

International Union of Biological Sciences

Section of Zoological Nomenclature

Report of Meeting, Canberra, 14–18 October 1988

Present: Dr W. D. L. Ride (Chairman), Dr H. G. Cogger, Miss R. A. Cooper, Professor J. O. Corliss, Professor C. Dupuis, Dr W. M. Eschmeyer, Mr K. D. Faïrey, Mrs A. Gentry, Miss A. J. A. Green, Dr R. B. Halliday, Professor L. B. Holthuis, Dr W. M. K. Houston, Dr K. H. L. Key, Dr M. E. King, Professor O. Kraus, Dr P. T. Lehtinen, Mr R. C. Longmore, Dr M. Meinander, Mr R. V. Melville, Dr E. S. Nielsen, Mr S. Rad, Dr D. C. F. Rentz, Dr B. J. Richardson, Mr J. D. D. Smith, Dr D. L. Strusz, Dr F. C. Thompson, Dr P. K. Tubbs, Dr G. F. Van Tets, Dr D. W. Walton.
By invitation: Mr R. J. F. Henderson (Queensland Herbarium).

1. Meetings took place on three days. Not all persons listed were present on all occasions. Dr Cogger took the Chair when Dr Ride was unable to be present.

2. The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming all present. He explained that the Section of Zoological Nomenclature was convened by IUBS and consisted of members of the Commission, any zoologists being members of national or other delegations of IUBS and any other zoologists admitted by the Commission. Any botanists present were by invitation. He explained that the main tasks of the Section were to elect members to the Commission, to initiate consideration of amendments to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, and to consider resolutions forwarded by the pre-Assembly Biotaxonomy Workshop.

3. *Election of Members to the Commission*

All members of the Section had a vote in the ballot for new members of the Commission. Five vacancies had been announced, arising from the completion of tenure by Professor Alvarado, Dr Bernardi, Professors Dupuis and Holthuis and the death of Professor Zheng. Twenty-one zoologists had been nominated, including the four retiring members, who the Council of the Commission had ruled eligible for re-election. In accordance with Article 4(d) of its Constitution, the Commission had selected 10 of the nominees to present to the Section as candidates. Five of the 10 nominees were recommended by the Commission for election to secure the best balance of nationality and zoological field in Commission membership. The ballot was open throughout the afternoon of 17 October and the morning of 18 October. Forty-three members of the Section voted. Dr Ride and Professor Corliss conducted the election. The following five zoologists were elected to the Commission:

BOCK, Prof W. J.	U.S.A.	Ornithology
DUPUIS, Prof C.	France	Heteroptera
HOLTHUIS, Prof L. B.	Netherlands	Crustacea
MARTINS DE SOUZA, Prof U. R.	Brazil	Coleoptera
NIELSEN, Dr C.	Denmark	Bryozoa, Mollusca, Coelenterata

4. *Consideration of Amendments to the Code*

The Chairman explained that proposals to amend the Code could be submitted to the Commission's Executive Secretary. Proposals would be published in the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature (BZN) for discussion by zoologists and would be considered by a committee of the Commission. It was intended to work towards a new edition of the Code which in draft form could be considered by the Commission and the Section in 1991. An opportunity for preliminary consideration would arise at meetings of the Section and the Commission planned in conjunction with ICSEB at its meeting in Maryland in July 1990. The new edition could be ratified by IUBS in 1994 and published as soon after that as possible. The views and advice of the Section on the general principles involved would provide a valuable input to the Commission.

The Section considered a document prepared by the Executive Secretary of the Commission. This incorporated suggestions and proposals for amendments made by a large number of zoologists and by members of the Commission since publication of the 3rd Edition in February 1985, and other points that had come to the attention of the Secretariat. Proposals had been examined by the Commission's Scrutinising Committee which had met in London in April 1988. This report records the Section's response to proposals that were discussed, together with additional amendments proposed from the floor.

Article 1(a). Zoological Nomenclature. Definition and Scope. Names of animal taxa. A proposal that the fundamental aims of zoological nomenclature should be incorporated in Article 1(a) was not favoured since such a definition would be out of place in the Articles and should remain in the Preamble.

