



---

Synopsis of Proposals on Botanical Nomenclature Berlin 1987

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (Feb., 1987), pp. 174-281

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1221395>

Accessed: 27/07/2012 02:28

---

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>

SYNOPSIS OF PROPOSALS ON BOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE  
BERLIN 1987

*A review of the proposals concerning the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature submitted to the XIV International Botanical Congress at Berlin 1987, by Werner Greuter (Rapporteur-général) and John McNeill (Vice-rapporteur).*

*Notice*

Each personal member of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy is entitled to participate in the Preliminary Mail Vote on nomenclature proposals, as stated in Division III of the Code. (There are no *institutional* votes allowed in the mail ballot.) Authors of nomenclature proposals and members of nomenclature committees are also entitled to participate: any such persons not receiving a ballot (enclosed herewith in *Taxon* for all members of IAPT) may reproduce a member's ballot if available to them or request one (and a Synopsis, if needed) from Dr. D.H. Nicolson, Department of Botany, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

The voting forms (ballots) should be returned to the Vice-rapporteur (J. McNeill) by May 15, 1987, so that they may be included in the tabulation which will be made available to the members of the Nomenclature Section.

The sessions of the Nomenclature Section, which will take definitive action on proposals, will be held in the International Congress Centre (ICC), Berlin (West), from Monday, 20 July (9:00 a.m.) to Friday, 24 July, 1987 (noon).

Each registered member of the Congress is entitled to enroll as a member of the Nomenclature Section. Congress registration as well as registration for the Nomenclature Section will start on Sunday, July 19 at 10:00 a.m. in the ICC. Each member of the Nomenclature Section is entitled to one personal vote in the sessions. Personal votes can neither be transferred nor accumulated; a single person never receives more than one personal vote. A member of the Nomenclature Section may be the official delegate of more than one institution, but no one person will be allowed more than 15 votes (including his personal vote). Official delegates are required to submit their credentials and to collect their voting cards when registering for the Nomenclature Section. Institutions were advised of their votes in October 1986, in accordance with Division III of the Code.

*Introduction*

This Synopsis repeats the exact wording of the proposals, along with reference to the published justification. (Proposals, which repeat existing paragraphs of the Code largely unaltered, have sometimes been clarified by italicizing the new or replacement text). Although the numbered sequence of proposals only extends to 334, the presence of subordinate proposals (e.g. 164A, 164B & 164C) means that 349 proposals were, in fact, submitted, although with subsequent withdrawals etc. (see below) the final number to be voted upon reduces to 336. The comments by the rapporteurs have been drafted during a working meeting in Ottawa, August 1-6, 1986. The rapporteurs have endeavoured to outline the foreseeable consequences of each of the proposals, but to keep back their personal opinions on their desirability. The comments are the result of a consensus between the rapporteur and the vice-rapporteur, and both have equal responsibility for them.

As noted on the ballot, there are four voting options: 'yes', 'no', 'ed. c.' and 'sp. c.'; all proposals accepted by the Congress are reviewed by the Editorial Committee prior to the production of the next edition of the Code and any necessary editorial changes made; consequently, a 'yes' vote only implies approval of the intent of the proposal, not necessarily its exact wording. Unless otherwise noted, an 'ed. c.' vote instructs the Editorial Committee to consider inclusion in the Code of material in the proposal but does

not absolutely require it to do so. A 'sp. c.' vote refers the proposal to a Special Committee to review the matter, either during the Nomenclature Section meetings, or, more likely, prior to the next Congress; it implies the desire to establish such a committee. In order to make the result of the ballot as meaningful as possible, instructions have been added in several cases as to how particular expressions of opinion will be interpreted. All proposals that relate to special groups are being referred to the Permanent Nomenclatural Committees for those groups (Code Div. III.2) in order that they may give their opinions prior to the meetings of the Nomenclature Section.

Proposals included in Committee Reports have been considered to be proposals by that Committee if they were favoured by at least two thirds of the active committee members. If not, they are considered to originate from members of that committee, and are listed under the name of the author of the Committee report, generally the Convener. Six proposals included in such reports, but not supported by at least one committee member, have been considered as not submitted (Props. 114, 116, 122, 143, 152 and 312). Five proposals (57, 58, 63, 74 and 151) were withdrawn by their authors, and two others (6 and 7), that were superseded by later proposals by the same author, are considered to have been withdrawn.

The proposals are arranged in the sequence of the provisions of the Code that they affect, the general proposals being listed first. Within each of the provisions, the proposals have been lettered sequentially in the order in which the rapporteurs believe they might usefully be discussed by the Section. Needless to say, the Section or its Chairman are completely free to adopt another sequence for their deliberations.

### *Acknowledgements*

We are grateful to Miss Alison Hendry who contributed extensively to the preparation of this report, including the compilation of the Appendices, and also to those who, with her, transcribed our comments (largely over a holiday weekend) and helped to prepare the final Synopsis under a very tight time-schedule.

### *Contents*

Notice . . . . .	174
Introduction . . . . .	174
Acknowledgements . . . . .	175
List of Proposals . . . . .	176
Synopsis of Proposals, with Rapporteurs' Comments . . . . .	182
Appendix A: Report on the Status of Nomina Conservanda et Rejicienda Proposita . .	260
Appendix B: Review of Reports of Nomenclature Committees . . . . .	283

LIST OF PROPOSALS

1	Art. 4	Reveal & Bedell	Taxon 32: 661-662
2	Art. 17	Reveal & Bedell	Taxon 32: 661-662
3	Art. 57	Johnston	Taxon 33: 124-125
4	Div. III	Johnston	Taxon 33: 125
5	Rec. 75A	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 348-350
6	[Incorporated in Proposal 37A]		
7	[Considered withdrawn by virtue of Prop. 37B]		
8	App. II	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 473-475
9	App. II	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 473-475
10	App. II	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 473-475
11	App. II	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 473-475
12	App. II	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 473-475
13	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-478
14	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-478
15	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-479
16	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-479
17	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-479
18	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-479
19	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-479
20	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-479
21	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-479
22	Art. 63bis (new)	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-480
23	Art. 63bis (new)	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-480
24	Art. 63bis (new)	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-480
25	Art. 63bis (new)	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-480
26	Art. 63bis (new)	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-480
27	Art. 63bis (new)	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-480
28	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 476-482
29	Art. 65	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 482-483
30	Art. 66	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 483
31	Art. 67	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 484
32	Art. 68	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 484
33	Art. 72	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 484-485
34	Art. 6	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 485
35	Art. 6	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 485
36	Art. 6	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 485
37A	Art. 18	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 472-473
37B	Art. 6	Parkinson	Taxon 33: 486
38	Div. III	Dörfler & Braun	Taxon 33: 533
39	Div. III	Kalkman	Taxon 33: 535
40	Art. 7	Hansen & Seberg	Taxon 33: 745
41	Art. 7	Hansen & Seberg	Taxon 33: 745
42	Art. 13	Singer & Ponce de León	Taxon 33: 745
43	Art. 18	Singer & Ponce de León	Taxon 33: 745
44	Art. 23	Singer & Ponce de León	Taxon 33: 747
45	Art. 10	Parkinson	Taxon 34: 328
46	Rec. 10A	Parkinson	Taxon 34: 328-329
47	Rec. 10A	Parkinson	Taxon 34: 329-330
48	Rec. 46E	Laundon	Taxon 34: 333
49	Rec. 46E	Guédès	Taxon 34: 333
50	Div. III	Guédès	Taxon 34: 334
51	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 34: 335
52	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 34: 335
53	Art. 63	Parkinson	Taxon 34: 335
54	App. I H.10	Parkinson	Taxon 34: 336
55	Art. 50	Parkinson	Taxon 34: 337

