

ZOOLOGISCHE MEDEDELINGEN

UITGEGEVEN DOOR HET

RIJKSMUSEUM VAN NATUURLIJKE HISTORIE TE LEIDEN
(MINISTERIE VAN WELZIJN, VOLKSGEZONDHEID EN CULTUUR)

Deel 61 no. 10

18 juni 1987

ISSN 0024-0672

**ON THE GENERIC NAMES *GONYDACTYLUS* KUHL & VAN
HASSELT, 1822, *GONIODACTYLUS* SCHLEGEL, 1826, AND
GONYODACTYLUS WAGLER, 1830
(REPTILIA: SAURIA: GEKKONIDAE)**

by

G. F. MEES

Mees, G.F.: On the generic names *Gonydactylus* Kuhl & van Hasselt, 1822, *Goniodactylus* Schlegel, 1826, and *Gonyodactylus* Wagler, 1830 (Reptilia: Sauria: Gekkonidae).

Zool. Med. Leiden 61 (10), 18-vi-1987: 137-140. — ISSN 0024-0672.

Key words: *Gonydactylus*, *Goniodactylus*, *Gonyodactylus*.

Instead of straightening it out, Kluge (1985) has added some twists to the tortuous history of the name *Gonydactylus* Kuhl & van Hasselt. In this paper, an attempt is made to present the case more clearly. Contrary to Kluge's conclusion, the name does not affect current nomenclature.

G.F. Mees, Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands.

In a recent paper, Kluge (1985) discusses the generic name *Gonydactylus*, first published by Kuhl & van Hasselt (1822: 102), and concludes correctly that it is a nomen nudum and as such has no status in zoological nomenclature. Yet, on a later page, Kluge argues that *Gonydactylus* Kuhl & van Hasselt, 1822, is a senior synonym of *Tarentola* Gray (1825: 199) and of *Cyrtodactylus* Gray (1827: 55) and adds: “. . . it appears that no one has validly selected a type-species for *Gonydactylus* Kuhl & van Hasselt (1822) . . . Thus, *Gonydactylus* could be regarded as a senior synonym of either *Cyrtodactylus* or *Tarentola*. While *Cyrtodactylus* has been widely employed in the past 25 years, *Tarentola* has had a much longer consistent usage as a senior synonym. Therefore, in order to protect *Tarentola*, *pulchella* Gray (1827) is selected as the type-species of the genus *Gonyodactylus*. This designation also makes *Gonydactylus* Kuhl & van Hasselt a senior objective synonym of *Cyrtodactylus*”.

This summarises the apparent purpose of Kluge's paper: to save *Tarentola*,

and to replace *Cyrtodactylus* by *Gonyodactylus*. The name *Gonyodactylus* referred to above, is from Wagler (1830: 144). If I understand Kluge's reasoning correctly, he believes that Wagler, by providing a valid description of *Gonyodactylus* "Kuhl", and including two validly published species, has retrospectively validated *Gonyodactylus* Kuhl & van Hasselt as from 1822, and provided two type species for it. Of course, there is no provision in the Code (Ride et al., 1985), under which such a retrospective validation of a nomen nudum would be possible, and the designation of a type-species for the genus *Gonyodactylus* Kuhl & van Hasselt (1822) is meaningless from the point of view of nomenclature.

What then is the first validation of *Gonyodactylus* or any of its emendations? I believe it to be Schlegel (1826: 235):

"Nouveau Genre: *Goniodactylus* Kuhl. Espèces: *G. marmoratus* Kuhl, N. esp. — Et *Ascalabotes stenodactylus* Licht."

Goniodactylus Schlegel was rejected as a nomen nudum by Kluge, but it is not. The inclusion of the previously described species *Ascalabotes stenodactylus* Licht. (recte: *sthenodactylus*), provides an indication (Code: art. 12 (b) (5)). As at the time *G. marmoratus* was a nomen nudum and had no status, *Ascalabotes sthenodactylus* Lichtenstein, 1823, is the type of the genus by monotypy.

Incidentally, Kluge refers to the Code for treating *Goniodactylus* as an unjustified emendation of *Gonyodactylus*. This is a misinterpretation of the Code, as for purposes of nomenclature the nomen nudum *Gonyodactylus* can be ignored: it cannot preoccupy, and published emendations based on it, must count as entirely new names. Therefore, *Goniodactylus* is the valid original spelling.

Gonyodactylus Wagler (1830: 144) is, like *Goniodactylus* Schlegel, 1826, an emendation of *Gonyodactylus* Kuhl & van Hasselt. As there is no reference to Schlegel, and the included species are different, the name was clearly based directly on the nomen nudum of Kuhl & van Hasselt, and must be regarded as a new genus, not an emendation of *Goniodactylus* Schlegel. *Gonyodactylus* is not a homonym of *Goniodactylus* under the Code (art. 56 (b)). The two species included by Wagler in *Gonyodactylus* are *Gecko annulatus* Geoffroy (lapsus!) = *Gecko annularis* Geoffroy, 1827, and *Cyrtodactylus pulchellus* Gray, 1827. Kluge has selected *Cyrtodactylus pulchellus* Gray as its type-species.

