SCIAENA LINNAEUS, 1758 (PISCES) : PROPOSED VARIATION UNDER
THE PLENARY POWERS OF THE RULING GIVEN IN OPINION 93
CONCERNING THE TYPE-SPECIES. Z.N.(S.) 850

By E. Trewavas (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

1. In Opinion 93 (1926) "by suspension of its Rules", the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature placed the genus *Sciaena* on the Official List with type "*umbra* L.=*Cheilodipterus aquila* Lacép. as restr. by Cuvier, 1815".*

I hope to show that this has met with no acceptance, since *Sciaena umbra* Linnaeus is neither wholly nor partly equivalent to *Cheilodipterus aquila* Lacépède; further that no advantage in stability is to be gained by following alternative (i) of Article 70a and declaring these names to be equivalent. I propose that instead the Commission should follow alternative (iii) of Art. 70a to fix the type as *Sciaena umbra* L., as nominally designated by Cuvier in 1814, but as restricted by him in 1817.

2. Opinion 93 on *Sciaena* comprises three parts:

(i) A nomenclatorial decision to designate *Sciaena umbra* L. as the type of *Sciaena*.

(ii) A taxonomic decision equating *S. umbra* L. with *Cheilodipterus aquila* Lacépède.

(iii) An ambiguous qualifying clause, "as restr. by Cuvier 1815".* As it reads this means that Lacépède's description was indecisive until Cuvier fixed the name to the species so fully and unmistakably described by himself. But the Commissioners (especially D.S.J.) probably meant that *S. umbra* L. was a complex taxon until Cuvier restricted it to *C. aquila* Lac., and this is in fact the explanation given by Jordan and Evermann (1917: 13 and 128).

3. *The Mediterranean Sciaenidae: taxonomic situation*

Of the five Linnean species of *Sciaena*, the first three are species dubiae and not Sciaenidae as since understood. In 1814 Cuvier restricted the genus to Nos. 4 and 5, the two species which Linnaeus took from Artedi and named *S. umbra* and *S. cirrosa*. The type-species of *Sciaena* must therefore bear one of these names. Three sciaenid species were then known in the Mediterranean and Cuvier believed that the name *umbra* covered two of them and *cirrosa* the third. We shall refer to them by the French names which Cuvier associated with them and by the scientific names adopted for them in Günther's Catalogue.

(i) Le Maigre, *Sciaena aquila* (Lacépède). This is the species which Opinion 93 would make the type of *Sciaena* under the name *S. umbra* L.

(ii) Le Corb (or Corp), *Corvina nigra* (Bloch). This is the true *Sciaena umbra* L. (see para. 6 below).

(iii) L'Ombrine, *Umbrina cirrhosa* (L.). The only one of the three with a cirrus or barbel.

From Cuvier and Valenciennes onwards nearly all authors have agreed

*This should be 1814; see bibliography.

in placing these species in three genera, and this emphasizes the necessity of agreeing on the type-species of *Sciaena*.

4. For further discussion it will be convenient to refer to the summary of the history of the nomenclature of each species in the appendix. I have included only names given to the respective Mediterranean species in the full understanding that they were these species; that is, apart from the interpretation of Linnaeus's names no taxonomic question is involved. The only exception is placed in square brackets, and three pre-1758 references are similarly bracketed.

It will be seen that "le Maigre" was not described or named by Linnaeus (see para. 6 below) and that very few authors have used a Linnaean name for it; that "le Corb" has been named both *umbra* L. and *nigra* Bl., several authors accepting these as synonyms; recent authors lean to *umbra*; that "l'Ombrine" has been named *cirrosa* or *cirrrosa* with great consistency, only Lacépède, followed by Risso (1810), naming it *Perca umbra*, while using *Sciaena umbra* for "le Corb".

Each time that *Sciaena umbra* has been used for le Maigre the usage has broken down under closer study. Thus Cuvier used it in 1814 and 1829, but not in 1817 or 1830. Bonaparte accepted it in his *Iconografia*, but became confused in 1846. Doderlein used it in his *Prodromo* (1878), but in his final system (1889) transferred it to the synonymy of le Corb.

5. *The Sciaena of Artedi, ed. Linnaeus, 1738.*

The *Sciaena* No. 1, "maxilla . . . inferiore cirrosa", is stated to be the "*Sciaena et Umbra auctorum*".

The *Sciaena* No. 2, "pinnis ventralibus nigerrimus", is the species known in Rome as Umbrino.

Careful study of the earlier authors leads me to the conclusion that *Umbra* and probably *Sciaena* were used for l'Ombrine (*Umbrina cirrhosa* of Günther). Salviani's figure of the fish described under the heading "De Umbrina", "G(reek) σκιονα, L(atin) Vmbra, V(ernac.) Ombrine", has a short barbel and must, as well as his "Coracinus", be l'Ombrine. For Rondelet *Coracinus* is le Corb, *Umbra* l'Ombrine, and his *Latus* is almost entirely based on le Maigre, with some confusion with *Lates niloticus*.