56	Art. 3	Parkinson	Taxon 34: 337
57	[Withdrawn by proposer]		
58	[Withdrawn by proposer]		
59	Art. 4	Heath	Taxon 34: 540
60	Rec. 10A	Heath	Taxon 34: 540
61	Art. 10	Heath	Taxon 34: 540-541
62	Art. 10	Heath	Taxon 34: 541
63	[Withdrawn by proposer in favour of Prop. 325]		
64	Art. 10	Heath	Taxon 34: 541
65	Art. 63	Heath	Taxon 34: 542
66	Art. 32	Heath	Taxon 34: 542
67	Rec. 46A	Heath	Taxon 34: 542
68	Rec. 46A	Heath	Taxon 34: 542
69	Art. 69	Heath	Taxon 34: 542
70	Art. 73	Heath	Taxon 34: 543
71	Art. 73	Heath	Taxon 34: 543
72	Art. 73	Heath	Taxon 34: 543
73	Art. 73	Heath	Taxon 34: 543-544
74	[Withdrawn by proposer in favour of Prop. 326]		
75	App. I H. 5bis	Heath	Taxon 34: 544
76	App. I H. 6	Heath	Taxon 34: 544
77	App. I H. 6	Heath	Taxon 34: 544
78	App. I H. 6	Heath	Taxon 34: 544
79	App. VI (new)	Heath	Taxon 34: 544-545
80	Art. 6	Nicolson	Taxon 34: 719
81	Art. 6	Nicolson	Taxon 34: 719-720
82	Rec. 23B	Rajwar	Taxon 34: 720
83	Art. 33	Kovanda	Taxon 34: 721
84	Art. 63	Rauschert	Taxon 34: 721-726
85	Art. 63	Rauschert	Taxon 34: 721-726
86	Pre. 11 (new)	Kanis	Taxon 35: 185
87	Gen. Prop.	Kanis	Taxon 35: 185
88	Gen. Prop.	Kanis	Taxon 35: 185
89A	App. I H. 5	Yeo	Taxon 35: 186
89B	App. I H.11	Yeo	Taxon 35: 186
89C	App. I H.11	Yeo	Taxon 35: 187
89D	App. I H.11A (new)	Yeo	Taxon 35: 187
90	App. I H.11	Yeo	Taxon 35: 187-188
91	Rec. 7B (new)	Seidenfaden	Taxon 35: 396
92	Art. 9	Farr	Taxon 35: 396-397
93	Art. 23	Friis	Taxon 35: 399-400
94	Art. 42	Friis	Taxon 35: 400-403
95	Art. 37	Meerow	Taxon 35: 608
96	Gen. Prop.	Eichler	Taxon 35: 608-609
97	Gen. Prop.	Eichler	Taxon 35: 609
98	Art. 67	Eichler	Taxon 35: 609
99	Art. 7	Chapman	Taxon 35: 756-757
100	Art. 10	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 757
101	Art. 10	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 758
102	Art. 10	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 758
103	Art. 10	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 758
104	Art. 10	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 759
105	Art. 10	Chapman	Taxon 35: 759
106	Art. 32	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 759
107	Art. 32	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 760
108	Art. 32	Chapman	Taxon 35: 760
109	Art. 33	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 761
110	Art. 33	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 761

111	Art. 33	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 761
112	Art. 33	Chapman	Taxon 35: 762
113	Art. 33	Chapman	Taxon 35: 762
114	[No Committee support -- considered withdrawn]		
115	Art. 33	Chapman	Taxon 35: 763
116	[No Committee support -- considered withdrawn]		
117	Art. 33	Chapman	Taxon 35: 763
118	Art. 33	Chapman	Taxon 35: 764
119	Art. 33	Chapman	Taxon 35: 764
120	Art. 33	Chapman	Taxon 35: 764
121	Art. 33	Chapman	Taxon 35: 765
122	[No Committee support -- considered withdrawn]		
123	Art. 33	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 765
124	Art. 33	Chapman	Taxon 35: 766
125	Art. 33	Chapman	Taxon 35: 767
126	Rec. 33A (new)	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 767
127	Art. 33	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 768
128	Art. 34	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 769
129	Art. 34	Chapman	Taxon 35: 769
130	Art. 34	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 770
131	Art. 34	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 770
132	Art. 34	Chapman	Taxon 35: 771
133	Art. 36	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 772
134	Art. 37	Chapman	Taxon 35: 772
135	Art. 37	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 772
136	Art. 37	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 772
137	Art. 37	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 773
138	Art. 37	Chapman	Taxon 35: 773
139	Art. 37	Chapman	Taxon 35: 774
140	Art. 37	Chapman	Taxon 35: 774
141	Art. 37	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 775
142	Art. 37	Chapman	Taxon 35: 775
143	[No Committee support -- considered withdrawn]		
144	Art. 37	Chapman	Taxon 35: 775
145	Art. 37	Chapman	Taxon 35: 776
146	Art. 37	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 776
147	Art. 37	Chapman	Taxon 35: 776
148	Art. 41	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 776-777
149	Art. 41	Comm. Valid Publ.	Taxon 35: 777
150	Art. 42	Chapman	Taxon 35: 777
151	[Withdrawn by proposers: duplicates Prop. 94]		
152	[No Committee support -- considered withdrawn]		
153	Art. 13	Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens	Taxon 35: 779
154	Art. 14	Gams	Taxon 35: 780
155A	Art. 14	Gams	Taxon 35: 780
155B	Art. 14	Gams	Taxon 35: 780
156	Art. 6	Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens	Taxon 35: 780
157	Art. 45	Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens	Taxon 35: 780
158	Art. 48	Gams	Taxon 35: 780
159	Art. 62	Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens	Taxon 35: 780
160	Art. 63	Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens	Taxon 35: 780
161	Art. 64	Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens	Taxon 35: 780
162	Rec. 7C (new)	Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens	Taxon 35: 781
163A	Art. 35	Gams	Taxon 35: 781
163B	Art. 35	Gams	Taxon 35: 781
164A	Art. 7	Gams	Taxon 35: 781
164B	Art. 7	Gams	Taxon 35: 781
164C	Art. 7	Gams	Taxon 35: 781

165	Art. 14	Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens	Taxon 35: 781
166	Rec. 50E	Hawksworth	Taxon 35: 786
167	Div. III	Hawksworth	Taxon 35: 786
168	Art. 13	Holm et al.	Taxon 35: 787
169	Art. 46	Holm & Santesson	Taxon 35: 793
170	Art. 73	Rauschert	Taxon 35: 794
171	Art. 18	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 795
172	Art. 19	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 795
173	Art. 18	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 795
174	Art. 20	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 796
175	Art. 23	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 796
176	Art. 23	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 796
177	Rec. 50F	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 796
178	Art. 75	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 797
179	Art. 64	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 797
180	Art. 64	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 797
181	Art. 64	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 797
182	Art. 64	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 797
183	Art. 73	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 797
184	Art. 73	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 798
185	Rec. 73G	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 798
186	Rec. 73G	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 799
187	Art. 73	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 799
188	Art. 73	Demoulin & Nicolson	Taxon 35: 799
189	Art. 73	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 800
190	Art. 73	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 800
191	Art. 73	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 800
192	Rec. 73B	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 801
193	Rec. 73B	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 801
194	Art. 75	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 801
195	Art. 75	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 801
196	Rec. 75A	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 802
197	Rec. 75A	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 802
198	Rec. 75A	Comm. Orthogr.	Taxon 35: 803
199	Rec. 50F	Weber & Adolphi	Taxon 35: 803
200	Art. 75	Weber & Adolphi	Taxon 35: 803
201A	Art. 64	Eichler	Taxon 35: 806-807
201B	Art. 64	Eichler	Taxon 35: 807-808
202	Art. 10	Brummitt	Taxon 35: 809
203	Art. 14	Brummitt	Taxon 35: 809
204	Rec. 46E	Yeo	Taxon 35: 814
205	Rec. 46E	Yeo	Taxon 35: 814
206	Rec. 46D	Yeo	Taxon 35: 815
207	Rec. 46E	Yeo	Taxon 35: 815
208	Art. 46	Yeo	Taxon 35: 815
209	Rec. 46F	Yeo	Taxon 35: 815
210	Rec. 46B	Yeo	Taxon 35: 815
211	Rec. 46A	Yeo	Taxon 35: 815
212	Art. 33	Yeo	Taxon 35: 815
213	Art. 46	Yeo	Taxon 35: 815
214	Art. 6	Comm. Registration	Taxon 35: 817
215	Art. 32	Comm. Registration	Taxon 35: 819
216	Div. III	Comm. Registration	Taxon 35: 819
217	Gen. Prop.	Comm. Registration	Taxon 35: 819
218	Gen. Prop.	Comm. Registration	Taxon 35: 819
219	Gen. Prop.	Comm. Registration	Taxon 35: 819
220	Art. 14	Greuter et al.	Taxon 35: 820
221	Art. 69	Greuter et al.	Taxon 35: 820

