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subdivision, and thus (Art. 7.10) of the generic name Phegopteris. (Happily enough, this is the same species as designated by Ching (1963).)

I can heartily agree with the application of Art. 63.3 to Phegopteris, but only because its type (a) is not the same as the type of Gymnocarpium, and (b) is provided by the rankless subdivision, instead of the result of a lectotypification, dating from 1963.

Ad (a): If Ching (1933) had designated Gymnocarpium phegopteris (L.) Newman as the lectotype of Gymnocarpium, the case would have been comparable to the Hordelymus/Cuviera case before Cuviera was rejected (with the only difference that those names were monotypic on publication). Then I would have the same reluctance to accept that the youngest name is legitimate.

Ad (b): If Phegopteris had been untypified until 1963, e.g. because Polypodium phegopteris would not have existed, the case (though more complicated again) would essentially be comparable to the Blepharozia/Phitiium case. Again under the present Code I would have the same reluctance to accept that Art. 63.3 can be applied.

Under the present Art. 63.3, Phegopteris is "saved" anyhow. With the proposed amendment of Art. 63, it is saved only thanks to Art. 22.4 which determines that Phegopteris was typified since its establishment already.
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(246)–(254B) Miscellaneous nomenclatural proposals to the Berlin Congress.

Some of the proposals we make below may impinge on items coming from the Committee on Valid Publication or Committee on Lectotypification. At the time of writing we do not have the final reports of these committees and so are unable to be certain about any overlap or conflict with their conclusions.
(1) Non-retroactivity of Lectotypifications

Principle VI of the Code states "The rules of nomenclature are retroactive unless expressly limited", but does this also apply to the effects of lectotypifications, which are merely choices the Code authorizes and not rules in themselves? Rauschert (Taxon 34: 721–726. 1985) presents considerable evidence that lectotypifications have not been regarded by others as retroactive in effect and quotes the emphatic remarks made by the late Dr. Donk at the Edinburgh Congress, who feared that admission of retroactivity of lectotypifications would send him down in history as "Bloody Donk, Donk the Ripper". We agree with Rauschert that the words "when published" in Art. 63.1 constitute an expressed limitation of the retroactivity principle. We also agree with him that for practical purposes it is highly undesirable to regard lectotypifications as retroactive (see Rauschert and Šutara's discussions of Leccinum, loc. cit. 678–685, 713, 724–725). It has often been said that the introduction of the concept of illegitimacy into the rules was unfortunate, and retroactivity of lectotypifications, in our view, can only make an already undesirable feature all the worse. Thus, if retroactivity of lectotypification is accepted, we will create a new category of names alongside those classes as either legitimate or illegitimate; this would be the 'potentially illegitimate' name, describing those whose original circumscriptions included an element that one day could be designated the lectotype of an older name.

However, the effects of lectotypifications have an important bearing on more than just the legitimacy of names with which Rauschert has been concerned. Articles 22 and 26 dictate that the names of infrageneric and infraspecific taxa which include the type of the correct generic or specific name with which they are combined, are to repeat that name unaltered, i.e. they are autonyms. Names that are not in accordance with this requirement are invalid (cf. Art. 32.1(b)). However, when published, many such infrageneric and infraspecific names did not include the type of their respective generic or specific name because the latter's lectotype had not yet been designated. If the effects of lectotypifications are held to be retroactive, such names can be retroactively invalidated with unpleasant consequences. For example, Echinocereus series ['Reihe'] Erecti Schumann was validly published in 1898 and included some 21 species. Its lectotype was determined as E. engelmannii (Engelm.) Lemair by Buxbaum in 1974. Schumann's series also included E. viridiflorus Engelm., which Britton and Rose designated as the lectotype of Echinocereus Engelm. in 1922. Today, series Erecti does not include the generic lectotype, and thus it seems ridiculous that this well known name should be retroactively invalidated because it once included a taxon later determined to be the type of the generic name, yet not referable to the infrageneric taxon concerned (cf. Taylor, The Genus Echinocereus, 1985). Until this question of retroactivity is resolved the status of such names hangs in the balance, and until lectotypification of relevant generic or specific names takes place, infrageneric or infraspecific names affected by Arts. 22, 26 and 32.1(b) may be considered to be 'potentially invalid'.