Artedi's *Sciaena* No. 1 is therefore entirely l'Ombrine, *Umbrina cirrhosa* of Günther, and his *Sciaena* No. 2 is, by the description, le Corb, *Corvina nigra* of C. & V., while the vernacular name associated with it may apply to this species or to l'Ombrine. [Cf. Rondelet's statement (1554, p. 132) that in Rome and Montpellier they sell "Coracinus pro umbra et umbra pro coracinus"]. Artedi thus ignores le Maigre.

6. *The species of Sciaena of Linnaeus (1758).*

Linnaeus listed five species. The first three have too few fin rays to belong to the Sciaenidae as now understood and have been omitted from most subsequent systems as *species dubiae*. The fourth is *Sciaena umbra* and the diagnosis is that of Artedi's *Sciaena* No. 2 (with "nigerrimus" incorrectly transcribed as "integerrimus"), with a bibliographical reference to the same. There is also a reference to the *Sciaena umbra* of Hasselquist's *Iter Palaestinum* ed. Linnaeus (1757). The latter is unmistakably *Umbrina cirrhosa* of Günther.*

*Walbaum, too, (1792, p. 306 Additamentum) recognised this.

Thus, *Sciaena umbra* Linn. (except the 'synon. Hasselquist' which is *Umbrina cirrhosa*) is Le Corb, *Corvina nigra* of C. & V. and of Günther, and there is in it no admixture of Le Maigre, "*S. aquila*". Linnaeus's fifth species, *Sciaena cirrosa*, is the *Umbrina cirrhosa* of Günther, and this has never been in doubt.

7. Four times has a type been designated for the genus *Sciaena* before the publication of Opinion 93 (as explicit a designation as could be expected at that time):—

(i) Cuvier, 1814, p. 13.

"Je propose aux naturalistes de remettre ensemble ces trois poissons pour en reformer le genre *Sciaena* tel qu'il avoit été établi par Artedi, et pour y joindre les premiers *johnius* de Bloch, lesquels ne diffèrent évidemment en rien de générique, ni du maigre ni du corp.

Le *sciaena cirrhosa* offrira seul assez de caractères pour former un sous-genre dans le genre *sciaena*, a cause de ses dents toutes en fin velours comme celles de la perche, et du tubercule charnu . . ." etc.

"Le genre [i.e. *Sciaena*] ainsi établi, je conserverai au corp, corbeau ou negre, le nom de *sciaena nigra* qui lui a été imposé par Bloch, et je restreindrai au maigre, celui de *sciaena umbra*, qui lui avoit été donné en commun avec le corp, par Linnaeus". Thus the only Linnaean name retained in *Sciaena* by Cuvier, *umbra*, was wrongly restricted by him to a non-Linnaean species (see para. 5 above).

In Le Règne Animal (1817), however, Cuvier proposed the genus *Umbrina* for *S. cirrosa* L. and distinguished two species of *Sciaena* under the headings:—

"Le Corb ou Corbeau (*Sciaena umbra*, L.) *Sc. nigra* Bl. 297 "

and

"Le Fegaro ou Maigre, Aigle, etc. (*Sciaena aquila* nob.) "

We may therefore say that Cuvier designated *S. umbra* L. as the type-species of *Sciaena* in 1814, but misidentified it, correcting this misidentification in 1817. Whatever Cuvier did in 1829 and 1830 need not affect the validity of this type-designation.

(ii) Gill, 1862, pp. 81–82.

"*Sciaena* (Artedi) " "Type *Sciaena aquila* Cuv.", obviously invalid.

(iii) Bleeker, 1863, p. 66. "Je note ici que, l'espèce typique du genre *Sciaena* Art. étant l'*Umbrina cirrhosa* C.V., le nom de *Sciaena* devra être appliqué aux espèces dont Cuvier a fait des *Umbrina*, et ne pourra plus être employé dans le sens de Cuvier. Ni M.-Günther ni M.-Gill, dans leurs travaux sur les Sciénoïdes, paraissent avoir fait attention à ce que le nom générique d'Artedi est mal employé par les auteurs modernes et M.-Gill cite même le *Sciaena aquila* Cuv. comme type du genre."