222	Art. 69	Greuter et al.	Taxon 35: 820
223	Art. 69	Greuter et al.	Taxon 35: 821
224	Art. 69	Brummitt	Taxon 35: 822
225	Gen. Prop.	Hnatiuk & Chapman	Taxon 35: 823
226	Art. 29	Brummitt et al.	Taxon 35: 824
227A	Gen. Prop.	Brummitt et al.	Taxon 35: 824
227B	Gen. Prop.	Brummitt et al.	Taxon 35: 824
228A	Art. 30	Brummitt et al.	Taxon 35: 824-825
228B	Art. 30	Brummitt et al.	Taxon 35: 825
229	Art. 29	Hnatiuk	Taxon 35: 826
230	Art. 29	Isoviita	Taxon 35: 827
231	Art. 4	Voss	Taxon 35: 828
232	Art. 8	Voss	Taxon 35: 828
233	Art. 14	Voss	Taxon 35: 828
234	Art. 17	Voss	Taxon 35: 828
235	Art. 29	Voss	Taxon 35: 828
236	Art. 33	Voss	Taxon 35: 828
237	Rec. 50A	Voss	Taxon 35: 829
238	Art. 57	Voss	Taxon 35: 829
239	Art. 69	Voss	Taxon 35: 829
240	Art. 73	Voss	Taxon 35: 829
241	G. Typ. 3	Voss	Taxon 35: 829-830
242	G. Typ. 4	Voss	Taxon 35: 830
243	Art. 6	Zijlstra	Taxon 35: 832
244	Art. 7	Zijlstra	Taxon 35: 832-833
245	Art. 63	Zijlstra	Taxon 35: 833
246	Art. 7	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 835-836
247	Art. 7	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 836
248	Art. 20	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 837
249A	Art. 21	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 837
249B	Art. 21	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 837
250	Art. 32	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 838
251A	Art. 33	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 839
251B	Art. 33	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 839
252	Rec. 46D	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 839
253	Rec. 46E	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 840
254A	Art. 49	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 841
254B	Art. 49	Taylor & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 841
255	Art. 37	Constantinescu	Taxon 35: 841
256	Rec. 37B	Constantinescu	Taxon 35: 841
257	Rec. 7A	Constantinescu	Taxon 35: 841
258	Art. 3	Thomas & Raven	Taxon 35: 843
259	Art. 64	Parkinson	Taxon 35: 843-844
260	Art. 64	Parkinson	Taxon 35: 844-845
261	Art. 21	Parkinson	Taxon 35: 845-846
262	Art. 24	Parkinson	Taxon 35: 846
263	Art. 10	Wijnands	Taxon 35: 846
264	Art. 14	Fosberg	Taxon 35: 847
265	Art. 6	Fosberg	Taxon 35: 848
266	Art. 69	Fosberg	Taxon 35: 849
267	Art. 69	Fosberg	Taxon 35: 849
268	Art. 69	Fosberg	Taxon 35: 850
269	Art. 73	Fosberg	Taxon 35: 850
270	Art. 73	Fosberg	Taxon 35: 850
271	Rec. 73G	Fosberg	Taxon 35: 850
272	Rec. 73G	Fosberg	Taxon 35: 850
273	Rec. 73G	Fosberg	Taxon 35: 850
274	[Number not allocated]		



275	Pre. 9bis (new)	Henderson	Taxon 35: 851
276	Art. 7	Henderson	Taxon 35: 851
277	Art. 21	Henderson	Taxon 35: 852
278	Art. 24	Henderson	Taxon 35: 852
279	Art. 32	Henderson	Taxon 35: 852
280	Art. 32	Henderson	Taxon 35: 852
281	Art. 63	Henderson	Taxon 35: 852
282	Art. 63	Henderson	Taxon 35: 852
283	App. I H. 3	Henderson	Taxon 35: 853
284	App. I H. 3	Henderson	Taxon 35: 853
285	App. I H. 8	Henderson	Taxon 35: 853
286	G. Typ. 3	Henderson	Taxon 35: 853
287	G. Typ. 4	Henderson	Taxon 35: 853
288	Art. 8	Zijlstra	Taxon 35: 858
289	Art. 8	Zijlstra	Taxon 35: 860
290	Art. 8	Zijlstra	Taxon 35: 865
291A	Art. 8	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 873
291B	Art. 8	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 873
292	Art. 8	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 873
293	Art. 8	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 874
294	Art. 8	McNeill	Taxon 35: 874
295	Art. 8	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 874
296	Art. 8	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 874
297	Art. 8	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 874
298	Art. 8	McNeill	Taxon 35: 875
299	Art. 8	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 875
300	Art. 8	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 875
301	Art. 8	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 875
302	Art. 8	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 875
303	Art. 63	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 875
304	Art. 9	McNeill	Taxon 35: 876
305	Art. 9	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 876
306	Art. 9	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 876
307	Art. 9	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 876
308	Art. 9	McNeill	Taxon 35: 876
309	Art. 7	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 877
310	G. Typ. 1	Comm. Lectotyp.	Taxon 35: 877-878
311	G. Typ. 4	McNeill	Taxon 35: 878
312	[No Committee support -- considered withdrawn]		
313	Art. 37	McNeill et al.	Taxon 35: 882
314	Art. 37	McNeill et al.	Taxon 35: 882
315	Rec. 32B	McNeill et al.	Taxon 35: 882
316	Art. 36	McNeill et al.	Taxon 35: 882
317	Art. 32	Perry	Taxon 35: 883
318	Art. 19	Davies & Brummitt	Taxon 35: 884
319	Art. 9	Pedley	Taxon 35: 884
320	G. Typ. 1	Pedley	Taxon 35: 884
321	App. I H.10B	Yeo	Taxon 35: 884
322	Art. 14	Scott & Zijlstra	Taxon 35: 885
323A	Art. 4	Yeo	Taxon 35: 887-888
323B	Art. 4	Yeo	Taxon 35: 888
324	Art. 40	Yeo	Taxon 35: 888
325	Art. 10	Yeo	Taxon 35: 888
326	App. I H. 3	Yeo	Taxon 35: 888
327	App. I H. 6A	Yeo	Taxon 35: 888
328	Art. 69	McNeill	Taxon 35: 889
329	Art. 69	McNeill	Taxon 35: 889
330	Art. 69	McNeill	Taxon 35: 890

331	Prin. I	Taylor et al.	Taxon 35: 893
332	Art. 23	Taylor et al.	Taxon 35: 893
333	Art. 36	Taylor et al.	Taxon 35: 893
334	Art. 65	Taylor et al.	Taxon 35: 893

## General Proposals

*Prop. A (227A - Brummitt et al., Taxon 35: 824):* Insert in the Code a Guide to Approved Publications, as follows:

"The General Committee will appoint a Publications Committee which will (a) compile and maintain lists of approved publications; (b) designate documenting centres for different major groups\* (such designations will be subject to review by the Committee at any time); and (c) approve publications other than approved journals according to recommendations submitted by the documenting centres.

