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REJECTION, AS NOT BEING OF SUBGENERIC STATUS, OF THE INTERMEDIATE TERMS USED BY HÜBNER (J.) BETWEEN THE GENERIC AND SPECIFIC NAMES OF SPECIES IN THE FIRST VOLUME OF THE WORK ENTITLED "SAMMLUNG EXOTISCHER SCHMETTERLINGE" PUBLISHED IN THE PERIOD 1806—1823 AND ALSO IN THE WORK ENTITLED "SYSTEMATISCH-ALPHABETISCHES VERZEICHNIS ALLER BISHER BEI DEN FÜRBILDUNGEN ZUR SAMMLUNG EUROPAISCHER SCHMETTERLINGE ANGEGEBENEN GATTUNGSBENNUNGEN" PUBLISHED IN 1822

RULING :—(1) Where, in the first volume of the work entitled Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge published in the period 1806—1823 Hübner (J.) cited a species under a name having an apparently trinominal form (e.g. the name Princeps dominans capys), the generic name (Princeps) and the specific name (capys) are to be accepted as satisfying the provisions of Article 25 and therefore as being available names, but the intermediate term (dominans) is not to be treated as having acquired the status of a subgeneric name in virtue of having been so published.

(2) The Ruling given in (1) above applies also to terms placed between generic names and specific names—thus forming apparent trinominals used by Hübner (J.) in the work entitled Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss aller bisher bei den Fürbildungen zur Sammlung europäischer Schmetterlinge angegebenen Gattungsbennungen published in the year 1822.

(3) The works specified in (1) and (2), including, in the former case all three volumes of the Sammlung, are
hereby placed on the Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature as Works Nos. 7 and 8 respectively, the Rulings given above to be incorporated in the entries to be made in that List.

I.—THE STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On 18th March 1946 Senhor José Oiticica Filho (Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil) submitted the following application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature asking for a Ruling on the status to be accorded to each of the three terms employed collectively to form the scientific names of species by Jacob Hübner (a) in volume 1 of his Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge published in the period 1806—1823, and (b) in the work entitled Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss aller bisher bei den Firbildungen zur Sammlung europäischer Schmetterlinge angegebenen Gattungsbezeichnungen (commonly known as the "Syst.-alph. Verz.") published in the year 1822:

(a) Letter from Senhor José Oiticica Filho dated 18th March 1946

I write to call your attention to the paper which I have written with d’Almeida about trinominal combinations by Hübner.

I am very sorry that we do not agree with your opinion in this case, but, as you know well, it is necessary to discuss these cases in order to bring matters to their proper place.

(b) Enclosure to Senhor Oiticica Filho’s letter of 18th March 1946

(Note: —With the exception of the "Addendum" (which was communicated in typescript under cover of Senhor Oiticica Filho’s letter of 18th March 1946), the following paper had been published prior to its submission to the International Commission, in Volume 4 (No. 3) of the serial publication "Revista Agronomia" on 12th January 1946.)
An opinion, placed before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, on the status of trinominal combinations by Hübner

By R. FERREIRA d'ALMEIDA
(Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro)

and

JOSÉ OITICICA FILHO
(Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro)

We publish the present note on Hübner’s trinominal combinations for the consideration of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

(1) Hemming (1934—1937) endeavoured to revalidate the so-called generic names appearing in the trinominal works of Hübner, namely: Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge (vol. 1, cl806—1819) and Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss, (etc.), (1822).

(2) Apparently with the object of justifying the revalidation of such names as of generic standing, Hemming (1937: 13—19) wrote a chapter with the title “Hübner’s views on the classification of the Lepidoptera”. In this chapter Hemming explained and interpreted in his own way Hübner’s various classifications and arrived at the following conclusion (see table on page 19): in a name, for example, Nereis fulva Polynnia Hübner, 1806, pl. 7, the name Nereis represents the genus, fulva the sub-genus, and Polynnia the species. This opinion of Hemming’s, if accepted, would introduce enormous confusion in the nomenclature of Lepidoptera. As we shall see:

(3) A name such as Nereis fulva Polynnia can, under the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature, be interpreted only in one or other of the two following ways:

(a) as interpreted by Hemming (1937), (see paragraph 2) that is, Nereis genus, fulva sub-genus and Polynnia species.

(b) or Nereis genus, fulva species and Polynnia sub-species.

(4) Hübner’s names, interpreted in the sense of (a) (fulva as sub-genus), would oblige us to accord to the name fulva and many others a status, from a nomenclatural point of view, of the same value as that of a genus. It is Article 6 of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature that so states. We are unaware, however, that any author, at any time, has so acted, not even Hemming himself. The facts speak for themselves, thus making Hemming’s interpretations untenable.
(5) The names as interpreted in the sense of (b) in paragraph (3), would cause analogous nomenclatural confusion. There has not been in the past, nor is there now, any author who has considered fulva a species and Polymnia a sub-species, not even Hübner himself.

