

The family-group name APTORNITHIDAE Bonaparte, 1856 is the valid name for the family-level taxon containing the genus *Aptornis*. I propose that this name should also be placed on the Official List.

Comment on the proposed conservation of some mammal generic names first published in Brisson's (1762) *Regnum Animale*

(Case 2928; see BZN 51: 135–146, 266–267, 342–348; 52: 78–93, 187–192, 271–275)

Anthea Gentry

clo The Secretariat, The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

I read with great interest the comment (BZN 52: 273–275) by Prof Claude Dupuis, who has amplified from his own researches details of Brisson's career and works. I welcome his support for my application, at least as far as the conservation of 11 of Brisson's new generic names is concerned.

Brisson's (1762) publication is described on the title page as 'Editio altera auctior', but there is no mention of an editor and, notwithstanding Prof Dupuis has mentioned a couple of textual alterations, little evidence of editing following the first (1756) publication. A note (Bibliopola lectori) by the publisher, Theodore Haak, to the reader records that he has omitted the French text of the first edition and reprinted only the Latin as a convenience to students, so that this work may be more easily carried. He notes that the taxonomic arrangement of a 'Vir. Cel.' (celebrated man) who teaches in the Leiden Academy (and who Prof Dupuis has identified as J.N.S. Allamand) has been followed for the quadrupeds. This presumably refers to the placement of 'Le Lamantin/Manatus' in *Phoca* rather than in *Odobenus*, mentioned by Prof Dupuis, since there appear to be no other differences from Brisson's original (1756) work. Haak also records (in translation): 'In this, my edition, are given descriptions of some animals which the author [Brisson] has not mentioned; but lest these additions, if unsatisfactory, be attributed to him, they are placed between these brackets, []. Also, a † signifies that there is material in our museum'. The additions amount to some 14 new taxonomic species but no new generic names. Dupuis has noted that some of the additions derive from Gmelin (1758, 1760). Others derive from Aldrovandi (1645), Flacourt (1661), Steller (1751), Juan & Ulloa (1752) and Daubenton (1762). Allamand's name does not appear on the title page of the (1762) publication nor, to my knowledge, elsewhere in the work. For this reason, and those given above, I believe that to cite the (1762) publication as 'Brisson édit Allamand' would be inappropriate.

I share Prof Dupuis's reluctance to reject old and classic works. It was because of the confusion surrounding the status of Brisson's (1760) *Ornithologia*, necessitating three separate rulings over more than 50 years, and my desire to avoid a recurrence in this case, that I proposed that the (1762) work on mammals be rejected at the same time as conserving the names in current usage. Placing the *Regnum Animale* on the Official Index, as a work which did not use binominal names for species, would be in accord with Article 11c of the Code, whereas placing it on the Official List, as Prof Dupuis has suggested, would not be. Comments on this case have demonstrated that the work has de facto been rejected by some authors and my proposal has been endorsed by others.

The ruling on Brisson's (1760) *Ornithologia* was eventually (Direction 105, October 1963) restricted to the generic names listed in his *Tabula Synoptica Avium*. In the case of Brisson (1762), the status of each of the mammal generic names used in the work is so well known, and has been known for so long, that approval by the Commission of the rejection proposal will result in no unforeseen consequences. Of the 46 names included in the *Regnum Animale* and set out in Brisson's *Tabula Synoptica Quadrupedum* (pp. 12, 13) and *Tabula Synoptica Cetaceorum* (p. 218), 25 were published by Linnaeus and are included in the latter's 10th edition (1758) of *Systema Naturae*; nine were new names which have long been recognised as junior synonyms of names published by Linnaeus (1758) (see, for example, Merriam, 1895); and 12 were new names which are currently in use. One of the new names (*Odobenus*) has already been conserved and the application seeks to conserve the remaining 11 names.

