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(138-146) Nine proposals to amend Art. 60 of the Code

Gillian Perry¹ & Dan H. Nicolson²

Proposals dealing with correction of original spelling

(138) Add a paragraph after Art. 60.1:

"60.1bis. For a generic name, only those corrections made by the original author(s) in the same work where the name was validly published are to be accepted, unless the name was published in a journal, when corrections made in a subsequent issue, published within 3 years, must also be accepted."

It is considered that in the interest of nomenclatural stability the Code should place constraints on the correction of orthographical and typographical errors. The directive of the Code to use "original spelling" is meaningless if anyone can "correct" anything that they do not like on the pretext that it is an orthographical or typographical error. The proposed provision would limit corrections to be accepted to those made by the original author under the conditions outlined. The proposal imposes a time limit of three years for corrections published in a subsequent issue of a journal. Three years were chosen to ensure that there would be sufficient time to publish a correction in the next issue of, for example, a house journal that only appears irregularly.

(139) Add a second paragraph after Art. 60.1:

"60.1ter. For specific or infraspecific epithets, only the following corrections are to be accepted: (a) all corrections made by the original author(s) in the same work where the specific or infraspecific name was validly published, plus, if the name was published in a journal, all those corrections made in a subsequent issue, published within 3 years; (b) the correction of errors evident from the protologue; (c) the correction of errors that it can be demonstrated were the result of a copyist's or printer's error (e.g. upside down letters, incorrect sequence of letters)."

In the case of specific and infraspecific epithets it would seem appropriate to allow more liberty to correct. The proposed new provision would allow, in addition to those corrections made as outlined for generic name, the correction of obvious typographical errors as well as the correction of those errors that are evident from the protologue.

If Art. 60.1bis and 60.1ter were accepted then the following additional changes to the Code would be needed.

(140) In the second line of Art. 60.1, add "(but see Art. 60.1bis for generic names and 60.1ter for specific and infraspecific epithets)" after "errors".

(141) Delete Art. 60.3.

¹ Western Australian Herbarium, Department of Conservation and Land Management, Locked Bag 104, Bentley Delivery Centre, Western Australia 6983, Australia.
² Botany Department, MRC-166, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560-0166, U.S.A.
(142) Add the following example after Art. 60 Ex. 3:

“Solanum rohrii Wright (1894) was based on the misreading of the name “Roth” on a herbarium label. However, as this error is not evident from the protologue, the name must not be corrected to S. “rothii”."

(143) Rewrite Art. 60 Ex. 4 as follows:

“Indigofera “longipednuculata” Y. Y. Fang & C. Z. Zheng (1983) is to be corrected to I. longipedunculata since it must be assumed that a printer’s error has resulted in a “u” and “n” being reversed.”

Proposals dealing with intentional latinisation

The phrase “except for terminations covered by Art. 60.11” at the end of Art. 60.7 together with Art. 60 Ex. 10 were added to the Code to make it clear that Art. 60.11 (terminations) overrides Art. 60.7 (intentional latinisation). Ex. 10 indicates that the spelling Zygophyllum billardierii is unacceptable and must be corrected to Z. billardierei. That the spelling “billardierii” violates Art. 60.11 is obvious but the fact that the example maintains that the name must be spelled Z. billardierei, without giving what would appear to be the equally possible option Z. billardieri is significant. From this it is argued that for the purpose of forming a specific or infraspecific epithet, an intended latinisation of a modern personal name cannot be preserved if the only change in orthography involved (a) dropping the final vowel or (b) in the case of a name ending in a silent “e” or an unaccented “e” changing the “e” to an “i”.

This means for example that Blandfordia backhousii Gunn & Lindley (in Bot. Reg. t. 18. 1845), named after Backhouse, must be changed to B. backhousei and that Aneilema loureirii Hance (in J. Bot. 6: 250. 1868), named in honour of Loureiro, must become A. loureiroi. To ensure that the significance of Ex. 10 is recognised it is proposed that a slightly reworded Ex. 10 be made a “voted example” and that an explanatory note and two additional examples be inserted below Ex. 10.

(144) In Art. 60 Ex. 10, second line, add “of the intended epithet, “billardierii”, obtained from that latinisation,” after “termination”; and in the last line replace “is correctly spelled” with “is to be spelled”.

(145) Make Art. 60 Ex. 10 a “voted example”.

(146) Add the following Note and two examples after Art. 60 Ex. 10:

“Note 1sexies. For the purpose of forming a specific or infraspecific epithet, an intended latinisation of a modern personal name cannot be preserved if the only change in orthography was (a) the omission of the final vowel or (b), in the case of a name ending in silent or unaccented “e”, changing that “e” to an “i”.

“Ex. 10bis. Blandfordia “backhousii” was named by Gunn & Lindley (1845) after James Backhouse. The intended latinisation, “Backhousius” (in nominative), resulted from changing the a silent “e” to “i”, and so Gunn and Lindley’s latinisation cannot be preserved and the name is correctly spelled B. backhousei Gunn & Lindley.

“Ex. 10ter. Briquet (1894) named Hystis glaziouii to honour A. F. E. Glaziou. Briquet’s intentional latinisation, “Glaziovius” (in nominative), resulted from changing “u” to “v”, and so Briquet’s spelling H. glaziovii is to be preserved and must not be altered to H. “glazioui”.”