

OPINION 772

CURIMATA WALBAUM, 1792 (PISCES): REJECTED AS A GENERIC NAME AND PLACED ON THE OFFICIAL INDEX

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers the following specific names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

- (a) *curimata* Walbaum, 1792, as published in the binomen *Salmo curimata*;
- (b) *immaculatus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Salmo immaculatus*.

(2) Under the plenary powers, insofar as is necessary, all designations of type-species for the nominal genus *Curimata* Bosc, 1817, are hereby set aside, and the nominal species *Salmo edentulus* Bloch, 1794, is hereby designated to be the type-species of that genus.

(3) It is hereby Ruled that the name *Curimata*, used by Walbaum, 1792, in the binomen *Salmo (Curimata) Marggravii*, is a specific name and the word *Marggravii* (= *marcgravi*) does not form part of a combination of scientific names.

(4) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *Curimata* Bosc, 1817 (gender: feminine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (2) above, *Salmo edentulus* Bloch, 1794 (Name No. 1709);
- (b) *Prochilodus* Agassiz, 1829 (gender: masculine), type-species, by designation by Eigenmann, 1910, *Prochilodus argenteus* Agassiz, 1829 (Name No. 1710).

(4) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *edentulus* Bloch, 1794, as published in the binomen *Salmo edentulus* (type-species of *Curimata* Bosc, 1817) (Name No. 2136);
- (b) *argenteus* Agassiz, 1829, as published in the binomen *Prochilodus argenteus* (type-species of *Prochilodus* Agassiz, 1829) (Name No. 2137).

(5) The name *Curimata* Walbaum, 1792 (published in the binomen *Salmo (Curimata) Marggravii* as a specific name, but mistakenly considered by some authors to be a generic name) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1793.

(6) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *curimata* Walbaum, 1792, as published in the binomen *Salmo Curimata* (as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above) (Name No. 856);
- (b) *immaculatus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Salmo immaculatus* (as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above) (Name No. 857);

(c) *Marggravii* (= *marcgravi*) [Walbaum, 1792], as published in the combination *Salmo (Curimata) Marggravii* (a cheironym) (Name No. 858).

(7) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) CURIMATINAE Eigenmann & Eigenmann, 1889 (type-genus *Curimata* Bosc, 1817) (Name No. 404);
- (b) PROCHILODINAE Eigenmann, 1910 (type-genus *Prochilodus* Agassiz, 1829) (Name No. 405).

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1590)

The present case was submitted to the office of the Commission by Dr. J. Gery in January 1963. Dr. Gery's application was sent to the printer on 31 January 1963 and was published on 21 October 1963 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 20 : 390-394. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Constitution Art. 12b; *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 21 : 184) and to one specialist serial. A comment giving additional information and, in part, expressing an objection was received from Dr. W. R. Taylor and was published in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 21 : 260.

In answer to Dr. Taylor's criticism, Dr. Gery wrote as follows:

"(a) I am glad that you do not object *a priori* to the rejection of Walbaum: this is the most important question. The basic discussion is indeed not in (1) of my application, but in (2). The question is: apart from purely nomenclatural problems, shall we adopt *Curimata* sens. Marcgrave (Walbaum) or *Curimata* sens. Cuvier. *Curimata* Walbaum is what we now call *Prochilodus*, and what we put into a separate sub-family. Indeed, in the 18th century, the group would have comprised also what we now call Curimatins, as is still the case among the Indians. Then came Cuvier who restricted *Curimata* to the edentulous forms making an error in identification (this is a rough schema on my part). Eigenmann & Eigenmann (1889) and Eigenmann (1910) ratified it, and correctly designated what Cuvier believed to be his *Curimata*.

"In the meantime *Prochilodus* had been already established, again on *Curimata* Walbaum (and, as you already know, a third genus could also be involved, *Hemiodus*, even as early as in Bloch's time).

"This is why, to prevent such a mix-up, I believe that every good reason to invalidate Walbaum must come into action. If this is not done, see what could happen by reference, for example, to Fowler's Peixes do Brazil (written eventually with a cross-card-index): *Prochilodus* Agass. has its type *marggravi* Walbaum, and *Curimata* Walbaum has *edentulus* Bloch as type!

"(b) I do not agree with you concerning the danger of jeopardizing group-names in using *Curimatus* Oken ex Cuvier: there is no danger at all provided that its type was designated. This was done by Eigenmann & Eigenmann 1889 and it is a definitive act, following the rule of the first reviewer. Certainly, one may argue that E. & E. did not cite Oken, but 'Les Curimates' Cuvier. Anyhow, in 1910, Eigenmann clearly cited *Curimatus* Oken with type-designation, and without error in identification of the type-species (I use 'error' in the Rule's sense: in fact, nobody knows if *edentulus* is really *cyprinoides*, but this is

another story, a non-nomenclatural one, involving the study of the complicated Artenkreis *cyprinoides-schomburgki*).

“(c) I believe I have sufficiently demonstrated that *primo*: *Curimata* sens. Walbaum is untenable; *secundo*: *Curimata* sens. Cuvier does not break the continuity of the nomenclature.