Unlike Art. 63, there is no expressed limitation of the principle of retroactivity in relation to Articles 22 and 26 and lectotypifications. While we believe the latter are never retroactive in effect, it nevertheless seems desirable that this should be clearly stated in the Code. Acceptance of the proposal we are making below would remove the need for a Note beneath Art. 63.1 and makes Rauschert's Proposal 85 unnecessary by clarifying that nowhere in the Code are lectotypifications retroactive.

However, besides the question of retroactivity, our proposal attempts to resolve another ambiguity of lectotypification in the present Code by its reference to "inclusion in an effectively published work". At present it is not clear whether publication is necessary for a lectotypification to be operative, and we have encountered instances where an annotation on a herbarium sheet has been regarded as effective lectotypification. Our proposal would preclude this possibility.

(246) Proposal to add to Art. 7.5 a new sentence: "A lectotypification is operative only from the date of its inclusion in an effectively published work."

If the Editorial Committee wishes to include Examples the following may be considered:

"Ex. 1. When originally published, Echinocereus Engelm. series ['Reihe'] Erecti Schumann (1898) included, among other species, E. viridiflorus Engelm., which was subsequently designated lectotype of the generic name by Britton and Rose (1922). Since the generic lectotype had not been determined at the date when ser. Erecti was published, the latter is valid and can be used for an infrageneric taxon in Echinocereus so long as its circumscription does not include E. viridiflorus (cf. Arts. 22 and 32.1(b))."

"Ex. 2. When originally published, Leccinum S. F. Gray (1 Nov. 1821) included Boletus edulis Bull.: Fr., which was subsequently proposed as lectotype of Boletus Fr.: Fr. (1 Jan. 1821) by Donk (Regn. Veg. 34: 33. 1964) and became the conserved type of Boletus on publication of the Seattle Code in
1972. Nevertheless, *Leccinum* S. F. Gray was legitimate when published and remains so irrespective of subsequent developments.”

(2) Designation of Lectotypes and Neotypes

The Committee on Valid Publication has proposed modification of Art. 37 to make it obligatory after 1 Jan. 1990 to cite the herbarium in which a holotype specimen is permanently conserved—see Prop. 143. We are in favour of this idea, but feel it is illogical that the same provision has not been extended to include lectotypes and neotypes. The uncertainty caused by an author who designates a collection represented by duplicates in various herbaria, but fails to cite one of these, is the same for lectotypes and neotypes as it is for holotypes. In discussion with colleagues we have found conflicting views over whether an author who merely cites a collection, such as ‘Smith 1234’, as a lectotype or neotype without specifying the herbarium, has effectively typified the name concerned. May there be two stages in lectotypification under the present Code, one designating a *lectotype collection* and the second designating a *lectotype specimen* in one herbarium in which this collection is preserved? Or if the herbarium is not indicated, is the typification not operative, making selection of a quite different specimen possible in future? These questions are best avoided by making the citation of herbaria a requirement of lecto- and neotypification in line with that proposed for holotypes.

To avoid the necessity of adjusting the Code in three places, we propose the addition of a single paragraph to Article 7, which accounts for all three categories of type. If accepted it would render unnecessary the proposal from the Committee on Valid Publication to modify Art. 37. It should be noted that Art. 37 already includes a cross-reference to Art. 7, providing valuable emphasis for this new requirement in relation to holotypes.

(247) Proposal to add after Art. 7.18 a new paragraph: “7.19. On or after 1 Jan. 1990, in cases where the holotype, lectotype or neotype of a name of a taxon at species rank or below is a specimen or unpublished illustration, a type is considered to be designated only if the herbarium or other institution in which it is conserved is stated.”

It may be desirable to add a note of warning after this Article, that failure to observe these provisions for holotypes will cause names of new taxa to be invalid under Arts. 37 and 32.1(d).

