NAMES ASCRIBED BY PUBLISHING AUTHORS TO OTHERS

P. F. Yeo *

This matter is covered by Recommendations 46C and 46D of the Code; a valuable discussion of these Recommendations, and of Article 46, has been supplied by Voss (1965).

When an author ascribes a name to another it may be that the name was
(a) used in a manuscript or herbarium annotation of the earlier author
(b) invalidly published by the earlier author
(c) wrongly ascribed to the earlier author
(d) accompanied by a description written by the earlier author but not previously published.

A further possibility is (e) that the author publishes a description written by another author without acknowledgment.

(a) and (b). Recommendation 46C allows that “When a name has been proposed but not validly published by one author and is subsequently validly published and ascribed to him by another author, the name of the former author followed by the connecting word ex may be inserted before the name of the publishing author”. The purpose of this Recommendation is not made clear in the Code. One possibility is to enable the giving of credit to the coiner of the name (who perhaps first discovered or recognized the taxon), but Voss (l.c.) quotes a statement by Fosberg that the idea of ‘credit’ for a name has not been, and should not be, introduced into the Code, and this must indeed be at most a minor element involved in Recommendation 46C, though it is probably a major element in the ascription, by publishing authors, of plant names to others. Bullock (Taxon 7: 223—224, 1958) considered that the only possible purpose for citing a “pre-publication” author must be to indicate the type of the name, and that its use should therefore be forbidden in those cases where the publishing author did not in fact see the material studied by the originator of the name. It seems to me undesirable to carry out such a proposal, as authorities are not generally a means of indicating types and there is no reason why some and not others should have this function forced upon them. Such indications are in any case only approximate: to determine the type with certainty one must inevitably consult the protologue, and one will there find out if the publishing author used the manuscript name of another, and can decide whether this is relevant to typification or not. The perpetual citation of a “pre-publication” author is, therefore, not justified on the ground of giving assistance in typification.

The purpose of citing authorities, outside nomenclatural works, is to avoid confusion of homonyms. (Bullock (l.c.) claimed that this is not mentioned in the Code, but it is surely implicit in, and indeed the purpose for the inclusion of, the phrase “For the indication of the name of a taxon to be accurate and complete” in Art. 46, for if homonyms did not exist, names would be complete without authorities.) But the correct and incorrect ways of abbreviating citations containing ex result in two apparently unconnected citations, e.g. Penstemon speciosus Douglas and P. speciosus Lindley, thus suggesting the existence of homonyms where there are none. One purpose of continuing to use ‘ex’ citations is, therefore, to eliminate such misapprehensions. The value of this is all the greater because of the very widespread and,
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in the light of Voss’s historical account, seemingly almost perverse disregard of the provision of Article 46 that the publishing author must be cited, and of the part of Recommendation 46C stating that the citation of two authors connected by ex should be abbreviated by retaining the publishing author.

(c). In J. G. Baker’s account of the Liliaceae in Jour. Linn. Soc. (Bot.) 14 (1875) we find on p. 630 the name Ruscus hypophyllum var. hypoglossum Lam. I have not been able to find this combination in an earlier work; possibly Baker considered that it was made implicitly by the statement in Lamarck and De Candolle, Flore Française ed. 3. 3: 180 (1815), that R. hypoglossum L. does not appear to differ from R. hypophyllum L. If, then, the name was never proposed by Lamarck, Recommendation 46C does not apply, and we must write “R. hypophyllum var. hypoglossum (L.) Baker”. In this context, “(L.) Baker” has no evident connection with “Lam.”, whereas “(L.) Lam. ex Baker” does, and shows at once that there is no homonymy involved. A similar false ascription was made by Kunth (Enum. 5: 275 (1850)) in publishing “Ruscus hypoglossum var. angustifolius Poll.” Pollini published this variety with a description and the designation β, but without a name (Fl. Veron. 3: 195 (1824)), so we must cite “var. angustifolius Kunth” in place of “var. angustifolius Poll.”. Voss (1965, p. 158) gives an example of a partially incorrect ascription, where Gleason, publishing the herbarium names of the deceased Cogniaux, accompanied by his own descriptions, used the citation Cogniaux et Gleason. Voss’s conclusion is that the correct full citation should be Cogniaux ex Gleason. But “Cogniaux” is not the citation which originally appeared with the names of these taxa, and the solution which I would prefer, if the Code allowed it, would be to write Cogniaux et Gleason ex Gleason. Thus I am in favour, for the purposes of revisional and monographic work, of always quoting the original citation in full before the ex which precedes the publishing author’s name. This rule should be straightforward in application, and gives a fully accurate (if sometimes cumbersome) reference to the original valid publication. This would best fulfill what I conceive to be the main function of Recommendation 46C, namely to connect up the correct citation of the publishing author’s name with the citation which actually appeared in the original publication.