Elsewhere in the same year (1863a, 142–4) Bleeker repeated this designation and proposed a new name *Pseudosciaena*, for *Sciaena* Cuv. nec Linn.*

*In 1889, Jordan & Eigenmann took *S. aquila* to be the type of *Pseudosciaena*, which they used as a subgenus of *Sciaena*. This type-designation was evidently Bleeker's intention, for, although (1863a, 142) he first used the name to describe a new Chinese species as *Pseudosciaena amblyceps*, he wrote at the end of that description, "Rem. Le nom générique de *Sciaena* étant donné primitivement à l'espèce décrite depuis sous le nom d'*Umbrina cirrhosa*, le genre *Umbrina* Cuv. devra porter le nom de *Sciaena*, tandis que le genre *Sciaena* de M.-Cuvier devra prendre un autre nom, qui pourrait être celui de *Pseudosciaena*. L'espèce actuelle me paraît être nouvelle pour la science".

Thus Bleeker clearly proposed *Pseudosciaena* as a nom. nov. for *Sciaena* Cuv. nec Linn. and the type-species of *Pseudosciaena* must be *Sciaena umbra* Cuv. 1814, nec. Linn. (= *Cheilodipterus aquila* Lac.).

In his "Genera of Fishes" (1919), however, Jordan cited *Ps. amblyceps* as the type of *Pseudosciaena*.

This designation of *S. cirrosa* as the type-species has been accepted by Fowler since 1918 and by Weber and de Beaufort (1936) in works on Indo-Pacific fishes, and Fowler introduced it into Eastern Atlantic usage in 1936.

(iv) Jordan & Eigenmann (1889) analysed the situation very clearly, but at this time omitted any consideration of Cuvier's work of 1814 and dated his first restriction from *Le Règne Animal* (1817). They wrote (p. 420) "*Sciaena* was originally (Artedi, 1738 ; Linnaeus, 1758) founded on the typical species of the two modern genera *Umbrina* and *Corvina*. In 1817, *Umbrina* was set off from this group and *Sciaena* was made to apply to the group later called *Corvina*, a third species (*aquila*) being added to *Sciaena*. Later (1829) *Corvina* was separated by Cuvier. This gave *Umbrina*, *Corvina* and *Sciaena*, the latter name then standing for *aquila*. In 1862*, Bleeker", etc. . . . "In our view but one arrangement of these names is allowable. *Umbrina* must stand, *Sciaena* must take the place of *Corvina*, and the third species (*aquila*) must take a new name—*Pseudosciaena* Bleeker". Thus they declared *Sciaena umbra* (= *Corvina umbra* or *C. nigra*) to be the type of *Sciaena* ; they used *Pseudosciaena* as a subgenus of *Sciaena*.

Jordan & Thompson (1911) reiterated this decision. (At this time they recognized *Argyrosomus* as a senior synonym of *Pseudosciaena*.)

8. The decision of Opinion 93 was evidently intended nevertheless by D. S. Jordan to fix the conception *Sciaena* to le Maigre and to justify this by confirming Cuvier's designation of 1814, the suspension of the Rules being necessary for the arbitrary acceptance of Cuvier's decision (implicitly repudiated in 1817) to equate *S. umbra* L. with le Maigre, later recognized to be *Cheilodipterus aquila* Lacépède.

This synonymy, however, has stuck in the throats of almost all subsequent authors†, including Cuvier himself in the first edition of *Le Règne Animal* (1817) and in the *Hist. Nat. Poissons* (1830). For, as explained in para. 6 above, *S. umbra* L. is a mixture of le Corb and l'Ombrine but has no taint of le Maigre. The many nineteenth century authors who took le Maigre implicitly as the type of *Sciaena* took it under the name *S. aquila* (Lac.).

9. Any misgivings we may have at upsetting nineteenth century nomenclature of these well-known species are in vain, for *aquila* was not the first specific name for le Maigre nor *Pseudosciaena* its first generic name ; *Corvina* Cuv. was preceded by *Coracinus* Pallas, 1814 (valid since *Coracinus* Gronovius is disallowed), as well as by *Sciaena* itself. Moreover, twentieth century authors have been divided between adherents of Bleeker and of Opinion 93.

The first specific name for le Maigre was *regia*, used by Asso (1801) in the combination *Perca regia*. This was first recognized by Lozano y Rey (1952), who placed it in the genus *Johnius* Bloch (following Fowler, 1936). I agree, however, with Lin (1938, p. 170) in considering le Maigre to differ too much from the type-species of *Johnius* to be included in the same genus, and agree with him and an earlier opinion of Fowler (1918, pp. 62–65) in adopting for it *Argyrosomus* de la Pylaie (1836), a name irregularly but validly proposed in the following words (p. 532) :—

" . . . l'*Argyrosomus procerus*, nouveau genre que j'ai formé avec le

**errore pro* 1863.

†Steindachner (1870, p. 698) is an exception.

Sciaena aquila, Cuv., et auquel j'associe une nouvelle espèce l'*Arg. sparoides*, de la Baie de Bourg-Neuf."

This report was a summary of a work which he had in hand, but which was never published in full. The "new species" is a *nomen nudum* but the type of *Argyrosomus* is evidently *Sciaena aquila* of Cuv. although he gives it a new specific name at the same time as a new generic one. This was recognized by Jordan and Thompson (1911), although they included both Maigne and Corb in their conception of *Sciaena*.