(3) Hyphenated Generic Names

Article 20.3 states ‘The name of a genus may not consist of two words, unless these words are joined by a hyphen’. This rule has been part of the Code since the Vienna Congress (1905) and is currently reinforced by Note 3 beneath Art. 73.9, which reminds us that ‘a generic name published with a hyphen can be changed only by conservation’. In practice the number of accepted generic names which must be written with a hyphen is small, and seems even smaller since the hyphen is easily ignored and forgotten. For example, *Fitzroya* and *Saxegothaea*, the generic names of two well known conifers, should be written as *Fitz-* *Roya* and *Saxe-* *Gothaea* according to their original spellings, but nearly all reference works write them without hyphens. In such circumstances it is clearly desirable that the familiar spelling be conserved, but the preparation of the necessary proposals is a time-consuming business, and further expends the valuable time of those who have to consider such proposals as members of specialist committees, e.g. Committee for Spermatophyta. If a hyphenated generic name is maintained as such, or if conservation of the unhyphenated form fails, difficulties beyond those of the unfamiliarity of these names can occur. Modern data processing systems, adaptable as they are supposed to be, cannot always cope with hyphenated generic names (unless specially programmed), since the problems they cause are not restricted to the hyphen alone. Unlike hyphenated epithets, hyphenated generic names are inconsistent with respect to whether the first letter of the second word element is capitalized or not. This is also a difficult thing to remember when writing such names, and here it should be pointed out that the Code itself has run into difficulties—the hyphenated names in Art. 20.3 Ex. 7 should have an upper case letter for the second word element in each case! Furthermore, if a computerized data-base cannot cope with a hyphenated generic name, data on the constituent species of that genus may be difficult to recall. Thus the potential problems are much greater than with hyphenated epithets.

Some may consider the proposal presented below to represent needless meddling with the Code. However, we believe it is but a small change, and one worth making for the sake of consistency in the written form of generic names and for the time saved of those involved in conservation proposals and computerized data processing.

836
(248) Proposal to revise Art. 20.3 to read: “The name of a genus may not consist of more than one word. If a name of a genus was originally published as two or more words hyphenated together, it is to be corrected to read as one word with the hyphen(s) deleted and, where necessary, the second word element decapitalized.” Adjust Example 7 to read: “...Sebastianio-Schaueria, and Neves-Armondia (both hyphenated when originally published) are validly published, and the latter are to be written as Sebastianoschaueria and Nevesarmondia”. Delete Note 3 and Ex. 14 under Art. 73.9 and adjust second sentence of Rec. 73G Note 1 to read: “For the use of hyphens in epithets see Art. 23.1.”

(4) Substantive and Adjectival Infrageneric Epithets

Recommendation 21B.1 states that “The epithet of a subgenus or section is preferably a substantive, that of a subsection or lower subdivision of a genus preferably a plural adjective”. Unfortunately it is not made clear whether epithets with the same stem in the form of substantives or plural adjectives are to be treated as different epithets or as different forms of the same epithet. By analogy with Rec. 23A.2, which deals with species epithets, the former seems to apply. Some authors have assumed, however, that such epithets may be converted from one form to the other and vice versa. For example, in Fl. Reip. Pop. Sin. 65(1): 210 (1982) we have “Callicarpa series Verticirimae (H. T. Chang) P’ei et S. L. Chen, stat. nov.—[based on Callicarpa Sect. Verticirima H. T. Chang in Acta Phytotax. Sin. 1: 298 (1951)”. Another example is Pinus ser. Balfourianaes (Engelm.) E. Murray in Kalmia 13: 12. 1983, based on Pinus subsect. Balfouriana Engelm. The question is, should we consider P’ei and Chen’s series name as a nom. nov., despite their parenthetical author citation and statement of “stat. nov.”, or regard their use of the adjectival form of this epithet as an error and correct it back to Chang’s substantive form? This problem arises fairly frequently in compilation of Index Kewensis. There seems no obvious answer to the question and so we put forward two alternative proposals with examples for consideration. Either of these should settle the problem of how such names are to be treated.

(249A) Proposal to insert new Art. 21.3: “When an author publishing an infrageneric epithet in the form of a plural adjective indicates (by way of a parenthetical author citation or basionym reference) that the epithet is based on an earlier published infrageneric epithet with the same stem but in the form of a substantive (or vice versa) he is deemed to have published a substitute name (nom. nov.) and not a new combination (or stat. nov.).” Renumber present Art. 21.3 as 21.4 and insert further Example:

“Ex. 2. Pinus series Balfourianaes E. Murray in Kalmia 13: 12 (1983) is to be treated as a nom. nov. for Pinus subsect. Balfouriana Engelm. and is not to be cited as ser. Balfourianaes (Engelm.) E. Murray, since these two forms (plural adjective and substantive) represent independent epithets.”