A list of journals relevant to each major group will be drawn up and maintained by the Committee. In order for a journal to be included in any or all of these lists, its editor (or publisher as appropriate) must make an application to the Committee. All such submissions will be accepted by the Committee on condition that copies of the journal are deposited at the appropriate documenting centre or centres. [*For an alternative to the latter sentence, see Proposal 227B*]. Such lists will be open for deletion or addition of titles at any time.

For publications not included in the approved journal list for the appropriate documenting centre (or centres), such as books, pamphlets or reprints from non-approved journals, copies must be deposited at the appropriate centre with a request that included names be treated as effectively published. The Publications Committee will delegate to the documenting centres authority to assess such publications, and make recommendations to and seek decisions from the Committee. The Committee will then rule certain publications as approved.

The documenting centres will be required to publish at least annually lists of new names appearing in approved works.\*\*

\* As from 1 January 1990 the documenting centre for Spermatophyta and Pteridophyta will be the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, for mosses will be The Missouri Botanical Garden, for hepatics will be The Field Museum of Natural History, and for Fungi (including myxomycetes and lichen-forming fungi) will be the CAB International Mycological Institute.

\*\* Currently these will be the *Index Kewensis*, *Index Muscorum Supplementum*, *Index Hepaticarum Supplementum*, and *Index of Fungi* for the appropriate groups.

*Prop. B (227B - Brummitt et al., Taxon 35: 824):* The same as proposal 227A but the third sentence of paragraph 2 (starting "All such submissions . . .") replaced by "The Committee will use its discretion in deciding which journals should appear on the lists.":

Proposal 227B is an alternative to Proposal 227A.

*Prop. C (217 - Comm. Registration, Taxon 35: 819):* General proposal:

"That the General Committee, upon proposal by the Committee for Registration, set up a "Guide for the Registration of New Names", to be published in "Taxon" and to be submitted to the XV International Botanical Congress."

*Prop. D (218 - Comm. Registration, Taxon 35: 819):* General proposal:

"That the Committee for Registration be given a mandate to actively investigate, negotiate and test the structures, procedures and mechanisms, including finance, required for the implementation of a system for the registration of new plant names."

*Prop. E (219 - Comm. Registration, Taxon 35: 819):* General Proposal:

"That the Committee for Registration be instructed to devise incorporating the requirements for effective publication into the "Guide for the Registration of New Plant Names."

*Prop. F (225 - Hnatiuk & Chapman, Taxon 35: 823):* The XIV International Botanic Congress empower the General Committee to develop a program to compile a world-wide Index of plant names to be completed by the year 2000, and which will become the basis for limiting the rule of Priority for names published prior to that date (or some other date such as 1990).

*Prop. G (87 - Kanis, Taxon 35: 185):* The International Botanical Congress in 1987 consider official publication of the Code in English only.

*Prop. H (88 - Kanis, Taxon 35: 185):* Publication of the principal text of the Code in other languages be sponsored and the necessary machinery for this be created by the appropriate bodies.

*Prop. I (96 - Eichler, Taxon 35: 608-609):* The Editorial Committee be charged to incorporate a wording in the forthcoming Code which rules those names illegitimate which are correctly replaced by autonyms and meet all other requirements for valid publication.

*Prop. J (97 - Eichler, Taxon 35: 609):* The Editorial Committee be charged to incorporate in an appropriate place in the forthcoming Code a recommendation to the effect that authors publishing new names of subdivisions of genera and of infraspecific taxa should avoid the use of identical names to those which are correctly replaced by the relevant autonym.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A*, together with Art. 29 *Prop. C*, aims at resolving difficulties experienced in the definition of what is and what is not effective publication, and to compensate for the failure of the Committee on Effective Publication to submit a report. Whether the proposed remedy is acceptable will have to be thoroughly discussed. It places responsibility for achieving effective publication on the editors or publishers of journals, or, failing these, on the authors of papers or books. It also assumes the existence or setup of a machinery that is not yet clear in every detail. Those who, while favouring the principle of establishing a set (or sets) of approved publications, are hesitant to support the details of the present proposal should vote 'sp. c.'; such a vote will be interpreted as referring the proposal for study by the Committee for Registration (Div. III *Prop. A.*), which would be established if *Prop. E* is adopted.

*Prop. B* differs from *Prop. A* in giving increased authority to the proposed Publications Committee, but also in removing the obligation from publishers of approved journals to deposit copies at the appropriate registration centres.

*Props. C - E* are put forward by the Committee for Registration of Plant Names. They depend on the acceptance of Div. III *Prop. A* and define the mandate and tasks of the Committee for Registration that is proposed there. The principle of registration is considered under Art. 6 *Prop. A*.

*Prop. F* would achieve, retroactively for all scientific plant names, what registration of plant names is designed to effect for future names. This is definitely a tremendous task, and it is doubtful if the General Committee is the appropriate body to study its feasibility. It could, however, be examined on a non-committal basis by the Committee for Registration, if such a committee is set up. Those in favour of the latter course should vote 'sp. c.'

*Props. G & H* would, if adopted, remove the German and French versions of the rules from future editions of the Code, and would, furthermore, provide for the separate publication of authorized versions of the rules in any other language. It is doubtful whether the Nomenclature Section can bind IAPT, the publisher of the Code, in this

respect, but the opinion of the Section, and of taxonomists at large, will certainly be valuable when a decision is made on whether and how the next edition of the Code is to be produced. Should the Section feel that inclusion of German and French versions in the official Code is not mandatory, this might speed up the publication of future editions considerably, and, at the same time, make the book less expensive. If Prop. H is accepted, the General Committee will have to work out the details of how translated versions could apply for and obtain official recognition (taking it for granted that financial sponsorship is not intended by the proposer.)

*Props. I & J* are put forward as alternatives to deal with the situation where new names have been proposed in contravention of the autonym rule and are therefore not validly published under Art. 32.1 (b). The proposer feels this creates a problem since such names can later be validated by an author who applies them to a subordinate taxon that does not include the type of the name of the genus or species concerned. Prop. I would rule that such names are illegitimate, not, as at present, invalid. Prop. J would simply recommend against later validation of such names. The proposer has failed to acknowledge that a majority of names in this situation are not completely new, but are new combinations based on legitimate earlier basionyms. These could not, in any event, become illegitimate. It is not clear whether, through Prop. I, they would now become valid. If their type is believed to belong to another taxon, they may indeed later be validated and taken up -- and it is difficult to see why this should be discouraged; indeed, some might rather have them declared valid from the outset. Under these premises it is difficult to see how the Editorial Committee could come up with a satisfactory wording, were either of the proposals adopted.

#### Preamble 9bis (new)

*Prop. A (275 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 851)*: Add to the Preamble as 10 the following and change existing 10 to 11.

"Should any uncertainty in interpreting the meaning of words used in the Code arise, An annotated Glossary of Botanical Nomenclature, *Regnum vegetabile* 56 (1969), or its most recent up-dating, should be taken as a guide for clarification."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* seeks to give formal "interpretive" status to *An annotated glossary of botanical nomenclature* prepared "with special reference to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature as adopted by the 10th International Botanical Congress at Edinburgh in 1964". The nomenclature section at Edinburgh "was emphatic in stipulating that . . . [this glossary] . . . would be unofficial" and its introduction emphasizes that it has "no official standing under the Code". The Glossary is still very helpful in interpreting the wording of the Code, particularly for newcomers to botanical nomenclature, but whether it is desirable to give it formal status now may be questioned, particularly when 20 years and 4 Congresses will have intervened since its publication.

#### Preamble 11 (new)

*Prop. A (86 - Kanis, Taxon 35: 185)*: The following paragraph be included in the Preamble:

"The text of the Code is initially written in English and this wording is ruled correct should there be any effective difference with translations."

