

(331–333) Proposals on the type of the name of a genus or a subdivision of a genus

Paul M. Kirk^{1,2} & Yi-Jian Yao¹

¹ State Key Laboratory of Mycology, Institute of Microbiology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China

² Royal Botanic Gardens (Jodrell Laboratory), Kew, Surrey TW9 3AB, U.K.

Author for correspondence: Paul M. Kirk, p.kirk@kew.org

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/654.40>

An inconsistency in the *Code* permits the introduction of names of new genera or subdivisions of a genus lacking a *Code*-compliant type. This occurs when the authors of a new genus or a new subdivision of a genus select an existing species as the ‘type species’ but are not required to ensure this name is typified.

A change to Art. 10.1 was introduced in the *Sydney Code* (1983) as a result of a proposal from a special committee on typification of generic names, established by direction of the Nomenclatural Section associated with the previous IBC in Leningrad. The change was to require that the type of a generic or a subdivision of a generic name be the type of the name of a species, not the species itself.

Prior to the *Sydney Code*, the application of a name at the rank of species and below was determined by a type comprising (usually) a specimen, whereas above the rank of species it was determined by a name. The specimen could be examined by any number of empirical-based methodologies, which is not the case for a name, for this is just a string of characters. The reworded Art. 10.1 reads:

“10.1. The type of a name of a genus or of any subdivision of a genus is the type of a name of a species [...]. For purposes of designation or citation of a type, the species name alone suffices, i.e. it is considered as the full equivalent of its type.”

The problem with this wording is that it assumed that a species name designated or cited as a type was already, or was concurrently, typified. This may be true for new genera or subdivisions of genera where the name is based on a new species published at the same time, but many such names were published by designating a pre-existing species name which may not have been satisfactorily typified, thereby lacking a *Code*-compliant type. A more dogmatic interpretation would argue that this typification requirement is implied, and thus any generic names published during the last thirty-odd years were not validly published if the species name was not typified – a requirement that has only existed for about 50 years, whereas species names have been available as potential types of genera for over 250 years.

(331) Add a new paragraph to Art. 40 as follows:

“40.6bis. For the name of a new genus or subdivision of a genus published on or after 1 January 2019, indication of the type must include the species name (Art. 10.1) as well as citation of the type of that name (see Art. 7–9); if necessary, by designating a type for that species under the relevant provisions of Art. 7 and 9.”

Add at the end of Art. 10.1: “(but see Art. 40.6bis)”

(332) Add a new Recommendation at an appropriate place in the Code:

“*n. n.* Authors proposing names of new families or subdivisions of families are urged to ensure that the generic name on which the family is based is effectively typified, in line with that required for names of new genera and subdivisions of genera (see Art. 40.6bis); if necessary, by designating a type for the species that is the type of the relevant generic name.”

This recommendation is, of course, dependant on the acceptance of Prop. 331 – if for some inconceivable reason Prop. 331 fails to be accepted the proposal immediately above should be replaced with the following.

(333) Add a new Recommendation at an appropriate place in the Code:

“*n. n.* Authors proposing names of new families or subdivisions of families or names of genera or subdivisions of genera are urged to ensure that the generic name on which the name of a family or subdivision of a family is based or the species name on which the name of a genus or a subdivision of genus is based is effectively typified, in line with that required for names of new species; if necessary, by designating a type for the relevant generic or species name.”