(249B) Proposal (alternative to 249A above) to insert new Art. 21.3: “When an author publishing an infrageneric epithet in the form of a plural adjective indicates (by way of a parenthesis author citation or basionym reference) that the epithet is based on an earlier published infrageneric epithet with the same stem but in the form of a substantive (or vice versa) the original form of the epithet is to be restored (the change in form being regarded as an error) and the name treated as a new combination (or stat. nov.).” Renumber present Art. 21.3 as 21.4 and insert further Example:

“Ex. 2. Pinus series Balfourianaes (Engelm.) E. Murray in Kalmia 13: 12 (1983), based on Pinus subsect. Balfouriana Engelm., is to be corrected to read ‘Balfouriana’ as it was intended as a stat. nov., not a new epithet in plural adjectival form.”

(5) Clarification of ‘context’ in Article 32.2

The present Article 32.2, introduced at Sydney following a proposal by Meikle (Taxon 28: 160–161. 1979), rules on the way in which a type is to be selected for a name validated by reference to a previously published description or diagnosis. The Code’s example of how Adenanthera bicolor Moon should be lectotypified is perfectly clear, but when the Article is applied to other examples problems of interpretation can arise. Backeberg published many names after 1957, which have to be considered invalid since the types were either not designated or were known to have been living specimens (cf. Arts. 37 and 9.5; Eggl in Bradleya 3: 97–102. 1985). Subsequently, Mottram (Mammillaria Index, 1980) has made reference back to Backeberg’s original diagnoses for certain of his new Mammillaria names (Descr. Cact. Nov. III: 8. 1963) and at first sight appears to have validated them according to Art. 32.1. However, the types he cites (as ‘lectotypes’) are illustrations published by Backeberg three...
years after his diagnoses (Kakteenlexicon, 1966). These illustrations are connected with the earlier published diagnoses only by virtue of their captions, which employ the same names, there being no indication that the actual plants figured represent those earlier described. Are such elements to be regarded as 'selected from the context of the validating description or diagnosis' (Art. 32.2)? We believe they are not, but it is not absolutely clear whether to observe Art. 32.2 means these names have been validated by Mottram or not. The addition of the following example beneath Art. 32.2 reflects what we believe is the status of such names and should help define the meaning of 'context' in this Article.

(250) Proposal to add the following Example beneath Art. 32.2: “Ex. 4. The name Mammillaria dixanthocentron Backeb. Descr. Cact. Nov. III: 8 (1963), nom. inval. (Arts. 9.5 and 37) was not validated by Mottram, Mammillaria Index, 24 (1980), since although he satisfied the requirements of Art. 32.1, the type he designated (Backeb. Kakteenlexicon, fig. 212. 1966) was not selected from the context of Backeb's validating diagnosis.

(6) What Is a Bibliographic Error of Citation?

The provision that "Bibliographic errors of citation do not invalidate publication of a new combination", currently included in Art. 33.2, has been in the Code since the 1952 Stockholm edition. The Examples given have varied considerably between recent editions as different attempts have been made to illustrate what is meant by this sentence. The 1972 Seattle Code gave only one Example, in which an illegitimate (homonymous) name was given as the basionym instead of the nom. nov. with the same epithet published nine years later which should have been given according to the Note under Art. 72. However, this was deleted from the 1978 Leningrad Code and replaced by a different Example in which the place of publication of the basionym (Trichipteris kalbreyeri) and its cited author constituted merely a later usage of a name previously validated by a different author in a different publication. This appears again in the 1983 Sydney Code as Example 5, together with a new Example 6 which gives a very comparable case from mycological literature. A new Example 4 is also now given in which the basionym was cited giving the wrong genus and wrong date. (The new Example 3 is not concerned with bibliographic errors; its first sentence refers to the first provision of Art. 33.2, while its second sentence is not relevant to this Article at all but to Art. 45.)

It seems reasonable to accept Example 4 as a case where two bibliographic errors are made (though some might consider that quotation of Mespilus instead of Pyrus in the basionym is a nomenclatural and not bibliographic error). Examples 5 and 6, however, are more than what we would regard as bibliographic errors, and are directly contrary to Art. 33.3. They do not by any stretch of the imagination give a reference to the place of publication of the basionym, and the names concerned must be considered invalid under Art. 33.3.

Another peculiarity of the sentence in question is that it refers only to publication of new combinations. The previous sentence covers nomina nova as well. Presumably there is no deliberate intention to exclude these from the provisions for bibliographic errors, and they should also be allowed for in this second sentence.

How much latitude is it desirable to allow publishing authors of new combinations and nomina nova? There is a whole series of degrees of error possible, from a simple mistake in page number or date to citation of a completely wrong reference. Some errors are understandable, and perhaps forgivable, while others are blatant bad practice. Where do we draw the line?

