

aimed to prevent, say, *Haloragidoideae* instead of *Haloragoideae* as a subfamily of *Haloragaceae* (or *Cannabineae* or *Cannabideae* instead of *Cannabeae* as a tribe in *Cannabaceae*). The proposed note could be placed following the examples accompanying 19.4. It is also relevant for Rec. 19A.2 (and proposal 291).

Acknowledgements

The first of these two sets of proposals would not have been submitted but for Kristina Lemson, at <http://www.chs.ecu.edu.au/org/staff/>

[klemon.html](#), a specialist on one of the genera of Epacridaceae / Epacridoideae. A remarkably lengthy discussion with John McNeill assured a clean solution. Details of publication given here are those provided in the extensive website maintained by James L. Reveal at <http://www.inform.umd.edu/PBIO/fam/sgindex.html> (referred to in the above proposals as “Reveal’s website”). This is done as a matter of convenience and is not intended as an endorsement, as the proposer does not intend to take any kind of position on the priority of any suprageneric name.

(296) A proposal to reinstate illustrations as types

R. K. Brummitt, K. M. Challis, P. J. Cribb, E. Nic Lughadha & N. P. Taylor

The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AE, U.K. r.brummitt@rbgkew.org.uk

Prop. 296: Delete Art. 37.4.

We believe that changes concerning illustrations as types introduced into the St. Louis Code by the Editorial Committee were made without any mandate from the Congress. The new Art. 37.4, replacing the previous Art. 8.3, was never proposed or discussed at St. Louis. It now clearly rules that any name of a new taxon published since 1958 with an illustration as its type is not validly published unless it was impossible to preserve a type specimen. This change has been found to be destabilising to plant nomenclature and retroactively make many names not validly published. The application of the wording of the new Art. 37.4, referring to “if it is impossible to preserve a specimen”, is very unsat-

isfactory since interpretations of what is ‘impossible’ will vary greatly. Valid publication of names should be clear from the protologue and not dependent on subjective factors or information only available elsewhere. A full discussion of the matter by the present authors has been submitted for publication in *Taxon* and is currently under review.

On acceptance of this proposal, the meeting may wish to consider whether Art. 8.3 of the *Tokyo Code* should be reinstated, but the present authors do not favour this. Those who wish to rule against illustrations being types for names of new taxa published in the future may wish to propose an alternative Art. 37.4, but again the present authors do not favour this.

(297–298) Proposals to recommend increased precision in author citations by the addition of dates of valid publication

David L. Hawksworth

MycoNova, The Yellow House, Calle Aguila 12, Colonia La Maliciosa, Mataelpino, Madrid 28492, Spain. myconova@terra.es

A proposal to modify Art. 46.1 by advocating the citation of dates of publication after the names (or abbreviations) of the names of authors of scientific names (Hawksworth in Taxon 47: 951. 1998) was rejected at the St. Louis Congress. However, this practice is commonplace in zoology and is being increasingly used in mycology (e.g., Cannon & al., Br. Ascom. 1983; Purvis & al., Lich. Fl. Gr. Br. Irl. 1992; Malcolm & Galloway, N. Z. Lich. 1997; Kirk & al., Dict. Fungi. Ed. 9. 2001; Coppins, Checklist Lich. Gr. Br. Irl. 2002); since 2000 this has been a requirement in the instructions to authors of *Mycological Research*, the second most highly cited mycology journal worldwide in 2003 according to ISI Journal Citation Reports.

At present author citations tend to be copied from one publication to another without any checking as to the original place of publication. If a date also has to be added, authors are more likely to check the original publications. Further, the addition of a date more accurately pinpoints a particular publication than does an otherwise naked author citation.

In the mail ballot prior to the St. Louis Congress, a substantial proportion of those responding, amounting to around one third of all votes cast, were in favour of the requirement to add the year

whenever author citations were employed (66 Yes vs. 143 No). There was consequently substantial support for the concept. While the Vienna Congress might agree with the St. Louis Congress and find this suggestion too excessive as part of an Article and therefore being made a mandatory requirement, it might have less objection to the inclusion of a new Recommendation aimed at encouraging what can only be viewed as sound practice. The proposal to add a new Recommendation is therefore made here.

(297) Proposal to recommend that dates of valid publication of names are added to author citations

Insert a new Rec. 46E: “46E.1. In order to enhance the value of author citations as an abbreviated bibliographical reference to the place of valid publication of a name, it is recommended that the year of valid publication be given immediately after the citation of the name(s) or abbreviated names of the author(s). The dates should be presented in a typographical style which distinguishes them from references cited in the text whose full bibliographical details are provided in lists of literature cited, for example by the omission of parentheses.”

