



(232-244) Thirteen Proposals to Clarify the Use of 'in' and 'ex' in Author Citations

Author(s): R. K. Brummitt

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (Feb., 1993), pp. 145-155

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1223327>

Accessed: 06/07/2012 10:13

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Taxon*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

(232-244) Thirteen proposals to clarify the use of 'in' and 'ex' in author citations

R. K. Brummitt¹

After struggling for years to make some sense out of other people's interpretations of when we should apply 'ex' citations and when not to do so, I concluded some time ago that the *Code* is highly ambiguous and inadequate in this matter. Not only will different people well versed in nomenclature often come to diametrically opposed conclusions based on the present wording, but current practices in publishing new names show repeatedly that botanists do not appreciate the difficulties which exist. Compilation of *Index kewensis* produces a continuous flow of problem cases.

At the 1987 Berlin Congress I proposed that a Special Committee on 'in' or 'ex' be set up, which was done. Originally I was not a member of this Committee, but in early 1990 I supplied the secretary over 40 fully documented problem cases, and was favoured in return by receiving much of the Committee's correspondence. This demonstrated that, as might have been predicted, the Committee members were divided on interpretation of even the most fundamental issue of when to use an 'ex' citation. On some issues there seemed to be general agreement.

At the time of writing this, the Committee's correspondence had lapsed for a rather long time and not even a draft report had been produced. A few days before the closing date for proposals, too late for consultation with Committee members, I was invited to submit my own proposals, which are presented here. In doing this I have tried to reflect some of the various views of Committee members which I am aware of, and not only my own personal views. Resolution of current doubts and ambiguities is, in my opinion, an urgent necessity at a time when stability of nomenclature is under major discussion.

Five general points, which affect the wording of more than one proposal, may be made:

1. The present Art. 46.2 (requiring 'in') and 46.3 (requiring 'ex') are not contrasting or mutually exclusive, and in many cases both could be equally applied, giving rise to present ambiguities.
2. A majority of the Committee agreed, I believe, that decisions should be made only on the internal evidence of the publication concerned, and not on external circumstantial evidence.
3. Since the requirements for valid publication of names of new taxa are very different from those for new combinations and nomina nova, the wording of Art. 46.2 and 46.3 should reflect this and allow for two different situations. At present these paragraphs seem to have been written without any consideration of new combinations and nomina nova.
4. The examples currently given in the *Code* are inadequate because they do not indicate what the protologue said or why that particular authorship is appropriate.
5. The present *Code* is at best ambiguous and at worst misleading as to whether 'in' (and what follows it) is part of the author citation or of a bibliographic reference

¹ The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 3AE, U.K.

following it. This needs to be clarified and the wording of paragraphs 46.2 and 46.3 adjusted accordingly.

Seven major issues have been identified, and proposals are made below. Draft examples are provided for consideration of the Editorial Committee if the proposals are accepted.

1. Simple cases of 'in' or 'ex' for new taxa

Out of many thousands of potential examples, that of *Tephrosia cephalantha* has been quoted in discussions and has become a test case. The name was published in the account of *Leguminosae* subfam. *Papilionoideae* written by J. G. Baker (in Oliver, Fl. Trop. Afr. 2: 119. 1871). The entry reads "39. *T. cephalantha*, Welw. mss." followed by a full description and citation of one collection by "Dr. Welwitsch". The description is very comparable with those of other species of the genus in the account, and was evidently written by Baker. Should we now cite authorship of the name as "Welwitsch" or "Welwitsch ex Baker"?

In discussion of such cases in the Committee's correspondence, two approaches emerged. One is represented by two comments from different members: "I think much of the confusion surrounding 'in' and 'ex' has been engendered by authors' statements not having been taken at face value. If in a paper by A and B a new species is attributed to A or B or C, why query it?" and "I think we have to assume in modern times that when an author says that a name in his work is to be attributed to another, we are to accept that – unless there is definite evidence to the contrary". This approach would apparently favour acceptance of *T. cephalantha* Welwitsch without an 'ex' citation, based on an assumption that by citing Welwitsch after the name Baker was implying that Welwitsch supplied both the name and description (Art. 46.2) in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

The alternative view is that Baker was the publishing author, who ascribed the name to another person (Welwitsch), and that Art. 46.3 therefore applies and the name should be given as *T. cephalantha* Welwitsch ex Baker or just *T. cephalantha* Baker. This seems to be the view which most botanists would take today. The example gives only one of many names written by Welwitsch on his specimens which were taken up with a validating description by others and which are found in modern literature with an 'ex' citation or with the publishing author as the sole author.

