

ART. XLVI.—*Canons of Systematic Nomenclature for the higher groups*; by SAMUEL H. SCUDDER.

SEVERAL years ago, the American Association for the Advancement of Science appointed a committee to reconsider the canons of biological nomenclature, and to report whether, with the growth of science, they required any additions or alterations. No report has yet been made, nor, so far as we are aware, is any likely to be presented, until the subject is again brought prominently forward and new instructions given. Professor A. E. Verrill has since republished * the Revised Rules of Zoölogical Nomenclature adopted by the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1865, and has accompanied them by a few apt comments; in England, Mr. W. F. Kirby, in a paper read before the Linnean Society of London, has called attention to the extensive changes which a strict adherence to the laws of priority would cause in the generic nomenclature of butterflies; and quite recently has put the same into practice in his catalogue of these insects.

But hitherto very little has been said concerning the special application of definite rules to groups higher than genera, and it is to this division of the subject that we desire to call attention.

In attempting to legislate upon this branch of zoölogical nomenclature, two principles must be kept in view: *first*, so far as possible, the canons already in general acceptance for generic nomenclature should be applied to all the monomial groups. Unity of principle lies at the foundation of acceptable legislation; *second*, retrospective laws should be avoided.

One difficulty meets us at the outset,— what some are pleased to term the unstable nature of the higher groups, but which we should prefer to call the disagreement of naturalists as to the limits and value of these groups; yet as this diversity of view is a nearly equal hindrance to any code of rules, it needs only to be mentioned in passing.

Endeavoring to keep in mind the principles above enunciated, and as the simplest means of presenting our views, the following outline of a code is suggested for the consideration of zoölogists.

Canons.—I. The name originally given by the founder of a group should be permanently retained, to the exclusion of all subsequent synonyms.

This rule, recognizing the law of priority, which lies at the foundation of all systematic nomenclature, is the same as the

* This Journal, July, 1869.

first and prime rule of the code accepted by the British Association, with the exception of certain references made exclusively to species; and, since this canon meets universal acceptance, there is no need of discussing it, aside from the following limitations.

1. This law of priority should not extend to works published before 1758.

The same reasons for such a limitation do not exist in the present instance as in the case of specific nomenclature; but similar objections can be made to an earlier limitation. Only three reasonable courses are open to the naturalist: to accept (a) no limitation whatever, in which case "our zoölogical studies would be frittered away amid the refinements of classical learning; (b) the limitation here formulated, in which case all our systematic nomenclature takes its common origin in the tenth edition of Linné's *Systema Naturæ*;* or (c) to apply the laws of nomenclature to each kind of group (subfamily, family, class, etc.), from the time when such group was first brought into use—which would engender such confusion as speedily to bring all nomenclature into deserved disrepute.

2. Plural or collective substantives (or adjectives used as substantives) are alone admissible.

As the higher groups are all collective—in idea, if not in fact—it is essential that the names applied to them should be at least capable of a collective sense; and names which are not so formed should be dropped. The retrospective action of such a law would be very slight.

3. A name which has been previously proposed for some genus or higher group in zoölogy should be expunged.

This accords too well with accepted rules to require any discussion.

4. When two authors define and name (differently) the same group, both making it of the same or very nearly the same extent, the later name (or if synchronous, the least known name) should be cancelled, and never again brought into use.

With the exception of certain verbal modifications, this law is identical with the sixth section of the British Association rules, where it is applied to genera only.

5. In any subsequent alterations of the limits of a group, its name should never be cancelled; but should be retained either in a restricted or an enlarged sense.

The necessity for such a limitation is obvious; otherwise a different name would (or, could) be given by every author who

* The English—the strongest upholders of the plan of dating from the twelfth edition of the *Systema Naturæ*—are now, by degrees, accepting the earlier date of 1758 as the starting point for zoölogical nomenclature, and we may assume that, in this view, the whole scientific world will sooner or later concur.

differed from preceding ones in his ideas of the precise limitation of any group in question. This indeed has already been done, and, if continued, will create lamentable confusion; but this limitation should itself be subject to one exception, which may be formulated thus:

6. But any assemblage so defined by an author as harshly to violate the groupings of nature (as known to naturalists of his time), should be cancelled.

Such a rule would prevent the injury which might accrue to science by too close an application of the preceding law. The parenthetical limitation seems, however, to be necessary.

II. Changes in the name of one group should not affect the names of other groups.

This follows as a corollary of the first canon, but it has been not infrequently violated, and it is easy to perceive the cause. The nomenclature of higher groups, notably of families and subfamilies, has, to a considerable degree, been founded upon generic names, with the addition of special collective endings to the root (see recommendation 1). Now, when a generic name which has formed the basis of a family designation has been found to be pre-occupied, it has been thought necessary by some to recast the nomenclature of the higher group. But why? After a name has been long applied to a group, it ceases to have any intrinsic meaning, and is simply associated with the group itself, recalling it without reference to any particular member of the same. It certainly would be agreeable if we had a nomenclature in which each group should by the very association of ideas recall its members; but since that is utterly impossible, and we have to deal with a mass of synonyms already tangled and intricate, our problem is—how best to make our way out of the difficulty without a continual wrangling over names and entailing endless disputes upon future generations.

To this canon no exception whatever should be made; for it would be difficult to draw the line anywhere and gain general consent. Anyone who considers the subject, will see that one apparently reasonable exception will lead to another scarcely less desirable, until the whole value and force of the proposed canon is destroyed.

III. The mere enumeration of its members, when known, is a sufficient definition of the limits of a group, and gives it an unquestionable claim to recognition.

Although it is certainly *most* desirable that every name proposed for a group should, when first propounded (or shortly after), be accompanied by a full description of its essential characters, it is evident that no one acquainted with the subject of which an author treats can fail to understand his meaning if he defines his groups by mere enumeration of their members. If

for instance, he designates the known genera to be embraced in a proposed family, he actually defines his group much better than he could do by a specification of its characters, since we have probably not yet been favored with any description of a natural family which gives everything which is characteristic and omits all that is not.

Recommendations.—1. "That assemblages of genera, termed families, should be uniformly named by adding the termination *-idæ* to the name of the earliest known or most typically characterized genus in them; and that their subdivision, termed subfamilies, should be similarly constructed with the termination *-inæ*."

This recommendation, formulated by the committee of the British Association, is deprived of a great part of its value by the disagreement of naturalists as to the nature of family and subfamily groups,—assemblages of very diverse natures having received this designation at the hands of different writers; indeed, up to the issue of Professor Agassiz's *Essay on Classification*, no one had ever attempted to give definite shape to current opinions upon the subject; and it will be long before we shall see a general concurrence in either the views put forward in that work, or in any modification of them. Such being the case, it is evident that this recommendation cannot have the force of a law, nor be allowed any retrospective action. Otherwise these rules, or any other reasonable ones (however generally they may be accepted), are powerless to assign to any higher natural group a fixed and unalterable name; but the group in question would receive a different name from different authors, according as they considered it a subfamily or an assemblage of still another nature.

2. All monomial collective names should be derived from the Greek, and have a plural form.

3. Only the surname of the author who first proposed a group need follow its name, whether the group be used in its original or in a modified sense; but when it is desirable to indicate at the same time its recognized, altered limits, the surname of the writer who first proposed the accepted circumscription may follow in a parenthesis.

In systematic nomenclature, the object is to register titles, not to gratify pride, and the names of authors are appended for convenience, not fame; the question of justice or injustice has no place here; and yet the above recommendation ought to be satisfactory to those who view this matter in a different light.