OPINIONS AND DECLARATIONS RENDERED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

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

Secretary to the Commission

VOLUME 2. Part 45. Pp. 509-520.

OPINION 175

On the type of the genus *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), a genus based upon an erroneously determined species



LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature Sold at the Publications Office of the Commission 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

1946

Price three shillings

(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION

The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. Karl Jordan, Ph.D., F.R.S. (United Kingdom).

Vice-President: Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.).

Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (United Kingdom).

The Members of the Commission

Class 1946

Herr Professor Dr. Walter ARNDT (Germany).

Dr. William Thomas CALMAN (United Kingdom).

Professor Teiso ESAKI (Japan).

Professor Béla von HANKÓ (Hungary).

Dr. Tadeusz JACZEWSKI (Poland).

Dr. Norman R. STOLL (U.S.A.).

Class 1949

Senor Dr. Angel CABRERA (Argentina).

Mr. Francis HEMMING (United Kingdom) (Secretary to the Commission).

Dr. Karl JORDAN (United Kingdom) (President of the Commission).

Dr. Joseph PEARSON (Australia).

Monsieur le Docteur Jacques PELLEGRIN (France).

Herr Professor Dr. Rudolf RICHTER (Germany).

Class 1952

Senhor Dr. Afranio do AMARAL (Brazil).

Professor James Chester BRADLEY (U.S.A.).

Professor Ludovico di CAPORIACCO (Italy).

Professor J. R. DYMOND (Canada).

Dr. James L. PETERS (U.S.A.) (Vice-President of the Commission).

Dr. Harold E. VOKES (U.S.A.).

Secretariat of the Commission:

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

Publications Office of the Commission:

41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W. 7.

Personal address of the Secretary:

83, Fellows Road (Garden Flat), London, N.W. 3.

OPINION 175.

ON THE TYPE OF THE GENUS POLYOMMATUS LATREILLE. 1804 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES.

SUMMARY.—Under suspension of the rules Papilio icarus Rottemburg, 1775, is hereby designated as the type of Polyommatus Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera).

I.—THE STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

In 1935 Commissioner Francis Hemming prepared for the consideration of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature a paper dealing with the interpretation of Opinion 65 relating to the determination of the types of genera based upon erroneously determined species, with special reference to certain genera in the Sub-Order Rhopalocera of the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta). One of the genera in question was Polyommatus Latreille, 1804, in the family LYCAENIDAE.

2. The portion of the foregoing paper relating to this genus reads as follows: - 1

(3) POLYOMMATUS LATREILLE, 1804

Latreille, 1804, Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat. 24 (Tab.): 185, 200 id., 1805, in Sonnini's Buffon (Ins.) 14: 116 id., 1817, in Cuvier's Règne anim. 3:553

46. When in 1804 Latreille first published this name he gave a short diagnosis on p. 185 but cited no species. On p. 200, in a comparison of his system with that of Fabricius, he gave what he called "argus Fab.". The genus Polyommatus Latreille is thus a monotypical genus and its type is "argus Fab.".

47. Fabricius never named an insect Papilio argus and whenever he used that name he made it clear that he was referring to the species so named by Linnaeus in 1758. The first occasion on which he used this name was in 1775 (Syst. Ent.: 525), the year in which Schiffermüller and Denis first detected the existence of the second very similar species, to which they inadvertently (and wrongly) transferred the name Papilio

¹ The text of the first part of this paper relating to the interpretation of Opinion 65 is quoted in full in Opinion 168 (pp. 411-430 above). The portions of the second part relating to the types of the other genera discussed are quoted in Opinions 169 (Lycaeides Hüber) (pp. 431-442 above), 173 (Agriades Hübner) (pp. 483-494 above), 177 (Euchloë Hübner), 179 (Princeps Hübner), and 181 (Carcharodus Hübner).

