

(246) Proposal to amend Article 16 to provide for automatic typification in the absence of a family name

Scott A. Redhead

National Mycological Herbarium, Eastern Cereal and Oilseed Research Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, C.E.F., Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0C6. scott.redhead@agr.gc.ca

(246) Amend Art. 16.1 as follows:

Add ahead of the semicolon in the penultimate line, “or (2), in the absence of an included legitimate family name, is formed from the genitive singular of an included legitimate generic name as specified in Art. 18.1 but with the termination denoting the rank replacing *-aceae*”, and add “(1)” between “formed” and “by” in the third line.

The ability to conduct phylogenetic analyses to test deep relationships now allows biologists to construct reasonably accurate classifications from the Kingdom downwards rather than rank by rank from the species upwards. As a result, some systematists have published ordinal level names in the absence of legitimate familial names, each clearly linked to an included generic name. Although

such names do not meet the criteria of Art. 16.1(a) for valid publication as automatically typified names, names of taxa above the rank of family are not required to be formed in this way and if “not so formed” can always be treated as “descriptive names” under Art. 16.1(b) (cf. Hoffmann & Greuter in *Taxon* 42: 641–645. 1993). Article 16.1 explains and dictates how the names of taxa above the rank of family based upon legitimate family names are automatically typified, but does not clearly define how such names are to be typified if they are not so based and yet the root is a generic name. This proposal logically ties the type of the root generic name to the higher ranked name rather than treat the names above the rank of family as descriptive names.

(247–261) Fifteen proposals for the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* dealing with suprageneric names

James L. Reveal¹ & Kanchi N. Gandhi²

1 *L.H. Bailey Hortorium, Department of Plant Biology, 412 Mann Library Building, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853-4301, U.S.A.*

2 *Harvard University Herbaria, 22 Divinity Avenue, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138-2094, U.S.A.*

Author for correspondence: James L. Reveal, jlr326@cornell.edu

Various minor suggestions related to suprageneric names are proposed to clarify current provisions in the *Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146. 2006).

(247) Add a new Note to Art. 16:

“*Note 2bis.* Autonyms are not established automatically above the rank of family (Art. 22.1, 26.1).”

(248) Add a new Note to Art. 18:

“*Note 1bis.* Autonyms are not established automatically above the rank of genus (Art. 22.1, 26.1).”

If one or both of the above proposals are accepted, the Editorial Committee is urged to add references to these Notes in Art. 6.8.

(249) Delete the second paragraph from the introduction to App. IIB and move it, in a slightly modified form, to Art. 18, and add a new Example:

“*18.5bis.* When two names listed in App. IIB compete, the earlier must be retained unless the contrary is indicated in App. IIB or one of the competing names is listed in Art. 18.5. For any family including the type of an alternative family name in Art. 18.5, one or the other of these alternative names is to be used with priority dating from that of the earlier name.”

“*Ex. 8bis.* Although both *Hypericaceae* Juss. and *Guttiferae* Juss. were published in 1789, *Clusiaceae* Lindl. (1836), the alternative name for *Guttiferae*, has equal priority with *Hypericaceae*. Likewise, *Guttiferae*, and thus *Clusiaceae*, has priority over *Hypericaceae* even though *Guttiferae* was submerged into *Hypericaceae* before *Hypericaceae* was submerged into either *Guttiferae* or *Clusiaceae*.”

The above provision, almost universally practised, is moved from the introduction to App. IIB to the main body of the *Code* so that this suggestion becomes an established rule.

(250) At the end of Art. 32.1(d), after the closing parenthesis, add the phrase “of a taxon in an appropriate rank (see Art. 41)”.

If adopted, clause (d) of Art. 32.1 would read: “be accompanied by a description or diagnosis or by a reference to a previously and effectively published description or diagnosis (except as provided in Art. 42.3, 44.1, and H.9) of a taxon in an appropriate rank (see Art. 41).” Our proposal merely draws attention to the fact that names published at the rank of family and below are subject to the special provisions outlined in Art. 41.

