

PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CODE

Edited by Nicholas J. Turland & John H. Wiersema

(391–396) Proposals to amend the provisions of the *Code* on selection of types of generic names using a largely mechanical method**Special Committee on Publications Using a Largely Mechanical Method of Selection of Types (Art. 10.5(b)) (especially under the *American Code*)****Members of the Special Committee: John McNeill (Convener),¹ Fred R. Barrie (Secretary),²****Kanchi N. Gandhi,³ Victoria C. Hollowell,⁴ Scott A. Redhead,⁵ Lars Söderström⁶ & James L. Zarucchi⁷**¹ *Royal Botanic Garden, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh, EH3 5LR, Scotland, U.K.*² *Missouri Botanical Garden, P.O. Box 299, Saint Louis, Missouri 63166-0299, U.S.A.; Herbarium, Botany Department, Department of Science and Education, Field Museum of Natural History, 1400 S. Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60605-2496, U.S.A.*³ *Herbaria, Harvard University, 22 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138-2020, U.S.A.*⁴ *1753 Folkstone Drive, Saint Louis, Missouri 63131, U.S.A.*⁵ *Ottawa Research and Development Centre, 960 Carling Avenue, Science and Technology Branch, Agriculture and Agri-Food, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0C6*⁶ *Department of Biology, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, 7491 Trondheim, Norway*⁷ *Missouri Botanical Garden, P.O. Box 299, Saint Louis, Missouri 63166-0299, U.S.A.*Author for correspondence: *John McNeill, J.McNeill@rbge.ac.uk*DOI <https://doi.org/10.12705/656.30>

These proposals are supported by the Report of the Special Committee that is also published in this issue (McNeill & al. in *Taxon* 65: 1443–1448. 2016).

(391) Add text to Art. 10.5 following clause (b):

“A type selection made under a largely mechanical method is superseded by any later choice of a different type not made under that method, unless, in the interval, the supersedable choice has been affirmed in a publication that did not use a mechanical method of selection.”

(392) Add a Note following Art. 10.5:

“*Note 2bis.* The effective date of a typification (cf. Art. 22.2, 48.2 and 52.2(b)) subject to supersession under Art. 10.5(b) remains that of the original selection, unless the type has been superseded.”

(393) Add a new Article defining “a largely mechanical method of [type] selection” following Art. 10.5:

“*10.5bis.* For the purposes of Art. 10.5(b), “a largely mechanical method of selection” is defined as one in which the type is selected following a set of objective criteria such as those set out in “Canon 15” of the so-called “Philadelphia Code” (Arthur & al. in *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club* 31: 255–257. 1904) or in “Canon 15” of the *American Code of Botanical Nomenclature* (Arthur & al. in *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club* 34: 172–174. 1907).”

(394) Add a new Article establishing the criteria for a publication adopting “a largely mechanical method of [type] selection” following Art. 10.5bis:

“*10.5ter.* The following criteria determine whether a particular publication, appearing prior to 1 January 1935, has adopted a largely mechanical method of type selection:

- (a) any statement to that effect, including that the *American Code* or the “Philadelphia Code” was being followed or that types were determined in a particular mechanical way (e.g. the first species in order); or
- (b) adoption of any provision of the “Philadelphia Code” or the

American Code that was contrary to the provisions of the *International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature* in force at that time, e.g. the inclusion of one or more tautonyms as species names.

Additionally for publications appearing prior to 1 January 1921:

(c) if an author of the publication was a signatory of the “Philadelphia Code”¹ (and was therefore also a signatory of the *American Code*);

(d) if an author of the publication stated publicly (e.g. in another publication) that in the typification of generic names the “Philadelphia Code” or the *American Code* was followed;

(e) if an author of the publication was an employee or a recognized associate of the New York Botanical Garden; or

(f) if an author of the publication was an employee of the United States federal government.

[Footnote:]

- 1 A list of the 23 signatories of the “Philadelphia Code” was published in *Taxon* 65: 1448. 2016, as well as in *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club* 31: 250. 1904.”