10. Summary.

The International Commission is asked to fix the type-species of the genus *Sciaena* L., unsatisfactorily fixed by Opinion 93.

The alternatives are :

- (i) *Sciaena* L., 1758, type *Sciaena umbra* L., 1758, as designated nominally by Cuvier in 1814 (*Mem. Mus. Paris* I : 13), but as identified by Cuvier in 1817 (*Règne, Animal* II : 298).
- (ii) *Sciaena* L., 1758, type *Sciaena cirrosa* L., 1758, as designated by Bleeker in 1863 (*Verh. holland. Maatsch. Wet.*, (2) 18 : 66).

Neither of these alternatives was generally followed in the nineteenth century, but both then and by many twentieth century authors, an untenable practice, originated by Cuvier in 1829 and 1830, was followed, namely the implicit acceptance as type of this Linnean genus of a non-Linnean species, "*Sciaena aquila* (Lacépède)".

Opinion 93 attempted to combine the first part of alternative (i) with this untenable practice by accepting a synonymy based on Cuvier's original misidentification of *S. umbra*. This is one of the modes of use of the plenary powers allowed by Article 70 of the Code, but it has never been accepted for *Sciaena* by any author who has studied the position, either before or after the promulgation of Opinion 93.

Alternative (i) has been explicitly accepted, since the confusion caused by Cuvier, only by Jordan & Eigenmann in their revisionary work of 1889. Writers on the American fauna use *Umbrina* for the congeners of *Sciaena cirrosa* L. ; in so doing they may be implicitly following Jordan & Eigenmann ; at any rate they are rejecting alternative (ii).

Alternative (ii) has been followed since 1918 by writers on the Indo-Pacific fauna.* In 1936 Fowler introduced it into the Eastern Atlantic literature ; following him it has been used in faunal works on the Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean by several authors from 1949 onwards.

In asking the Commission to accept alternative (i) I am keeping as near as seems feasible to Opinion 93 as it concerns *Sciaena*. I realise that there are also arguments for alternative (ii).

11. Corollary.

The names of the three classical sciaenid species of the Mediterranean and Eastern Atlantic can no longer remain as they were in Cuvier & Valenciennes (1830) or in Günther's "Catalogue" (1860), but must be changed as shown in the following table, according to which alternative of para. 10 may be adopted.

*Work in progress shows that some, if not all, the Indo-Pacific species involved are in fact not congeneric with *S. cirrosa* L.

Traditional name	Alternative (i) here advocated	Alternative (ii)
<i>Corvina nigra</i> <i>Umbrina cirrhosa</i> * <i>Sciaena aquila</i>	<i>Sciaena umbra</i> <i>Umbrina cirrosa</i> <i>Argyrosomus regius</i>	<i>Coracinus umbra</i> <i>Sciaena cirrosa</i> <i>Argyrosomus regius</i>

I am aware that the genus *Johnius* Bloch, 1792, has been made by some authors to accommodate one or two of these species, but I do not agree with the taxonomic decision involved.

12. I therefore ask the International Commission to act in accordance with Art. 70a (iii) of the Code and :

- (1) to repeal the Ruling given in Opinion 93 in so far as it concerns the generic name *Sciaena* Linnaeus, 1758 ;
- (2) to Rule that the type-species of *Sciaena* Linnaeus, 1758, is to be accepted as *Sciaena umbra* Linnaeus, 1758, as designated by Cuvier, 1814 (*Mem. Mus. Paris* 1 : 13), and restricted by him in 1817, despite the fact that Cuvier misidentified that species in 1814 ;
- (3) to confirm the addition to the Official List of Generic Names of the generic name *Sciaena* Linnaeus, 1758 (gender : feminine), type-species, by designation by Cuvier, 1814, *Sciaena umbra* Linnaeus, 1758, as restricted by Cuvier, 1817 (Name No. 444) ;
- (4) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology :
 - (a) *Umbrina* Cuvier, 1817 (gender : feminine), type-species, by monotypy, *Sciaena cirrosa* Linnaeus, 1758 ;
 - (b) *Argyrosomus* de la Pylaie, 1835 (gender : masculine), type-species, by original designation, *Argyrosomus procerus* de la Pylaie (nom. nov. for *Cheilodipterus aquila* Lacépède, 1803 = *Perca regia* Asso, 1801) ;
- (5) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology :
 - (a) *umbra* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Sciaena umbra*, as restricted by Cuvier, 1817 (type-species of *Sciaena* Linnaeus, 1758) ;
 - (b) *cirrosa* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Sciaena cirrosa* (type-species of *Umbrina* Cuvier, 1817) ;
 - (c) *regia* Asso, 1801, as published in the binomen *Perca regia*.

