

(3) Vladimir E. Sokolov

Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

The application by Anthea Gentry is aimed at stopping the long debate about the status of 11 mammal generic names and at eliminating uncertainty in their usage.

The formation of the names *Philander* (Marsupialia), *Pteropus* (Chiroptera), *Glis*, *Cuniculus* and *Hydrochoerus* (Rodentia), *Meles*, *Lutra* and *Hyaena* (Carnivora), *Tapirus* (Perissodactyla), *Tragulus* and *Giraffa* (Artiodactyla), first introduced by Brisson (1762), is not perfect for formal requirements, nor indeed is the whole *Regnum Animale*. This is why the view of the authors of two recently published reference works (Honacki, Kinman & Koeppl, 1982; Wilson & Reeder, 1993), who rejected Brisson's names, should be respected. I see, however, at least two arguments against the rejection of Brisson's names.

The first is stability of nomenclature, one of the important principles of the Code and accepted by the international zoological community. The 11 generic names for mammals have been in established and very wide usage for more than two centuries, attributed to Brisson. The names are used in numerous manuals and reference books in many countries, including the former Soviet Union. Since some of the genera include fossil species, the names are also widely used in palaeotheriology. It would not be an exaggeration to say that most of these names are familiar to every student of biology and natural history in our country.

The rejection of Brisson's (1762) generic names would in some cases require substitution by other names which, in some instances, would lead to great confusion, as in the case of *Cuniculus*, which would have to be called *Agouti*. In these cases the new names would be unfamiliar to most zoologists. Some names would have to change authorship and date.

To overcome the relatively small and well-known formal problem, American workers (cited above) suggested a way that would create many more problems, with various undesirable consequences. Thus, the second reason to oppose the rejection of Brisson's names is common sense. The solution proposed in the application is based on common sense. In this we are invited to fix the accepted usage of the 11 generic names by their conservation, and at the same time to eliminate future confusion and controversy by rejecting Brisson's work for nomenclatural purposes as being incompletely binominal.

To conclude, I strongly support the reasonable initiative to conserve the 11 mammal generic names, to reject the work by Brisson (1762) for nomenclature purposes, and to make all the concomitant decisions, and I ask the Commission to solve this case positively by applying the fundamentals of stability, common sense and wisdom.

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domestic animals

(Case 3010; see BZN 53: 28–37, 125, 192–200)

(1) Elizabeth A. Voigt

McGregor Museum, 2 Egerton Road, P.O. Box 316, Kimberley 8300, South Africa

As a researcher concerned with the origins of domestic animals in southern Africa, I fully support the proposal of Juliet Clutton-Brock and her colleagues that there should be a clear distinction in the nomenclature between the domestic and wild forms of the relevant species, as laid out in the application. This is particularly important in southern Africa as the wild progenitors of domestic forms never occurred here. Unless there is uniform usage of specific names so as to identify domestic forms there will be considerable confusion in the literature with regard to domestic animals in southern Africa.

(2) A.V. Abramov

Department of Mammalogy, Zoological Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg 199034, Russia

I agree with the proposal (BZN 53: 28–37) put forward by Gentry, Clutton-Brock & Groves to conserve the usage of separate specific names for wild and domestic mammals.

In their application the authors have incorrectly cited the source of the original description of the wild Bactrian camel, *Camelus ferus*, and have attributed it to Przewalski (1883). As colleagues and I (Abramov, Baryshnikov & Tikhonov, 1992, pp. 10–11) have already noted, this species was described by Przewalski (1878, pp. 20, 43) as *Camelus bactrianus ferus* in an earlier work.

Falk (1786, p. 292) described *Camelus dromedarius ferus* from East Kazakhstan, West China, Mongolia and South Siberia. Whether his description refers to wild or feral specimens, and to the Arabian or Bactrian camel, is not fully clear, but his name is available and is a senior homonym of *Camelus ferus* Przewalski, 1878. Falk's name has not been in use for a long time and should be suppressed in order to conserve Przewalski's (1878) name, as earlier proposed (Heptner, 1966; Abramov et al., 1992).

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

- (1) to use its plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy the name *ferus* Falk, 1786, as published in the trinomen *Camelus dromedarius ferus*, and all uses of the name *Camelus ferus* prior to the publication of *Camelus ferus* Przewalski, 1878;
- (2) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology the name *ferus* Falk, 1786, as published in the trinomen *Camelus dromedarius ferus*.

Additional references

- Abramov, A.V., Baryshnikov, G.F. & Tikhonov, A.N. 1992. *The catalogue of type specimens in the collection of the Zoological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Mammalia*, part 3. 28 pp. St Petersburg. [In Russian].
- Falk, J.P. 1786. *Beiträge zur topographischen Kenntnis des Russischen Reiches*, vol. 3. 584 pp. St Petersburg.
- Heptner, V.G. 1966. On the distribution of the wild camel (*Camelus ferus* Przew., 1883) on the territory of USSR. *Zoologicheskii Zhurnal*, **45**: 109–118. [In Russian].
- Przewalski, N.M. 1878. *From Kul'dzha through Tyan'-Shan' to Lob-Nor*. 63 pp. St Petersburg. [In Russian].

(3) Henry Gee

23 Northcroft Road, Ealing, London W13 9SR, U.K.

I support fully the proposal to conserve the usage of the 15 mammal specific names which were based on wild species.

My studies on British Pleistocene bovines made it clear to me that *Bos primigenius* Bojanus, 1827 is as different from *Bos taurus* Linnaeus, 1758 in its morphology as it is from any other bovid. Therefore to include *primigenius* in *taurus* after their separation seems to me both illogical and unnecessary.

To argue in opposition that *B. primigenius* and *B. taurus* might have been interfertile is pointless as *B. primigenius* is now extinct and this cannot be tested; we do know that *B. taurus* can hybridize with members of other genera such as *Bison*. One might as well turn the argument on its head by suggesting (with at least equal justification) that *taurus* should be subsumed within *primigenius*, but this would — I think wrongly — ignore the well-known differences between wild and domestic forms.

I think that the authors of the application are correct in not discussing the nomenclature of domestic animals in this proposal. This would only confuse an already complicated issue, which is probably best tackled piece by piece.

(4) Alan W. Gentry

Department of Palaeontology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road,
London SW7 5BD, U.K.

I wish to express support for the proposed conservation of usage of 15 mammal names based on wild species.

The inconsistency in the nomenclature of species from which domestic forms have been derived has led to ambiguity in academic studies and administrative difficulties in wildlife legislation and customs documentation. It is deeply undesirable to allow a situation to continue in which workers are confused by the use of names. A substantial improvement of the situation will ensue, if this application is approved, in that the usage of 15 widely used scientific names will be conserved.

Success of this application will also produce, as far as any outside change can, better conditions in which nomenclature for domestic animals can be systematized.



Voigt, Elizabeth A. et al. 1996. "On the proposed conservation of usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domestic animals." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 53, 286–288. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.14179>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44548>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.14179>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/14179>

Holding Institution

Natural History Museum Library, London

Sponsored by

Natural History Museum Library, London

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.