(395) Add a new Recommendation 10A.2:

“*10A.2.* In citing a type selection made under a largely mechanical method that has since been affirmed by an author not following such a method, both the place of original selection and that of effective affirmation should be cited, e.g. “*Quercus* L. ... Type: *Q. robur* L. designated by Britton & Brown (Ill. Fl. N. U.S., ed. 2, 1: 616. 1913); affirmed by Green (in *Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.*: 189. 1929).”

(396) Add Examples following Art 10.5ter:

“*Ex. 7bis.* (a) Underwood (in *Mem. Torrey Bot. Club* 6: 247–283. 1899) wrote (p. 251): “For each genus established the first named species will be regarded as type.” Therefore his designation (p. 276) of *Caenopteris furcata* Bergius as type of *Caenopteris* Bergius (in *Acta Acad. Sci. Imp. Petrop.* 1782(2): 249. 1786) is supersedable; this has been effected by Copeland (*Gen. Filicum*: 166. 1947), who designated *C. rutifolia* Bergius as type.

Ex. 7ter. (a) Murrill (in *J. Mycol.* 9: 87. 1903), referring to generic types, wrote: “The principles by which I have been chiefly guided are

also quite well known having been stated and explained by Underwood [see Ex. 7bis]. Consequently Murrill (l.c.: 95, 98) listed the first-named species treated by Quélet (Enchir. Fung.: 175. 1886), *Coriolus lutescens* (Pers.) Quélet, as type of *Coriolus* Quélet (l.c.), and later (in Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 32: 640. 1906) listed *Polyporus zonatus* Nees as type because it was “the first species accompanied by a correct citation of a figure”. Both lectotypifications are considered to be mechanical and were superseded by the choice of *Polyporus versicolor* (L.) Fr. by Donk (Revis. Niederl. Homobasidiomyc.: 180. 1933).

Ex. 7quater. (b) Britton & Wilson (Bot. Porto Rico 6: 262. 1925) designated *Cucurbita lagenaria* L. as type of *Cucurbita* L. (Sp. Pl.: 1010. 1753). As Britton & Wilson included many tautonyms in their publication (e.g. “*Abrus Abrus* (L.) W. Wight”, “*Acisanthera Acisanthera* (L.) Britton”, and “*Ananas Ananas* (L.) Voss”), they were evidently following the *American Code*, and their type selections followed a mechanical method. Their selection of *C. lagenaria* (currently treated as *Lagenaria siceraria* (Molina) Standl.) has been superseded by the selection of *C. pepo* L. by Green (in Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.: 190. 1929).

Ex. 7quinques. (d) In considering the typification of *Achyranthes* L. in a preliminary to his account of *Amaranthaceae* in the *North*

American Flora, Paul C. Standley (in J. Wash. Acad. Sci. 5: 72. 1915) selected *A. repens* L. as type stating that “there seems, moreover, no doubt as to the type of the genus *Achyranthes* under the *American Code* of nomenclature”, noting that, as a result, “the name *Achyranthes* must be used in a sense other than that in which it has generally been employed in recent years”. As a result of this publication of acceptance of the *American Code*, not only is Standley’s selection of *A. repens* superseded by that of *A. aspera* L. by Hitchcock (in Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.: 135. 1929), but types cited in his other publications (e.g. in Britton, N. Amer. Fl. 21: 1–254. 1916–1918) are supersedable under Art. 10.5. Thus his statement (p. 134. 1917) that *A. repens* was the type of *Achyranthes* does not constitute priorable affirmation of his earlier selection; similarly his publication of type designations previously made by Britton & Brown, such as *Chenopodium rubrum* L. (p. 9. 1916) and *Amaranthus caudatus* L. (p. 102, 1917), does not constitute priorable affirmation of their selection; the typification of *Chenopodium* L. has been superseded by the selection of *C. album* L. by Hitchcock (l.c.: 137) and that of *Amaranthus* L. was first affirmed by Green (in Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.: 188. 1929).”

In addition, the Editorial Committee should indicate that the current Art. 10 Ex. 6 is an Example of Art. 10ter(a).