Perhaps the key to these different approaches lies in the comment quoted above which says that "we have to assume in modern times ...". When this situation arises in current literature – which it frequently does – it would seem to complicate matters unnecessarily if we use an 'ex' citation which the publishing author in most cases would not have expected or wanted and which he could have avoided with a little more care in presenting the facts. But if we were to apply this liberal attitude evenly throughout we would reverse current practice in citing authors of many thousands of names and more or less eliminate 'ex' citations altogether. We would be crediting authorship of plant names to many botanists who never described plants and merely wrote manuscript names on specimens. The present *Code* makes no distinction between "ancient" and modern authors, and Art. 46.2, which avoids the 'ex' citation, clearly requires that the author credited with the name should have supplied the

description. (The discussion of issue 4, ‘Internal evidence only?’, becomes relevant here.) Unless there is to be a major shift in current practice, it seems that insistence on authorship of the description should remain. Both viewpoints are catered for in the proposals below.

In Committee correspondence it has also been said that ‘ex’ citations should only be used when author A had used a name without validly publishing it (either effectively publishing it without all the data necessary for validation or just using it in a manuscript or on a herbarium specimen), and author B published validating information. This would mean that one might not be able to determine authorship of a name without thoroughly searching all a person’s unpublished manuscripts and all herbarium specimens he saw to determine whether he ‘used’ the name. And paradoxically if author A never wrote the name down anywhere and communicated only verbally with the author B, he would be credited with full authorship of the name (A in B), whereas if he wrote it somewhere on any piece of paper he would not be credited with full authorship and could appear only as A ex B! This seems neither practical nor sensible.

In contrast with *Tephrosia cephalantha*, there are many cases in which both the name and description were attributed by one author to another. There are different ways in which this may be done, as shown by the examples included with Prop. (233) below. All include a clear statement that the description is by the person who is not credited with overall authorship of the publication, and all should result in Art. 46.2 being applied and avoiding an ex citation. It may be noted that the example of *Orchis rotundifolia* Banks ex Pursh, currently given in the *Code* as a case where Art. 46.3 applies, should actually be an example of a case where Art. 46.2 applies, resulting in *O. rotundifolia* Banks, under interpretations of the present *Code* in either Prop. (232) or (233) below, since Pursh appended Banks’s name after the name and after the description.

The lack of contrast between Art. 46.2 and 46.3, and the consequent ambiguity, seems to be caused by the emphasis in 46.2 on who supplied the name and description (circumstantial evidence may be required to determine this), while 46.3 emphasises who published the name. In many cases one author supplied the information and another published it, so that both paragraphs apply equally to the same case. Circumstantial evidence of who supplied the name should surely be irrelevant, and authorship should be determined by what was actually stated in the original publication. The critical factors seem to be who is ascribed authorship of the name and who is said to have written the description.

The first proposal below presents the option to vote for the simple solution of always accepting the ascription of the authorship of the name given by the publishing author. Acceptance of this would, it seems, eliminate ‘ex’ citations almost completely.

(232) *Replace Art. 46.2 (deleting or revising Art. 46.3), and add an example:*

“46.2. When the name of a new taxon was ascribed to one author (or authors) in a publication by another author (or authors), authorship of the name must be as ascribed, i.e. the first author (or authors) and not the publishing author (or authors).

“*Ex. Ibis* The name *Tephrosia cephalantha* was validated in an account published by Baker (in Oliver, Fl. Trop. Afr. 2: 119. 1871), who ascribed the name to Wel-

witsch. Although Baker was the publishing author and apparently author of the species description, the name should be cited as *Tephrosia cephalantha* Welwitsch.”

If the above proposal is not accepted, clarification of Art. 46.2 and 46.3 is needed so that there is a clear contrast between them. The two following proposals are intended to achieve this.

(233) Replace Art. 46.2, reword Art. 46 Ex. 2, and add three examples:

“46.2a. When both the name and description or diagnosis of a new taxon were ascribed to one author (or authors) in a publication by another author (or authors), authorship of the name must be attributed to the first author (or authors) only.

“Ex. 2. The name *Viburnum ternatum* was published in Sargent (Trees and Shrubs 2: 37. 1907) and was ascribed to ‘Rehd.’ and the whole account of the species was signed “Alfred Rehder” at the foot of the article.