*Some authors have corrected Linnaeus's orthography ; others have held to it, as I propose.

APPENDIX (i)

LE MAIGRE

- 1801 *Perca regia* Asso, 42.
 [1802 *Labrus hololepidotus* Lacépède, III, 518, pl. 21, specifically or subspecifically distinct from Le Maigre, although some later authors consider them identical.]
 1803 *Cheilodipterus aquila* Lacépède, V, 685, pl. 21, fig. 3.
 1810 *Perca vanloo* Risso, 298, pl. 9, fig. 30.
 1814 *Sciaena umbra*; Cuvier.
 1817 "*Sciaena aquila* Nob.", Cuvier, II, 298.
 1826 *Sciaena aquila*; Risso, 411.
 1827 "*Sciaena aquila*, Cuv.", Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 314.
 1829 "*Sciaena umbra* Nob.", Cuvier, II, 172, under the heading "Les Maigres ou Sciènes propres (*Sciaena* Nob.)".
 1830 "*Sciaena aquila*, Nob., Chéilodiptère aigle, Lac.", Cuvier in Cuvier and Valenciennes, V, 28.
 1835 *Argyrosomus procerus* de la Pylaie, 532. (Atlantic coast).
 1832-41 *Sciaena umbra* L. "pro parte, imo exclusa diagnosi et synon. Hasselq."; Bonaparte.
 1846 *Sciaena umbra* L. et "? *Sciaena aquila* Cuv. et Val."; Bonaparte, 55.
 1860 *Sciaena aquila* (Lacép.); Günther, 291.
 1861 "*Sciaena umbra* L."; Canestrini, 262 (List only; considered Le Maigre by elimination E.T.).
 1862 "*Sciaena aquila* Cuv."; Gill, 82.
 1863a *Pseudosciaena aquila* (Lac.) (by implication) Bleeker, 142.
 1878 "*Sciaena umbra* Linn."; Doderlein, 38.
 1870 "*Sciaena umbra* (= *Sc. aquila* Risso, Cuv. Val. etc.)", Steindachner, 698.
 1889 *Sciaena aquila* Cuv.; Doderlein, 100 [Synonymy includes "*Sciaena umbra* Cuv. (nec Lin.)"].
 1889 *Sciaena* (*Pseudosciaena*) *aquila*; Jordan & Eigenmann, 405.
 1893 "*Sciaena aquila* Risso (*Sc. umbra* Cuv., Bp., nec L., *Perca Vanloo* Risso, I. N., *Sc. hololepidota* C.V.)"; Carus 1893, 651.
 1893 *Sciaena aquila* (Lac.); Smitt, F. A.
 1919 "*Sciaena aquila* Risso"; Metzelaar, 238.
 1935 *Sciaena aquila* (Lac.); Nobre, 31.
 1936 *Johnius hololepidotus* (Lac.); Fowler.
 1949 *Johnius hololepidotus* (Lac.); Tortonese & Trotti, 81.
 1952 *Johnius regius* (Asso); Lozano y Rey.
 1954 *Sciaena aquila* (Lac.); Poll, 234.
 1954-6 *Johnius regia* (Asso); Albuquerque, 702.
 [1957 *Sciaena aquila* Lacép.; Moal (unpubl. CCTA/CSA)].
 1959 *Pseudosciaena hololepidota*; Collignon, 6.
 1962 *Argyrosomus regium**; Trewavas, 174.

APPENDIX (ii)

LE CORB

- [1738 *Sciaena* No. 2, Artedi ed. Linnaeus.]

*According to Art 30a (i) 3 this should be *regius*.