“Thus, I agree with you that *Curimata* Bosc ex Cuvier can be chosen instead of *Curimatus* Oken ex Cuvier, if (1) it can be demonstrated that it has indeed priority over Oken; (2) The Commission revalorize this *nomen oblitum*; (3) it is based on the same species as that of Cuvier (Oken), as designated by Eigenmann 1910—this is very probable, on clear indication.

“(d) Finally all subsequent names, of Cloquet and others, are not consistent with the case, if an earlier genus is available, that is with correct type-designation. As it was the case, I did not mention them.”

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 23 August 1965 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (65)28 either for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 20 : 393–394, as amended in the accompanying Secretary's Note. The Note which accompanied Voting Paper (65)28 first set out Dr. Gery's letter in answer to Dr. Taylor (see above) and then continued as follows:

“In summary, *Curimatus* Oken cannot be placed on the Official List, as requested, because it is a *nomen nudum*. It seems best, therefore, to replace this by *Curimata* Bosc. This genus appears never to have been credited to Bosc, or had species referred to it, and it is doubtful whether it has a legal type-species. As a safeguard, however, it is suggested that the Commission should use the plenary powers, insofar as is necessary, to fix *Salmo edentulus* as type of *Curimata* Bosc. The proposals should, then, be amended as follows:

“Add (1) (c) to use the plenary powers, insofar as is necessary, to set aside all designations of type-species for the nominal genus *Curimata* Bosc, 1817, and, having done so, to designate *Salmo edentulus* Bloch, 1794, to be the type-species of that genus.

“Replace (3) (a) as follows:

Curimata Bosc, 1817 (*Nouv. Dict. d'Hist. nat.* (nouv. ed.) 9 : 9)
(gender: feminine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers, *Salmo edentulus* Bloch, 1794.

“Replace in (4) (a) ‘*Curimatus* Oken’ by ‘*Curimata* Bosc.’”

At the close of the prescribed voting period on 23 November 1965 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—twenty-two (22), received in the following order: China, Holthuis, Vokes, Riley, Obruchev, Alvarado, Simpson, Munroe, Lemche, do Amaral, Stoll, Mayr, Boschma, Ride, Sabrosky,* Jaczewski, Forest, Kraus, Binder, Mertens, Evans, Bonnet.

Negative votes—three (3): Tortonese, Uchida, Brinck.

Voting Papers not returned—one (1): Hubbs.

* An affirmative vote in part only (see comment below)

The following comments were made by Commissioners in returning their votes:

Dr. L. B. Holthuis (31.viii.65): "In my opinion *curimata* Walbaum is clearly a specific name and not a subgeneric one.

"The suppression asked for in par. (1) (b) of *immaculatus* Linnaeus, 1766, is evidently an error for *immaculatus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 312), published in the combination *Salmo immaculatus*.

"At first I was worried about the name *Marcgravii* Donndorff, 1798; if that is an available name, it would preoccupy *argenteus* Agassiz, 1829. But my colleague Boeseman showed me that Donndorff copied Walbaum and that his *Marcgravii* is not a specific name either."

Mr. C. W. Sabrosky (18.xi.65): "I have critically studied Walbaum (1792) and agree with the conclusion of Gery that *Curimata* is a specific name.

"I do not approve (1) (b) of the application because I strongly object in principle to Commission action on *nomina dubia*. More important, I wish to call attention to the fact that *Salmo immaculatus* Linné of the 12th edition, for which suppression is required, is not new there but is merely a later use of *Salmo immaculatus* Linné of 1758, 10th edition, p. 312.

"A minor note: The 'emendation' *Marcgravii* appeared first in the same work by Walbaum, on page 660. Perhaps *Marggravii* on p. 80 was only a typographical error."

Dr. Gery's error in attributing the specific name *Salmo immaculatus* to Linnaeus, 1766, instead of to Linnaeus, 1758, has been corrected in the present Ruling.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on the Official Lists and Indexes by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

argenteus, *Prochilodus*, J. L. R. Agassiz, 1829, *Sel. Gen. Spec. Pisc. Brasil.*: 63, pl. 38

Curimata Bosc, 1817, *Nouv. Dict. d'Hist. nat.* (nouv. ed.) 9 : 9

Curimata Walbaum, 1792, *Artedi Genera Piscium*, Ichth. (ed. 2) 3 : 80

curimata, *Salmo*, Walbaum, 1792, *Artedi Genera Piscium*, Ichth. (ed. 2) 3 : 80

CURIMATINAE Eigenmann & Eigenmann, 1889, *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 4 : 409

edentulus, *Salmo*, Bloch, 1794, *Naturgesch. Ausl. Fische* 8 : pl. 380

immaculatus, *Salmo*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 312

marggravii, *Salmo* (*Curimata*), Walbaum, 1792, *Artedi Genera Piscium*, Ichth. (ed. 2) 3 : 80

PROCHILODINAE Eigenmann, 1910, *Rep. Princeton Univ. Exped. Patag.* 3 (4) : 424

Prochilodus Agassiz, 1829, *Sel. Gen. Spec. Pisc. Brasil.*: 62

The following is the original reference for the designation of a type-species for a genus concerned in the present Ruling:

For *Prochilodus* Agassiz, 1829 : Eigenmann, 1910, *Rep. Princeton Univ. Exped. Patag.* 3 (4) : 424

CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (65)28 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 772.

G. OWEN EVANS
Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

W. E. CHINA
Assistant Secretary

London

14 February 1966