GOBIUS ORCA COLLETT, 1874 (PISCES): PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SET ASIDE A FIRST REVISER SELECTION Z.N.(S.) 1655

By P. J. Miller (Zoology Dept., The University, Glasgow W.2, Scotland)

1. In the present application, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested to use its plenary powers to set aside a long overlooked "first reviser" selection of a specific name for a monotypic gobiid genus. The species in question is a small, infrequently encountered inhabitant of offshore waters in the Eastern Atlantic boreal region, and was originally named twice in the same publication. Both specific names have been in use until recently, under the impression that they have referred to separate taxa. The name having page precedence in the original publication was employed by the present author in a modern revision which gives, for the first time, supporting evidence that the two names are synonymous. A much earlier worker, however, fulfilling the requirements of a "first reviser" as laid down in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (1961) (Article 24), reached a similar conclusion but chose as senior synonym the second specific name proposed in the original paper. According to Article 24(a) of the Code, "if more than one name for a single taxon . . . [is] published simultaneously . . . relative priority is determined by the action of the first reviser", the rule of page precedence in determining priority, adopted at the Paris Session of the International Commission in July 1948 (Bull. Zool. Nomencl. 4: 330-331; 1950), having been annulled among the Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature (1953, Pt. 2, Sect. 2, Art. 28, pp. 66-67). In the present case, what technically qualifies as the first revision of the two nominal species was long neglected and not adopted by subsequent workers, and the extensive modern treatment of the taxon has appeared under the species name which has page priority but which was not selected in the first revision. making the present application, it is felt that stability in nomenclature of this notoriously difficult group of bony fishes would be best served by setting aside the nomenclatural result of the hitherto forgotten first revision, and adding to the Official List the specific name currently in use. Full details of the nomenclature of the two nominal species involved are provided in the following paragraphs.

2. In 1874, Robert Collett published a short article which comprised descriptions of two new, supposedly distinct species of European gobiid fishes, named respectively *Gobius orca* (p. 446) and *Gobius scorpioides* (p. 447). Collett (1875) later provided more detailed accounts and also figures of these two nominal species (*G. orca*, pp. 172–175, Pl. III, figs. 1–3; *G. scorpioides*, pp. 175–179, Pl. III, figs. 4–6). The type specimens of both nominal species are in the collections of the Zoologisk Museum, Universitetet i Oslo, Norway: they consist of the holotype of *G. orca* (No. J3999), a male from Espevaer, Hardangerfjord, Norway, dredged in 145–180 m. during July 1873, and two syntypes of *Gobius scorpioides* (Nos. J4020, J4021), both females, from Hvittingsô, Stavangerfjord, Norway, and Lyngholmen, Hardangerfjord, dredged in 37 and 110 m. during July 1872 and August 1873 respectively. Further details of these specimens are given by Miller (1963, p. 218, Table VI).

3. Winther (1877), after examination of an additional specimen (Universitetets Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen, No. 91), which he referred to Gobius scorpioides, proposed that the two species should be removed from the genus Gobius L. into a new genus, which was termed Lebetus, thus (p. 49):

"Lebetus n. gen.

Den anden af de for vor Fauna nye Arter, Gobius scorpioides Collett, opstilles her som Repraesentant for en ny Slaegt. Udsondringen af denne Art tilligemed den naerstaaende Gob. orca (Collett) fra Gobius Cuv. er motiveret ved den Eiendommelighed, at begge disse Arter mangle det Hovedsaerkjende, de tragtformet sammenvoxede Bugfinner, hvorved Slaegten Gobius fra Cuviers Tid har vaeret skarpt skilt fra de naermest staaende Slaegter." etc.

An English translation of the above by the late Dr. A. Bruun is given by Whitley (1931, p. 156). Whether or not Gobius scorpioides may be regarded as the type-species of Lebetus by original designation is perhaps debatable under Article 67(c) (i) of the Code. If this is not the case, then the first valid designation of a type-species for the genus (satisfying Article 69(a) (iii)) is that by Jordan (1919, p. 392), who regarded G. scorpioides Collett as the "orthotype" (i.e. type by original designation [Frizzell, 1933, p. 659]) of Lebetus Winther 1877. As well as including Lebetus, Jordan (1920, p. 487) also lists the nominal genus "Lebistes Smitt 1899: 543" with the orthotype given as "L. scorpioides Smitt." As noted by Koumans (1931, p. 148, 162), this is clearly an erroneous reference to Lebetus, which was recognised by Smitt (1900, p. 554) as a subgenus of Gobius containing a single species, G. scorpioides Collett. The generic name Lebistes is, of course, preoccupied by Lebistes Filippi (1862, p. 69) among the cyprinodont teleosts, and, to replace this name within the Gobiidae, Whitley (1930, p. 123) proposed Butigobius (type-species "Lebistes scorpioides Smitt" by original designation). Later, Whitley (1931) reviewed the nomenclatural situation consequent upon his inability to consult Smitt's work before proposing Butigobius, and stated that the latter was to be regarded as a junior synonym of Lebetus Winther, of which Gobius scorpioides Collett was cited as the type-species by "virtual haplotypy". Since Winther (1877) clearly included the two species G. orca and G. scorpioides when founding Lebetus, it would seem that this statement by Whitley and his choice of type terminology (see Frizzell, 1933, p. 650) implies acceptance of Smitt's conclusion, discussed in the next paragraph, that the two nominal species of Lebetus are synonymous. Although quoted in full by Whitley, it was not commented upon by him.