- 1758 *Sciaena umbra* (Excl. ref. to Hasselquist), Linnaeus, 289.
 1788 *Sciaena umbra* (Excl. ref. to Hasselq.), Linn. ed. Gmelin.
 1788 *Sciaena umbra* L.; Bonnaterre, 119.
 1792 *Sciaena nigra* Bloch, pl. 297, vol. 6, (nec. *S. nigra* Forskål, 1775, 47).
 1801 *Johnius niger* (Bloch); Schneider, 76.
 1802 *Sciaena umbra*; Lacépède, IV, 314.
 1806 *Sciena umbra* L. (sic); Viviani.
 1810 *Sciaena umbra* Lin.; Risso, 295.
 1814 *Sciaena nigra* Bloch; Cuvier, 14.
 1814 *Coracinus chalcis* Pallas, 256.
 1817 "Le Corb ou Corbeau (*Sciaena umbra* L.) *Sc. nigra* Bl. 297"; Cuvier, 298.
 1826 "*S(ciaena) umbra*"; Risso, 410.
 1827 "*Sciaena umbra*, Lin., *Sciaena nigra*, Bl."; I. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire.
 1829 "Le corb noir (*Sciaena nigra* Gm.*) Bl. 297"; Cuvier, 173.
 1830 "*Corvina nigra*, Nob; *Sciaena nigra*, Linn. Gm.*"; Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 86.
 1832-41 "*Corvina nigra*, Bloch nec Gmel."; Bonaparte (first in the synonymy comes: "*Sciaena umbra*, Linn. Syst. Nat. 1, p. 480, sp. 4, pro p. et excl. synon. Hasselq.")
 [? 1847] *Melantha nigra*; Gistel, 109.
 1848 *Excursor nigra*; Gistel, xiii.
 1860 *Corvina nigra* Bl.; Günther, 296.
 1862 "*Corvina nigra* Cuv."; Gill, 85.
 1878 "*Corvina nigra* Cuv."; Doderlein, 38.
 1881 "*Corvina nigra* Cuv."; Moreau, 402.
 1889 "*Sciaena (Sciaena) umbra* Linnaeus"; Jordan & Eigenmann, 397 and 406.
 1889 "*Corvina nigra* Cuv. Val."; Doderlein, 105 [Synonymy includes "*Sciaena umbra* Linn.".]
 1893 "*Co. vina* Cuv. 1. *C. nigra* (*Sciaena Umbra* L. nec Cuv. *Sc. nigra* Bl., *Sc. cappa* Raf.)"; Carus, 652.
 1919 "*Sciaena (Corvina) nigra* Bl. Schn."; Metzelaar, 238.
 1935 *Corvina umbra* (L.); Nobre, 32.
 1936 *Johnius umbra* (L.); Fowler, 883.
 1948 "*Corvina nigra* C.V."; Soljan, 203.
 1949 *Johnius umbra* L.; Tortonese & Trotti, 81.
 1952 *Johnius umbra* L.; Lozano y Rey.
 1954-6 *Johnius umbra* (L.); Albuquerque, 703.
 1959 *Johnius umbra*; Collignon, 7.
 1963 *Sciaena umbra*; Trewavas, 174.

APPENDIX (iii)

L'OMBRINE

[1738 *Sciaena* No. 1. Artedi ed. Linnaeus.][1757 *Sciaena umbra* Hasselquist ed. Linnaeus, 352.]

*Error; *S. nigra* Gmelin=*S. nigra* Forskål, 1775, a Red Sea Lutjanid of genus *Macolor*. For this information I thank Mr. N. B. Marshall.

- 1758 *Sciaena cirrosa* Linn., 289.
Sciaena umbra (part.) Linn., 289 (ref. to Hasselquist only).
- 1788 *Sciaena cirrosa*, Linn. ed. Gmelin, 1300.
- 1788 *Sciaena cirrosa* Linn.; Bonnaterre, 121 ("Le Corp"; the figure, pl. 53, fig. 203, is bad and shows no barbel, but the text describes l'ombrine).
- 1792 *Sciaena cirrosa*; Bloch, pl. 300.
- 1801 *Johnius cirrhosus*; Bl. Schn., 76.
- 1801 *Sparus coracinus*; Asso, 36.
- 1802 *Perca umbra*; Lacépède, IV, 414.
- 1806 *Sciaena cirrhosa* L.; Viviani in Faujas-Saint-Fond, 370.
- 1810 "*Perca umbra* Lac."; Risso, 297.
- 1810 "*Perca umbra* Lac. (*Sciaena cirrosa* Linn.)"; Rafinesque, 16.
- 1814 *Sciaena cirrhosa*; Cuvier, 11, 13 & 14.
- 1814 *Coracinus boops*; Pallas, 259.
- 1817 "*Umbrina* Cuv.", "L'Ombrine barbue de la Méditerranée (*Sciaena cirrhosa*, L.)"; Cuvier, 297.
- 1826 *Umbrina cirrhosa*; Risso.
- 1827 *Umbrina cirrhata* (sic); I. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire.
- 1829 "*Umbrina* N.", "(*Sciaena cirrhosa*, L.)"; Cuvier.
- 1830 "L'Ombrine commune. (*Umbrina vulgaris*, Nob., *Sciaena cirrhosa*, L.)"; Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 171.
- 1832-41 *Umbrina cirrosa*, (L.); Bonaparte.
- 1848 *Attilus cirrhosa* (L.); Gistel, 109.
- 1860 *Umbrina cirrhosa*, (L.); Günther, 274.
- 1862 "*Umbrina cirrhosa* Cuv."; Gill, 86.
- 1863 *Sciaena cirrhosa*, L.; Bleeker, 66.
- 1878 "*Umbrina cirrhosa* Cuv."; Doderlein, 38.
- 1881 *Umbrina cirrosa*; Moreau, II, 391.
- 1889 "*Umbrina cirrhosa* (ex Lin.)"; Doderlein, 94.
- 1889 *Umbrina cirrosa* (L.); Jordan & Eigenmann, 419 and 422.
- 1893 "*Umbrina cirrosa* Cuv. (*Sciaena cirrosa* L., *Perca umbra* Lac. Risso, I. N. nec L., *U. vulgaris* C.V., *U. canariensis* Val., var. Stdchnr.)"; Carus, 65.
- 1919 *Umbrina cirrhosa* L.; Metzelaar, 237.
- 1935 *Umbrina cirrosa* (L.); Nobre, 29.
- 1936 *Sciaena cirrosa* L.; Fowler, 889.
- 1948 "*Umbrina cirrosa* Cuv."; Soljan, 175.
- 1949 *Sciaena cirrosa* L.; Tortonese & Trotti, 81.
- 1949 *Sciaena cirrosa* L.; J. L. B. Smith, 227.
- 1952 *Sciaena cirrosa* L.; Lozano y Rey, 239.
- 1954-6 *Sciaena cirrosa* L.; Albuquerque, 700.
- 1959 *Sciaena cirrosa* L.; Collignon, 8.
- 1961 *Umbrina cirrhosa*; Dardignac, 263.
- 1962 *Umbrina cirrosa*; Trewavas, 174.