(6) All students of the Order Lepidoptera know perfectly well that all the old-time authors and even also modern authors have always rejected the so-called generic names of Hübner’s trinomial works. It is true that names such as Manduca and many others were in fact used, but always in reference to Hübner’s Tentamen, a binomial work accepted by the older authors. As an example of the rejection by modern authors of Hübner’s trinomial combinations we have: Rothschild and Jordan (1903: 52) who cited Manduca obscura; Stichel (1938: 66) who wrote “Dryas phalerata, Jac. Huebner, Samml. exot. Schmett. 1, 1, 43 (especiei nom. ternar. quod, vanum)” and who immediately afterwards criticised the Hemming name “Dryas, Gen. Nam Holarct. Butterfl., p. 56 (type Pap. julia F.) constitut. vana, vide antea”. D’Almeida (1942: 190) and (1943: 92) considered that Hübner’s trinomial designations should not be accepted and criticised Hemming for trying to prove that such names are binominals.

(7) On the other hand, the specific names proposed for the first time in the works referred to above have been, and are, accepted by all authors. We are in agreement with this conclusion, for there would be still greater confusion than uniformity if we were to reject in toto the works by Hübner referred to above, applying to this case, in all its severity, provisions of Article 2 of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature. Precedents exist, however, where specific names published in works which are clearly non-binominal, for example, those of Linnaeus (see Opinion 124), those of Cramer and Stoll (1775—1791), and those of Fabricius (1775, 1781, 1787, 1793, 1798) and others, have been considered as valid in nomenclature by all entomologists, both old-time and modern.

(8) Hemming (who strenuously endeavoured to validate Hübner’s trinomial names) in 1934 (: 35—40) had advanced a series of arguments to the end of invalidating Retzius’ work (1783) which contains trinomial combinations as good as, or even better than, Hübner’s. It is interesting to compare the arguments propounded by Hemming (1934 : 37) to invalidate the work by Retzius referred to above, with those we present above.

(9) In these circumstances, we propose that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should take steps for the promulgation of an Opinion to the following effect:

The combinations used by Hübner in his Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge (vol. 1, 1806—1819) and in the Systematisch-
alphabetisches Verzeichniss etc. (1822), for example Princeps dominans Capys, are not to be accepted as trinominals in the sense of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature, that is, as representing a genus, species and sub-species. Only the specific names (capys for example) are to be accepted in the works referred to above, for greater confusion than uniformity would result from the rejection of those names.

The other names in the combination (Princeps dominans for example) have no status in nomenclature. Thus, the names Princeps, dominans, etc., can be employed, if used by authors in valid combinations in accordance with the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature.
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Addendum

It is as well to note for the better understanding of our proposal that when we state, for example, “Nereis genus, fulva subgenus and Polynnia species” we are employing an abbreviated language, consistently used. In reality, what we are saying is—Nereis generic name, fulva subgeneric name and Polynnia trivial name of the species. We know perfectly well that the name of the species is the complete binomen. In the same way, when writing “Nereis genus, fulva species and Polynnia subspecies” our intention is clearly to indicate the following meaning: “Nereis generic name, fulva trivial name of the species and Polynnia trivial name of subspecies”. We know perfectly well that the subspecies name is the complete trinomen. When we write “only the specific name” (capys for example), written in accordance with the International Rules, we are perfectly aware that “capys” is the trivial name of the species referred to.

II.—THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CASE

2. Registration of the present application: On the receipt of the present application, the question of the status to be accorded to certain terms published by Jacob Hübner was allotted the Registered Number Z.N.(S.) 218.
3. Supplementary statement submitted by Senhor Oiticica Filho:
On 18th May 1946 Senhor Oiticica Filho forwarded, on behalf of Senhor Ferreira d’Almeida and himself, the following supplementary statement which he asked might be attached to the application already submitted:—

Supplementary Statement submitted by Senhor Oiticica Filho under cover of his letter of 15th May 1946

Addendum 2

We have received a very kind letter (dated 28th April 1946) from Hemming expressing an opinion (for the first time, we think) about Hübner's trinominals. In this letter Hemming says: “The reason that I took the view that I did in the present case is a two-fold one: (1) It seemed to me that this case was governed by the principle previously laid down by the Commission in Opinion 124 in regard to the Linnean subdivisions of genera and (2) that, quite apart from the foregoing consideration, the intermediate words used by Hübner in his trinominals were adjectives and thus ineligible as generic or subgeneric names, since the Règles (Article 8) provide that such names must be nouns (‘mot... employé comme substantif.’).”