Article 8. What constitutes publication. It was important to make clear and uniform the status of suppressed works. They could be cited for reference purposes, but names could not be available in them, nor would they be sources of formal nomenclatural acts, i.e. they would have the same status as works published before 1758.

Article 11(f)iii. Criteria of availability. Family-group names. A family-group name published before 1900, but not itself fully latinised, can be available with its original author and date, provided that it has been latinised by later authors and generally accepted as valid by authors interested in the group concerned. It had been proposed that the requirement that acceptance as valid must be by authors 'interested in the group' was unnecessarily restrictive and might be dispensed with. No conclusion was reached; some members thought that this requirement should be retained.

Articles 12 and 13. Criteria of availability. Names published (a) before 1931, and (b) after 1930. It was agreed that there was a case for simplifying and merging these two Articles into a single Article. The words 'purported to differentiate the taxon' could be replaced by 'purported to make the taxon identifiable'. There was support for the suggestion that, from a future date, a new species-group name would not be available unless a type specimen or specimens had been labelled and deposited in a publicly accessible collection. There would be circumstances when this requirement could not be met, e.g. for specimens that could not be retained for physical or legal reasons.

Article 23(b). Principle of Priority. Purpose. This Article is open to criticism since it places on a worker wishing to preserve current general usage of a junior name the onus to apply to the Commission for its conservation. It would be preferable to place on the worker wishing to introduce a forgotten senior synonym to replace a junior synonym in

general current use the onus to justify that action. The following amendment was proposed by Dr Key:

‘After 19—,

(1) A name that has remained unused in the primary zoological literature for more than 50 years is not to displace a junior synonym in general use unless the Commission so rules;

(2) An author who considers that a name unused, or rarely used, within a period of less than 50 years would disturb stability or universality, or cause confusion, if it replaced a junior synonym in general current use, should apply to the Commission requesting a ruling to give precedence to the name in current use’.

In discussion, members agreed that the proposed amendment had many attractions but agreement was not reached. It was noted that Articles 23(b), 79, 80 and the Preamble needed to be considered together.

Article 24(b). Principle of the First Reviser. It was noted that, in the case of authors citing names established by themselves, the present requirement that the competing names in question must be cited together was unnecessarily restrictive. It was agreed that the wording of this Article should be amplified so that an author who subsequently used only one of two or more synonyms previously published simultaneously by himself should be held to have acted as the first reviser unless another author had already become the first reviser.

Article 29(b)(i). Family-group names. Determination of stem in names of type genera. It had been proposed that, in the construction of family-group names when the genitive singular of the generic name had the form *-idis*, the stem should be elided so that family-group names had the form *-IDAE* rather than *-IDIDAE*. Members had no strong views on this proposal but recognised that some groups of workers, such as ichthyologists, would favour it.

Article 31(a). Species-group names formed from personal names. Use of the terminations *-i* and *-ii* needed clarification. Opinion was divided between the advantages of following the original spelling or of changing *-ii* to *-i*, except in certain cases. There was little support for permitting the user to have discretion as to which termination should be used.

Article 31(b). Adjectival species-group names. Agreement in gender. There was strong support for a proposal that the spelling of an adjectival specific name should remain as in the original binomen, even when combined with a generic name of a different gender from that in the original combination. Classical knowledge was becoming uncommon and, more significantly, data retrieval techniques required uniform usage.

Article 33(a). Formation and treatment of names. Kinds of subsequent spellings. There was strong support for the proposal that the Code should make it absolutely clear that, in all cases of doubt, a different subsequent spelling should be treated as incorrect and not as an unjustified emendation.

Article 39. Family-group taxa and names. Homonymy of the type genus. It was thought desirable to maintain the concept of the family-group taxon, so that, when the name of a type genus is found to be a junior homonym, the family-group name should be replaced by the name based on the replacement name of the type genus.

Article 40. Family-group taxa. Synonymy of the name of a type genus. The meeting favoured a simplification of this Article, with merging of Sections (a) and (b). It was

most important to maintain continuity of the family-group name in current general usage, even if based on a type genus name itself rejected as a junior synonym.