“Ex. 2bis In a paper by O. M. Hilliard and B. L. Burtt (Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 43: 365. 1986) names of new species of *Schoenoxiphium* were ascribed to I. Kukkonen, preceded (pp. 364-365) by a statement “The following diagnostic descriptions of new species have been supplied by Dr. I. Kukkonen in order to make the names available for use”.

“Ex. 2ter In Torrey and A. Gray (Fl. N. Amer. 1: 198. 1838) the names *Calyptridium* and *Calyptridium monandrum* were ascribed to “Nutt. mss.” and the descriptions were enclosed in double quotes indicating that Nuttall wrote them, as acknowledged on p. ix of the Preface to the volume.

“Ex. 2quat. The name *Brachystelma* was published by Sims (Bot. Mag. 49: t. 2343, 1822) who added “BROWN Mscr.” at the end of the generic diagnosis, indicating that Brown wrote it.

“Authorship of these names must be attributed as *Viburnum ternatum* Rehder, *Schoenoxiphium altum* Kukkonen, *Calyptridium* Nuttall and *C. monandrum* Nuttall, and *Brachystelma* R. Brown.”

(234) Replace Art. 46.3, and Art. 46 Ex. 3-4, with:

“46.3. When the name, but not the description, of a newly described taxon was ascribed to one author (or authors) in a publication by another author (or authors), authorship of the name must be attributed to the publishing author (or authors), but the name of the first author may be placed first followed by the word ‘ex’.

“Ex. 3. Seemann (Fl. Vit. 22. 1865) published under *Gossypium* “*G. tomentosum*, Nutt. mss.” followed by a validating description; the name may be cited as *Gossypium tomentosum* Nutt. ex Seemann or *G. tomentosum* Seemann.

“Ex. 3bis The name *Lithocarpus polystachyus* published by Rehder was based on *Quercus polystachya* DC. (Prodr. 16(2): 107. 1864) who ascribed the name to “Wall. list n. 2789” where it was a nomen nudum; the combination in *Lithocarpus* may be cited as *L. polystachyus* (Wall. ex DC.) Rehder or *L. polystachyus* (DC.) Rehder.

“Ex. 4. Linnaeus (Gen. Pl. ed. 5: 322. 1754) ascribed the name *Lupinus* to the pre-starting point author Tournefort; this name may be cited as *Lupinus* Tournefort ex L. or *Lupinus* L.

“Ex. 4ter *Lilium tianschanicum* (in V. I. Grubov & T. V. Egorova, Rast. Centr. Azii 7: 70. 1977) was described as a new species ascribed to Ivanova; since there was no

indication that Ivanova described the species, the name may be cited as *L. tianschanicum* Ivanova ex Grubov & T. V. Egorova or *L. tianschanicum* Grubov & T. V. Egorova.

“*Ex. 4quat.* In a paper by D. E. Boufford, Z. H. Tsi & P. S. Wang (J. Arnold Arbor. 71: 123. 1990) the name *Rubus fanjingshanensis* was ascribed to L. T. Lu with no indication that Lu described it; the name should be attributed to L. T. Lu ex Boufford, Z. H. Tsi & P. S. Wang, or to Boufford, Z. H. Tsi & P. S. Wang.”

2. *New combinations and nomina nova*

It is not necessary to publish a description or diagnosis or to cite a type in order to validate a new combination or nomen novum, and criteria different from those applied to new taxa are needed to determine whether an ‘ex’ citation is appropriate. Is it necessary for the author of the publication to do more than merely ascribe a new combination or nomen novum to somebody else if we are to avoid an ‘ex’ citation, or can we in these cases merely accept the ascription of the name? In the present Art. 46 there is no example of an ‘ex’ citation for a new combination.

In J. W. Green (Census Vasc. Pl. W. Australia, ed. 2, 6. 1985), a new combination was given as “*Neotysonia phyllostegia* (F. Muell.) Paul G. Wilson”. The publishing author of the book was J. W. Green, but on p. 5 he wrote “I particularly want to thank Paul Wilson for his continued encouragement and much-valued nomenclatural advice”. Is this sufficient to allow the author of the combination to be given as just Paul G. Wilson without adding ‘ex J. W. Green’? Also on p. 6 Green published a new combination as “*Tersonia cyathiflora* (Fenzl) A. S. George, comb. nov.”, but nowhere in the acknowledgements on p. 5 nor anywhere else is there any mention of A. S. George. Does this matter? Should we treat the two cases differently?