N.B. Acceptance of this proposal would make the relevant statement in the Preface redundant.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* seeks to incorporate into the main body of the Code a statement that has appeared in the Preface since the Paris Code of 1956, as a

reflection of the way in which the Editorial Committee has operated. The provision proposed could stand irrespective of whether or not there will, in the future, be authorized translations of the rules into other languages, either as part of the Code or separately (see also General Proposals G & M).

### Principle I

*Prop. A (331 - Taylor et al., Taxon 35: 893):* Proposal to add italicized text to Principle I so that it reads:

"Botanical nomenclature is independent of zoological nomenclature (*phytoflagellates* excepted). The Code applies equally to names of taxonomic groups treated as plants whether or not these groups were originally so treated."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* does not appear to be necessary, irrespective of whether or not the other proposals to confer special nomenclatural status on the "phytoflagellates" were to be accepted. The Principles are very generalized statements, and exceptions to several of them have been provided for elsewhere in the Code without this being specifically mentioned. If this proposal, or any other in the same package (Art. 23 Prop. D, Art. 36 Prop. B and Art. 65 Prop. B), is accepted, the Editorial Committee will also consider inclusion, in a suitable place in the Code, of a definition of "phytoflagellates", in conformity with that given by the proposers in their original paper.

### Article 3

*Prop. A (258 - Thomas & Raven, Taxon 35: 843):* Change the name of the hierarchical category of division (*divisio*) to phylum (*phylum*) in Art. 3.1 and elsewhere in the Code and make this usage retroactive to 1753.

The following sentence is to be added at an appropriate place in the Code: "Names of taxa published in the rank of division are to be automatically treated as having been simultaneously published in the rank of phylum."

*Prop. B (56 - Parkinson, Taxon 34: 337):* Change Art. 3 Note 1 "For the ranks of hybrid taxa see Art. H.3.1." to a new paragraph to read:

"3.3 The principal ranks of nothotaxa (hybrid taxa) are nothospecies and nothogenus; these are the same rank as species and genus respectively, only the terms denoting the ranks differing in order to indicate the hybrid character. The subordinate ranks of nothotaxa are the same as the subordinate ranks of taxa, except that nothosubgenus is the highest rank permitted (see Art. 4.1)."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is essentially the same as proposals considered and not accepted at the Leningrad and Sydney Congresses. The pros and cons were exhaustively discussed there (see, in particular, *Englera* 2: 16-17. 1982). No new arguments have been put forward by the proposers (indeed the erroneous claim that the term phylum is used in the Bacteriological and Zoological Codes is renewed), but they base their resubmission on the increased level of support received at Sydney. (See Art. 4 Prop. B for an opposite proposal).

*Prop. B* seeks to make clear that the ranks of hybrids (nothotaxa) are the same as the corresponding ranks recognized in Art. 3. (The proposal is to replace the present Note by a new paragraph in Art. 3 not in Art. H.3 as misprinted in *Taxon* 34: 337). The proposal would also limit nothotaxa to ranks up to that of nothogenus, which would certainly have the merit of avoiding the complications that acceptance of Art. H.5bis Prop. A would introduce.

## Article 4

*Prop. A (1 - Reveal & Bedell, Taxon 32: 661-662):* Amend Art. 4.1 as follows:

After "... the prefix sub (*sub-*)" add "or the prefix super (*super-*)," and after "Subclassis" add "Superordo."

*Prop. B (59 - Heath, Taxon 34: 540):* Add a new example to Art. 4 as follows: "The rank of *phylum* should not be used."

*Prop. C (231 - Voss, Taxon 35: 828):* Art. 4.1. Delete the word *regnum* at beginning of the list of "subordinate ranks," - or delete the word "subordinate".

*Prop. D (323A - Yeo, Taxon 35: 887-888):* Add to Art. 4:

"Note 3. Throughout this Code the expression 'subdivision of a family' refers only to categories between family and genus in rank and 'subdivision of a genus' refers only to categories between genus and species in rank."

Art. 10. Change footnotes \*\* and \*\*\* to read 'see Art. 4, Note 3'

Art. 19.3 Add '\*' after 'subdivision of a family' and add corresponding footnote '\* See Art. 4, Note 3'.

Arts. 21.1, H.8.1 and H.9.1. Add '\*' after 'subdivision of a genus' and add corresponding footnote '\* See Art. 4, Note 3'. The Editorial Committee is invited to consider putting the new note before one or both of the others in Art. 4.

*Prop. E (323B - Yeo, Taxon 35: 888):* Alternative to Prop. D.

Arts. H.8.1 and H.9.1. Add footnotes at the places indicated in Prop. 323A, penultimate paragraph, referring to the second footnote on page 10 of the Code.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* really aims only at introducing the new rank "superordo", although the suggested wording would provide for the use of the prefix *super-* before all other principal ranks. The rank superordo is anyhow permissible under Art. 4.2.

*Prop. B* is the exact opposite of Art. 3 Prop. A. As worded, the proposal is not an example, nor is it appropriate as an addition to Art. 4.2, but should, if adopted, become a recommendation.

*Props. C, D & E* are all merely editorial and can be referred to the Editorial Committee by those who favour them. Note, however, that the justification for Prop. E is rather tenuous in view of entries in the subject index of the Code.

## Article 6

*Prop. A (214 - Comm. Registration, Taxon 35: 817):* Add a new paragraph after Art. 6.2:

"Registration is achieved by entering into an official register names that otherwise meet the criteria for valid publication (see Art. 32.1(e)):"

*Prop. B (35 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 485):* Eliminate the concept of nomenclatural legitimacy by replacing Art. 6.3 with the following:

"6.3 A name is available for a taxon if it is validly published and the type of the name is included in the taxon" and replace the word "legitimate" in Art. 6.5 with the word "available".

*Prop. C (34 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 485):* Eliminate the concept of nomenclatural illegitimacy by deleting Art. 6.4 and the words "whether it is legitimate or illegitimate (see Art. 12)" from Art. 6.6

*Prop. D (36 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 485):* The Editorial Committee is asked to eliminate the words "legitimate" and "illegitimate" from the Code, replacing them by the terms valid, available, etc., as appropriate in the context.

[With references to 27 Articles etc.; see Taxon 33: 485-486.]

*Prop. E (37B - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 486):* Delete the last sentence of Art. 6.4 starting "A name which according to the Code was illegitimate . . ."

*Prop. F (80 - Nicolson, Taxon 34: 719):* Amend Art. 6.4 by adding the italicized text so that the last sentence reads:

"A name which according to this Code was illegitimate when published cannot become legitimate later unless it is conserved or unless the earlier name that causes illegitimacy has been formally rejected."

"Ex. *Hiptage* Gaertner (1790) is an illegitimate renaming of *Gaertnera* Schreber (1789). When *Gaertnera* Schreber (1789, Malpighiac.) was formally rejected in favor of *Gaertnera* Lamarck (1792, Rubiac.), *nom. cons.*, *Hiptage* Gaertner (1790) became legitimate."

*Prop. G (81 - Nicolson, Taxon 34: 719-720):* Add a new sentence to Art. 6.4:

"An infrafamilial name, based on the stem of a conserved generic name, is legitimate even if the generic name was originally illegitimate."

"Ex. In Araceae, subfamily Colocasioideae Engler (Nova Acta Acad. Leopold.-Carol. 39: 148. 1876), based on *Colocasia* Schott (1832) non Link (1795), is legitimate since *Colocasia* Schott is conserved."

*Prop. H (243 - Zijlstra, Taxon 35: 832):* Amend Art. 6.4 by deleting the last four words, and add a Note to follow Art. 6.4: "The phrase, according to this Code, comprises the Principles, the Articles as well as the Appendices."

*Prop. I (156 - Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens, Taxon 35: 780):* Add to Art. 6.4: ". . . unless it is conserved or sanctioned."