Koyama, in Bot. Mag. Tokyo 69: 64. 1956, made the combination Machaerina iridifolia (Baker) Koyama, basing it on Cladium iridifolium Baker, Fl. Mauritius: 424. 1877, but the latter is itself only a combination based on Scirpus iridifolius Bory, Voy. 2: 94, t. 23. 1804. Here the supposed basionym is actually a newly published name which should appear in indexes or published synonymies, and so seems one stage better than the Alsophila kalbreyeri case in Example 5 where the supposed basionym is merely a later usage by a different author. This Machaerina case is comparable with that of Sulcorebutia ambigua quoted by Rowley in his proposal to the Sydney Congress in Taxon 29: 342. 1980.

In Feddes Repert. 68: 207. 1963 D. A. Webb published the name Saxifraga dichotomy subsp. albarraciniensis (Pau) D. A. Webb, citing the basionym as S. albarraciniensis Pau, Not. Bot. Fl. Esp. 6: 54 (1895). However, the latter name was actually published six months earlier by the same author, Pau, in Actas Soc. Esp. Hist. Nat., 2 ser., 3: 134 (1895) (a reference not given in Index Kewensis), and Fernandez Casas and Lainz in Candollea 29: 328 (1974) have declared Webb's combination invalid and have re-published it in their own names. Webb had correctly quoted the bibliographic information available to him at the time, and has only been proved wrong by more recent investigation.
He at least got the author of the basionym right, and therefore did better than Tryon in the *Alsophila kalbreyeri* case. Webb's error is understandable, and according to Example 5 his reference is to be treated as a bibliographic error and his combination was valid. At the same time, however, according to strict interpretation of Art. 33.3 his combination is invalid, as indicated by Fernandez Casas and Lainz.

The critical point seems to be whether or not a bibliographic error may include citation of a completely erroneous reference or only a minor slip in citation of the volume, page or date of the correct reference. If one wishes to take a hard line over bibliographic errors one will argue that if the reference given (allowing for the error included) is not to the actual place of publication of the basionym then the name is not valid, in which case we must delete present Examples 5 and 6 or transfer them with changed wording to Art. 33.3. On the other hand, if one wishes to introduce a subjective element, accept reasonable attempts to find the correct place of publication of the basionym, and permit completely incorrect references given in good faith, then an extra clause is necessary under Art. 33.2 and a let-out clause is required under Art. 33.3. We present this choice to the Congress in the form of the following alternative proposals, both incorporating the new allowance for *nomen nova*.

(251A) Proposal to revise the second sentence of Art. 33.2 to read "Bibliographic errors in the citation of the place of publication of the basionym or replaced synonym, or reference to the wrong place of publication of such names given in good faith, do not invalidate publication of a new combination or *nomen novum*." Include the new examples given above, indicating that *Machaerina iridifolia* (Bory) Koyama and *Saxifraga dichotoma* subsp. *albarracensis* (Pau) D. A. Webb are valid (perhaps deleting the present Example 6 which is too similar to the present Example 5). Add to Art. 33.3 "except as allowed under the second sentence of Art. 33.2".

(251B) Proposal (alternative to 251A above). Revise the second sentence of Art. 33.2 to read "Bibliographic errors in the citation of the place of publication of the basionym or replaced synonym do not invalidate publication of a new combination or *nomen novum*.

Transfer Examples 5 and 6 to Art. 33.3 with changed wording indicating that *Alsophila kalbreyeri* and *Lasiodobelium corticale* were not validated by Tryon and Raitviir respectively (or delete Example 6 altogether), and add the further examples indicating that *Machaerina iridifolia* and *Saxifraga dichotoma* subsp. *albarracensis* were not validated by Koyama and D. A. Webb respectively.

We are grateful to Professor D. A. Webb (Dublin) and W. Marais (Kew) for discussion of the above problem and provision of examples.

(7) On 'in' and 'ex' Citations.

As has been pointed out in a series of proposals by P. F. Yeo accompanying this (see Proposals 204–213) the citation of authors' names after taxa is a significant matter in which precision is required to avoid confusion. This is becoming increasingly important in compilation of data banks, where homonyms are usually distinguished solely by differences in author citation. We agree with Yeo in principle that some of the issues at present covered by Recommendations under Art. 46 (particularly 46D.1 and 46E.1, and perhaps 46C.1 as well) would be more appropriate as parts of the Article, giving rulings rather than mere Recommendations. There remain, however, a number of questions of what these Recommendations—or Articles—should say.

