communication to the Secretary to the Commission in regard to this subject.

IV.—AUTHORITY FOR THE ISSUE OF THE PRESENT OPINION.

WHEREAS the By-Laws of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature provide that, except in cases involving the suspension of the Rules, an Opinion is to be deemed to have been adopted by the said International Commission as soon as a majority of the Members of the Commission, that is to say ten (10) Members of the said Commission, have recorded their votes in favour thereof, provided that where any proposed Opinion involves a reversal of any former Opinion rendered by the Commission, such proposed Opinion should require the concurrence of at least fourteen (14) Members of the Commission voting on the same before such Opinion is to be deemed to have been rendered by the Commission; and

WHEREAS it might be held that the proviso set forth above might apply to the present Opinion since the said Opinion is supplementary to an Opinion (Opinion II) already rendered by the Commission; and

WHEREAS sixteen (16) Members of the Commission have signified their concurrence in the present Opinion, twelve (12) either in person or through Alternates at the Meeting of the Commission held in Lisbon in September, 1935, and four (4) by subsequent adherence to the Resolution adopted in this matter at the said Meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE,

I, FRANCIS HEMMING, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, acting in virtue of all and every the powers conferred upon me by reason of holding the said Office of Secretary to the International Commission, hereby announce the said Opinion on behalf of the International Commission, acting for the International Zoological Congress, and direct that it be rendered and printed as Opinion Number One Hundred and Thirty-Six (136) of the said Commission.

In faith whereof, I, the undersigned FRANCIS HEMMING, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have signed the present Opinion.

DONE in London, this thirtieth day of June, Nineteen Hundred and Thirty-Nine, in a single copy, which shall remain deposited in the archives of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

*Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

FRANCIS HEMMING