argus Linnaeus (see paragraph 29 above).² It must be concluded therefore that on this occasion Fabricius used the name Papilio argus Linnaeus in the sense intended by Linnaeus and that, like Linnaeus in 1758, he did not the sense intended by Linnaeus and that, like Linnaeus in 1758, he did not realise the existence of more than one species and confused examples of both under the same name. In Fabricius's later works the name Papilio argus Linnaeus was used in much the same way. If therefore it were to be assumed—as, under Opinion 65, it must be assumed in the first instance—that Fabricius correctly identified Papilio argus Linnaeus, 1758, and therefore that the species so identified, being the sole species included by Latreille in the genus Polyommatus Latreille, 1804, was automatically the type of that genus, then the name Polyommatus Latreille, 1804, would be an objective synonym of Plebejus Kluk, 1802, of which also that species is the type

the type.

48. It is quite clear however from Latreille's subsequent writings that the true Papilio argus Linnaeus was not the species to which Latreille intended to refer when in 1804 he cited "argus Fab." as the sole species belonging to the genus Polyommatus Latreille. Thus, in 1805 (the year following the publication of the name Polyommatus Latreille) and again in 1817 Latreille gave for what he called "argus" the reference "P. argus bleu, pl. 38, fig. 80." The reference is to Ernst & Engramelle's Papillons d'Europe and the figure cited represents the common European species Papilio icarus Rottemburg, 1775. In 1817 Latreille added a reference to figs. 292-294 [on pl. Pap. 60] of Hübner's Sammlung europäischer Schmetterlinge, which also represent that species. There is therefore no doubt that, when Latreille established the genus Polyommatus and placed in it the species which he called "argus Fab." his 48. It is quite clear however from Latreille's subsequent writings that matus and placed in it the species which he called "argus Fab.," his intention was to cite the species, the oldest available name for which is *Papilio icarus* Rottemburg. This is the sense in which the name *Polyommatus* Latreille has been universally used for many years.

49. There is clearly no sense or justification for interpreting the Code in such a way as (a) to deprive Papilio icarus Rottemburg and its numerous congeners of the generic name Polyommatus Latreille and (b) to sink that well-known and universally used name as a synonym of Plebejus Kluk, merely for the sake of maintaining the patently unwarrantable assumption that Latreille correctly identified *Papilio argus* Fabricius (and therefore also *Papilio argus* Linnaeus) at the time when he founded the genus *Polyommatus* Latreille.

50. I accordingly ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to render an Opinion under their plenary powers declaring that the type of Polyommatus Latreille, 1804, is Papilio icarus Rottemburg, 1775, Naturforscher 6:21, i.e. the species to which Latreille was certainly referring when he founded that genus.

II.—THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CASE.

3. The questions raised in Commissioner Hemming's paper were considered by the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature at their meeting held at Madrid in September 1935 during the Sixth International Congress of Entomology. The International Committee unanimously agreed to recommend the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to render an Opinion clarifying the meaning of Opinion 65 in the manner

² For the passage here referred to, see *Opinion* 169 (page 434 above).

proposed.³ Having reached this conclusion on the general question involved, the International Committee examined the particular cases in the Order Lepidoptera submitted in the same paper. The International Committee considered that, if (as they had just agreed to recommend) the International Commission agreed to render an *Opinion* clarifying *Opinion* 65 in the manner proposed in the petition, the only possible course as regards the genus *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804, would be for the International Commission to render an *Opinion* declaring *Papilio icarus* Rottemburg, 1775, to be its type. The International Committee agreed therefore to recommend the International Commission to proceed in this way under their plenary powers.

4. The above and other resolutions adopted by the International Committee at their meeting held at Madrid were confirmed by the Sixth International Congress of Entomology at the Con-

cilium Plenum held at Madrid on 12th September 1935.

III.—THE CONCLUSION REACHED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.