*Prop. J (265 - Fosberg, Taxon 35: 848):* In Art. 6.8: Change "as can be" to '*as are*'. Delete "whether they are formally created as names or not", and replace by '*they have no existence as validly published names, and, thus, are not taken into account for purposes of priority or homonymy, nor can they be transferred. They cannot be later published validly, as the result would be later homonyms. There would, however, be no obstacle to the epithets being used in other combinations, if otherwise the combinations would be legitimate.*'

Art. 7.18: Delete in its entirety.

Art. 32.6: Delete in its entirety.

Art. 46.1: Delete "unless the provisions for autonyms apply (Arts. 19.3, 22.1, and 26.1; see also Art. 16.1)," and insert: '*this does not apply to autonyms, as they are not validly published and depend only on the higher rank name to which they apply, which is accompanied by an author citation.*'

Art. 57.3: Delete in its entirety.

[Editorial adjustments to Arts. 14.9, 32.1, 33.1, and 57.2]

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- The principle of registration of newly published plant names has been favoured by resolutions adopted at ICSEB III and at the XXII General Assembly of IUBS. *Prop. A*, put forward by the Committee for Registration of Plant Names, is a direct consequence of these resolutions. Acceptance of this proposal will not, however, make registration mandatory for the time being. It will give increased weight to the mandate of the Committee for Registration (Div. III, *Prop. A*), to devise and set up the necessary machinery. The XV International Botanical Congress will then have to decide whether the proposed arrangements are satisfactory and whether or not the principle of registration of plant names shall be enforced. (See also Art. 32 *Prop. A*).

*Props. B, C, D & E* are part of a single package that aims at eliminating the concept of illegitimacy from the Code. Although many share the feeling that the introduction of the concept of illegitimacy may not have been wise, it cannot be overlooked that abolishing it now would cause a very considerable number of name changes and have a major destabilizing effect on the nomenclature of plants. Those feeling that the proposals have some merit may wish to refer them, by a 'sp. c.' vote, to the special committee whose set-up has been requested by Art. 63 Prop. A.

*Props. F, G & H* have the same common thrust: to confer retroactive effect to the conservation and rejection of names. The rapporteurs believe that such retroactive effect would be in the interest of nomenclatural stability, but are not persuaded that the proposed remedy is adequate to the ailment. Those who are in favour of the principle but disapprove of the individual proposals should vote 'ed. c.', thereby conferring a mandate to the Editorial Committee to combine the proposals in an appropriate manner. *Prop. F* is basically sound, but it should be noted that it is not a name that causes illegitimacy of another name, but inclusion of its type in the corresponding taxon. It leaves part of the problem open, in that names are still said "to become legitimate later" and not, retroactively, from their first publication. *Prop. G* (which, incidentally, concerns names of subdivisions of families and not infrafamilial names) is superfluous if the principle of retroactivity of conservation and rejection is admitted. If approved, it might be better included in Art. 19.1. Under the present Code, the penalty for such names being based on an illegitimate generic name is invalidity, not illegitimacy. While the intent of *Prop. H* is clear to the rapporteurs, the wording is not. Inclusion of an appropriate paragraph under Art. 14 might be a better solution.

*Prop. I* advances an editorial modification that would be required if the principle of divorcing sanctioned status from conserved status is accepted. It can be referred to the Editorial Committee for appropriate action, in the light of the decisions on Art. 14 Props. E-I.

*Prop. J* constitutes a complex but coherent package. Its adoption would abolish the principle of "piorability of autonyms" that was adopted in Sydney after long and heated debate. The questions linked to autonyms are manifold and extremely complex. It is apparently impossible to devise a solution that is satisfactory to everybody. The rapporteurs are, however, afraid that reversal of the decisions taken in Sydney might negatively affect the credibility of the nomenclatural rules as a whole.

## Article 7

*Prop. A (99 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 756-757):* Add a Note between Articles 7.3 & 7.4 to read:

"For names of genera and subdivisions of genera\*, if evidently only data on one species are included in the protologue, until 1990 this may be assumed to be an indication of the holotype even without a direct statement that this is so. The inclusion of data on a species may concern: citation of a Latin or vernacular name, a herbarium specimen, a locality, or (a reference to) descriptive data or a figure. If in a genus published before 1958, no data on species are included, and a specimen is known which can be considered to have been used by the author of the new genus, this specimen constitutes the holotype.

Ex. 1. *Halophila* was published with a generic diagnosis by Du Petit-Thouars (Gen. Nov. Madag. 2. 1806), without any binomial nor any data on the species being given. The Thouars specimen which was named and validly published as *H. madagascariensis* by Doty & Stone (Taxon 16: 417. 1967) can be considered to be the holotype (*H. madagascariensis* Steudel, 1840 is a *nom. nud.*).

Ex. 2. *Macaranga* was published with a generic diagnosis by Du Petit-Thouars (Gen. Nov. Madag. 26. 1806), without any binomial being given. From the citation of two vernacular names (in "*Macaranga* nomen madagascaricum. *Panopia*, Noron. Species mauritiana, ligno levissimo, *Boisviolin dicta.*") it is evident that there is no holotype. Thouars might have intended to inclose more than one species."

\* = footnote on p. 10 (ICBN)



*Prop. B (276 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 851):* Modify Article 7.4 to read:

"7.4. If no holotype was indicated by the author who describes a taxon, or when the holotype has been lost or destroyed, or when a designated holotype is found to consist of material of more than one taxon, a lectotype or a neotype as a substitute for it may be designated. A lectotype always takes precedence over a neotype. An isotype, if such exists and is part of the original material, must be chosen as the lectotype. If no such isotype exists, a lectotype must be chosen from among the syntypes, if such exist. If neither an examined isotype nor a syntype nor any of the original material is extant, a neotype may be selected."

*Prop. C (246 - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 835-836):* Add to Art. 7.5 a new sentence:

"A lectotypification is operative only from the date of its inclusion in an effectively published work."

The following examples may be considered.

*Ex. 1.* When originally published, *Echinocereus* Engelm. series ('Reihe') *Erecti* Schumann (1898) included, among other species, *E. viridiflorus* Engelm., which was subsequently designated lectotype of the generic name by Britton & Rose (1922). Since the generic lectotype had not been determined at the date when ser. *Erecti* was published, the latter is valid and can be used for an infrageneric taxon in *Echinocereus* so long as its circumscription does not include *E. viridiflorus* (cf. Arts. 22 and 32.1(b))."

*Ex. 2.* When originally published, *Leccinum* S.F. Gray (1 Nov. 1821) included *Boletus edulis* Bull.: Fr., which was subsequently proposed as lectotype of *Boletus* Fr.: Fr. (1 Jan. 1821) by Donk (Regn. Veg. 34: 33. 1964) and became the conserved type of *Boletus* on publication of the Seattle Code in 1972. Nevertheless, *Leccinum* S.F. Gray was legitimate when published and remains so irrespective of subsequent developments."

*Prop. D (40 - Hansen & Seberg, Taxon 33: 745):* Remove the first sentence defining the term *paratype* from the second footnote in 'Guide for the Determination of Types' (p. 80, ICBN 1983), insert it after Art. 7.7. 'A syntype . . . ' as Art. 7.8, and reword it as follows:

"A paratype is a specimen or other element cited in the protologue that is neither the holotype nor an isotype or the syntypes when two or more specimens simultaneously were designated as types."

Change the second footnote (p. 80) in the 'Guide for the Determination of Types' by replacing the first sentence defining the term paratype with:

"\*\*A paratype is defined in Article 7.8. In most cases . . . "

*Prop. E (41 - Hansen & Seberg, Taxon 33: 745):* Insert as a new Article (7.9) the definition of the new term *paralectotype* as follows:

"A paralectotype is a specimen or other element cited in the protologue that, prior to lectotypification, was included among the syntypes, and is not the selected lectotype or a duplicate thereof."