REFERENCES

- Albuquerque, R. M., 1954-56, Peixes de Portugal e ilhas adjacentes. *Portugaliae Acta Biologica Lisboa* (B) 5 : i-xvi, 1-1164

- Artedi, P. ed Linnaeus, 1738, *Ichthyologia . . . posthuma*.
- Asso, I. de, 1801, Introduction à la ichthyologia oriental de España. *An. Cienc. nat. Madrid* 4 : 28-52
- Barnard, K. H., 1925-27, A monograph of the marine fishes of South Africa. *Ann. S. Afr. Mus.* 21 : 1-418 (1925) and 419-1065 (1927)
- Beaufort, L. F. de, see Weber, M.
- Bleeker, P., 1863, Poissons de la côte de Guinée. *Natuurk. Verh. holland. Maatsch. Wet.* (2) 18 : 1-136, pls. i-xxviii
- Bleeker, P., 1863a, Descr. de quelques espèces de poissons . . . de la Chine. *Ned. Tijdschr. Dierk.* 1 : 135-150
- Bloch, M. E., 1792, *Naturgesch. Ausl. Fische*, Pt. 6
- Bonaparte, C. L., 1832-41, *Iconografia fauna Italica*, III, Pesci
- Bonaparte, C. L., 1846, *Catalogo metodico dei pesci Europei* (Napoli)
- Bonnaterre, J. P., 1788, *Encyclopédie méthodique. Zoologie. Ichthyologie*. pp. vi+215, 102 pls.
- Canestrini, G., 1861, *Catologo dei pesci del golfo di Genova*. *Arch. Zool. Anat. Fisiol. Genova* 1 : 262-267
- Carus, J. V., 1893, *Prodromus faunae Mediterraneae*, vol. II, pp. 489-711 ; Pisces
- Collignon, J., 1959, La systématique des sciaenidés de l'Atlantique oriental. *Bull. Inst. Océanogr. Monaco*, No. 1155
- Cuvier, G., 1814, Sur un poisson célèbre, et cependant presque inconnu des auteurs systématiques, appelé sur nos côtes de l'Océan, Aigle, ou Maigre, et sur celles de la Méditerranée, Umbra, Fegaro et Poisson Royal ; avec une description abrégée de sa vessie natatoire. *Mém. Mus. Paris* 1 : 1-21, pls. i-iii (for date see Sherborn 1914)
- Cuvier, G., 1817, *Règne animal*, vol. II
- Cuvier, G., 1829, *Règne animal*, 2nd ed. vol. II
- Cuvier, G., & Valenciennes, A., 1830, *Hist. nat. poissons* 5
- Dardignac, J., 1961, Les ombrines des côtes atlantiques du Maroc. *Rev. Trav. Inst. Pêches marit.* 25 : 263-279
- Doderlein, P., 1889, *Manuale ittologico del Mediterraneo*. Fasc. IV (Palermo)
- Faujas-Saint-Fond, 1806, Sur les poissons du Golfe de la Spezzia et de la mer de Gènes. *Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris* 8 : 365-371
- Fowler, H. W., 1918, *Copeia*, pp. 62-65
- Fowler, H. W., 1933, Fishes of the Philippine and adjacent seas. *Bull. U.S. Nat. Mus.* No. 100, vol. 12
- Fowler, H. W., 1936, The marine fishes of West Africa. *Bull. Amer. Mus. nat. Hist.*, N.Y. 70
- Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, I., 1827, Poissons de la Mer Rouge et de la Méditerranée, in Sonnini's *Descr. Egypte*, *Hist. nat.* pt. 1, 311-340
- Gill, T., 1862, Revision of the genera of North American Sciaeninae. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* 1861(1862), 79-89
- Gistel, J. von N. F. X., 1848, *Naturgesch. des Thierreichs*, pp. xvi+216, pls. 1-32 (Stuttgart). [Gistel's *Handb. Naturgesch.* 1850 (1847-49 ?) I have not seen]
- Gmelin, J. F., 1788, *Linnaei Syst. Nat.* 13th Ed.

