

Beitr. Ent.	Berlin	ISSN 0005-805X
49 (1999) 1	S. 141 - 146	6.04.1999

## The Faunæ Ligusticæ Fragmenta of MASSIMILIANO SPINOLA (1805)

DONALD B. BAKER

**Additional key words:** bibliography - Italy - Insecta (Hymenoptera)

### Summary

The Faunæ Ligusticæ Fragmenta, Decas Prima, 1805, was the first and only part to be printed of a projected work on the insects of Liguria. It was printed at the expense of its author, MASSIMILIANO SPINOLA, and, so far as is known, only one copy survives, this primarily for the reason that its author shortly, and almost entirely successfully, sought to suppress it. Whether the Faunæ was or was not validly published has been disputed. It is argued here that the Faunæ was not validly published within a strict reading of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, and that the few taxa, all Hymenoptera, described in it should be known by the names, some altered, under which they were first validly published in the same author's Insectorum Liguriæ, volume I, 1806.

### Zusammenfassung

Die Faunæ Ligusticæ Fragmenta, Decas Prima, 1805, waren der erste und einzige gedruckte Teil eines geplanten Werkes über die Insekten Liguriens. Er wurde auf Kosten seines Autors MASSIMILIANO SPINOLA gedruckt. Soweit bekannt ist, blieb nur eine Kopie erhalten, da sein Autor kurzerhand und mit beinahe vollem Erfolg versuchte, ihn zu unterdrücken. Ob die Faunæ damit als valid publiziert gelten müssen oder nicht, wird diskutiert. Hier wird begründet, daß die Faunæ im strengen Sinne der Internationalen Regeln für die Zoologische Nomenklatur nicht gültig veröffentlicht worden sind und daß die wenigen Taxa, alle Hymenoptera, die darin beschrieben sind, mit den Namen bezeichnet werden sollten, einige etwas verändert, unter denen sie in den Insectorum Liguriæ, Bd. I, 1806, des gleichen Autors erstmals gültig publiziert wurden.

### Acknowledgments

The author is indebted to the librarians of the General and Entomology Libraries of the Natural History Museum, London, and to Dr GUIDO PAGLIANO, Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali, Torino, for access to the literature, and to Dr P. H. B. BAKER, F.C.O., Prof. D. S. SMITH, Oxford, and Dr P. K. TUBBS, ICZN, for their careful reading of earlier versions of the text and for helpful comments.

### Introduction

The Faunæ Ligusticæ Fragmenta, Decas Prima, hereinafter referred to simply as the Faunæ, comprising the descriptions of ten new species of Hymenoptera collected in Liguria, was its author's first, youthful, venture in entomology<sup>1</sup>. It was printed for and at the expense of MASSIMILIANO SPINOLA<sup>2</sup>, of the house of the Marchesi Spinola of Tassarolo (vide VIDANO &

ARZONE, 1978; PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES, 1980). The title page of the work, reproduced by MENKE (1980: 11) reads: FAUNNÆ [sic] LIGUSTICÆ / FRAGMENTA / AUTHORE M\*\*\*\*\* S\*\*\*\*\* [rule] DECAS PRIMA [rule] [rule] GENUÆ / Anno 1805. Mense Novembris. [double rule] TYPIS PETRI CAJETANI API. Page 21 calls for a plate, not, however, present. So far as is known, only one copy of the Faunæ survives, this primarily for the reason that, shortly after its printing, SPINOLA sought to suppress the work and burned those copies he still held. Subsequently, doubtless profiting from the comments and advice of some of the Parisian entomologists to whom he had presented copies of the Faunæ, he commenced publication of the more polished, and this time to be completed, work, the *Insectorum Liguriæ species novæ aut rariores*, the first volume of which appeared, scarcely a year after the Faunæ fiasco, in October 1806 (SPINOLA, 1806-1808). The existence of the Faunæ has been registered in several entomological bibliographies, but neither whether their compilers had actually seen copies, nor whence their information might have come, is always manifest: DALLA TORRE (1888: 249) certainly had not seen the work. The question that persists is whether the Faunæ was a validly published work within a strict reading of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (3rd Edition, 1985), the Articles in question being Articles 8 and 9.