*Prop. F (309 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 877):* Permit neotypification when all other original material differs taxonomically from a destroyed holotype or established lectotype:

a) Add new Art. 7.8*bis* to read: "When a holotype or a previously designated lectotype has been lost or destroyed and it can be shown that all the other original material differs taxonomically from the destroyed type, a neotype may be selected to preserve the usage established by the previous typification, as an exception to Arts. 7.4 and 7.8."

b) Add a new Art. 8.5 to read: "A neotype selected under Art. 7.8*bis* may be superseded if it can be shown to differ taxonomically from the holotype or lectotype that it replaced."

c) Revise the second sentence of Art. 7.4 to read: "A lectotype always takes precedence over a neotype, except as provided by Art. 7.8*bis*."

d) Insert the words "acceptable under Art. 7.8*bis*" after "all the material" in line 2 of Art. 7.8.

*Prop. G (244 - Zijlstra, Taxon 35: 832-833):* Replace Art. 7.11 with the following (the emendation is italicized):

"A name which was nomenclaturally superfluous when published (*illegitimate under Art. 63.1*) is automatically typified by the type of the name which ought to have been adopted under the rules. *If, however, the author of a superfluous name has definitely indicated a different type, the name is taxonomically superfluous when published (see Art. 63.3).*"

*Prop. H (164A - Gams, Taxon 35: 781):* In the most conservative way, Art. 7.17 should be reformulated as follows:

"7.17. Typification of names adopted in one of the works specified in Art. 13.1 (d), and thereby sanctioned, may be based on anything associated with the name in that work"

*Prop. I (164B - Gams, Taxon 35: 781):* Reformulate Art. 7.17 as follows:

"7.17. Neotypification of names adopted in one of the works specified in Art. 13.1(d), and thereby sanctioned, may be based on anything associated with the name in that work. If the interpretation by the sanctioning author is at variance with the use by the original author, the name should be treated as if newly described by the sanctioning author and attributed to him alone. Note: Neo- and lectotypification of such names must be effected only to safeguard existing usage."

*Prop. J (164C - Gams, Taxon 35: 781):* Delete Art. 7.17.

Add to the 'Guide for the determination of types':

"Neotypification of names adopted in one of the works specified in Art. 13.1(d) and thereby sanctioned may be based on anything associated with the name in that work, unless the choice is in serious conflict with the protologue".

*Prop. K (247 - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 836):* After Art. 7.18 add a new paragraph:

"On or after 1 Jan. 1990, in cases where the holotype, lectotype or neotype of a name of a taxon at species rank or below is a specimen or unpublished illustration, a type is considered to be designated only if the herbarium or other institution in which it is conserved is stated."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* was included in the report of the Special Committee on Valid Publication, but is not supported by that committee. It depends on the adoption of Art. 10 *Prop. B*. Even those favouring the latter may not be convinced that the present proposal is, in fact, necessary, or, if it is, that it is rightly placed under Art. 7. (*Art. 10 Prop. H* and *Art. 37 Prop. L* partly cover the same ground.)

*Prop. B* would include two additions to the present text of Art. 7.4. The first aims at bringing it into line with Art. 9.2, and can be considered as primarily editorial (especially if the word "designated" is replaced by "purported"). The second addition may be more controversial. It would rule that isotypes that were not seen by the original author prior to publication of the protologue are not part of the "original material", and imply that they are not eligible as lectotypes. Under the present rule, they are not only eligible, but take precedence over paratypes that have definitely been studied by the author. In many cases it will be extremely hard to prove which isotypes have, and which have not, been studied by the original author. The effect of the proposal is, in many ways, opposed to the intent of Art. 7 *Prop. F*.

*Prop. C* has a double thrust. The first is to state that any lectotypification must be effectively published. (This would also be taken care of by adoption of Art. 8 *Prop. F* or Art. 29 *Prop. A*.) The second is to make it unmistakably clear that lectotypification only takes effect from its date of publication and so can have no retroactive effect on the legitimacy and validity of names. (*Art. 63 Prop. B* has the same intent but deals only with legitimacy not validity, whereas *Art. 63 Prop. K* presents the opposite position.) Those who are in favour of retroactivity being limited should vote 'yes'; those favouring the attachment of a lectotype to a name from the date of publication of the name should

vote 'no', their votes on Art. 8 Prop. F conveying their view on the need for a lectotypification to be effectively published. Those wishing to refer the question to a Special Committee for further study (Art. 63 Prop. A) should vote 'sp. c.'.

*Prop. D* is an editorial clarification, to take effect in the event that T.1, Prop. A is approved. An 'ed. c.' vote seems appropriate.

*Prop. E* introduces a new term, "paralectotype", into nomenclatural terminology. Those feeling that the term is necessary for clarity of the rules should vote 'yes'.

*Prop. F* aims at promoting nomenclatural stability in those cases where extant type material is lost or destroyed and subsequent lectotypification would enforce a taxonomic shift in the application of the name. It is a new, somewhat unorthodox idea that deserves careful consideration.

*Prop. G*, and the correlated Art. 63 Prop. C, would remove illegitimacy from superfluous names that are not, under the present Art. 7.11, automatically typified. The effects of such a retroactive change are somewhat difficult to foresee, although concrete examples may not be very numerous. The proposed new ruling might be easier to apply if the words "definitely indicated" were replaced by "definitely designated".

*Props. H, I & J* are alternatives, all included in the report of the Sub-Committee C of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens but, apparently, without unambiguous support from that committee. They all aim at rewording or replacing the present Art. 7.17 that is judged to be unsatisfactory. The rewording of *Prop. H* is not, however, a significant improvement. An 'ed. c.' vote on this would be interpreted as an instruction to the Editorial Committee to improve the present wording without modifying the meaning. *Prop. I* introduces the term neotypification for typification of sanctioned names by material that was not part of the original protologue, and would, in such cases, remove the citation of the original author from the quoted authority. The final "note" is not a note and inadequate as a provision, but might be transformed into a recommendation. Adoption of *Prop. J* would, on the contrary, make it impossible to neotypify sanctioned names in the sense of the sanctioning author when this is at variance with the protologue of the original author. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens favours *Prop. H*, and opposes *Props. I* and *J*.

*Prop. K* deals with two different matters. The reference to holotypes bears on the valid publication of names; it is misplaced here and should be dealt with under Art. 37, where *Prop. G* addresses the same issue. The reference to lecto- and neotypes belongs under Art. 8, where *Prop. D* includes a similar provision, as (c). An 'ed. c.' vote will be interpreted as favouring that aspect (although not necessarily the entire Art. 8 Prop. D).

#### Recommendation 7A

*Prop. A (257 - Constantinescu, Taxon 35: 841):* Delete Rec. 7A.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* can be referred to the Editorial Committee as it is dependent on the outcome of Art. 37 Prop. M and Rec. 37A Prop. A.

#### Recommendation 7B (new)

*Prop. A (91 - Seidenfaden, Taxon 35: 396):* Proposal for a new Recommendation 7B.

Add new Recommendation 7B.1: It is strongly recommended that all decisions about the status of a herbarium specimen, such as its designation as a lecto- or neotype, be permanently indicated on the sheet. The name of the student who made the choice, and as far as possible also the date, should be indicated too.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- The proposed new Recommendation reflects current practice that is indeed commendable, but cannot be enforced. If it is adopted, some rewording would be required.

## Recommendation 7C (new)

*Prop. A (162 - Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens, Taxon 35: 781):* Proposal for a new recommendation after Art. 7.8:

"Neotypification should not aim at resurrection of names of uncertain application."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- This new Recommendation (*Prop. A*) has been proposed on behalf of the Subcommittee C of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens, but does not concern the fungi alone. It is doubtful whether the recommendation would serve a useful purpose. Names that are not typified and are open to neotypification will remain a potential threat to extant names as long as their status has not been clarified. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens has expressed a negative opinion on this.

## Article 8

*Prop. A (291A - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 873):* Amend Art. 8.1, line 1 to read:

"The author who, on or after 1 Jan. 1935, first designates a lectotype or a neotype must be followed, . . ."

