

## Discussion Draft of the Fourth Edition of the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature*

### Comment on endings of species-group epithets (Articles 31, 32 and 48)

W.D.L. Ride (Chairman of the Editorial Committee for the 4th Edition)  
*Department of Geology, Australian National University, GPO Box 4,  
Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia*

#### *Introduction*

This comment is made to help zoologists to understand more clearly the options open to the Commission and the Section of Zoological Nomenclature of the International Union of Biological Sciences when they come to review the drafts of Articles 31 (Endings of species-group epithets), 32 (Original spellings), and 48 (Change of generic assignment) for the 4th Edition. Zoologists are urged to provide written comments on the options that the Commission and the Section can take into account at that time.

There is need for balanced input from zoologists so that options may be reviewed on the basis of wide informed opinion. Two of these are given in the Discussion Draft (Articles 31b(ii), 32c and 48). The issue arises as a consequence of the decision of the Commission that the Editorial Committee was to provide in the Discussion Draft that the mandatory changes in spelling to maintain agreement between the parts of a binomen or trinomen would no longer be required when changes in generic combination are made.

The example presented in the Discussion Draft to illustrate the matter is that of *Psittacus chrysostomus* Kuhl, 1820. When transferred to *Neophema* Salvadori, 1891, under the current Code (Articles 31b, 34b) a mandatory change in spelling to *Neophema chrystostoma* is required to maintain agreement in gender between the parts of the name. The latter combination (and spelling) resulting from the mandatory change has been in universal use for a considerable period.

#### *Options*

There are four principal options open for the treatment of already available adjectival or participial species-group epithets of which the spelling has been changed to meet the requirements of the current Articles 31 and 34, as in the example given. Variants of several of these four are also possible. The further possibility that all generic names might be deemed to have a common gender and that epithets be brought into agreement with that is not included. The principal options are:

1. To maintain the most common current spelling in use. *Advantage*: This would cause least upset to spellings in the existing literature (especially the non-taxonomic literature); it would not require the original literature to be consulted to ascertain the original ending (the original literature would still be consulted to confirm other aspects of spelling, date of publication, etc.). *Disadvantage*: The solution does not provide for names which have no completely stable generic association; many (possibly most) names are not in common use but have various generic allocations in the specialist literature and in such cases of no common use, a decision by users



would have to be made whether, of those uses, the most recent use would apply; disputation is likely to arise in the case of some names as to which of several is in 'most common use'; with the adoption of parts of the proposed *List of Available and Potentially Valid Names* (see Articles 77 and 78 in the Discussion Draft) the spellings of such names would differ from those in the List, which will record the original spellings.

2. To maintain the most common current spelling in use so long as the current generic allocation remains unchanged. *Advantage*: As in 1 above, but when a taxonomic change in genera results in a new form of the name becoming introduced into the non-taxonomic literature, opportunity would be taken to complete the change to the original spelling. *Disadvantage*: The same as the first three disadvantages given in 1 above.

3. To adopt the first reviser principle, namely that the first spelling used after the adoption of the 4th Edition would become invariable. *Advantage*: The rule would be clear-cut and is widely applied in nomenclature in lectotype selection, etc. *Disadvantage*: Instability of spelling would prevail until all usages had been ascertained in all literature published after the new edition and the first had been adopted.

4. To revert to the original spelling. *Advantage*: The provision would be applied in the same manner as that of confirming spellings, places of publication, date, etc.; there would be no doubt as to the correct spelling of any name. *Disadvantage*: Endings of many names in common use would be changed.

### *Comment*

In the Discussion Draft, in this matter alone, the Editorial Committee thought it useful to present drafts of two options for consideration (Options 2 and 4 above).

The zoological community is asked to consider the matter carefully and assist the Commission with factual statements in support of a preferred outcome based on names in use in their own fields.

When preparing the Discussion Draft the Editorial Committee was exposed to strongly expressed opinions which caused it to draft the options which have been circulated. A decision must be made to adopt an outcome in the eventual Code that will result in stable and universally accepted spellings. It is hoped that zoologists will comment in such a way as to lead the Commission to adopt a solution that is easy to apply, is productive of least uncertainty for future users of names, and is least upsetting in the longer term.

### **Comment on availability of new names and need for ratification in the Zoological Record (Article 11b)**

R.W. Crosskey

*The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*

1. By far the most perturbing aspect of the new draft Code is the proposal (Article 11b) that the availability of new animal names must be ratified by their appearance



Ride, W. D. L. 1995. "Comment On Endings Of Species group Epithets (Articles 31, 32 And 48)." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 52, 228–229.

<https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.6778>.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44798>

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.6778>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/6778>

#### **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.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

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>.