



A potentially contentious case of correction under Article 32.5.1.1 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature

EDWARD C. DICKINSON¹, NORMAND DAVID² & STEVEN M. S. GREGORY³

¹Flat 3, 19 Bolsover Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex BN20 7JG, U.K.

²516 Shakespeare, Dollard-des-Ormeaux, Quebec, Canada H9G 1A2 E-mail: normanddavid@videotron.ca

³35 Monarch Road, Northampton, Northamptonshire, NN2 6EH, U.K.

We deal here with a case involving a corrigendum and two spellings although these take the shape of two names.

"*brachypterus* or *macrorhynchus*" Gould, 1841 (p. 163)

On page 188 of the same number¹ of the journal volume in which the above pair of names appeared a corrigendum specifies: 'P. 163. Line 7, erase the words "*brachypterus* or"'. This action by Gould's publisher introduced a correction that leaves *macrorhynchus* as the correct original spelling, and this was also used in the index of the volume. It should be observed that the correction is also consistent with Gould's description ("*rostrum praegrandi*", "bill ... also projects much farther...than in any other species inhabiting Australia"), and with the lack of a comment therein on wing length. Gould (1865: 89) used "*brachypterus*" (which could be viewed as a First Reviser act under Art. 24.2.4), and Mathews (1912: 282) selected "*brachypterus*" (which could be viewed as a First Reviser act under Art. 24.2.3), but these later acts are unnecessary and nullified as the precedence of the spelling *macrorhynchus* is objectively determined under Arts. 24.2.5 and 32.5.1.1 combined with Art. 86.3.

Podargus macrorhynchus, now *Podargus strigoides macrorhynchus* [Dickinson, 2003: 237, where "*brachypterus*" was used].

Here the author introduced two names linked by the word 'or'. Art. 32.1 defines an original spelling as the spelling used in the work in which the name was established. The Code (ICZN 1999) does not self-evidently provide for this curious situation unless the two names are considered one in which case Art. 32.5.1.1 applies. Here however we have two very different spellings. An alternative resolution of this case, if these spellings are judged to be different names and not different spellings, lies in acceptance of the selection of a First Reviser and that act must be found in a subsequent work. Dubois (2006) provided the term *allelonyms* for such alternative nomina published together for the same taxon, and suggested that the valid one be fixed by a First Reviser action.

The introduction of Article 24.2.4 in the 1999 Edition of the Code retroactively empowers original authors, and here makes Gould (1865) the First Reviser. He selected "*brachypterus*", the same selection as that made by Mathews (1912) and endorsed by Schodde & Mason (1999) on the basis of the previous edition of the Code (ICZN 1985). While this does seem desirable from the point of view of stability, the recent introduction of Art. 32.5.1.1. does not allow it. A First Reviser is to accept a publisher's or author's corrigendum as clear evidence of an inadvertent error. It is thus mandatory, under the 1999 Code, to use the spelling *macrorhynchus* and to put aside the name "*brachypterus*" which Gould (1841: 188) or his publisher requested be erased. Equally the introduction of Art. 24.2.5 can now be cited to show that First Reviser action was unnecessary since the corrigendum in 1841 allows the objective determination of the correct name *macrorhynchus*.

Acknowledgements

We are pleased to acknowledge Michel Gosselin and the late Izya Kerchner for sharing their thoughts on this case or on the interpretation of the relevant articles of the Code.

1. Duncan (1937) dated pages 119–188 'July 1841'.