(251) In the first line of Art. 33.2, after the word “reference”, add the phrase “(see Art. 32.6)”.

(252) Add a new Example to Art. 33:

“*Ex. 7bis.* When Reveal and Hoogland (in Bull. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat., sér. 4, sect. B Adansonia 12: 206. 1990) published *Xanthophylloaceae* they cited a later name published by Chodat (in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. III, 4: 329, 343. 1896) associated with diagnoses in German, which is to be corrected to *Xanthophylleae* Baill. (Hist. Pl. 5: 81, 91. 1874), associated with a diagnosis in French. However, when Takhtajan (Sist. Magnolif.: 192. 1987) published “*Xanthophylloideae*”, he cited “*Xanthophyllacées*” (Lecomte, Fl. Indo-Chine 1: 242. 1909), which was a nomen nudum. Although *Xanthophylleae* Baill. was available, Takhtajan’s reference to a name that was not validly published cannot be corrected and thus his “*Xanthophylloideae*” likewise was not validly published.”

(253) Alter the date given in Art. 35.2, from “1908” to “1887”.

As Art. 35.2 is now written, of the 414 newly proposed names in *Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien* (Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 1887–1907) traditionally treated at the ranks of subfamily, tribe, and subtribe, only 79 are associated with a stated rank. If the above change is adopted, only seven of the 414 new names would not be validly published (five proposed at the rank of section and two with an improper termination). A review of the literature has failed to disclose a single instance where one of the 414 names has ever been rejected because it is unranked. Adoption of this earlier date will also qualify names published in *Das Pflanzenreich* (Engler, Pflanzenz. 1900–1907) and in *Syllabus der Pflanzenfamilien* (Engler, Syll. Pflanzenfam. 1898–1907). While Engler and his colleagues usually designated a rank for names ending in *-oideae*, and (in the *Syllabus*) for names at the rank of order and suborder, these authors often failed to associate a rank with names now considered to be at the ranks of tribe and subtribe that ended in *-eae* or *-inae*, respectively.

Altering the date obviously will have an impact on other publications, but, interestingly, most are works associated with Engler or his group (e.g., Dalla Torre & Harms, Gen. Siphon. Engl. 1900). Essentially all new names proposed in journals at this time were associated with a stated rank. Likewise, nearly all newly proposed names in textbooks, encyclopaedias, and floras proposed from 1887 to 1907 are associated with ranks. The change in date will impact essentially only those critical works of Engler and Prantl for which adoption of a rank has never been questioned.

The following alterations to Art. 41 require a brief explanation of suprageneric names. For names of families and subdivisions of families, priority is operative, but above the rank of family, priority is not a factor in the choice of names (Art. 11.10, Art. 16 Note 2). Furthermore, unlike names at the rank of family or below, which are covered by a series of special provisions in Art. 41, names above the rank of family are subject to all provisions for valid publication given in Chapter IV. Accordingly, all names above the rank of family (“suprafamilial” names) must have a validating description or diagnosis, or a direct (on or after 1 Jan 1953) or indirect reference to an effectively published description or diagnosis. Furthermore, on or after 1 January 1935, the validating description or diagnosis must be in Latin.

Although the modern practice of validating suprafamilial names by providing a full and direct reference to the Latin description of its generic type began in the 1980s by the late Arthur Cronquist, it was done occasionally by earlier authors. In all instances, the taxon as defined by its author was unispecific. This practice is in accord with the Code as presently written, as there are no provisions similar to Art. 41.1

governing names above the rank of family, so that, when a reference is provided to a previously and effectively published description or diagnosis, that description or diagnosis may apply to a taxon at any rank.

Finally, a name at and above the rank of genus is a monomial, that is, such a name stands alone and its authorship and bibliographic reference is not altered when the taxon to which it is applied is moved from being subordinate to one higher taxon to being subordinate to another. Here we deal only with names above the rank of genus.