- Günther, A., 1860, Cat. Fishes vol. 2
- Hasselquist, F., 1757, *Iter Palaestinum* [Natural history, ed. Linnaeus ; Fishes, pp. 324–407]
- Jordan, D. S., & Eigenmann, C. H., 1889, A review of the Sciaenidae of America and Europe. *Rep. U.S. Comm. Fish.* 1886, 343–451, pls. i–iv
- Jordan, D. S., & Evermann, B. W., 1917, The genera of fishes Part 1, Stanford Univ. Publ.
- Jordan, D. S., Evermann, B. W., Clark, H. W., 1930, Check list of the fishes . . . of north and middle America. *Rep. U.S. Comm. Fish.* 1928, pt. II, 1–670
- Jordan, D. S., & Thompson, W. F., 1911, A review of the sciaenoid fishes of Japan. *Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus.* 39 : 241–261
- Lacépède, B. G. E., 1802, Hist. nat. poissons, vols. III & IV
- Lacépède, B. G. E., 1803, id. vol. V.
- Lin, S. Y., 1938, Further notes on sciaenid fishes of China. *Lignan Sci. J.* 17 : 161–173
- Linnaeus, C., 1758, Syst. Nat. 10th ed.
- Lozano y Rey, L., 1952, Peces Fisoclistos pt. 1. *Mem. Acad. Cienc. Madrid (Cienc. nat.)* 14
- Metzelaar, J., 1919. Over tropisch Atlantische visschen. pp. 317 (Amsterdam)
- Moreau, E., 1881, Hist. nat. poissons de la France, 3 vols. (Paris)
- Nobre, A., 1935, Fauna marinha de Portugal, I. Vertebrados. (Porto)
- Pallas, P. S.*, 1814, Zoographia Rosso-Asiatica, vol. III
- Poll, M., 1954, Expéd. Océanogr. Belge . . . Atlantique Sud (1948–1949), Poissons. IV
- Pylaie, de la, 1835, Recherches, en France, sur les poissons de l'Océan, pendant les années 1832 et 1833. *C.R. Congrès Sci. France*, Poitiers : 532
- Rafinesque-Schmaltz, C. S., 1810, Indice d'ittiologia Siciliana pp. 70, 2 pls. (Messina)
- Risso, A., 1810. Ichthyologie de Nice, pp. 388, 11 pls. (Paris)
- Risso, A., 1826, Hist. nat. Europe meridionale, 5 vols. (Paris and Strasbourg)
- Schneider, J. F., 1801, Blochii systema ichthyologiae
- Sherborn, C. D., 1914, An attempt at a fixation of the dates of issue of the parts of the publications of the Musée d'Histoire Naturelle of Paris, 1800–1850. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (8) 13 : 365–368
- Smith, J. L. B., 1949, The sea fishes of southern Africa. (Central News Agency Ltd., South Africa)
- Smitt, F. A., 1893, ed. and revised by, Scandinavian fishes (London and Stockholm)
- Soljan, T., 1948, Fauna i flora Jadrani, Kn. 1, Ribe. (Split).
- Steindachner, F., 1870, Fischfauna des Senegal. *S.B. Akad. Wien* 60 : 669–714

*Opinion 212 of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature dates vol. III "[1814]" and rules that names there proposed are to date from that year. Most of the plates prepared for this work were never published, but the drawings are still in Leningrad, and photographs of those of *Coracinus chalcis* and *C. boops* kindly supplied by Dr. L. Svetovidov, confirm their identity respectively with *Sciaena umbra* and *S. cirrosa* Linn. 1758.

- Tortonese, E., & Trotti, L., 1949, Catalogo dei pesci del Mar Ligure, pp. 1-118.
Publ. No. 1 of Centro Talassogr. Tirreno, Genova
- Trewavas, E., 1962, A basis for classifying the sciaenid fishes of tropical West Africa. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (13) 5 : 167-176
- Trotti, L., see Tortonese, E.
- Viviani, in Faujas-Saint-Fond, *q.v.*
- Weber, M., & de Beaufort, L. F., 1936, Fishes of the Indo-Australian Archipelago vol. VII (Leiden)

Trewavas, Ethelwynn. 1963. "Sciaena Linnaeus, 1758 (Pisces): proposed variation under the plenary powers of the ruling given in Opinion 93 concerning the type species. Z.N.(S.) 850." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 20, 349–360. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.6646>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44462>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.6646>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/6646>

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.

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>.