Neither *Gonyodactylus* Kuhl & van Hasselt, 1822 (nomen nudum), nor *Goniodactylus* Schlegel, 1826 (an objective junior synonym of *Stenodactylus* Fitzinger, 1826), nor *Gonyodactylus* Wagler, 1830 (through Kluge's selection of a type-species now an objective junior synonym of *Cyrtodactylus*), can affect currently established nomenclature.

As regards the postulated priority of *Stenodactylus* Fitzinger over *Goniodactylus* Schlegel, both published in 1826: there is good internal evidence for it in Schlegel's paper, where Fitzinger's work is referred to as having been published.

Interestingly, Joger (1984a) has recently divided *Tarentola* into several subgenera, amongst which *Sahelogecko* subgen. nov., which includes *Gecko annularis* Geoffroy. Before Kluge's selection of *Cyrtodactylus pulchellus* as the type-species of *Gonyodactylus*, that name was potentially available for the proposed subgenus. It must be noted, that *Sahelogecko* as published by Joger is not a valid name: Joger has included three species in this subgenus (*Tarentola annularis*, *T. ephippiata* and *T. parvicarinata*), but he failed to indicate a type-species, as is mandatory under the Code (art. 13 (b)). The same applies to Joger's subgenus *Makariogecko*, which does not even have any species included and is not validated by a reference to Joger (1984b).

I have accepted 1827 as the year of publication of *Gecko annularis* Geoffroy, following Sherborn (1897) and Tollitt (1986). Joger (1984a: 163) has claimed that the description dates from 1809, "nicht 1823, wie in allen bisherigen Arbeiten angenommen", but his arguments do not give the impression that he has thoroughly investigated the matter. Authorship of the portion of text in which *Gecko annularis* is described, is generally ascribed to Isidore Geoffroy (1805-1861), not to his father Etienne Geoffroy (1772-1844). In 1809, Isidore was four years old: even in a brilliant family, a four-year-old could hardly be the author of a scientific paper. Therefore, I continue to accept 1827 (not 1823 as erroneously claimed by Joger) as the year of publication.

For providing me with the necessary literature, and for helpful discussions, I am indebted to my colleagues L.B. Holthuis and M.S. Hoogmoed. Finally, I should like to mention that in April 1986, I wrote a letter to Dr. Kluge, in which the matters here dealt with were pointed out to him. No reply has been received, and therefore I have felt free to publish these corrections in the journal in which his article appeared.

REFERENCES

- Fitzinger, L.I., 1826. Neue Classification der Reptilien nach ihren natürlichen Verwandtschaften. Wien: (viii) + 66 p.
- Gray, J.E., 1825. A synopsis of the genera of reptiles and amphibia, with a description of some new species. — Ann. Philos. (n. s.) 10: 193-217.
- Gray, J.E., 1827. A synopsis of the genera of saurian reptiles, in which some new genera are indicated, and the others reviewed by actual examination. — Philos. Mag. Ann. (n. s.) 2 (7): 53-56.

- Joger, U., 1984a. Taxonomische Revision der Gattung *Tarentola* (Reptilia, Gekkonidae). — Bonn. Zool. Beitr. 35: 129-174.
- Joger, U., 1984b. Die Radiation der Gattung *Tarentola* in Makaronesien. — Cour. Forsch. - Inst. Senckenberg 71: 91-111.
- Kluge, A.G., 1985. Notes on gekko nomenclature (Sauria: Gekkonidae). — Zool. Meded. 59: 95-100.
- Kuhl, H. & J.C. van Hasselt, 1822. Uittreksels uit brieven . . . aan de Heeren C.J. Temminck, Th. van Swinderen en W. de Haan (vervolg). — Alg. Konst- en Letter-Bode (1822) 1: 99-104.
- Ride, W.D.L. et al., 1985. Code international de nomenclature zoologique/International code of zoological nomenclature. London: xx + 338 p.
- Schlegel, H., 1826. Notice sur l'erpétologie de l'île de Java; par M. Boié. (ouvrage manuscrit). — Bull. Sci. Nat. (Férussac) 9: 233-240.
- Sherborn, C.D., 1897. On the dates of the natural history portion of Savigny's "Description de l'Égypte". — Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 285-288.
- Tollitt, M.E., 1986. Dates and authorship of the text volumes of the Histoire naturelle section of Savigny's Description de l'Égypte Z.N. (S.) 2515. — Bull. Zool. Nomencl. 43: 107-111.
- Wagler, J., 1830. Natürliches System der Amphibien, mit vorangehender Classification der Säugethiere und Vögel. München, Stuttgart und Tübingen: vi + 354 p.