Names included in both the *Systema Naturae* (Linnaeus, 1758) and *Regnum Animale* (Brisson, 1762) are the following:

<i>Balaena</i>	<i>Equus</i>	<i>Myrmecophaga</i>
<i>Bos</i>	<i>Erinaceus</i>	<i>Phoca</i>
<i>Camelus</i>	<i>Felis</i>	<i>Rhinoceros</i>
<i>Canis</i>	<i>Hippopotamus</i>	<i>Sciurus</i>
<i>Castor</i>	<i>Hystrix</i>	<i>Simia</i>
<i>Cervus</i>	<i>Lepus</i>	<i>Sus</i>
<i>Delphinus</i>	<i>Mus</i>	<i>Talpa</i>
<i>Elephas</i>	<i>Mustela</i>	<i>Ursus</i>
		<i>Vespertilio</i>

These Linnaean names (with the exception of *Simia*, which was suppressed in Direction 24, November 1955) will remain in use whatever the outcome of my application. The majority have been placed on the Official List, attributed to Linnaeus (1758): *Balaena*, *Bos*, *Castor*, *Delphinus*, *Erinaceus*, *Hippopotamus*, *Hystrix*, *Phoca*, *Sus*, *Talpa* and *Ursus* in Opinion 75 (January 1922); *Canis*, *Cervus*, *Felis*, *Lepus*, *Mus*, *Myrmecophaga* in Opinion 91 (October 1926) (with the type species of all the above placed on the Official List in Direction 22, November 1955); *Vespertilio* in Opinion 91 (and the type species in Direction 98, May 1958); and *Equus* and its type species in Opinion 271 (September 1954).

Names first published by Brisson (1762), and their Linnaean (1758) synonymies given by Merriam (1895), are the following:

Brisson (1762)	Linnaeus (1758)
<i>Aries</i>	<i>Ovis</i>
<i>Cataphractus</i>	<i>Dasybus</i>
<i>Ceratodon</i>	<i>Monodon</i>
<i>Cetus</i>	<i>Physeter</i>
<i>Hircus</i>	<i>Capra</i>
<i>Musaraneus</i>	<i>Sorex</i>
<i>Pholidotus</i>	<i>Manis</i>
<i>Prosimia</i>	<i>Lemur</i>
<i>Tardigradus</i>	<i>Bradypus</i>

These synonymies have long been accepted (see also BZN 51: 332 for *Tardigradus Bradypus*). Brisson's names in this category are not in use and there is no need for Commission action to deal with them individually. Linnaeus's (1758) names *Monodon* and *Ovis* were placed on the Official List in Opinion 75; the names *Bradypus*, *Capra* and *Sorex* in Opinion 91; and *Lemur* in Opinion 122 (January 1931). The type species of all the above were placed on the Official List in Direction 22.

The specific name of *Pholidotus longicaudatus* Brisson, 1762 (p. 19) was used by some authors, in the combination *Manis longicaudata*, for the long tailed pangolin of West Africa (see Meester in Meester & Setzer, 1971, part 4, p. 2). Pocock (1924, p. 722) designated *P. longicaudatus* as the type species of the new genus *Uromanis*, which is currently treated as a synonym (Corbet & Hill, 1991; Schlitter in Wilson & Reeder, 1993) or as a subgenus of *Manis* (Ellerman, Morrison-Scott & Hayman, 1953; Nowak, 1991). Mohr (1961, pp. 9, 10) recorded Brisson's name as invalid and used the name *Manis tetradactyla* (Linnaeus, 1766) for the taxon. The conservation of the specific name *longicaudatus* Brisson, 1762 is not proposed.

Rejection of a non-binominal work by the Commission is for nomenclatural purposes alone and does not imply any criticism of the work or denial of its scientific or historical significance. If the proposal is approved, Brisson's work would not be available for his new names other than those individually conserved, thereby protecting junior synonyms in use, or for nomenclatural acts, but his descriptions would still serve as indications in rendering available names proposed by later authors (Article 12b(1) of the Code). I believe that in the case of Brisson (1762) nomenclatural rejection of the work at the same time as conserving the 11 new names in use will give a clear and unequivocal ruling.