4. In his "Preliminary notes on the arrangement of the genus Gobius, with an enumeration of its European species", Smitt (1900) included Lebetus Winther as a subgenus of Gobius, thus (p. 554): " $\beta\beta$: Cheek longer than the postorbital part of the head.—LEBETUS, WINTHER.—Gobius scorpioides

COLL. ($\delta = Gob. orca, COLL.$)."

In thus defining the relationship between Collett's two nominal species, Smitt cited both synonyms involved, indicated that they apply to the same species, chose Gobius scorpioides as the name of this taxon, and therefore, qualifies as "first reviser" of the two species, according to Article 24(a) (i). This revision,

which contains no evidence for the union of the two species, was overlooked or ignored in subsequent important references to this complex (e.g. Collett, 1902; Holt & Byrne, 1903; Grieg, 1913; Fage, 1918; Petersen, 1919; Duncker, 1928; De Buen, 1930 a, b, 1931; Koumans, 1931; Ehrenbaum, 1936; Tåning, 1940, etc.*) until noted by Miller (1961, p. 676). When published in 1900, there was no reason for selection of the name scorpioides in preference to orca on the grounds of appropriateness or of much greater frequency of usage, since, up to that date, the binomen Gobius scorpioides had appeared in eight publications, Lebetus scorpioides in three, Gobius orca in seven, and Lebetus orca in two (Miller, 1963, pp. 216–217).

- 5. Recently, the present author (Miller, 1961; 1963) has confirmed that Gobius orca and G. scorpioides are based on sexual dimorphism within a single species, with supporting evidence for this conclusion drawn from a study of coloration, meristic characters, body proportions, and distribution. Acting on the order in which these specific names were first published (see para. 1), orca was selected as the senior synonym and employed for the species in the binomen Lebetus orca (Collett 1874), Gobius scorpioides Collett 1874 being regarded as a junior subjective synonym (Miller, 1961, p. 676). Under the former name, a redescription of the species was provided, including, for the first time, details of the modified lateral-line system and the skeleton which have contributed towards a better understanding of systematic position, as well as an account of geographical and ecological distribution, diet, reproduction, and sexual dimorphism (Miller, 1963).
- 6. Accordingly, in the interest of stability in nomenclature, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is herein asked:—

(1) to use its plenary powers:

(a) to set aside the selection made by Smitt (1900), as first reviser, of scorpioides Collet 1874 in preference to orca Collett 1874, both names in the binomina Gobius scorpioides and Gobius orca having been published in the same work and on the same date, and being currently regarded as applicable to the same taxon, and, having done so.

(b) to grant precedence to the specific name orca Collett 1874, as published in the binomen Gobius orca, over scorpioides Collett 1874, as published in the binomen Gobius scorpioides.

- (2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, the specific name orca Collett 1874, as published in the binomen Gobius orca, to take precedence over the specific name scorpioides Collett 1874, as published in the binomen Gobius scorpioides, by the Ruling given under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above.
- 7. I am indebted to Dr. R. M. Bailey, Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, U.S.A., and to Mr. D. Heppell, Zoology Department, Glasgow University, for advice on nomenclatural rulings and procedure. By this help, neither is necessarily committed to supporting this application.

^{*} given in full by Miller (1963, pp. 249-253).

REFERENCES

COLLETT, R. 1874. On two apparently new species of Gobius from Norway. Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. (4) 13: 446-447

1875. Bidrag til Kundskaben om Norges Gobier. Förh. Vid. Selsk. Christiania 1874: 151-179

FILIPPI, F. 1862. Note zoologiche. Arch. Zool. Anat. Fisiol. 1: 52-76

FRIZZELL, D. L. 1933. Terminology of types. Amer. Midl. Nat. 14: 637-668 INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE. 1950. The official record of proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at their session held in Paris in July 1948. Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4: 1-760

1953. Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature. 135 pp. London 1961. International Code of Zoological Nomenclature Adopted by the XV International Congress of Zoology. 176 pp. London

JORDAN, D. S. 1919. The Genera of Fishes. Part III, 285-410 pp. Stanford 1920. The Genera of Fishes. Part IV, 412-576 pp. Stanford

KOUMANS, F. P. 1931. A Preliminary Revision of the Genera of the Gobioid Fishes with United Ventral Fins. 174 pp. Lisse

MILLER, P. J. 1961. The species of the teleostean genus Lebetus. Nature, London. 192:675-676

1963. Taxonomy and biology of the genus Lebetus (Teleostei-Gobioidea). Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), Zool. 10: 205-256

SMITT, F. A. 1900. Preliminary notes on the arrangement of the genus Gobius, with an enumeration of its european species. Öfv. K.svensk. Vetensk.- Akad. Förh. 1899: 543-555

WHITLEY, G. P. 1930. Additions to the check-list of the fishes of New South Wales (No. 3). Austr. Zool., Sydney 6: 117-123

—— 1931. Studies in ichthyology, No. 5. Rec. Austr. Mus., Sydney 18: 138-160 WINTHER, G. 1877. Om de danske fiske af slaegten Gobius. Naturh. Tidsskr. Kjöbenhavn (3) 11:41-56



Miller, Peter James. 1964. "Gobius orca Collett, 1874 (Pisces): proposed use of the plenary powers to set aside a first reviser selection." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 21, 388–391. https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.28522.

View This Item Online: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44463

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.28522

Permalink: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/28522

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.