### A Published Work or a Proof?

Before dealing with the question whether the Faunæ was or was not a validly published work, it is necessary to dismiss Day's suggestion, recorded by MENKE (1980: 10), that the only known copy of the Faunæ, that in the library of the Swedish Academy of Sciences in Stockholm, inscribed by SPINOLA to the veteran G. A. OLIVIER<sup>3</sup>, is a proof. The numerous typographical errors in the Stockholm copy (including the 'Faunnæ' of the title) are in fact sufficiently explained by SPINOLA's remarks in the *Insectorum Liguriæ* (1806, 1: xi: 'Num quid loquar de decade quadam ? Opus igni damnavi immaturè editum, ac typographo ignarissimo erroribus sordide inquinatum ...'<sup>4</sup>) and cannot be construed as denoting a proof. Further, it would be most unusual for a proof to be printed in multiple copies, and still more unusual for an author to distribute, uncorrected, copies of a proof. If, most unusually, spare copies of a proof should be available, one would expect to find them corrected, even if only as a matter of courtesy or respect, before any were sent to friends or mentors; or destroyed if resetting and reprinting were to be insisted on.

### Publication or Private Circulation?

GESTRO (1917: 38, note <sup>(3)</sup>) believed that the Faunæ was not a published work.<sup>5</sup> MENKE (1980: 10) presented a most tendentious account, based on an infelicitous and inaccurate translation<sup>4</sup> of SPINOLA's words in the *Insectorum Liguriæ* (quoted above), of the case for legitimate publication. PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES subsequently (1983: 217-219) gave a more reasoned, but not entirely persuasive, account, drawing on correspondence between MASSIMILIANO SPINOLA and P. A. LATREILLE preserved in the Tassarolo archives. It is clear from PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES' account that copies of the Faunæ were addressed by SPINOLA to various prominent Parisian entomologists, and probably copies were addressed to a few others elsewhere whom he thought likely to be interested: obviously, in 1805 the potential readership for a work such as the Faunæ was a very limited one, and at that early date SPINOLA can have had few regular entomological correspondents. SPINOLA's decision to abandon the work, prompted as much if not more by his perception that the Faunæ was inadequate (as may well have been reinforced by the comments of some of its recipients: cf. LATREILLE's reference quoted below) as by his dissatisfaction with the quality of the

printing, was followed by an attempt at its entire suppression. That this attempt was not confined to the burning of his residual copies but may have been accompanied by entreaties to recipients to destroy their copies is suggested by its remarkably successful results: in well over a century and despite careful search in the various archives and libraries where copies of the *Faunæ* might reasonably be expected to be found (cf. PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES, 1983: 216), no copy but that at Stockholm has come to light (there was none in SPINOLA's own entomological library at Tassarolo, but this might have been expected).

That the Api print-run must have been a small one is further attested by the fact that, so far as it has been possible to ascertain, no copies have surfaced in the trade. Some copies may have been leaked by the printer, and a few certainly were received by LEPRIEUR in Paris, but here there appear to have been definite instructions for cancellation and LEPRIEUR was described as 'ne voulant point se charger de la vente'.<sup>6</sup>

Circulation, however, is not at all the same thing as publication, and LATREILLE, commenting on SPINOLA's reference to the *Faunæ* in the introduction to the *Insectorum Liguriæ*, wrote (21 October 1806): 'Je crois que vous auriez bien fait de ne pas revenir sur votre première décade. *Elle n'avoit pas été publique; vous ne l'aviez communiquée qu'à des amis ...*' (quoted by PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES, 1983: 218; present italics). LATREILLE was clearly better placed to know the extent to which the *Faunæ* had been circulated than any present-day writer (cf. the extracts from his letter of 18 January 1806, also quoted by PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES).

### Internal Evidence

The title page of the *Faunæ* is itself evidence not only for private publication but for the fact that the work was intended for private distribution: it bears simply the printer's imprint 'Typis Petri Cajetani Api'. The author's name is not given, only the indication 'M\*\*\*\*\* S\*\*\*\*\*' (which would of course be adequate for a work circulated only to intimates). No information is given as to publisher or as to where copies of the work might be procured [cf. Code, Article 8(a)(2)]: there is not even a 'sumptibus auctoris' ['at the expense of the author', an often-used formula that appeared, for example, on the title of the *Insectorum Liguriæ*] or similar indication that might indicate a source of supply. The only possible inference is that the work was printed privately for private circulation [cf. Code, Article 9(8) - the *Faunæ* amounts in reality to no more than a note distributed to colleagues in explanation of a plate - a plate which in fact was lacking].

