ON THE PROPER GENERIC NAME OF THE TUNNY AND ALBICORE.

BY THEODORE GILL.

In 1817, in the first edition of the Régne Animal, Cuvier proposed two subgenera of Scomber, which he employed, however, in a generic sense; one, Thynnus, was based upon the common Tunny (with which were associated other and smaller species), having moderate pectoral fins; and the other, Orcynus, was based upon the Alalonga of the Mediterranean, and characterized by the long pectoral fins. Subsequently, by many ichthyologists, these two genera were combined into one, under the name Thynnus. In 1861 the present writer replaced the name Thynnus by the term Orycnus, which was substituted, inasmuch as Thynnus was used for a genus of hymenopterous insects by Fabricius in 1775. This name Orycnus was simply due to a misreading of the name Orcynus, and was subsequently replaced by Orcynus in its correct form. Nevertheless, in 1863, Dr. J. G. Cooper, in the "Proceedings of the California Academy of Natural Sciences" (vol. 3, p. 77), proposed to revert to the old groups of Cuvier in the following terms, describing a supposed new species, related to the Alalonga of the Mediterranean, which he called Orcynus pacificus:

"This species is one of several confounded by sailors under the Spanish names of Albicore and Bonito. The English name Tunny is applied to an allied species on the coast of Europe, the *Thynnus vulgaris*, Cuv., and to its near representative, the *T. secundi-dorsalis*, Storer, of the eastern American coast. These, however, are evidently of a different genus, and as *Thynnus* is pre-occupied in insects, the name *Orycnus*, applied by Gill to the same type, may perhaps be retained, although *founded on a mistake*."

Without reference to the reality of what was so evident to Dr. Cooper, we need only recall that here the name *Orycnus* was specifically proposed to be retained, at the same time that *Orcynus* was used for a related genus.

In 1888, Professor Jordan, in the "Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia" (reprinted in the "Annals and Magazine of Natural History" for 1888), apparently overlooking this specific application of the name Orycnus by Cooper, proposed the new name Albicora for the same genus, inasmuch as Orcynus had been used in 1815 for a genus of Carangids by Rafinesque, while Thynnus of Cuvier, as is well known, had been pre-occupied for a genus of hymenopterous insects.

The present author would have been glad if the name Orycnus could have fallen into "innocuous disnetude" but inasmuch as it had been

specifically and with malice prepense resurrected and proposed for retention by Cooper, it must surely be retained for the genus comprising the Tunny and Albicore. It belongs to a category of which there are many illustrations, being an anagram of another name, and numerous such have been proposed deliberately and generally adopted, such as Panulirus and Linuparus, anagrams of Palinurus, and various others.

If it is represented that the word Oryenus is merely due to a slip of the pen or typographical error, and therefore should not be retained, we can, in reply, refer for an analogous retention of an incorrect form to no less an authority than Professor Jordan. In the fifth edition of his excellent work, "A Manual of the Vertebrate Animals of the Northern United States," published a couple of months ago (1888, p. 92), we find the word Athlennes, which was originally proposed in 1886 as a designation for the Belone hians of Cuvier and Valenciennes. As we suspected at the time of publication, this name is really derived from an ancient Greek synonym of the common Belone belone of Europe, "αβλεννης, without mucosity."

Nevertheless, in a foot-note to the Manual we are informed that "this name was inadvertently printed 'Athlennes,' and may remain so; 'Ablennes' was intended." Surely, then, in strict analogy with such usage, the name Orycnus can be retained as the generic designation of the Tunny.



Gill, Theodore. 1889. "On the proper generic name of the tunny and albicore." *Proceedings of the United States National Museum* 11(716), 319–320. https://doi.org/10.5479/si.00963801.11-716.319.

View This Item Online: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/32566

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5479/si.00963801.11-716.319

Permalink: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/40657

Holding Institution

Smithsonian Libraries and Archives

Sponsored by

Smithsonian

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: NOT_IN_COPYRIGHT

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.