5. When the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature met at Lisbon immediately after the close of the Sixth International Congress of Entomology in September 1935, they found themselves confronted with a large number of cases involving proposals for the suspension of the rules, in respect of some of which advertisements had not been published or, if published, had not been published for the prescribed period, owing to the illness of Dr. C. W. Stiles, Secretary to the Commission, or for other causes. In these circumstances the Commission decided at their meeting held on the morning of Monday, 16th September 1935 (Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 9), that immediate consideration should be given to all cases submitted to the Commission that, in their judgment, had reached the stage at which a decision could properly be taken; that the By-Laws of the Commission should be suspended during the Lisbon Session to such extent as might be necessary to give effect to this decision; and that, in so far as this procedure involved taking decisions "under suspension of the rules" in cases where the prescribed advertisement procedure had not been complied with, the cases

³ For a full account of the subsequent history of the portion of this petition relating to the interpretation of *Opinion* 65 and the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature thereon, see *Opinion* 168 (pp. 411–430 above).

in question should be duly advertised as soon as might be practicable after the conclusion of the Lisbon Congress and that no *Opinion* should be rendered and published thereon until after the expiry of a period of one year from the date on which the said advertisement was despatched to the prescribed journals for publication. The case of *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804, was among the cases in question and was accordingly dealt with under the above procedure.

6. At the same meeting as that referred to above (Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 23), the International Commission agreed upon certain clarifications of *Opinion* 65 in regard to the status of genera based upon erroneously determined species (Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 23 (a) and (c)).⁴ Having thus cleared the ground regarding the principles involved, the Commission proceeded to consider the present and certain other cases in the Order Lepidoptera and the resolutions in regard thereto submitted by the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature. After careful consideration of the present case, the International Commission agreed (Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 23 (b) and (c)):— ⁵

(b) in the light of (a) above, to suspend the rules in the case of the undermentioned genera and to declare the types of the genera in question to be the species indicated below:

Name of genus

Type of genus

(3) Polyommatus Latreille, 1804, Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat. **24** (Tab.): 185, 200 Papilio icarus Rottemburg, 1775, Naturforscher 6:21 (the species misidentified as Papilio argus Linnaeus, 1758, by Latreille, 1804)

(c) to render Opinions in the sense of (a) and (b) above.

7. The foregoing decisions were embodied in paragraph 29 of the report which at their meeting held on the morning of Wednesday, 18th September 1935 (Lisbon Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion 6), the Commission unanimously agreed to submit to the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology. That report was unanimously approved by the Section on Nomenclature at its joint meeting with the International Commission held on the

⁴ See footnote 3.

⁵ Only those portions of Conclusion 23 which relate to the present case are here quoted. For the full text of Conclusion 23, see 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1:23-25.

afternoon of the same day. It was thereupon submitted to the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology, by which it was unanimously approved and adopted at the Concilium Plenum held on the afternoon of Saturday, 21st September 1935, the last day of the Congress.

- 8. In accordance with the decision taken by the Commission at Lisbon in regard to their procedure at that Session (paragraph 5 above), this case was duly advertised in 1936 in two or more of the journals named in the Resolution adopted by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in March 1913, 6 by which the said International Congress conferred upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature plenary power to suspend the rules as applied to any given case where, in the judgment of the Commission, the strict application of the rules would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity. In the period that has elapsed since the advertisement in the said journals of the proposed suspension of the rules in the present case, no communication of any kind has been addressed to the International Commission objecting to the issue of an *Opinion* in the terms proposed.
- 9. The present *Opinion* was concurred in by the twelve (12) Commissioners and Alternates present at the Lisbon Session of the International Commission, namely:—

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

- Alternates:—do Amaral vice Cabrera; Ohshima vice Esaki; Bradley vice Stone; Beier vice Handlirsch; Arndt vice Richter; and Mortensen vice Apstein.
- 10. The present *Opinion* was dissented from by no Commissioner or Alternate present at the Lisbon Session. Nor since that Session has any Commissioner who was neither present on that occasion nor represented thereat by an Alternate indicated disagreement with the conclusions then reached by the Commission in this matter.
- II. The following five (5) Commissioners who were not present at Lisbon nor represented thereat by Alternates did not vote on the present *Opinion*:—

Bolivar y Pieltain; Chapman; Fantham; Silvestri; and Stiles.