In view of this letter we beg permission to discuss this case further as follows:

(1) We have already discussed together the hypothesis of Hübner’s trinominals being the same as those of Linnaeus and in paragraph (7) of our paper we have cited some non-binominal works and called attention to Opinion 124. We are of the opinion that Linnaeus’ trinominals are not the same as Hübner’s and therefore that Opinion 124 cannot be applied to both these cases. Our reasons are the following:

(a) In commenting on the proposal dealt with in Opinion 184 (1944, Opin. Decl. Rend. Int. Com. Zool. Nom. 2:32, point (e)) Hemming wrote: “Where a not-strictly binominal author places an intermediate term between the generic name and the specific trivial name (as Linnaeus did in 1758 in some parts of the 10th edition of the Systema Naturae), no subgeneric status is thereby accorded to the intermediate term so used (Opinion 124).” We beg permission to say that the foregoing opinion by Hemming is a generalisation not contained in Opinion 124. On the contrary, in the discussion of the latter Opinion we read (1936, Smithson misc. Coll. 73 (No. 4):1—2): “After a discussion of the so-called subgenera in Linnaeus, 1758a,

1 Reproduced in paragraph 1 of the present Opinion.
the Secretary was instructed to prepare an *Opinion* to the effect that these are not subgenera, but if any group of specialists finds that because of the literature on said group this *Opinion* will produce greater confusion than uniformity, the Commission is prepared to take up individual cases under arguments which may be submitted. As we see, *Opinion* 124 refers strictly to Linnaeus and is subject to discussion if "any group of specialist" so desires. This *Opinion* is a very great exception in Linnaeus' work, because by Article 26 of the Rules this work "inaugurated the consistent general application of binary nomenclature in Zoology" and therefore it cannot be a "not-strictly binominal" work.

(b) The Linnean trinominals (as we see them; *Opinion* 124 is not clear in this matter) are very well formed in accordance with the International Rules. We see for example (Linnaeus, 1758: 468) "Rapae. 59. P.D." and at the top of page "Papilio Danaus". Each of the two words is single, simple, written with a capital letter and employed as a substantive in the nominative singular, in plain accordance with Article 8 of the Rules and *Opinion* 183. *Danaus* could be a sub-genus. We agree with *Opinion* 124, but not with the discussion in that *Opinion*. We think that the best argument against Linnaeus' subgenera is the great confusion they would introduce in the nomenclature, if accepted as such (at the least in the Order Lepidoptera).

(c) Hübner's trinominals, at first sight, are not formed in the same way as those of Linnaeus. Take, for example: "Nereis fulva Polymnia"; *fulva* is not written with a capital letter and is a classical Latin adjective. But this is not sufficient to invalidate the name *fulva* as the name of a subgenus. The case of a capital initial letter could be defended as of minor importance as at Hübner's time and the fact that *fulva* is a classical Latin adjective could well be defended, as we shall see in paragraph 2 of the present discussion.

(d) What we see in "Nereis fulva Polymnia" is a clear intention on the part of Hübner to write the name of the insect in a different

---

2 Subsequent to the preparation of the above paper, the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, extended to all the works both of Linnaeus and of Fabricius (J.C.) the Ruling given in *Opinion* 124 in relation to the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 266—267). The decision so taken has now been embodied in *Opinion* 279, which is being published simultaneously with the present *Opinion* as Part 11 of the present volume.

3 The foregoing quotation of the English translation of Article 26 of the *Règles* was correct at the time when the above paper was prepared, but at Paris in 1948 the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology amended this Article by substituting the word "binominales" for the word "binaires" at the same time that it made a corresponding amendment in Article 25 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 65).
way from that accepted by Linnaeus, that is: \textit{fulva} with a small letter and employed as an adjective, making part of the insect's name, only to show that his system was not like the Linnean system.

(e) Our reason for seeing things as above is as follows: Linnaeus employed as an adjective, for designating some lower categories, names that were not written as part of the insect's name. Take for example: \textit{Danaifestivi}; the word \textit{festivi} employed as an adjective, was not written as part of the insect's name. But in the Hübnerian nomenclature, we see just the opposite. In \textit{Nereis festiva Thales} for example, taking \textit{festiva} Hübner, by employing it as an adjective, made it part of the insect's name, an action of a type which it is impossible to find in Linnaeus, 1758.