The question of whether one uses 'in' or 'ex' is clearly a critical one, but the wording of Recs. 46D.1 and 46E.1 does not make a clear distinction. We are told that "When a name with a description or diagnosis (or reference to . . .) supplied by one author is published in a work by another" an 'in' citation is used, but "When an author who validly publishes a name ascribes it to another person" an 'ex' citation is required. But it is perfectly possible, and indeed likely, that both these situations may pertain in the same case. Thus in the case of *Orchis rotundifolia* given under Rec. 46E.1 as an Example of when to use an 'ex' citation (Orchis rotundifolia Banks ex Pursh), it seems very likely that Banks did supply the description in the work published by Pursh, which exactly satisfies the conditions of Rec. 46D.1 for which an 'in' citation is appropriate. The question which should be asked in this case is whether Banks is given as the publishing author of the description within the publication by Pursh.

(252) Proposal to amend Rec. 46D (or the appropriate Article if Yeo's Prop. 206 should be accepted) to read "When a name and its description or diagnosis (or reference to a description or diagnosis) are published by one author in a work by another author . . .".
Two simultaneously published proposals, (48) by Laundon in Taxon 3: 333 (1985) and (49) by Guédès (l.c. 333–334), both aim to change Rec. 46E with a similar goal in mind but with very different wordings. The point concerns use of ‘ex’ citations when the publishing author has taken up an epithet from a name not validly published by an earlier author, but has used that epithet in a different combination (either at a different rank or under a different generic or specific name). Both Laundon and Guédès object to simple ‘A ex B’ citations in this situation, which seem not to reflect the reality of the situation and can lead to absurd attributions of names. Thus in one of Laundon’s examples a subspecies name is attributed to Harms who probably never used this rank in his life. In other cases a binomial can be attributed to somebody who never used (and may not have been aware of) the generic name concerned. We confess much sympathy in principle with Laundon and Guédès, and would prefer not to give an ‘ex’ citation if the validating author has published a different combination from that invalidly used by the earlier author. In our experience this is also what most current publishing authors do in practice. However, as Dr. Yeo has pointed out to us, this is simply going back to the position which obtained before the 1969 Seattle Congress accepted his proposal to insert the present wording, and it is unfortunate to chop and change from one Congress to another. Now, since both Laundon and Guédès have re-opened the question, we simply comment on their respective wordings.

We agree with Guédès that it is desirable that some evidence be available that the earlier author actually did propose the name attributed to him in these cases, and that ascription of a name to an earlier author by somebody else later should be disregarded if the earlier author’s intentions are not so reflected. His lengthy proposal, however, would be difficult to enforce, and we certainly cannot agree with the second sentence of his proposal. Laundon’s proposal implies that the ascription of the name should be unaltered, when in fact it is the name itself which should be unaltered. We would suggest that a preferable wording would be as follows: In Rec. 46E.1, replace the part preceding the comma on the first line by “When an author validly publishes a name which was earlier proposed but not validated by another person and ascribes the name to that person, . . . ”, and add after the first sentence “If only the epithet, not the whole name, proposed but not validated by the earlier author is taken up by the validating author, an ‘ex’ citation should not be used”. Add Examples given by Laundon in Proposal 48.

Another frequently encountered problem of ‘in’ or ‘ex’ citations which is not covered by the present Art. 46 relates to multiple authors. In a number of notes on the genus Sophora published by Brummitt and J. B. Gillett in Kirkia 5: 259–270 (1966), the combination S. tomentosa subsp. occidentalis was ascribed to (L.) Brummitt, not (L.) Brummitt & J. B. Gillett. It is surely the prerogative of the publishing authors to indicate in this way how they wish the combination to be cited. To attribute the combination in future to (L.) Brummitt ex Brummitt & J. B. Gillett would be cumbersome, unhelpful and unnecessary. Nonetheless, we have sometimes seen author citations given in this way. A similar situation would have arisen if the paper had been by one author and the combination ascribed to two, and again an ‘ex’ citation seems undesirable. Such examples are common, but the Code gives no guidance on how the authorship should be given.

