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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-
ticularly the types, is of extreme importance for all taxonomic work and, consequently, the conditions for their preservation should be governed by the Rules rather than Recommendations.

Proposed by: O. Constantinescu, University of Uppsala, The Herbarium, P.O. Box 541, 751 21 Uppsala, Sweden.

(258) Proposal to substitute the term “Phylum” for “Division” in Art. 3.1 and elsewhere in the Code.

Proposals to effect this change were submitted to the Nomenclature Sessions of the Leningrad International Botanical Congress in 1975 (Taxon 23: 831–832. 1974) and at the Sydney International Botanical Congress in 1981 (Taxon 27: 121–122. 1978). These proposals, made by a group of internationally eminent biologists, represented an effort to bring the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature into conformity with the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature and the International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria, by replacing the term “division” by the term “phylum” throughout the ICBN.

The proposals failed to pass in each case, although the vote in 1981 was only 15 votes (of 405) short of the 60% required for passage (see Englera 2: 17. 1982). At Leningrad there appeared to be confusion in the minds of a number of the delegates. For example, one delegate told one of us (JHT) that he did not vote for the proposal because it would have meant that he could no longer use such names as Bryophyta, Pteridophyta, and Spermatophyta!

The objections to the passage of this proposal at the Sydney Congress have been summarized by W. Greuter and E. G. Voss (Englera 2: 16–17, 116–117. 1982). Some of the objections on the part of delegates bordered on the fatuous. The only potentially serious objection raised was that certain botanists in the past had used both categories in the same classification, phylum being at a higher hierarchical rank than division. As Paul Silva pointed out, Richard Wettstein in the four editions of his Handbuch der Systematischen Botanik (1st ed., Leipzig & Wien, 1901; 2nd ed., 1911; 3rd ed., 1924; 4th ed., 1935) had a category Stamm (phylum), subdivided into Abteilungen (divisions). Fosberg noted that several algologists have also utilized both categories, but in these cases, “phylum” referred to a category between division (or subdivision) and class; Demoulin noted that Feldmann (Rev. Algologique 10: 1–339. 1938) used “phylum” for a category of higher rank than “enbranchement” (division) in algae.

The desirability of having the names of the principal taxonomic categories, or as the zoologists call them, the “obligatory categories” (see Ehrlich, P. R. and D. D. Murphy, Syst. Zool. 32: 451–453. 1983), the same in both botanical and zoological nomenclature has been discussed in the previous proposals, and there seems to be substantive agreement that this is a worthy goal.

Indeed, a number of botanical authors have used “phylum” in place of “division,” including Charles E. Bessey in A Synopsis of Plant Phyla (Univ. Studies, Univ. Nebraska 7: 275–373. 1907), Lynn Margulis in Five Kingdoms (Freeman, 1981), and George Papanfuss (see Englera 2: 16. 1982). In Biology of Plants by Peter Raven and Helena Curtis (Worth, 1971), “phylum” was used in lieu of “division,” although three subsequent editions reverted to “division,” in accordance with the present Code.

If one looks at the various botanical codes starting with the Code adopted by the International Botanical Congress in Paris in 1867, there is no mention of “phylum.” Article 8 (p. 15) reads as follows:

ART. 8. Jedes Pflanzenindividuum gehört zu einer Art (species), jede Art zu einer Gattung (genus), jede Gattung zu einer Familie (ordo, familia), jede Familie zu einer Cohorte (cohors), jede Cohorte zu einer Classe (classis).

Article 10 (p. 16) shows the expanded hierarchical classification: “Regnum vegetabile. Divisio. Subdivisio. Classis . . . ” without mention of “phylum.”

The International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature adopted at Vienna in 1905, list Article 10 as follows (p. 36):

Art. 10. Every individual plant belongs to a species (species), every species to a genus (genus), every genus to a family (familia), every family to an order (ordo), every order to a class (classis), every class to a division (divisio).