(f) We are not the only ones to see the position as above. Take, for example, Rothschild and Jordan (1903: 52); they wrote "\textit{Manduca obscura}". Stichel (1938: 66) wrote "\textit{Dryas phalerata}". In the facsimile edition of the \textit{Sammlung} by Wytsmann the intermediate word of Hübner's trinominals are written with capital letters and with the same type of letter as the third name; for example: "\textit{Nereis Fulva Polymnia}" instead of "\textit{Nereis fulva Polymnia}" as in the original edition. This shows that the editor of the facsimile did not see any intention on the part of Hübner to treat \textit{fulva} as not being part of the insect's name.

2. Hemming's second argument, namely that the intermediate word in Hübner's trinominals were adjectives and thus ineligible as generic or subgeneric names is open to discussion, as we shall see.

(a) Article 8 of the \textit{Règles} is as follows: "Art. 8. Le nom générique consiste en un mot unique simple ou composé, écrit par une première lettre capitale et employé comme substantif au nominatif singulier. Exemples: Canis, Perca, Ceratodus, Hymenolepis".

When we examine this Article, we find that it provides that a generic name to be eligible under the Code must be employed as (employé comme) a substantive in the nominative singular; but it does not say that a name originally a classical Latin adjective (or other part of speech) is not to be employed as a substantive in the nomenclatorial language of genera, a language not strictly a classical one. And this Rule is a very wise one, because the use of adjectives (or other parts of speech) is a well known philological fact as substantives in all classical and modern languages.

(b) The wording used in the summary of \textit{Opinion} 183 (which interprets only part of Article 8), namely "The provision in Article 8 of the}
International Code that a generic name is to consist of a noun in the nominative singular . . . ”, as also the wording used by Hemming both in his comment published in Opinion 183 (p. 18 and 19) and in the letter that he sent to us, namely that a generic name “ must be a noun ” under Article 8 of the Règles, do not constitute a very precise way of referring to that Article.

When Opinion 183 says “ a generic name is to consist of a noun ” or Hemming says “ a generic name must be a noun ”, the immediate answer is : the generic name must be a noun from its classical origin or when it is employed as such ? But Article 8 leaves no doubt when it says “ Le nom générique consiste en un mot . . . employé comme substantif . . . ” and in point (a) above we have shown why this very wise wording is used.

(c) Let us take, for example, the name fulva (employed by Hübner), originally a classical Latin adjective and also a very good Portuguese one. If this word were to be used as the name of a girl, say as Fulva Miranda, it is very clear that the adjective “ fulva ” would be employed as a substantive, because it is a grammatical rule that proper nouns are substantives (nouns).

In the same way if, by way of example, we were to take the Hübnerian name “ Nereis fulva Polynnia ” and to make the word Fulva the name of a genus, with the combination Fulva polynnia, nobody could reject the name Fulva as being originally a classical Latin adjective or used as such, because we could employ this adjective as a substantive in classical Latin and a fortiori in non-classical Latin such as the nomenclatorial language is.

(d) It is very interesting in this connection to compare recommendation (c) of Article 8 in the Rules. The simple fact that the so-called adjectives Prasina and the past participle Productus are only not recommended (we do not know why), is a clear indication that they can be used as generic names, that is, employed as substantives in the nominative singular. But this recommendation is not a wise one because both Prasina and Productus were also substantives in classical Latin. In connection with Productus, we may cite the following rule of classical Latin grammar: “ Any verb can be the origin of a Latin substantive through the supine and declined in the fourth declination ”.

(e) In the same way in the Hübnerian trinominal “ Mancipium vorax monuste ”, the name vorax is both a very good classical Latin adjective and also a substantive.
(f) On the other hand, we find in the entomological literature some generic names that were classical Latin adjectives. For example, the generic names, in the Order Lepidoptera, *Nymphalis* and *Heliconius* (see Hemming 1934: 54 and 70), were adjectives in classical Latin. But we have no means under the Rules to reject these names as being classical Latin adjectives, because they can be employed as substantives in the nominative singular as non-classical Latin names or as names derived from the classical Latin adjectives and they have been employed as such since their creation by Kluk in 1802.

(g) If Article 8 were not so wise and so clear in its meaning, it would be impossible to justify the use of barbarous names, because it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain to what part of speech these names belonged in their original barbarous use.

(h) We are even permitted to use words which at their origin did not belong to any part of speech, because by recommendation (k) in Article 8, we may take as generic names "words formed by an arbitrary combination of letters". Such words can be used as generic names, if they are employed as substantives in the nominative singular.

(i) We agree with Hemming if, when saying that "the intermediate words used by Hübner were adjectives", he intended to convey the more precise concept:— the intermediate words were employed by Hübner in his trinominals as adjectives. We think that this was Hübner's intention and, in our opinion, this is another proof (see paragraph 1 of the present discussion), that, under the Rules, the Hübnerian trinominals are not acceptable and that we cannot apply to them the same reasoning as that applicable to the Linnean trinominals.