The easiest solution, and that which might seem to be merely common-sense for modern literature, would be simply to accept the ascription given in the publication. To attribute the combination *Tersonia cyathiflora* to A. S. George ex J. W. Green would seem to be cumbersome, unhelpful, and probably against the wishes of both authors. The following proposal would allow this easy solution, but would probably eliminate all ‘ex’ citations for new combinations and nomina nova.

(235) *Add a new sentence at the end of Art. 46.2, and an example:*

“When an intended new combination or *nomen novum* was ascribed to one author (or authors) in a publication by another author (or authors), authorship of the name must be attributed to the first author only and not to the publishing author.

“*Ex. 2non.* The combining author of *Tersonia cyathiflora*, based on *Haloragis cyathiflora* Fenzl, must be attributed as A. S. George, not as J. W. Green nor as A. S. George ex J. W. Green, since, when it was published in J. W. Green (Census Vasc. Pl. W. Australia, ed. 2, 6. 1985) J. W. Green ascribed the authorship in this way.”

Against acceptance of the above Prop. (235) is the fact that ‘ex’ citations for combining authors have been widely used in the past for cases in which the publishing author made no statement indicating that another author is responsible for the name. Examples appear in Appendix IIIA of the *Code* under entries numbered 2583, 2857, 6691, 6870 and 7592. Perusal of one volume of *Flora europaea*, vol. 3, revealed combining authors with ‘ex’ citations on pages 9, 11, 16, 17, 58, 66, 92,

109, 116, 117, 118, 140, 142, 144, 159, 187, 246, 278 and 288. If, in view of such extensive usage, Prop. (235) is not accepted, the following two proposals would be appropriate.

(236) *Add a new sentence at the end of Art. 46.2, and an example:*

“When an intended new combination or *nomen novum* was ascribed to one author (or authors) in a publication by another author (or authors), authorship of the name must be attributed to the first author (or authors) if a separate statement was made that the first author contributed in some way to the publication.

“*Ex. 2dec.* J. W. Green (Census Vasc. Pl. W. Australia, ed. 2, 6. 1985) published a combination as “*Neotysonia phyllostegia* (F. Muell.) Paul G. Wilson”; since on p. 5 he acknowledged assistance from Paul Wilson, the combining author must be cited as Paul G. Wilson and not Paul G. Wilson ex J. W. Green.”

(237) *Add a new sentence at the end of Art. 46.3, and an example:*

“When an intended new combination or *nomen novum* was ascribed to one author (or authors) in a publication by another author (or authors), authorship of the name must be attributed to the publishing author if no separate statement was made that the first author contributed in some way to the publication, but the first authors name followed by ‘ex’ may be placed before the name of the publishing author.

“*Ex. 4bis* J. W. Green (Census Vasc. Pl. W. Australia, ed. 2, 6. 1985) published a combination as “*Tersonia cyathiflora* (Fenzl) A. S. George”; since Green nowhere mentioned that A. S. George had contributed in any way, the combining author must be cited as A. S. George ex J. W. Green or just J. W. Green.”

In Prop. (232-237), reference is deliberately made to ‘intended’ new combinations or nomina nova. Frequent cases are encountered where a combination was validated unwittingly while incorrectly attributed to another author who failed to validate it. It seems misleading, unnecessary and unhelpful to cite the author who failed to validate the name and give an ‘ex’ citation. The following proposal would allow the common-sense solution.

(238) *Add a new Note, and three examples, at the end of Art. 46:*

“*Note 5.* When an author (or authors) validates a new combination or *nomen novum* while falsely attributing it to an earlier author who effectively but invalidly published the name, the authorship of the name should be cited as the validating author (or authors) only.

“*Ex. 6.* *Bignonia stans* was published by Linnaeus (Sp. Pl. ed. 2, 871. 1763) and Jussieu (Gen. Pl. 139. 1789) referred it to *Tecoma* without making the new combination. When Kunth (in Humboldt, Bonpland & Kunth, Nov. Gen. Sp. Pl. 3: 144. 1818) first made the combination in *Tecoma* he mistakenly attributed it to Jussieu; the name should be cited as *Tecoma stans* (L.) Kunth, not *T. stans* (L.) Juss. ex Kunth.