Proposal 281. I therefore propose the substitution of the following for para. 1 of Rec. 46C:

“When an author who first validly publishes a name ascribes it (with or without justification) to another person, the correct author citation is the name of the actual publishing author, but the name of the other person, followed by the connecting word ex, may be inserted before the name of the publishing author, if desired. The same holds for names of garden origin ascribed to “Hort.” (hortulanorum).”

Voss (1965, p. 158) points out that it may be difficult to determine proper author-ship where one author attributes a new combination to another, when all that the non-publishing author may have had to do was to supply the epithets combined in the new manner. In such cases he favours the use of in (presumably by analogy with a description by one author published in the work of another — see Rec. 46D), so that abbreviated citations are attributed to the first-named author. But this results in a citation which does not lead us to the place of first valid publication, which is against the utilitarian approach of the rest of Voss’s article.

Proposal 282. I therefore propose an additional paragraph to Recommendation 46C, worded as follows:

62
“When the authorship ascribed to a new combination in its place of first valid publication differs from that of the publishing author the connecting word ex should be used rather than in, even where the material quoted by the publishing author is sufficient to meet the requirements of Art. 32 (3) and Art. 33, para. 2 (cf. Rec. 46D).”

Burtt (Taxon 15: 106–107, 1966), in a note recommending the use of square brackets round the non-publishing author’s name as a guide to correct abbreviation, remarks that “the taxonomic mood ten years hence may well be to sweep away the use of ‘ex’.” Whereas the manner of abbreviating “ex” citations is regulated by the Code, the use of such citations is not obligatory, and is therefore dependent on the context in which a plant name is used, and on what one conceives to be the purpose of such citations. While I have argued that the scope of Recommendation 46C be extended, I would concede that, because of the prevalence of incorrect abbreviation, “ex” citations should only be used where they seem to be genuinely helpful. Thus, where a publishing author cites his own name, preceded by ex, after the non-publishing author’s name, there would be no need for later authors to cite the non-publishing author unless the incorrect abbreviation of the authority for the plant name concerned had already become prevalent. Also, it is possible to discourage the use of ex when new names are published in the future. If there was a recommendation to this effect in the Code, publishing authors could refer to it if they feared that failure to cite the manuscript author’s name could give offence. It is perfectly possible to acknowledge another author’s unpublished name without citing him as the authority. I therefore propose the following addition to the Code:

Proposal 283. “Recommendation 46G. Authors publishing names and combinations proposed but not validly published by other authors should refrain from citing these authors as authorities for the names.”

(d). Here, Recommendation 46D applies. Individual cases may occasionally give difficulty but it is doubtful if refinements of legislation would be worth while.

(e). When descriptions are supplied by an anonymous author, or by one only of several authors indicated on the title page, it would seem best to base the citation on direct evidence of authorship supplied only by the publication itself (including evidence from all parts of a serial publication). The admission of external evidence, while doubtless often of value in the tracing of types, makes for instability of author citation as bibliographic knowledge accumulates.

Dr. E. G. Voss has very kindly read the manuscript of this article and as a result of his advice some alterations have been made.
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