(j) In the foregoing discussion we have used the word "substantive" employed in the original English translation for the French "substantif", as we think that this translation is well within the content of Article 8 of the original French text of the Règles. In effect, if we open Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language, Second Edition—1943—we see on page 2515: "substantive—2—Gram. (a) A noun—(b) A pronoun, verbal noun, or any part of speech used as a noun equivalent (the good die young; the why is not explained)". As we see, a substantive can be a word that was originally a noun, but it can also be any part of speech used as (that is, employed as, "employé comme") a noun equivalent and we have shown in the foregoing discussion that this is the meaning of the word "substantif" in Article 8 of the Règles.

4. Comment by Dr. Charles D. Michener (American Museum of Natural History, New York): On 7th July 1946 the following
I have recently read with interest your paper entitled "An Opinion, Placed Before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the Status of Trinominal Combinations by Hübner".

It seems to me that you may have, to a certain extent, misunderstood Hemming's meaning in his works on Hübner. In item 3 of your paper you say:

3. A name such as *Nereis fulva Polymnia* under the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature can only be interpreted in the two following ways:

(a) as interpreted by Hemming (1937) (see item 2), that is, *Nereis* genus, *fulva* sub-genus and *Polymnia* species.

(b) or then, *Nereis* genus, *fulva* species and *Polymnia* subspecies.

I do not think that Hemming interpreted Hübner's trinominals in either of these ways. On page 14 of Hemming's "Hübner" (1937), he states concerning Volume 1 of the *Sammlung Exotischer Schmetterlinge*, "Each Stirps [genus] was, however, subdivided into groups intermediate between what would now be called the genus and the species". Furthermore, on page 15 he says, "The name of the species is given at the foot of the plate as *Nereis fulva Polymnia*. It is clear that Hübner did not regard the words which he employed to denote the category intermediate between the genus (Stirps) and the species as forming part of the actual name of the insect, for he printed the Latin words employed to denote these terms with a small initial letter, while he printed both the generic and specific names with capital initial letters. Further, he employed some of these terms as subdivisions of more than one genus. For example, he used the word "*festivae*" as a sub-division, both of the *Stirps*, which he called the *Nerëides* and of that which he called the *Diphtherae*.

Concerning Hübner's *Systematisch-Alphabetisches Verzeichniss*, Hemming, in the work referred to (page 566) says, "Thus the name of each species consisted of three Latin words, (a) the generic name,
(b) an intermediate term *more or less* subgeneric in *sense*, and (c) the specific name ‘’. (The italics are mine.)

To me it is clear that Hemming does not consider the middle name in a combination such as *Nereis fulva Polynnia* as subgeneric from the nomenclatorial point of view. From Hemming’s practice in other publications as well as from the above quotations, I believe that he regarded *Nereis* as the genus, *fulva* as a group name of no nomenclatorial significance (comparable to the Linnaean "phalanges"), and *polynnia* as the species. In this interpretation I fully agree. I do not think that it is reasonable to accept only the third (specific) name and exclude both the others from the nomenclature, as you have proposed.

I believe that if the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is to promulgate an opinion on this matter, it should be to the following effect:

In the combination (e.g. *Nereis fulva Polynnia*) used by Hübner in his *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge*, Volume 1, and in his *Systematisch-Alphabetisches Verzeichnis*, the first name (e.g. *Nereis*) is the genus, the last name (e.g. *Polynnia*) is the species, and the middle name (e.g. *fulva*) is a group name of no nomenclatorial value.

5. Comment by Mr. Francis Hemming (London): In view of the fact that the application received in the present case was, in part, a commentary on views previously published by Mr. Francis Hemming, an invitation was addressed to Mr. Hemming to furnish a further statement of his views, should he so desire. This invitation was accepted by Mr. Hemming who on 1st November 1946 submitted the following paper for consideration:

**On the status of the terms comprised in Jacob Hübner’s so-called trinominals**

*By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.*

*London*

As a lepidopterist, I welcome the move made by Senhor José Oiticica Filho to secure from the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature an authoritative ruling as to the status to be accorded to each of the three terms employed collectively to form the names of species in Volume 1 of Jacob Hübner’s *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* published in the period 1806—1823. For I recognise that, until such a Ruling has been given, it cannot be expected that these terms
will be interpreted in a uniform fashion by all specialists. I am glad also
that Senhor Oiticica Filho has asked that the Ruling to be given by the
International Commission should cover not only the names used by
Hübner in the foregoing volume but also the names used by that
author in the work commonly known as the *Syst.-alph. Verz.* published
in 1822, for the problem raised in each work is identical. I am, however,
unable to agree with all the conclusions reached by the applicants as
to the interpretation of these terms or with all the recommendations
which they submit.