While the private circulation of copies of a work does not constitute publication, neither [Code, Article 9(10)] does the reading of a work, whether in full or by title, and CUVIER's reading, reported by LATREILLE, is therefore irrelevant ('Mr. CUVIER à présenté [sic, PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES] à la 1ère classe de l'Institut votre production').

### Conclusions and Recommendations

In the light of the foregoing and in the absence of concrete evidence that the *Faunæ Ligusticæ Fragmenta* was placed on sale or was otherwise made publicly available (as is particularly evidenced by its absence from entomological libraries generally), it is contended that publication within the meaning of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature did not take place and that the *Faunæ* is not available for nomenclatural purposes.

The taxa described in the *Faunæ* should be recognized under the names, some altered, under which they were first validly published in the same author's *Insectorum Liguriæ*, vol. I, 1806. The one genus-group name and the ten species-group names concerned are listed below (Table 1).

**Table 1**Names in the Faunæ Ligusticæ  
Fragmenta, 1805Names in the Insectorum  
Insectorum Liguriæ, 1  
(fasc. 1), 1806p. 7 *Polochrum*<sup>7</sup> *repandum*

p. 19 unchanged

p. 12 *Larra atrata*p. 14 *Larra micans*p. 13 *Bombus ligusticus*

p. 29 unchanged

p. 14 *Chrysis fasciata*

p. 7 unchanged

p. 15 *Pompilus dimidiatus*p. 12 *Pompilus elegans*p. 16 *Pompilus sex-maculatus*p. 16 *Larra sexmaculata*p. 17 *Astata nitida*

p. 18 unchanged

p. 18 *Philanthus tricinctus*p. 27 *Cerceris tricincta*p. 19 *Scolia abdominalis*

p. 25 unchanged

p. 20 *Hylotoma ventralis*

p. [1] unchanged

**Notes**<sup>1</sup> Aet. suæ 25.

<sup>2</sup> The Marchese MASSIMILIANO SPINOLA, Conte di Tassarolo, Senatore del Regno Sardo, Decurione di Genova, b. Pézenas (Hérault, France) 10 July 1780, d. Tassarolo 12 Nov 1857. His portrait, as a younger man, is reproduced by PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES (1980: [4]) from a miniature in the Castello di Tassarolo; his portrait bust, by BRILLA DI SAVONA, by CASOLARI & CASOLARI MORENO (1980: [6]).

<sup>3</sup> 'Au savant OLIVIER / membre de l'institut national / de france / Maximilien Spinola / son disciple et son admirateur.' G. A. OLIVIER (1756-1814).

<sup>4</sup> 'Now what is to be said of a certain Decade? A work I have condemned to the fire, prematurely brought forth [cf. infans immaturus est editus : Suetonius] and, moreover, vulgarly blemished by the errors of a most ignorant printer'.<sup>8</sup> There is no suggestion here that the work 'was very badly published' (MENKE). It might also be observed that SPINOLA was an educated gentleman<sup>9</sup>, and that to represent him as having written 'this work was dreadfully fouled up with errors' (as a member of the department of Classical Studies of an American university so elegantly rendered the passage), is as incongruous as it is inaccurate.

<sup>5</sup> GESTRO, who knew the Faunæ only from HAGEN, wrote (1917: 38): 'Le ricerche [for the basis of HAGEN's entry] che ne ho fatto e fatto fare sono riuscite infruttuose: perciò ho acquistato la convinzione che si tratti di quella sua prima decade che egli ha condannato al fuoco e della quale, per conseguenza, non dobbiamo tenere alcun conto'.

<sup>6</sup> How the small parcel of copies referred to by LATREILLE (letter dated 18 January 1806: PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES, 1983: 217-218) as having been received by LEPRIEUR (GRAVIER's representative in Paris) from GRAVIER in Genova came to have been in GRAVIER's hands in the first place is unclear: the Faunæ was printed by API, not by GRAVIER (who was however to be the printer of the Insectorum Liguriæ). It seems possible that GRAVIER's acquisition of a small number of copies from API had not been authorized by SPINOLA.