“*Ex. 7.* *Sagus* sect. *Pigafetta*, published by Blume (Rumphia 2: 154. 1843), was transferred to *Metroxylon* by Martius (Hist. Nat. Palm. 3: 213. 1845) and was raised to generic rank by Beccari (Malesia 1: 89. 1877) who attributed the generic name to “Mart.”; since Beccari clearly said that he was raising Martius’s infrageneric group to generic rank, his ascription of the generic name to Martius was (by present stand-

ards) a mistake and the generic name should be attributed to (Blume) Beccari [as now done in Appendix 3 of the *Code*] and not (Blume) Mart. ex Beccari.

“*Ex. 8.* Wild and R. B. Drummond (in Exell, & al., *Flora Zambesiaca* 2(2): 459-491. 1966) validated numerous combinations in *Cyphostemma* but wrongly attributed them to Descoings who had earlier effectively but invalidly published them (without full and direct citation of places of publication of basionyms). These combinations should be attributed to Wild & R. B. Drummond, not to Descoings nor to Descoings ex Wild & R. B. Drummond.”

3. Is ‘in’ part of the author citation?

When an ‘ex’ citation is used in accordance with Art. 46.3, it is essential to cite the author(s) after the ‘ex’, i.e., A ex B or just B are permitted, but not just A. The requirement of Art. 46.2 is less clear. It is rare to see authorship of a name in the form A in B without a following bibliographic reference, and members of the Committee were mostly agreed that ‘in B’ is part of the bibliographic reference and not part of the authorship of a scientific name. Nonetheless, the present wording of Art. 46.2 might well be interpreted as implying that ‘in B’ is part of the authorship of the name, particularly since it says that “the word ‘in’ is to be used to connect the names of the two authors” and, in the examples, “*Teucrium charidemi* Sandwith in Lacaita, *Cavanillesia* 3: 38 (1930)”. The latter is not a common way of giving the bibliographic reference when a name is published in a journal, and most editors would recommend “*Teucrium charidemi* Sandwith, *Cavanillesia* 3: ...” without mention of Lacaita (the author of the paper in which the name appeared), as given for example in *Flora europaea* (3: 135. 1972). It seems necessary to clarify the point in line with common usage.

(239) *Add a new Note after Art. 46.2, and reword Art. 46 Ex. 2:*

“*Note 3.* In cases in which Art. 46.2 is applied, it may sometimes be desirable to follow the author citation by the word ‘in’ followed by the author and title of the publication; the word ‘in’ and the author name following it are part of the bibliographic reference and not part of the authorship of the scientific name. In other cases, particularly for names published in journals, it may be preferable to omit ‘in’ and the second author completely.

“*Ex. 2.* *Viburnum ternatum* Rehder in Sargent, *Trees and Shrubs* 2: 37. 1907, where the author of the name is Rehder and what follows it is the bibliographic reference. *Teucrium charidemi* Sandwith, *Cavanillesia* 3: 38. 1930, which was included in a paper by Lacaita.”

4. Internal evidence only?

Probably a majority of the Committee agreed that authorship must be ascertainable from the internal evidence of the original publication and that evidence from other sources should be irrelevant. It should not be necessary to have to look at herbarium specimens or manuscripts, or to identify handwriting, to see whether an ascribed author proposed a name outside the publication. Suggestions that some person not credited with information in the published work actually wrote something

should be discounted. Opinions contrary to this have at times been expressed, and clear guidance seems desirable.

(240) *Add a new Art. 46.6a, and two examples:*

“46.6a. In determining the correct authorship of a name, only internal evidence published in the original publication may be taken into account. This evidence may include stated authorship of the whole work, ascription of other authors’ names to new names or descriptions of plants, statements in the introduction or acknowledgements, or typographic devices such as quotation marks.

“*Ex. 13.* Authorship of *Panicum linearifolium* is Scribner ex Britton & A. Brown, not Scribner ex Britton in Britton & A. Brown, even though it is generally accepted that A. Brown did not participate in writing the Flora, since the title-page attributes the whole work to both persons.

“*Ex. 14.* Although the descriptions in W. Aiton’s *Hortus Kewensis* (ed. 1, 1789, and ed. 2 by W. T. Aiton 1810-1813) are generally considered to have been written by Solander, Dryander or R. Brown, the names of new taxa published there must be attributed to Aiton, the stated author of the work, except where a name and description were both ascribed to somebody else.”