⁶ See Declaration 5 (1943, Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 1:31-40).

12. At the time when the vote was taken on the present *Opinion*, there was one (I) vacancy in the Commission consequent upon the death of Commissioner Horváth.

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

Whereas the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in March 1913 adopted a Resolution conferring upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature plenary power to suspend the rules as applied to any given cases where, in the judgment of the Commission, the strict application of the rules would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity, provided that not less than one year's notice of the possible suspension of the rules as applied to the said case should be given in two or more of five journals specified in the said Resolution, and provided that the vote in the Commission was unanimously in favour of the proposed suspension of the rules; and

Whereas the suspension of the rules is required to give valid force to the provisions of the present *Opinion* as set out in the summary thereof; and

Whereas not less than one year's notice of the possible suspension of the rules as applied to the present case has been given to two or more of the journals specified in the Resolution adopted by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in March 1913; and

Whereas the vote in the Commission at their Lisbon Session was unanimously in favour of the issue of an *Opinion* in the terms of the present *Opinion*;

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 in that behalf 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 Congress of Zoology, and direct that it be rendered and printed as *Opinion*

COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE. OPINION 175. 517

Number One Hundred and Seventy Five (Opinion 175) 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 twelfth day of October, Nineteen Hundred and Forty Three, 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

THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE COMMISSION.

(obtainable at the Publications Office of the Commission at 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.)

Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.

This journal has been established by the International Commission as their Official Organ in order to provide a medium for the publication of :—

- (a) proposals on zoological nomenclature submitted to the International Commission for deliberation and decision;
- (b) comments received from, and correspondence by the Secretary with, zoologists on proposals published in the *Bulletin* under (a) above; and
- (c) papers on nomenclatorial implications of developments in taxonomic theory and practice.

The *Bulletin* was established in 1943. Seven Parts of volume 1 have now been published. Further Parts are in the press.

Opinions and Declarations Rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The above work is being published in three volumes concurrently, namely:—

Volume I. This volume will contain Declarations I-9 (which have never previously been published) and Opinions I-I33 (the original issue of which is now out of print). Parts I-2I (containing Declarations I-9 and Opinions I-I2) have now been published.

Further Parts will be published shortly.

Volume 2. This volume, which contains the record of the decisions taken by the International Commission at Lisbon in 1935, is being published in two Sections (Sections A and B) with continuous pagination. Of these, Section A, containing Declarations 10–12 and Opinions 134–160, is now complete. Of Section B, which will contain Opinions 161–181, Parts 31–45 (containing Opinions 161–175) have now been published. The remaining Parts of this volume are in the press and will be published as soon as possible.

Volume 3. This volume, which commenced with Opinion 182, will contain the Opinions adopted by the International Commission since their meeting at Lisbon in 1935. Parts 1–11 (containing Opinions 182–192) have now been published. Further

Parts will be published as soon as possible.

APPEAL FOR FUNDS

The International Commission appeal earnestly to all institutions and individuals interested in the development of zoological nomenclature to contribute, according to their means, to the Commission's Special (Publications) Fund. Of the total sum of £1,800 required to enable the Commission to issue all the publications now awaiting printing, donations amounting to £969 16s. 1d. were received up to 30th June 1945. Additional contributions are urgently needed in order to enable the Commission to continue their work without interruption. Contributions of any amount, however small, will be most gratefully received.

Contributions should be sent to the International Commission at their Publications Office, 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W. 7, and made payable to the "International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature or Order" and crossed "Account payee. Coutts & Co.".

Printed in Great Britain by Richard Clay and Company, Ltd., Bungay, Suffolk.