2. The attitude which I have taken in the matter of the interpretation
of the so-called trinominals used in the first volume of Hübner's
*Samml. exot. Schmett.* is set out in the section devoted to Hübner's
ideas on the classification of the Lepidoptera included in the intro-
ductive portion of my book on that author's entomological publications
(Hemming, 1947, *Hübner* 1 : 13—19), while my interpretation of the
individual names concerned is set out in detail in the chapter on the
*Samml. exot. Schmett.* in the same work (Hemming, 1947, *ibid.* 1 : 327
—437). It will, however, be convenient if I briefly restate as follows my
point of view in this matter.

3. When in the early thirties I was engaged in the preparation of my
book the *Generic Names of the Holarctic Butterflies,* I had to consider
carefully what treatment should be given to the three terms comprised
in the names given to species figured on the plates in volume 1 of
Hübner's *Samml. exot. Schmett.* Of the three terms comprised in these
names, the third offered, it seemed to me, no difficulty at all, for in a
number of cases the species figured had been previously described by
other authors and the third term used by Hübner corresponded with the
trivial name used by the earlier author for the species in question. Thus,
the legend on plate [22] of volume 1 of the *Sammlung* is "*Limmus
feruginea* [sic] *Chrysippus*" and the species so figured is *Papilio
chrysippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 471). This is no
mere isolated example but represents the practice followed by Hübner,
whenever he figured a species under a name previously bestowed upon
it by an earlier author.

4. Having thus established beyond possibility of argument the
interpretation to be given to the third of the terms used by Hübner
in these trinominal combinations, I turned to consider the status of
the first of the three terms concerned. Here I was immediately struck
by the fact that these terms consisted of noun substantives and the
first letter of each of these words was printed with a capital letter. In
form, therefore, these names complied fully with the requirements
for generic names prescribed by Article 8 of the *Règles.* I had to
note also, however, that few, if any, of these terms had hitherto been
accepted as generic names and that, so far at least as the butterflies
were concerned, none was at that time in current use. This, I realised, might well provide an argument for asking the International Commission in individual cases to suppress a particular name in order to prevent the confusion which might follow its acceptance. But this consideration raised an issue which was entirely separate and one which was quite irrelevant, when considering the status to be accorded to these terms. I accordingly concluded that the first term in each of these trinominals must be regarded as being a generic name.

5. It was the second of the terms used in Hübner’s trinominals which proved the most difficult to interpret. The first point to note was that all these terms were adjectives and that the first letter of the word constituting each of them was printed with a small letter. This seemed to rule out altogether the possibility of regarding these terms as being in the nature of subgeneric names, even if, in dealing with names published as long ago as the first two decades of the last century, it would have been permissible to regard these terms in that light, having regard to the fact that such an interpretation would have been extremely artificial and would have involved imputing to Hübner a view which he could not possibly have held. Another possibility would have been to conclude that in the first volume of the *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* Hübner employed a special nomenclature of his own, instead of the Linnean system. Such a view would, however, have been impossible to reconcile with the consistent use by Hübner of the Linnean system for twenty years prior to the start of the publication of the *Sammlung* and again for twenty years afterwards, and would have been inherently improbable. On balance, it seemed much more probable that the system of nomenclature adopted in the first volume of the *Sammlung* represented an experimental development or the elaboration of the Linnean system which Hübner had attempted in 1806 in his *Tentamen* (since declared by the International Commission in Opinion 97 not to have been “published” within the meaning of Article 25). For many of the first terms used in the trinominals of the *Sammlung* (i.e. the terms accepted by myself as being generic names) were the same as those used in the *Tentamen*, the essential difference between the nomenclature used in these two works being that, whereas in the *Tentamen* the nomenclature used was strictly binominal, in the first volume of the *Sammlung* a third term —consisting of an adjective—was interposed in each name between the generic name and the specific trivial name. It seemed to me therefore—and it still so seems—that the logical view to take was that the system of nomenclature used by Hübner in the first volume of the *Sammlung* was the Linnean system but that in this volume Hübner, like Linnaeus himself on certain occasions, had interpolated between the generic names and the specific trivial names Latin words which were intended to be not names but terms of taxonomic significance only. On this view, a name such as *Linnaeus feruginea* [sic] *Chrysippus* as used by Hübner in the first volume of the *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* (paragraph 3 above) was strictly comparable with the
name *Papilio Danaus Chrysippus*, the form of which in the name in question was originally published by Linnaeus in 1758.

