

This conclusion became unavoidable when applied to Linnaeus's *Species plantarum* (1753). If we would accept the idea of ascription of a name by implication, we would conclude that *Erica ciliaris* was published by Loeffling in Linnaeus (p. 354), and *Dirca palustris* by Gronovius (p. 358). Such a decision would have consequences for the typification of these species names: i.e., one would have to designate a specimen investigated by Loeffling or Gronovius, respectively. With Pursh's *Flora americana septentrionalis* (1813), the same conclusion would seem appropriate when considering species names with descriptions ascribed to Pallas. Both of these works employ a similar format where binomials are presented without ascription and only the specific epithet appears in the page margins.

Our rejection of the idea of ascription by implication does not, however, imply that we favour the elimination of Ex. 5. We believe this example should be reworded, preserving its current interpretation of authorship for the name involved but removing any reference to "implication" and narrowing its application to a particular situation. We suggest that this clarification will also settle a long-persisting debate on the authorship of many names in Roemer & Schultes (Syst. Veg. 1817–1830), a work noteworthy for its inconsistent ascriptions of names and descriptions or diagnoses.

On the wording of Art. 46.3 and its interpretation, our discussions oscillated on one point: Is it correct that an author citation appearing in a list of synonyms, as presented in Ex. 10 dealing with *Hypnum crassinervium*, does not constitute ascription? In this example, one could conclude that "*Hypnum crassinervium* Dr. Taylor MSS." is not a synonym because a synonym is a different name for the same taxon. Moreover, in some works that kind of reference is often given to indicate the basis of a name. If we adhere strictly to the definition of ascription in Art. 46.3, however, we must say that citation in a synonym position is not a "direct association" with the name and therefore is not an ascription but

rather an "attribution," a term not defined in the *ICBN*. This seemingly follows the intent of the findings reached at Tokyo, even though it is against established custom and results in changes to numerous authorships.

We propose an amendment of Ex. 5 and that some new examples be added to Art. 46 as follows:

(233) Rephrase Art. 46 Ex. 5:

"Ex. 5. The name *Brachystelma* was published in Sims (Bot. Mag. ad t. 2343. 1822), along with one new species listed as "*Brachystelma tuberosa*. Brown Mscr."; in addition, at the end of the generic diagnosis Sims added "Brown, Mscr.", indicating that Brown wrote it. Because the generic and species names were simultaneously validated (Art. 42), the direct association of Brown's name with the species name and the generic diagnosis establishes that the genus should be cited as *Brachystelma* R. Br."

(234) Add the following new examples to Art. 46 following Art. 46.3 and 46.4, respectively:

"Ex. n. The name *Claytonia lanceolata* was published by Pursh (1813) without ascription of the name, as is the case for all names in Pursh's work, although the species description was ascribed to "Pall. Mss." Since the name itself was not ascribed to Pallas, the name must be cited as *Claytonia lanceolata* Pursh, not *Claytonia lanceolata* Pall. or *Claytonia lanceolata* Pall. ex Pursh."

"Ex. n. The name *Drymaria arenarioides* was published in Roemer & Schultes (Syst. Veg. 5: 406. 1819), with the name ascribed to "Humb. et Bonpl.", and the description ascribed to "Reliqu. Willd. MS.". Because of this, and because vol. 5 of this work is authored by Schultes alone, the name is to be cited as *Drymaria arenarioides* Humb. & Bonpl. ex Schult., not as *Drymaria arenarioides* Willd. or *Drymaria arenarioides* Willd. ex Roem. & Schult."

(235–240) Six proposals to amend the Code

Roberto Kiesling¹ & Detlev Metzger²

¹ Instituto de Botánica Darwinion, C. C. 22, (B1642HYD), San Isidro, Argentina. Miembro de la Carrera del Investigador Científico, CONICET. robertokiesling@darwin.edu.ar (author for correspondence)

² AG Pflanzenökologie, Fakultät 5: Institut für Biologie und Umweltwissenschaften, Universität Oldenburg, D-26111 Oldenburg, Germany. detlev.metzger@uni-oldenburg.de

After the last modification of the *Code* (Saint Louis, 2000) some specific cases and real or apparent contradictions have taken our attention, as well the lack of uniformity of rank abbreviations in the botanical literature. Therefore, we submit here five proposals to amend Articles of the *Code*. We also note that one of the current Recommendations is now obsolete and superfluous, and we therefore propose its deletion.

Different interpretations of the term 'specimen' have resulted in its replacement in some parts of the *Saint Louis Code* by the term 'gathering'. The new redaction of Art. 37.2 results in a contradiction of Art. 37.6. The first (Art. 37.2) allows designation of a gathering or parts thereof as type, "... even if it consists of two or more specimens as defined in Art. 8 ..." and the type may even be mentioned to be deposited in more than one herbarium (Art. 37 Ex. 1). Art. 37.2 is also limited by Art. 8.1, which defines "The type ... is either a single specimen conserved in one herbarium ...", although the definition of specimen is amplified at Art. 8.3. Art.

37.6 states, that "... on or after 1 January 1990 ... the *single* [our italics] herbarium or collection or institution in which the type is conserved must be specified." There are two possibilities to avoid contradiction: giving pre-eminence to Art. 37.2 over Art. 37.6, or the opposite. We will give two proposals for Art. 37.2 here:

(235) In Art. 37.2 add the reference " , but see Art. 8.1 and Art. 37.6" after "see also Art. 37.5":

The intention of the new Art. 37.2 in the *Saint Louis Code* was to enable subsequent valid publication of names published between and including 1 January 1958 and 31 December 1989 with types indicated by reference to more than one specimen but from one gathering (cf. Greuter & al. in Englera 20: 178–182. 2000). Therefore, Art. 37.6 in its current wording should be considered as a limitation of Art. 37.2, as mention of more than one herbarium for the type is allowed only before 1 January 1990. However, reference to Art. 8.1 and Art. 37.6 is lacking in Art. 37.2. An addition of such a reference would fix the relation of Art. 8.1,

Art. 37.2 and Art. 37.6 to avoid possible contradictory interpretations of Art. 37.