(254) Add a new paragraph at the beginning of Art. 41:

“41.0. In order to be validly published, a name above the rank of family must be accompanied (a) by a description or diagnosis of the taxon, or (b) by a reference (direct or indirect) to a previously and effectively published description or diagnosis of any suprageneric taxon, or (c) by a reference (direct or indirect) to a previously and effectively published description or diagnosis of a unispecific genus. However, for names above the rank of family proposed on or after 1 January 1935, the validating description or diagnosis must be in Latin (Art. 36.1).”

(255) If Prop. 254 is accepted, add two new Examples following Art. 41.0:

“*Ex. 0.* “*Malvidae*” was not validly published by Wu (in Acta Phytotax. Sin. 40: 308. 2002) by reference to *Malvaceae* Adans. (Fam. Pl. 2: 390. 1763) because the latter was associated with a description in French, not a description or diagnosis in Latin as required by Art. 36.1. *Malvidae* was later validated by Thorne & Reveal (in Bot. Rev. 73: 111. 2007).”

“*Ex. 0bis.* *Eucommiales* Nemejc ex Cronquist (Integr. Syst. Class. Fl. Pl.: 182. 1981) was validly published by Cronquist, who provided a full and direct reference to the Latin description associated with the unispecific genus *Eucommia* Oliv. (in Hooker’s Icon. Pl. 20: ad t. 1950. 1890).

(256) Add a new Note and a new Example to Art. 41:

“*Note n.* Names at and above the rank of genus are monomials and are assigned to any higher taxon without a change of authorship or place of publication.”

“*Ex. n.* The name *Weddellinoideae*, treated by Cusset and Cusset (in Bull. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat., sér. 4, sect. B Adansonia 10: 169. 1988) as if it were a new name based on *Weddellinoideae* Engl. (in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam., ed. 2, 18a: 28. 1928), is in fact an isonym, regardless of Cusset and Cusset having moved the subfamily from *Podostemonaceae* to *Tristichaceae*, this being merely a change in classification, not nomenclature.

(257) In Art. 41.1(b) add “; see Art. 32.5–6” after the word “indirect”.**(258) In Art. 41.2(b) add “; see Art. 32.5–6” after the word “indirect”.****(259) Add two new Examples following Art. 41.1:**

“*Ex. 0ter.* The subfamily *Erismoideae* Takht. (2009), was validly published by a full and direct reference to the French diagnosis of the tribe *Erismeeae* Dumort. (1829).”

“*Ex. 1bis.* *Chaetocarpeae* G.L. Webster (in Taxon 24: 595. 1975) was validly published by a full and direct reference to the previously and effectively published Latin diagnosis associated with the name *Chaetocarpinae* Müll.-Arg. (in Linnaea 34: 202. 1865,

“*Chaetocarpeae*”) even though Webster cited only the name and its bibliographic reference.”

(260) In Art. 41.3 add “(direct or indirect; see Art. 32.5–6)” after the word “reference” in clauses (b) and (c).

We recommend citation of the appropriate Articles of the *Code* that define the terms “direct and indirect” be added to Art. 41.1 and 41.2. Likewise, we recommend that the word “reference”, as used in Art. 41.3, be explained more fully by stating that the reference may be direct or indirect. In many respects this is a minor editorial matter and may be so recommended by the Rapporteurs.

(261) Add a new Example following Art. 53.1:

“*Ex. 3bis. Moreae* Britton & Rose (in *N. Amer. Fl.* 23: 201, 217. 1930), based on *Mora* Benth. (1839), is not a later homonym of *Moreae* Dumort. (*Anal. Fam. Pl.*: 17. 1829), based on *Morus* L. (1754), as the provision of homonymy does not apply to subdivisions of families.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are expressed to Werner Greuter, John McNeill, John Wiersema, and especially Nicholas Turland for their comments, suggestions, and ideas.