6. Having reached this conclusion, I felt justified in rejecting, as possessing no nomenclatorial significance, the intermediate terms used by Hübner (for example, in the case cited above, the term "*feruginea*"). For already the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had rejected in a similar manner the intermediate terms used by Linnaeus in 1758 between the generic names and the specific trivial names of the species of butterflies which he then described (for example, the term "*Danaus*" as used by Linnaeus in the case cited above). The decision so given in the Commission's *Opinion 124* (1936, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* 73 (No. 8): 1—2) was, it was true, limited to the terms used in this way by Linnaeus in 1758, but it was evident that this was not an intentional restriction but was due to the fact that the applicant in question had raised the problem only in relation to the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*.

7. To sum up, the conclusions which I reached in 1932—1933, when preparing my *Generic Names of the Holarctic Butterflies* were that of the three terms comprised in the names applied to species in the first volume of Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge*, (a) the first term could properly be accepted as a generic name, (b) the second term could not be regarded as possessing any nomenclatorial status (application to this work of Hübner's of the principle laid down in the Commission's *Opinion 124*), and (c) the third term was the specific trivial name applied by Hübner to the species concerned. (I should add at this point that in the application now submitted to the International Commission Senhor Oiticica Filho and Senhor Ferreira d'Almeida have inadvertently attributed to me the view that the middle terms of Hübner's trinominals should be regarded as the names of sub-genera. As explained in paragraphs 5 and 6 above, I never held this view. If I had done so, I should have included all these terms as subgeneric names in my *Generic Names of the Holarctic Butterflies*, instead of deliberately omitting them, as I then did.)

8. On re-examining the available evidence, I see no reason for modifying in any way the conclusions which I formerly reached in this matter. I now think, however, that there is a danger of confusion arising if in the future, as in the past, the *Opinions* of the Commission are used by zoologists as being in the nature of mines from which it is permissible to extract rulings by way of analogy on subjects not dealt with expressly in the *Opinions* in question. I have in mind therefore to suggest to the International Commission at its next Session that it should give consideration to the question of making a pronouncement as to the way in which its *Opinions* are to be interpreted. The solution which I favour is the issue of a pronouncement, preferably one formalised in some binding provision, that the only
meaning to be attached to any given one of the Commission’s *Opinions* is that expressly borne by the words used in the opening so-called ‘Summary’. Whether or not, a general principle of this kind is laid down by the Commission, it is, I think, desirable that the Commission should now render an *Opinion* defining in express form the status to be accorded to the various terms included by Hübner in the trinominal combinations discussed in the present note.

9. While, for the reasons which I have explained, I cannot agree in all respects with the theoretical discussion of this problem by Senhor Oiticica Filho and Senhor Ferreira d’Almeida in the application which they have submitted to the International Commission, I fully share their view that it is desirable that the Commission should reject in some appropriate manner the intermediate terms used by Hübner between what I regard as his generic names and his specific trivial names respectively. I do not consider that there are any grounds on which the first term (i.e. the term which I regard as constituting the generic name) in Hübner’s trinominals could properly be rejected as having no nomenclatorial status under the *Règles*. Nor am I in favour of the suppression *en bloc* of these names by the Commission under its Plenary Powers. For, so far as the butterflies are concerned, the acceptance of these terms leads neither to confusion nor to any significant name-changing, since in a large number of cases these names are junior synonyms (either subjectively or objectively) of older names or are applicable to genera not possessing well established names. I have not studied the generic names applied in the *Sammlung* to genera of Heterocera, and it may be that in this sector there would be grounds for suppressing some of the names in question under the Plenary Powers.

10. As to the form of the decision to be given in this case, my recommendation is that the International Commission should adopt an *Opinion*, supplementary to *Opinion* 124, expressly extending to the intermediate terms (i.e. the adjectives interpolated between generic names and specific trivial names) used by Hübner for the names of species in the first volume of his *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* published in the period 1805—1823 the decision given in the foregoing *Opinion* in relation to the comparable intermediate terms used by Linnaeus in the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*. I recommend further that a similar decision should be given in relation to the intermediate terms used by Hübner in the *Syst.-alph. Verz.* of 1822.

---

4 This question was considered in Paris in 1948 both by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology. It was then decided that in the case of any *Opinion* rendered by the Commission after the foregoing Congress the decision given therein “is to be looked for only in the ‘summary’ of that *Opinion*, that every such ‘summary’ is to be rigidly construed, and that no deductions, other than those expressly specified therein, are to be drawn therefrom” (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 137).
6. Note submitted to the Commission in Paris in 1948: Reference to this case was made in Paper I.C.(48)16 (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 3:115), submitted by the Secretary, to the Commission on 24th July 1948, in which the proposal formulated by Mr. Hemming in his paper of 1st November 1946 was briefly summarised as follows:—

(65) "Opinion" 124 (proposal supplementary to Proposal (61)): Consequential upon the decision already taken to clarify the contents of Opinion 124, it is suggested that it should be made clear that the terms (consisting of adjectives in the nominative singular) inserted between the generic name and the specific trivial name of each species figured in the first volume of Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* are not to be treated as subgeneric names as from the date of publication of that volume.