Although special exceptions for individual cases should be made in the *Code* as little as possible, I am moved to plead that an exception to the above new paragraph be made in the peculiar case of very many names published in G. Bentham & J. D. Hooker’s *Genera plantarum* 1862-1883. I am encouraged to make this plea after extensive consultation with Gea Zijlstra, *Index nominum genericorum* compiler at Utrecht. The title-pages credited the whole work to both authors and, within the work, they did not state which of them wrote which family. After the work was completed Bentham published an article (see proposal below) in which he said that they wished the work to be considered as the joint production of both, but at the same time he provided an analysis of who had written which family! Where completely new genera were described, the names were ascribed to the one who wrote the account, so authorship is either Bentham or Hooker filius. But there are many cases where they validated manuscript or invalid names of other authors, or raised infra-generic taxa to generic rank, or occasionally published new specific names, and ascribed them to other authors. Both *Index kewensis* and *Index nominum genericorum* are inconsistent in attributing the validation of these names, sometimes giving one author (Bentham or Hooker f.) and sometimes giving both (Bentham & Hooker f.). So many names are involved (some hundreds) that it seems very desirable to achieve consistency, and it would seem excessively pedantic to enforce the logical conclusion and attribute names to Bentham & Hooker filius when other names published in the same account are attributed to only one of them.

(241) *At the end of the new Art. 46.6a, add a new sentence and an example:*

“However, new names first validly published in G. Bentham and J. D. Hooker’s *Genera Plantarum* (1862-1883) which were not there ascribed to either Bentham or Hooker should not be attributed to both of them but to the one who wrote the account of the family as documented by Bentham (*J. Linn. Soc., Bot.* 20: 304-308. 1883; see Stafleu & Cowan (*Regnum Veg.* 94: 179-180. 1976) for complete analysis).

“*Ex. 15.* In Bentham & Hooker (*Genera Plantarum* 2: 1025. 1876) the name *Anetanthus* was ascribed to “Hiern, Pl. Bras. Warm. ined.” and is now to be attributed to Hiern ex Bentham and not Hiern ex Bentham and Hooker f.”

5. Epithets taken up in different combinations

The present *Ex. 5* under Art. 46.3, quoting *Lichen debilis* Smith published with the invalid *Calicium debile* Turn. & Borr. mss. in synonymy, was introduced into the Berlin Code. It illustrates a common problem, but this was not mentioned in the text of the Article and it is not clear what it is an example of or why that particular conclusion was given. It also only tells us what not to do, and not what we should do. There are possible complications of the original invalid name being validated later. Clear guidance is needed on a difficulty which arises rather frequently.

(242) Add two new sentences at the end of Art. 46.3, reword Art. 46 Ex. 5, and add two examples:

“When an author takes up an epithet from an invalidly published name proposed by another author, and validates a different name including this epithet, only the validating author should be cited. If the name originally but invalidly adopted by the first author was later validly published, the name of the first author should again be omitted.

“*Ex. 5.* The name *Lichen debilis*, which was validly published by Smith 1812 with “*Calicium debile* Turn. and Borr. Mss.” cited as a synonym, should be attributed to Smith only and not Turner & Borrer ex Smith.

“*Ex. 5bis* The name *Catha edulis* was published but not validated by Forsskål (*Fl. Aegypt.-Arab.* cvii, 63. 1775). The epithet was taken up by Vahl (*Symb. Bot.* 1: 21. 1790) who published the name *Celastrus edulis* which must be attributed to Vahl alone. This was transferred to *Catha* by Endlicher (*Enchir. Bot.* 575. 1841), whose combination should be cited as *Catha edulis* (Vahl) Endl., not as *C. edulis* (Forsskål ex Vahl) Endl., nor as *C. edulis* (Vahl) Forsskål ex Endl., nor as *C. edulis* (Forsskål ex Vahl) Forsskål ex Endl.

“*Ex. 5ter* J. B. Gillett (*Kew Bull.* 13: 128. 1958) published the name “*Tephrosia interrupta* subsp. *elongatiflora* Harms ex Gillett ssp. nov.”, based on a holotype specimen which he said was “labelled in a German hand” as “*Tephrosia confir. elongatiflora* Harms”. Harms did not use the rank of subspecies for this taxon, and the name should be cited as *T. interrupta* subsp. *elongatiflora* J. B. Gillett.”