<sup>7</sup> Both SHERBORN (1929: 5083) and NEAVE (1940: 847), in listing *Polochrum*, cited the Faunæ as well as the Insectorum Liguriæ, but in the circumstances it seems unlikely that either could have seen the former work in the original or in facsimile, or, consequently, been in a position to adjudicate on its validity.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. MCKERROW, 1927: 131, n. 2: 'They [the Dialogus theologicus] were 'depravatissime excusa' on account of the printer, who knew no Latin'.

<sup>9</sup> The Gazzetta di Genova, announcing SPINOLA's death, noted (17 November 1857) 'Gli studi che amava erano la matematica, la classica letteratura, la genealogia delle famiglie nobili de Genova ...'.

## References

- CASOLARI, C. & CASOLARI MORENO, R. 1980: Collezione Imenotterologica di MASSIMILIANO SPINOLA. - Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali / Cataloghi 1: [1]-[166].
- DALLA TORRE, K. W. von 1888: Hymenopteren Notizen. II. SPINOLA's Faunæ [sic] Liguria [sic] fragmenta 1805. - Wiener Entomologische Zeitung 7: 249.
- GESTRO, R. 1916 [1917]: Res Ligusticae XLII Ricordo di MASSIMILIANO SPINOLA. - Annali del Museo Civico di Storia Naturale Genova 47 (1915-1917): 33-53, 1 pl. [Unreliable compilation].
- McKERRON, R. B. 1927 [1948]: An introduction to bibliography for literary students. 3rd impression. Pp. [i]-xv, 1-359, [360: printer's imprint]. - Oxford; Clarendon Press.
- MENKE, A. S. 1980: SPINOLA's Faunnae Ligusticae Fragmenta Decas Prima, 1805. - Sphecos 3: 10-28.
- NEAVE, S. A. (ed.): 1940. Nomenclator zoologicus / A list of the names of genera and subgenera in Zoology from the tenth edition of LINNAEUS 1758 to the end of 1935. 3 (M-P), pp. [i-iv], [1]-1065. London; Zoological Society of London.
- PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES, P. 1980: La collezione SPINOLA DI TASSAROLO. N.p. [20 pp.]. - Torino; Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali. [Museum guide].
- PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES, P. 1983a: "Faunae Ligusticae Fragmenta" e "Insectorum Liguria species novae" di MASSIMILIANO SPINOLA: note bibliografiche. - Bollettino del Museo regionale di Scienze naturali di Torino 1: 215-226. [Further references].
- PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES, P. 1983b: Figure dell'Entomologia Piemontese. - Atti XIII Congresso nazionale Italiano di Entomologia : 31-34.
- SHERBORN, C. D. 1929: Index animalium sive index nominum quae ab A.D. MDCCCLVIII generibus et speciebus animalium imposita sunt. Sectio secunda a Kalendis Ianuariis, MDCCCI usque ad finem Decembris MDCCCL. Part XX. Index phyllochroma. - Pratincola. Pp. 4931- 5138. London; Trustees of the British Museum.
- SPINOLA, M. 1805: Faunnae Ligusticae Fragmenta. Decas Prima. Pp. [- : title, verso blank], 5-21. Genova; printed for the author. Original not seen.
- From the pagination of MENKE's reproduction (1980), it might appear that the Stockholm copy from which it was reproduced was incomplete. As reproduced by MENKE, p. 5 appears on the recto of p. 7 and from p. 8 even page numbers appear on the rectos, odd page numbers on the versos, presenting a curious appearance. If early works are to be reproduced, it is highly desirable that they should be reproduced *in toto* as exact facsimiles, even at the expense of possible blank pages; or, at least, a proper collation provided. According to previous authors, the Faunæ was printed in 8<sup>vo</sup> format, but the single signature appearing in MENKE's reproduction, A2, on p. 9, is then difficult to explain. If normal printing practice had been followed, one would expect to have found p. 7 signed A or A1 and the first gathering, unsigned, including apparently only the title-page and the preface ('Quas tibi præbeo, amice lector, ...', p. 5), would obviously have ended with p. 6 (apparently blank). It appears more likely that the Faunæ was in fact printed in 4<sup>o</sup>, with the first gathering still comprising less than a complete sheet, but examination of the original would be needed to confirm or disprove this.
- SPINOLA, M. 1806-1808: Insectorum / Liguria / species novae aut rariores, / quas / in agro Ligustico nuper detexit, / descripsit, et iconibus illustravit / Maximilianus Spinola, / adjecto catalogo specierum auctoribus jam enumeratarum, / quae in eadem regione passim occurrunt. Genova; printed for the author.
- Vol. I [Introductory matter and Fasc.1]. Half-title, title, pp. [i]-xvii [Proemium; catalogue of entomological works in author's library]; Fasc. 1, pp. [1]-159, [160: Errata], 2 pl. 21 Oct 1806.
- The original title page bears the imprint: Genuæ, / sumptibus auctoris. Typis YVES GRAVIER. [rule] 1806. The title page, printed at Frankfurt, of copies sold by Jäger has the altered imprint: Francofurti ad Moenum, / in Libraria Jægeria. / MDCCCIX.
- Vol. II [Introductory matter and Fasc.2-4]. Half-title, title, pp. [i]-ii [catalogue cont'd].
- Fasc. 2, pp. [1]-81, 31 Dec 1807.
- Fasc. 3, pp. [83]-206, 17 Feb 1808.
- Fasc. 4, folding table, pp. [207]-262, [i]-v. [explanation of plates; Errata Fasc.2-4], 5 pl. [pl. I and II, comprising fig. 1-8, not numbered]. 17 Mar 1808.