III.—THE DECISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

7. The present application was considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the Eleventh Meeting of its Paris Session held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July 1948 at 0930 hours. After examining the views expressed (i) in the application submitted by Senhor José Oiticica Filho and Senhor Ferreira d'Almeida, (ii) in the letter on this subject written to the last-named specialist by Dr. Charles D. Michener and (iii) in the paper submitted by Mr. Hemming, the Commission took a decision in the terms set out as follows in the Official Record of its Proceedings at the foregoing meeting (Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 9) (1950, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4:289—290):—

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

(1) that, where in volume 1 of the work *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* or in the *Systematisch-alphabetisches
Verzeichniss Hübner (J.) cited a species under a name having an apparently trinominal form (e.g. the name *Princeps dominans capys*), the generic name (*Princeps*) and the specific trivial name (*capys*) are to be accepted as satisfying the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles* but that the intermediate term (*dominans*) is not to be treated as having acquired the status of a subgeneric name by virtue of having been so published;

(2) to render an *Opinion* supplementary to *Opinion* 124, embodying the decision specified in (1) above.

8. The decision taken in the present case was reported to, and approved by, the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, at its Third Meeting held on Monday, 26th July 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 5 : 91—93).

9. The *Ruling* given in the present *Opinion* was concurred in by the sixteen (16) Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners present at the Paris Session of the International Commission, namely:—

 Beltrán *vice* Cabrera ; Boschma ; Bradley ; di Caporiacco ; Hemming ; Hindle *vice* Jordan ; Jorge *vice* do Amaral ; Kirby *vice* Stoll ; Lemche *vice* Dymond ; Mansour *vice* Hankó ; Metcalf *vice* Peters ; Riley *vice* Calman ; Rode ; Spärck *vice* Mortensen ; van Straelen *vice* Richter ; Usinger *vice* Vokes.

10. The *Ruling* given in the present *Opinion* was dissented from by no Commissioner or Alternate Commissioner present at the Paris Session.
11. At its meeting held at Copenhagen in August 1953, the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology decided to insert a provision in the Règles establishing an "Official List" to be styled the Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature and directing the insertion therein of the title of any work which the International Commission might either validate under its Plenary Powers or declare to be an available work, together with any supplementary decisions which the International Commission might take in regard to any aspect of the work in question (1953, Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl. : 24). Since the foregoing decision applies to past, as well as to future, decisions by the International Commission in cases of this kind, the opportunity presented by the preparation of the present Opinion has been taken to record the insertion in the foregoing Official List of the titles of the two works by Jacob Hübner dealt with in the present Opinion, with particulars of the decisions in regard thereto set out in the Ruling now given, namely (a) the work entitled Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge, three volumes (vol. 1, 1806—[1823]; vol. 2, [1819—1827]; vol. 3 (continuation by Geyer), [1827—1838]); (b) the work entitled Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss aller bisher bei den Förbildungen zur Sammlung europäischer Schmetterlinge angegebenen Gattungsnennungen published in 1822.

12. At the time of the adoption of the Ruling given in the present Opinion, the expression prescribed for the second portion of the binomen which constitutes the scientific name of a species was the expression "trivial name". Under a decision taken by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, the expression "specific name" was substituted for the expression "trivial name" (1953, Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl. : 21). The change in terminology so adopted has been incorporated in the Ruling given in the present Opinion.

13. The prescribed procedures were duly complied with by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in dealing with the present case, and the present Opinion is accordingly hereby rendered in the name of the said International Commission by the under-signed Francis Hemming, Secretary
to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in virtue of all and every the powers conferred upon him in that behalf.

14. The present Opinion shall be known as Opinion Two Hundred and Seventy-Six (276) of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

DONE in London, this Seventeenth day of January, Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-Four.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

FRANCIS HEMMING
Rejection, as not being of subgeneric status, of the Intermediate Terms used
by Hübner (J.) Between the generic and specific names of species in the first
volume of the work entitled Sammlung Exotischer Schmetterunge, published
in the period 1806 – 1823, and Also in the work entitled
Systematisch-Alphabetisches Verzeichniss Aller Bisher Bei Den Fürbildungen
Zur Sammlung Europäischer Schmetterlinge Amgegebenen
Gattungsbennungen published in 1822." Opinions and declarations rendered by
the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 6, 95–118.

View This Item Online: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/107613
Permalink: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/149682

Holding Institution
Smithsonian Libraries

Sponsored by
Biodiversity Heritage Library

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