In his comment Dupuis (BZN 52: 274–275) states that Brisson's new generic names are available from vol. 4 of Chesnaye des Bois's (1759) *Dictionnaire raisonné et universel des animaux*. At the end of this there is a section (pp. 593–636) in which taxonomic arrangements by Linnaeus (various works), Arnault de Nobleville & Salerne (a continuation of Geoffroy, 1741), Klein (1750, 1751), Brisson (1756), d'Argenville (1757) and Adanson (1757) are summarised, without either acceptance or rejection. Chesnaye des Bois (1759, p. v) records: 'J'allois terminer cet Ouvrage par les Tables synoptiques des diverses classes des animaux, suivant les différentes méthodes de Messieurs Linnaeus, Klein & Brisson ... J'ai consulté tous ces Auteurs, ainsi que les autres Ecrivains anciens & modernes, pour enrichir l'Histoire des Animaux'. Brisson's names, among those of many authors, appear throughout the four volumes of the *Dictionnaire* but always only for comparison with the names used for the same taxon by other authors. Neither in the summary (pp. 625–632) of Brisson's (1756) work nor in the *Dictionnaire* itself are Brisson's names adopted as valid. The same is true for the names in the other works mentioned. In his 'Approbation du Censeur Royal' of Chesnaye's work, Guettard (p. 639) notes: 'Cet Ouvrage est un abrégé de ce que les Voyageurs & les Naturalistes ont dit sur les Quadrupèdes, les Oiseaux, les Poissons, les Insectes, &c. On y trouve de plus les noms que ces animaux portent ou ont porté dans les différens pays où ils vivent'.

Thus, Brisson's (1756) names as they are reproduced in Chesnaye des Bois's (1759) *Dictionnaire* meet the requirements of Articles 11c(i), 11g(i) and 12b(i) for

availability, as noted by Dupuis, but since they are not adopted as valid names for taxa, do not fulfil the conditions of Articles 11d and 11d(ii). They are therefore unavailable from this work. The 11 generic names for which conservation is proposed are first made available in Brisson's (1762) *Regnum Animale*.

I do not agree with Dr M. Wolsan (BZN 52: 272–273) that some only of the generic names need be attributed to Brisson (1762). I support the view expressed by many previous commentators on this case (for example, W.F.H. Ansell, G.B. Corbet, M.R. Dawson, V. Falbusch, C.P. Groves, K. Heissig, J.E. Hill, D. Kock, H. Mayr, P.A. Morris, F. Petter, G. Rössner, B. Sigé, N. Sivasothi, A. Turner and D.W. Yalden) that, since Brisson was the first authority to recognise and name the 12 taxa, the names for all these genera should be attributed to his authorship. It would be anomalous and inconsistent to adopt his authorship for some but not others of his names. A number of commentators have noted that there is no viable alternative for the name *Tragulus*.

I believe that my application for the conservation of Brisson's 11 generic names in current use, at the same time rejecting the (1762) work, should stand. Of the 51 authors who have so far commented on this application, 43 support this view.

Additional references

- Aldrovandi, U. 1645. *Quadrupedibus digitatis viviparis*. 585 pp. Bologna.
- Daubenton, L.J.M. 1762. Sur les musaraignes, et en particulier sur une nouvelle espèce de musaraigne qui se trouve en France, et qui n'a pas été remarquée par les naturalistes. *Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences*, 1756: 203–213.
- Flacourt, E. de. 1661. *Histoire de la grande Isle de Madagascar, ... avec une relation de ce qui s'est passé ès années 1655, 1656 et 1657 ...* 471 pp. Paris.
- Juan, G. & Ulloa, Antoine de. 1752. *Voyage historique de l'Amérique meridionale ... fait par ordre du Roi d'Espagne*, vol. 1. Amsterdam & Leipzig.
- Mohr, E. 1961. *Schuppentiere*. 99 pp. Siemsen, Wittenberg.
- Pocock, R.I. 1924. The external characters of the pangolins (Manidae). *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1924(3): 707–723.
- Steller, G.W. 1751. De bestiis marinis. *Novi Commentarii Academiae Scientiarum Imperialis Petropolitanae*, 2: 289–398.