The original title page bears the same imprint as vol. I but 'Yvonis' for 'Yves' and the date 1808. The title page, printed in Paris, of copies sold by KÆNIG has the imprint Genuæ./sumptibus auctoris. Typis YVES GRAVIER. / Prostat Parisiis et Argentorati, / apud AMAND KÆNIG, bibliopolam./1808.

Bibliographers have referred to two *editions*, in the sense of printings, but the text was not reset and the Frankfurt and Paris agents merely supplied title pages bearing their own imprints to copies of the Genova printing. The work was however available in an ordinary issue and in a large paper issue on wove paper. VIDANO, C. & ARZONE, A. 1978: Sulla collezione SPINOLA conservata nel CASTELLO DI TASSAROLO. - Atti XI Congresso nazionale Italiano di Entomologia: 253-260.

**Author's address:**

Dr. DONALD B. BAKER  
Hope Entomological Collections  
University Museum of Natural History  
Oxford OX1 3PW, U. K.

**Besprechungen**

DE PRINS, W.: **Catalogue of the Lepidoptera of Belgium.** - Brussel: Koninklijk Belgisch Instituut voor Natuurwetenschappen, 1998. - 236 S. - (Studiedocumenten van het K.B.I.N.; 92)

Mit vorliegendem Werk wird erstmals für Belgien ein Katalog der im Lande nachgewiesenen Lepidopteren vorgelegt. Er reiht sich ein in die in den letzten Jahren veröffentlichten ähnlichen Werke für Frankreich, die Niederlande, Österreich, Dänemark. Als systematische Grundlage wurde das 1996 erschienene Werk „The Lepidoptera of Europe“ von KARSHOLT & RAZOWSKI verwendet. Die aus der Literatur oder durch Auswertung von Sammlungen erhaltenen Angaben für die einzelnen Arten werden, nach Provinzen getrennt, in Listen zusammengefaßt. Unterschiedliche Kennzeichnungen ermöglichen die Unterscheidung in Angaben aus dem Zeitraum bis 1980 und in die ab 1980. Für jede Art werden zusätzlich die erforderlichen Literaturzitate genannt. Jeder Familie vorangestellt sind allgemeine Bemerkungen zum Gesamtartenbestand, zur verwendeten Systematik und Nomenklatur, zur Bestimmungsliteratur und zu den Gewährsleuten, die Daten geliefert haben. Der Katalog umfaßt Angaben zu 2405 validen Arten aus 71 Familien.

Eine Liste der verwendeten Literatur sowie ein Register beschließen diesen Band, der einen wichtigen Baustein für eine hoffentlich in der Zukunft entstehende Europafauna darstellt. Der Preis von 580,- BEF wird kein Hindernis für eine weite Verbreitung dieses Nachschlagewerkes sein.

R. GAEDIKE