J. South Asian nat. Hist., ISSN 1022-0828. January, 1998. Vol.3, No. 1, pp. 117–119, 1 fig.
© Wildlife Heritage Trust of Sri Lanka, 95 Cotta Road, Colombo 8, Sri Lanka.

On the valid generic names for the Indian fishes usually referred to *Salmostoma* and *Somileptes* (Teleostei: Cyprinidae and Cobitidae)

Maurice Kottelat *

Abstract

Salmophasia Swainson, 1839 is the valid name for the cyprinid fishes usually referred to as *Salmostoma* Swainson, 1839. *Canthophrys* Swainson, 1838 is the valid name for the loaches usually referred to as *Somileptes* Swainson, 1839. *Somileptes* is an erroneous spelling; the valid spelling is *Somileptus*.

The fish names proposed by Swainson (1838, 1839) present a number of nomenclatural problems, most of them already mentioned by Swain (1882), Jordan (1919) and Eschmeyer (1990). Among those affecting Asian freshwater fishes, the case of *Brachirus*, *Brachyrus* and *Dendrochirus* has been recently discussed in Kottelat (in press) who concluded that *Brachirus* is the valid name for several species of freshwater soles usually placed in *Synaptura*, *Euryglossa*, *Anisochirus* or *Chabanaudetta*. The case of two invalid generic names is discussed here.

Salmophasia vs. *Salmostoma*

Swainson (1839: 184) created the subgenus *Cyprinus* (*Salmostoma*). On p. 284, he replaced this name by *Salmophasia*. These two names are simultaneous objective synonyms, and the first reviser (Jordan, 1919: 202) retained *Salmophasia* as having priority [International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN), art. 50 (f)]. Bleeker (1863: 33), Day (1875-78: 599) and Swain (1882: 279) had implicitly made the same choice in listing only *Salmophasia*; but as they do not explicitly mention *Salmostoma*, they cannot be considered as first reviser. So, the name *Salmophasia* should be used instead of *Salmostoma*.

* Route de la Baroche 12, Case postale 57, CH-2952 Cornol, Switzerland (address for correspondence) and School of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore, Kent Ridge, Singapore 119260. Email: mkottelat@vtx.ch

As *Salmophasia* is a replacement name for *Salmostoma*, the two names have the same type species. Swain (1882: 279) designated *Cyprinus oblonga* Swainson, 1839 as type species. This is an unjustified replacement name for *Cyprinus bacaila* Hamilton, 1822.

Salmostoma is a neutral noun and *Salmophasia* is a feminine noun; normally the termination of some specific names should change as a result of transfer from a genus with a neutral noun to a genus with a feminine noun. I checked this for the valid species of *Salmostoma* listed by Talwar & Jhingran (1991: 321-328) and found that no specific names will change. This in fact is a result of several specific names being misspelled: the specific names *Salmostoma kardahiensis*, *S. orissaensis* and *S. punjabensis* are incorrect for species placed in a genus with a neutral noun as these are masculine or feminine terminations. These terminations will now be correct with the generic name changed to *Salmophasia*. If retained as *Salmostoma*, the correct terminations should be *Salmostoma kardahiense*, *S. orissaense* and *S. punjabense*.

Canthophrys vs. _Somileptes_ and _Somileptus_

Swainson (1838: 364) created the name *Canthophrys*, but without including nominal species. In the second volume of the same work (1839: 190, 310), he again used *Canthophrys*, with three subgenera (*Canthophrys*, *Diacantha* Swainson, 1839 and *Somileptus* Swainson, 1839). He also included four species described by Hamilton (1822) in his genus *Canthophrys*, all renamed by him. Swain (1882: 282) designated *Canthophrys albescens* as type species of *Canthophrys*. *Canthophrys albescens* is an unnecessary replacement name for *Cobitis cucura* Hamilton (1822: 352), itself a simultaneous synonym of *Cobitis gongota* Hamilton (1822: 351). As *C. gongota* is the type species of *Somileptes*, by subsequent designation by Bleeker (1863: 3), *Canthophrys* Swainson, 1838 is a senior subjective synonym of *Somileptus* Swainson, 1839.

Swainson (1839) used the spelling *Somileptus* on p. 190 and *Somileptes* on p. 311. The first reviser is apparently Nalbant (1963: 364) who retained *Somileptus* as the valid spelling. Swainson had also used the spelling *Somileptus* in his index (p. 447) but this cannot be treated as a first reviser action as ICZN art. 24 (b) explicitly requires that the first reviser's action be subsequent to the action being revised (this issue is in fact not so clear, because the English version states "the first author to have subsequently cited...", while the French version states "the first author who has cited...", thus not excluding the possibility that an author be treated as his own reviser in the same work. In this particular case, if Swainson were treated as first reviser, the conclusion would not be changed. The French and English texts of the ICZN are supposed to be equivalent in force, meaning and authority (ICZN art. 85). This issue is of obvious concern in the case of posthumously published works to which editors have added their own comments, either in the text or as footnotes; under the French version of the ICZN, in some instances, such an editor could be treated as first reviser while this interpretation is excluded by the English version).

Cobitis gongota Hamilton, 1822 and *Cobitis cucura* Hamilton, 1822 are simultaneous synonyms. The first reviser is apparently Günther (1868: 363) who retained *C. gongota* as having priority.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank Sven O. Kullander and Sonia Muller for providing some of the literature.

Literature cited

Bleeker, P. 1863. Atlas ichthyologique des Indes orientales néêrlandaises. Muller, Amsterdam, 150 pp., pls. 102-144.

Day, F. 1875-78. The fishes of India; being a natural history of the fishes known to inhabit the seas and fresh waters of India, Burma, and Ceylon. Quaritch, London, xx + 778 pp., 195 pls.

Eschmeyer, W. N. 1990. Catalog of the genera of recent fishes. California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, 697 pp.

Günther, A. 1868. Catalogue of the fishes in the British Museum. 7. British Museum, London, xx + 512 pp.

Hamilton, F. 1822. An account of the fishes found in the River Ganges and its branches. Constable, Edinburgh, 2 vols., 405 pp., 39 pls.

Jordan, D. S. 1919. The genera of fishes, part II, from Agassiz to Bleeker, 1833-1858, twenty-six years, with the accepted type of each. A contribution to the stability of scientific nomenclature. Leland Stanford Jr. Univ. Publ., Univ. Ser., 36: i-ix + 163-284 + i-xiii.

Kottelat, M. In press. Fishes of the Nam Theun and Xe Bangfai basins (Laos), with diagnoses of a new genus and twenty new species (Cyprinidae, Balitoridae, Cobitidae, Coiidae and Eleotrididae). Ichthyol. Explor. Freshwaters, 9.

Nalbant, T. T. 1963. A study of the genera of Botiinae and Cobitinae (Pisces, Ostariophysi, Cobitidae). Trav. Mus. Hist. Nat. Gr. Antipa, 4: 343-379, 4 pls.

Swain, J. 1882. A review of Swainson's genera of fishes. Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia, 34: 272-284.

Swainson, W. 1838-1839. The natural history of fishes, amphibians, & reptiles, or monocardian animals. Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, & Longmans, and Taylor, London, 1 (1838): vi + 368 pp., 2 (1839): vi + 448 pp.

Talwar, P. K. & A. G. Jhingran. 1991. Inland fishes of India and adjacent countries. Oxford & IBH, New Delhi, 2 vols.