Article 51. Citation of name of author. Use of parentheses in changed combination. It was agreed that the use of parentheses to enclose the name of the author of a species-group name in a changed combination should be abandoned since, while of some value in taxonomic works, it was of little value for other uses. Furthermore, misleading information was given when, as frequently happened, parentheses were wrongly omitted.

Article 55. Homonymy, Family-group names. It had been proposed that homonymy in family-group names caused by the similarity of the names of their type genera could be permitted when confusion was unlikely to be caused. However, the view of the meeting was that increased use of data bases made it important to avoid homonymy in family-group names, even when occurring in widely different animal groups.

Article 70(b). Types in the genus-group. Misidentified type species. Action to be taken on a misidentified type species required careful consideration since it was important to maintain the meaning of the genus at the time the misidentification was discovered. It was desirable to provide procedures which did not require action by the Commission in every case; a number of possible solutions could be recognised and should be carefully considered.

Article 75. Types in the species-group. Neotypes. A proposal had been submitted that when, even if types existed, it was not possible to solve a complex zoological problem, the Commission could set aside the status of the existing type material and that a provisionally designated neotype could be treated as the type while the case was under consideration. This proposal was supported.

Article 78(c). Effective date of Opinions. It was agreed that the words '... and are to be reported to the next succeeding Congress' could be omitted.

Article 78(d). Status of Opinions and Directions. It was proposed that simple corrections or completions of an Opinion on matters which did not alter the substance of a ruling could be published without the need for a vote by the Commission. The term 'Direction' for such corrections and completions could be discontinued. The title 'Supplementary Opinion' might be appropriate in cases which required formal action by the Commission.

Article 79. Plenary power. The meeting debated the merits (BZN 45: 45–46) of conserving the names of taxa while not suppressing specified senior names. It was pointed out that it would be wrong to prejudge the status of senior synonyms or homonyms that might exist, although unknown at that time.

Article 80(b). Status of case under consideration. Date when consideration is deemed to begin. It had been suggested that a case be deemed to be under consideration from the date of its receipt by the Executive Secretary, rather than from the date of publication in the BZN of its receipt. This change was not favoured since it was not until the BZN was published that the existence of the case could be generally known.

Article 80(c). Status of case under consideration. Existing usage. It had been suggested that the definition of 'existing usage' to be followed while a case was under consideration should be widened to enable an author to use any name he considered best served the purpose of zoological nomenclature. This suggestion was not favoured since it introduced an undesirable element of subjectivity. It was recognised, however,

that the present words 'the most common current usage' were not appropriate in a minority of cases.

Article 87(b). Interpretation of the Code. Status of Recommendations, Examples, Titles, Footnotes, and Appendices. A blanket proposal to include Recommendations, Examples, Titles, Footnotes and Appendices as part of the 'legislative' text of the Code was not supported since this would be tantamount to converting them to Requirements. It was, however, possible that some sections should be made mandatory, but these should be considered on an ad-hoc basis.

The term 'nomenclaturally valid'. A proposal to apply the term 'nomenclaturally valid' to denote a name whose nomenclatural credentials were beyond reproach had been published (BZN 43: 308–309 and 44: 131). The meeting favoured the use of this term.

5. IUBS pre-Assembly Biotaxonomy Workshop

A Workshop 'Whose Name? What Specimen?' had been held at Canberra, 12–14 October 1988, attended by 85 botanists and zoologists including the majority of members of the Section of Zoological Nomenclature. The objective of the Workshop was to provide a forum for learning and exchanging ideas about some major proposals to change the formal ways in which taxonomists are obliged, under the International Codes of Nomenclature, to deal with biological names.

The Workshop passed five resolutions [published as an Appendix to the report of the General Session of the Commission in BZN 46: 12–13] to be presented to the IUBS General Assembly. These resolutions were considered by the Section. As a result of formal voting on each resolution the meeting directed that the Chairman convey to the Assembly its endorsement of, and support for, the resolutions and urge their adoption by the General Assembly.



Tubbs, Philip K. 1989. "International Union Of Biological Sciences. Section On Zoological Nomenclature. Report Of Meeting, Canberra, 14-18 October 1988." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 46, 14–18.
<https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.474>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44487>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.474>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/474>

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>.