6. Problems of multiple authors

It frequently happens that, in a publication by author A, a name was ascribed to A & B, or conversely, that in a publication by A and B, a name was ascribed to A alone. Since in both cases one author is common to both authorship of the publication and the ascribed authorship of the name, and should presumably have known what he or she was doing, there is a strong case for merely accepting the ascribed authorship. Frequently, however, one comes across the too pedantic citation A & B ex A, or A ex A & B. Complications with more than two authors also arise. Prop. (253) by Taylor & Brummitt (in *Taxon* 35: 840. 1986), which became Rec. 46E

Prop. D (in *Taxon* 36: 229. 1987), was submitted to the Berlin Congress to clarify how authorship should be cited, but was merely referred on to the new Special Committee on 'in' and 'ex'.

In the Committee discussions it has been said that this proposal, while not strictly necessary, would constitute a welcome clarification. It is perhaps surprising to some that authorships cited in the form A ex A & B or A & B ex A are frequently found in current literature and commonly occur even in *Index nominum genericorum* – e.g., *Asterantha* Klotzsch & Hanstein ex Hanstein, *Brocchinia* J. H. Schultes ex J. H. Schultes & J. A. Schultes [in J. J. Roemer & J. A. Schultes!], *Chazaliella* E. Petit ex E. Petit & Verdcourt, *Daucosma* Engelmann & A. Gray ex A. Gray, *Glossostigma* Wight & Arnott ex Arnott. Surely the 'ex' citation is unnecessary here, and ascribed authorship should be accepted. An even more unnecessary 'ex' citation (Tutin & al., *Fl. Eur.* 3: 44. 1972) is *Limonium calaminare* Pignatti ex Pignatti! The proposal originally made in 1986 is repeated here with more hope of success.

(243) *Add a new Art. 46.5, and two examples:*

"46.5. In cases involving joint authors where the authorship of the publication was not identical with that ascribed to a new name included, if at least one author is common to both, the ascription should be accepted without an 'ex' citation.

"Ex. 9. In an article on *Bromeliaceae* by L. B. Smith (*Acta Bot. Venez.* 14(3): 8. 1984) a new species, *Steyerbromelia discolor* was ascribed to L. B. Smith & Robinson; authorship of the name should be cited in this way, and not as L. B. Smith & Robinson ex L. B. Smith.

"Ex. 10. In a paper by Brummitt & J. B. Gillett (*Kirkia* 5: 259-270. 1966) the name *Sophora tomentosa* subsp. *occidentalis* was ascribed to (L.) Brummitt; authorship of the name should be cited in this way and not as (L.) Brummitt ex Brummitt & J. B. Gillett."

7. Use of 'ex' in original publication

Opinions have differed in the Committee on whether it is desirable for an author A to actually ascribe a name to "B ex A" when publishing it for the first time. It may be done as a courtesy to somebody who has proposed but not published the name, or may be considered helpful to avoid an impression of publishing a later homonym if the name has been invalidly published earlier. Although the practice of using the 'ex' in the original validation has been deplored by some, to others it seems an admirably clear way of establishing how a name should be cited. The alternative is to do only half the job and cite only the first proposer of the name, and leave it to later generations to notice that an 'ex' is needed. Why not clarify it from the start?

(244) *Add a new Note at the end of Art. 46, and two examples:*

"Note 6. An author publishing a new name, and wishing to establish that another person's name followed by 'ex' may precede his or hers in its authorship, may adopt the 'ex' citation in the protologue.

"Ex. 16. In validating the name *Nothotsuga* (*Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinburgh* 45: 390. 1989), C. N. Page cited it as "*Nothotsuga* H.-H. Hu ex C. N. Page" noting that in 1951 Hu had published the name as a *nomen nudum*; the name may be attributed to H.-H. Hu ex C. N. Page or just C. N. Page.

“*Ex. 17.* In a paper by J. T. Atwood (Selbyana 5: 302. 1981) a new species, *Maxillaria mombachoensis*, was attributed to “Heller ex Atwood”, with a note saying it was originally named by the late A. H. Heller; the name may be attributed to A. H. Heller ex Atwood or just Atwood.”

I am grateful to members of the Committee for cordial correspondence even when differences of interpretation emerged; to Rosemary Davies and Katherine Lloyd, *Index kewensis* compilers, for much discussion and provision of examples over a long period; and to Gea Zijlstra, ING compiler at Utrecht, for much correspondence on this subject.