(298) Insert a new example to the new Rec. 46E

"Ex. 1. The citations *Abrothallus* De Not. 1845, and *Acremonium lichenicola* W. Gams 1971 conform to this recommendation."

This new Recommendation will promote what can only be interpreted as good practice; it will: (1) encourage authors to check personally the background information of names whose authorities they wish to cite, rather than copy author citations from secondary,

tertiary, or even more removed sources, compounding or perpetuating errors; and (2) provide a means of more precisely pin-pointing a particular publication and so facilitating access to the original place of publication of a name.

Acknowledgement

This contribution was prepared while I was in receipt of an award from the Programa Ramón y Cajal of the Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología of Spain held at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

(299) Proposal to amend Article 52.3

Charles Jeffrey

Komarov Botanical Institute RAN, 2 Prof. Popov St, 197376 St. Petersburg, Russia

The first two clauses of the first sentence of Art. 52.3 read: "A name that was nomenclaturally superfluous when published is not illegitimate..." There follows a conditional clause that will be considered below but, should that condition be fulfilled, can such a name always be "not illegitimate", as implied by the present wording? What if the name proves to be a later homonym? There would then be a conflict with Art. 53.1. Amendment to the wording is obviously required.

The conditional clause that follows reads "if its basionym is legitimate, or if it is based on the stem of a legitimate generic name". Art. 33.3 defines the basionym of a name as its "name-bringing or epithet-bringing synonym" but a name can be such only if it is legitimate (Art. 11.4 - "the correct name is the combination of the final epithet of the earliest legitimate name of the taxon in the same rank, with the correct name of the genus or species to which it is assigned..."). The conditional clause in Art.

52.3 - "if its basionym is legitimate" - is consequently nonsensical, for an illegitimate name cannot be a basionym, as it cannot serve as a name-bringing or epithet-bringing synonym, and a basionym is therefore ipso facto always legitimate. Again amendment to the text is required.

The wording of the first sentence of Art. 52.3 consequently requires amendment on two counts. The following proposal is put forward to effect the required amendments.

(299) Amend the first sentence of Art. 52.3 to read as follows:

A name that was nomenclaturally superfluous when published is not illegitimate on account of its superfluity if it is a combination based on a name-bringing or epithet-bringing synonym (basionym), or if it is based on the stem of a legitimate generic name.

(300–301) Proposals to clarify the interpretation of Article 60.7 and its Example 11

John H. Wiersema¹ & Dan H. Nicolson²

¹ United States Department of Agriculture/Agricultural Research Service, Systematic Botany & Mycology Laboratory, Bldg. 011A, BARC-West, Beltsville, Maryland 20705, U.S.A. *jwiersema@ars-grin.gov*

² United States National Herbarium, Smithsonian Institution, NMNH, MRC-166, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A. *nicolson.dan@nmnh.si.edu*

(300) Modify Art. 60.7 to read (changes indicated in bold font):

60.7. When changes in spelling orthography by earlier authors who adopt personal, geographic, or vernacular names in nomenclature are intentional latinizations, they are to be preserved, except when they concern only the termination of epithets to which Art. 60.11 applies and stem changes to personal names involving (a) omission of a final vowel or final consonant or (b) conversion of a final vowel to a different vowel, which are to be corrected by restoration of the final letter.

(301) Rewrite Art. 60 Ex. 11 as follows (changes indicated in bold font):

Ex. 11. *Acacia "brandegeana"*, *Blandfordia "backhousii"*,

Cephalotaxus "fortuni", *Chenopodium "loureirei"*, *Convolvulus "loureiri"*, *Glochidion "melvilliorum"*, *Hypericum "buckleii"*, *Solanum "rantonnetii"*, and *Zygophyllum "billardieri"* were published to commemorate **T. S. Brandegee**, J. Backhouse, R. Fortune, J. de Loureiro, R. Melville and E. F. Melville, **S. F. Buckley**, **V. Rantonnet**, and J. J. H. de Labillardière (de la Billardière). The implicit latinizations are **Brandegeus**, **Backhousius**, **Fortunus**, **Loureireus** or **Loureirus**, **Melvilliuss**, **Buckleius**, **Rantonneus**, and **Billardierius**. The names are correctly cited as *Acacia brandegeana* **I. M. Johnst.**, *B. backhousei* Gunn & Lindl. (1845), *Cephalotaxus fortunei* Hook. (1850), *Chenopodium loureiroi* Steud. (1840), *Convolvulus loureiroi* G. Don (1836), *G. melvilleorum* Airy Shaw (1971), *H. buckleyi* **M. A. Curtis**, *S. rantonnetii* **Carrière**, and *Z. billardierei* DC. (1824).