Further complications may arise in cases like the revision of the genus Brachystegia by Burtt Davy and Hutchinson, Bull. Misc. Inf. Kew 1923: 129–163 (1923), where all the new names are ascribed to Hutch. & Burtt Davy. We have even seen the names attributed to Hutch. & Burtt Davy ex Burtt Davy & Hutch. Surely we can accept the clearly indicated wishes of the authors without such unnecessary complications.

Stated briefly, the principle seems to be that we do not see the need for ‘ex’ citations if at least one author’s name would appear both before and after the ‘ex’. In such cases we should accept the ascription given. The following proposal seeks to formalise this.

(253) Proposal to add to Rec. 46E: “In cases involving joint authors where the authorship of the publication is not identical with that ascribed to the new names included, if at least one author is common to both, the ascription given should be accepted without an ‘ex’ citation.

While putting forward only two proposals on these problems we are well aware that there are many cases where different users of the Code will come to differing conclusions over use of ‘in’ and ‘ex’. Debates have gone on for years, for example, over author citations involving Robert Brown and Aiton’s Hortus Kewensis, and the Committee for Spermatophyta is certainly confronted by this from time to time. There may be a good case for setting up a Special Committee at Berlin to try to introduce some standardisation of practice.
We are grateful to Dr. P. F. Yeo for very profitable discussion, even if we have a slight difference in emphasis on some points, and to Mr. J. R. Laundon for his comments on our comments on his proposal.

(8) Again, Parenthetical Authors of Suprageneric Names

Cogent arguments against parenthetical authors after names of families, subfamilies, tribes etc. were put forward by Darwin in Taxon 28: 581–584 (1979) with appropriate proposals to the Sydney Congress. Names at these ranks are essentially different from names at generic rank and below, since they are of predetermined form (the root of a generic name attached to a termination indicating rank) and not open to free choice by the author. Already at Sydney in 1981 this essential difference was recognized in acceptance of proposals to remove such names from the provisions of Art. 63 concerning superfluous names, where their inclusion had made nonsense. In many instances, because the name itself was predictable, it is not possible to know whether a publishing author intended the name as a combination or not, if indeed such names can be combinations.

Although Darwin’s main proposal, under Art. 49, received a majority in favour in the postal vote, it was rejected without discussion at Sydney in the rush to get through the agenda, while one of us, who wished to support the proposal, was apparently blinking an eyelid (Englera 2: 86. 1982). Instead of a firm decision being taken it was left, at the suggestion of Johnson, as optional whether parenthetical authors were used or not.

The Code itself is now ambiguous on the matter. The present Art. 49 says that parenthetical authors should be used at ranks of genus and below, which seems to us rather clearly to imply that they are not to be used at higher ranks. However, for subfamily names in Ericaceae mentioned in Example 1 under Rec. 19A the Editorial Committee of the Sydney Code have now inserted parenthetical authors which were not given in the Leningrad Code. One wonders if this was justified in view of the discussion and conclusion reported in Englera 2: 86 and the present wording of Art. 49. In Appendix II, however, the list of conserved family names consistently eliminates the parenthetical author, with the exception of one name in Hepaticae which was presumably entered by somebody other than the compiler of the much longer Angiosperm list. The situation seems unsatisfactory, and no clear guidance is available to users of names at these ranks. We offer alternative proposals in the hope of resolving the matter. Our clear preference is for the first.

(254A) Proposal to add at the end of Art. 49 “Parenthetical author citations are not used after names above the rank of genus”, and under Rec. 19A delete the parenthetical authors in Example 1.

(254B) Proposal to change the word “genus” in the first line only in Art. 49 to “family”, and instruct the Editorial Committee to have all the family names in Appendix 2 checked and parenthetical authors inserted where appropriate.


(255)–(257) Proposals to amend Art. 37.2 and Rec. 37B.

(255) Proposal to amend Art. 37 by adding a new Art. 37.2: “Publication on or after 1 Jan. 1989 of the name of a new taxon of the rank of species or below is valid only when the nomenclatural type is deposited in the herbarium of a public, permanent, responsible institution which is clearly indicated in the protologue.”

(256) Proposal to reword Rec. 37B as follows: “It is strongly recommended that the type specimens of taxa described prior to 1 Jan. 1989, and which are preserved in private or other kind of collections than those indicated in Art. 37.2, be transferred to public herbaria.”

(257) Proposal to delete Rec. 7A.

Comments: The taxonomy is based on the information contained by the specimens and no adequate taxonomic decision can be taken without their examination. The availability of the specimens, par-