(262–275) Proposals on Article 33 and other Articles concerning new combinations, status novi, and nomina nova

Nicholas J. Turland

Missouri Botanical Garden, P.O. Box 299, Saint Louis, Missouri 63166-0299, U.S.A. nicholas.turland@mobot.org

The following proposals aim to define more clearly the terms “name of a new taxon”, “new combination”, “status novus”, “nomen novum”, “basionym”, and “replaced synonym” by adding them to the status definitions in Art. 6. An addition to Art. 32.1(d) makes it explicit that the present requirements of that clause for valid publication of a name (to be accompanied by a description or diagnosis or by a reference to a previously and effectively published description or diagnosis) do not apply to new combinations, status novi, and nomina nova, which must instead meet the requirements of Art. 33. A new rule is added to Art. 33 so that the restrictions of Art. 41 (on permitted ranges of ranks of a basionym or replaced synonym) will remain in effect for new combinations, status novi, and nomina nova. The phrase “new generic name with a basionym”, editorially introduced into the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146. 2006), implicitly excludes status novi above the rank of genus, which are not forbidden by the *Code*, so the phrase is changed to “status novus”. Simplified wording is suggested in Art. 33 and other Articles where the above terms are used. It is argued that Art. 33.8 causes more problems than it was intended to prevent and should therefore be deleted.

(262) Add three new Articles to Art. 6, and adjust the Glossary as appropriate:

“6.9. The name of a new taxon is a name validly published in its own right, i.e. one not based on a previously validly published name; it is not a new combination, a status novus, or a nomen novum.”

“6.10. A nomen novum (nom. nov., avowed substitute, replacement name) is a new name based on but not formed from a previously published legitimate or illegitimate name, which is its replaced synonym. The replaced synonym does not provide the final epithet, name, or stem of the nomen novum (but see Art. 58.1).”

“6.11. A new combination (combinatio nova, comb. nov.) or a status novus (stat. nov., new status, i.e. new rank) is a new name based on and formed from a previously published legitimate name, which is its basionym. The basionym provides the final epithet, name, or stem of the new combination or status novus.”

Nomen novum, new combination, and status novus are established here as the preferred terms. Suitable Examples could be

included by the Editorial Committee, especially to illustrate how a basionym provides the final epithet, name, or stem of a new combination or status novus, and how a replaced synonym does not do so for a nomen novum.

(263) Reword Art. 7.3 and 7.4 as follows:

“7.3. A nomen novum (Art. 6.10) is typified by the type of its replaced synonym, even though it may have been applied erroneously to a taxon now considered not to include that type (but see Art. 33 Note 2 and 48.1).”

“7.4. A new combination or status novus (Art. 6.11) is typified by the type of its basionym, even though it may have been applied erroneously to a taxon now considered not to include that type (but see Art. 48.1 and 59.6).”

The wording is simplified, the term definitions having been added to Art. 6. The current second clause of Art. 7.4 could also apply to Art. 7.3 (except for the reference to Art. 59.6), so the relevant text is duplicated as an addition to Art. 7.3; see also Prop. 273, below. The redundant reference to Art. 33.4 in Art. 7.3 and unnecessary phrase “in all circumstances” in Art. 7.4 are removed.

(264) Amend clause (d) of Art. 32.1 as follows (new text in bold):

“32.1. In order to be validly published, a name of a taxon (autonyms excepted) must: [...] (d) be accompanied by a description or diagnosis or by a reference to a previously and effectively published description or diagnosis (except as provided in Art. 42.3, 44.1, and H.9) **or meet the requirements of Art. 33 for valid publication of a new combination, status novus, or nomen novum;** [...].”

This addition addresses a fundamental dichotomy in the *Code*, whereby a new name may be published either as the name of a new taxon in its own right or as a new combination, status novus, or nomen novum based on an existing name. In the latter case, Art. 32.1(d), requiring a reference to a previously and effectively published description or diagnosis, cannot be a requirement for valid publication, or at least the second sentence of Art. 32.5, requiring a *direct* reference on or after 1 January 1953, cannot apply. For example, a new combination