(236) At the end of Art. 37.2 add the following sentence and in Art. 37.6 replace the word “specimen” with “gathering”:

“, in which case these [specimens] are syntypes (Art. 9.4), from among which a lectotype (Art. 9.2) may be designated.”

Whether the word “specimens” should be included in the above sentence is left to the discretion of the Editorial Committee.

(237) Add a new Article 37.7:

“37.7. In the case of a new monotypic genus (or monotypic infrageneric taxon above the rank of species), the correct mention of, or reference to, the type of the species name is sufficient.”

This modification avoids a strict juristic application of the rules, which would require two separate indications of type in the case of a new, monotypic genus (or infrageneric taxon above the rank of species). The proposed amendment is consistent with the first part of Art. 37.3 and with Art. 42.1.

(238) Delete Rec. 45A.1:

The actual Rec. 45A.1 appeals to authors, when using new names in botanical works, to comply with the requirements for valid publication given in the *Code*. This Recommendation is superfluous in the current context.

To understand the original intention of this Recommendation, it is helpful to look at the ancestors of the current *Code*. Rec. 45A has his origin in the Recommendations following Art. 39 in the early editions of the *Rules* or *Code*, especially in the *Brussels Rules* (1912): “Botanists will do well ... XX. When publishing new names of new groups in works written in a modern language (floras, catalogues etc.) to publish simultaneously the Latin diagnoses and in palaeobotany also the figures, which will make the new names valid from the point of view of scientific nomenclature.” This formulation was adopted, only slightly changed, in subsequent editions of the *Code*: as Rec. XXIII in the *Cambridge Rules* (1935), as Rec. XXIII in the *Brittonia Rules* (1947) and as Rec. 54E in the *Stockholm Code* (1952). The *Montreal Code* (1961) amplified the Recommendation (as Rec. 45A), now appealing to “authors publishing a name of a new taxon ... comply with the requirements of valid publication”, thus no longer restricted to the Latin diagnosis.

This Recommendation is understandable for that time in the early 20th century, when only tradition imposed the publication of scientific papers in Latin language, but when the compulsory use of Latin in the validating description or diagnosis of a name of a new taxon did not exist. Subsequent editions of the *Code* kept this Recommendation with some alterations in redaction, under different numbering, even after the use of Latin in a validating description or diagnosis became compulsory from 1 January 1935. However, in the current context, the intention of this Recommendation is difficult to understand. For the taxonomist it should be a matter of course to fulfil the rules of the *Code*. The regular system of nomenclature, the *Code*, would have no authority if it were not used and followed by its addressees, the authors of botanical publications. This is properly indicated in the Preamble of the *Code*, but it is unnecessary to repeat this truism for a special case (use of new names) in a Recommendation ‘hidden’ somewhere in the *Code*. Consequently, we propose to delete Rec. 45A.1.

(239) Insert the following phrase in the last sentence of Art. 53.5, between “recommendation” and “may then”:

“, whether or not to treat the concerned names as homonyms,”

For a more congruent redaction of Art. 53.5, this phrase should be added to specify the purpose of a possible recommendation.

(240) Add a new Recommendation 5A.1:

“5A.1. With the aim of standardizing abbreviations of ranks, the following abbreviations are recommended: cl. (class), ord. (order), fam. (family), tr. (tribe), gen. (genus), sect. (section), ser. (series), sp. (species), var. (variety), f. (forma). The abbreviations for additional ranks created by addition of the prefix sub-, or for nothotaxa with the prefix notho-, should be formed by adding the prefixes, e.g., subsp. (subspecies), nothosp. (nothospecies).”

The ranks of taxa are not abbreviated uniformly in the botanical literature. We feel that a new Recommendation in Chapter I of the *Code* could provide guidance for authors on how to abbreviate the ranks, and that the recommended abbreviations could have a standardizing effect.

(241) A proposal on the orthography of names of hybrids

Rafaël Govaerts

Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AE, U.K. R.Govaerts@kew.org

(242) Add a sentence at the end of Art. H.3.1:

“A single letter space is left after the multiplication sign.”

and, as a corollary, replace Rec. H.3.A.1 by:

“If the multiplication sign is not available, the lower case letter “x” is used instead.”

In the spirit of creating greater nomenclatural stability as set out in Principle IV, I propose one orthography for names of hybrids. Neither Art. H.1 nor Art. H.3 explicitly says whether one should leave a space between the multiplication sign and the epithet. It is only in Rec. H.3A that this is recommended when the let-

ter “x” is used instead of a multiplication sign. Putting a space between the multiplication sign and the epithet is, however, not consistently observed, probably because it may be as confusing as the letter “x”, depending on which style of letter is used.

The multiplication sign followed by a space is, for example, used in Davis (*Cites Bulb Checklist*, 1999), Cullen (*The European Garden Flora* 4, 2000) and Lord (*RHS Plant Finder* 2003–2004, 2003).

As placing the multiplication sign against the initial letter seems inconsistent and important horticultural works refrain from doing so, I suggest that it would be a better idea to stabilize the use by permitting only one usage.