*Ex. 1.* *Leptarrhena* R. Br. is lectotypified by [the type of] *L. pyrolifolia* (D. Don) R. Br. ex Ser. on the basis of the first selection made after 1 Jan. 1935, that by Gornall (*Taxon* 34: 281. 1985), even although Rafinesque, in 1837, had made the same designation, and Small, in 1905, had designated *L. amplexifolia* (Sternberg) R.Br. ex Ser.

*Ex. 2.* The type of *Elymus* L. is *E. sibiricus* L. selected by Hitchcock & Green (in J. Briquet and H. Harms (eds.), *International rules of botanical nomenclature . . . revised . . . Cambridge, 1930* ("ed. 3"), p. 140. 1935), the first choice made after 1 Jan. 1935, and not *E. arenarius* selected by Nash (in N.L. Britton and A. Brown, *Ill. Fl. N. U.S.* ed. 2, 1: 288. 1913).

*Prop. B (291B - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 873):* Add a new note to Art. 8.1 to read:

"*Note 1.* For purposes of dating under Art. 8.1, a work reprinted without revision, or with only typographical corrections, retains its original date of publication; if, however, any taxonomic or nomenclatural changes are made, the work is treated as a new edition with its own date of publication."

*Ex. 3.* Although F.E. Clements and C.L. Shear, *The genera of fungi*, was reprinted in 1954, 1957, 1964 and 1973, typifications published in it are held to date to 1931, the year of its original publication.

*Prop. C (292 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 873):* Add a new Article 8.2 to read: For purposes of priority under Art. 8.1, designation of a lectotype or a neotype is achieved only if the designation is definitely accepted by the typifying author, and if the lectotype (or neotype) element is clearly indicated by direct citation including the term 'type' or an equivalent. Such designation is achieved even if it is attributed to another author, so long as no specific exclusion of new typifications is included in the work."

*Ex. 4.* *Leptarrhena* R. Br. is lectotypified by [the type of] *L. pyrolifolia* (D. Don) R. Br. ex Ser. on the basis of the selection made by Gornall (*Taxon* 34: 281. 1985), even although Gornall attributed the lectotypification to Rafinesque (*Fl. Tellur.* 2: 71-72. 1837), and although this had been previously specified as the type in *Index Nominum Genericorum* (Farr *et al.* 1979), a work in which new typifications are specifically excluded.

*Prop. D (293 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 874):* Add an additional paragraph to Art. 8.2, as outlined in Proposal C (or, if that proposal is not accepted for past designations, editorially combine its requirements with the following as Art. 8.2):

"Moreover, on or after 1 Jan. 1990, such designation is achieved only if, in addition, (a) a comparative evaluation of original material is presented (or reference provided to earlier publication of such an evaluation), (b) the lectotype or neotype has been examined

and its taxonomic determination is reported, and (c) in the case of a type specimen, the place of permanent deposition is reported."

*Prop. E (294 - McNeill, Taxon 35: 874):* If Proposal D is accepted, after "(b)" insert "in the case of the name of a species or infraspecific taxon".

*Prop. F (295 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 874):* Add new Art. 8.3: "Designation of a lectotype or a neotype for purposes of priority under Art. 8.1 is achieved only by effective publication under Arts. 29-31".

*Prop. G (296 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 874):* If Proposal Div. III, Prop. A from the Committee for Registration of Plant Names establishing a Committee for Registration is accepted, the following general proposal is made: "That the feasibility of establishing a register of lectotypes of plant names be added to the mandate of the Committee for Registration."

*Prop. H (297 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 874):* In the last two lines of Art. 8.1, delete the words "or that it was based on a largely mechanical method of selection".

*Prop. I (298 - McNeill, Taxon 35: 875):* Insert the words "any major component of" before "the protologue" in line 4 of Art. 8.1, so that the relevant portion reads "it may also be superseded if it can be shown that it is in serious conflict with *any major component* of the protologue\* . . . ."

*Prop. J (299 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 875):* Amend Arts. 8 and 7.4 to permit supersession of a lectotype in serious conflict with all major components of the protologue, if no other original material survives:

a) Delete, in lines 4 and 5 of Art. 8.1, the words "and another element is available which is not in conflict with the protologue."

b) Add new Art. 8.1*bis* to read: "If a lectotype is superseded under Art. 8.1 and no other original material is extant, a neotype may be chosen."

c) revise the second sentence of Art. 7.4 to read "A lectotype always takes precedence over a neotype, except as provided by Art. 8.1*bis*." d) Add the words "except as provided in Art. 8.1*bis*" to Art. 7.8.

*Prop. K (300 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 875):* As an alternative to Proposal 299, insert the words "or scarcely" after "not" in line 5 of Art. 8.1, so that the relevant portion reads "and another element is available which is not, or *scarcely*, in conflict with the protologue".

*Prop. L (301 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 875):* Insert a new clause after "the protologue" in line 5 of Art. 8.1 to read "or if it can be established that original material exists that was not considered by the lectotypifier, and if this material can be shown to fit the protologue much more closely than the existing lectotype".

*Prop. M (302 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 875):* Add a new Art. 8.4 to read: "In order for a lectotypification or neotypification to be superseded under Art. 8.1, the superseding author must indicate explicitly the typification being superseded and the justification for doing so. After 1 Jan. 1990, the justification must be in terms of the requirements of Art. 8.2."

*Prop. N (232 - Voss, Taxon 35: 828):* Art. 8.1. Replace the present text with the following:

8.1. The author who first designates a lectotype or a neotype must be followed, but his choice is superseded when it is shown that any one or more of the following conditions exist: (a) the holotype or, in the case of a neotype, any of the original material is rediscovered; (b) the choice is in serious conflict with the protologue\* and another element is available which is not in conflict with the protologue; (c) the choice

was based on a largely mechanical method of selection *and another element is available which is in better accord with the protologue*; (d) the choice is contrary to Art. 9.2.

*Prop. O (288 - Zijlstra, Taxon 35: 858)*: In Art. 8 add a Note as follows:

"A designation of a lectotype for a generic name of a phanerogam from Linnaeus' *Species Plantarum* (1753), published under the American Code, is superseded if it concerns a species name that provides the type of a conserved generic name." Add the following example: "*Sisymbrium nasturtium-aquaticum* L., chosen as the lectotype of *Sisymbrium* L. by Britton & Brown (Ill. Fl. N. U.S. ed. 2, 2: 162. 1913), is the type of *Nasturtium* R. Brown 1812 (nom. cons.). Thus Britton & Brown's lectotypification is superseded by the choice of *S. altissimum* L. by Payson (Univ. Wyoming Publ. Sci. Bot. 1: 6. 1922)."

*Prop. P (289 - Zijlstra, Taxon 35: 860)*: In Art. 8 add a Note:

"If an author before 1 Jan. 1953 in a single publication explicitly retained one of the original elements of a certain taxon, and specifically excluded from this taxon each of the other eligible syntypes, his action constituted lectotypification of the taxon concerned, even if he did not use the word (lecto)type."

The date of 1 Jan. 1953 should be replaced if the Committee on Lectotypification would propose another starting date for the requirement, unless they would propose a date earlier than 1935.

*Prop. Q (290 - Zijlstra, Taxon 35: 865)*: In Art. 8 add a Note:

"Only definite choices of one element constitute lectotypification."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A*, unanimously supported by the Committee for Lectotypification, would introduce a new starting point date into the Code. Lectotypifications proposed before January 1, 1935, might thus be disregarded. Hitchcock and Greene's lectotypifications, as published in a supplement to the "Cambridge Code" in February or March 1935, would become the first sizeable set of lectotypifications of names of genera. The proposal is carefully considered, and although it creates the problems inevitably linked to all starting-point date situations, may well provide a solution to many if not all difficulties that are linked to the present lectotypification concept.

*Prop. B* is worded as a note, but is certainly more than that. It provides a definition of what is to be regarded as a "new edition" for the purposes of Art. 8 -- a definition that is at variance with current bibliographical procedures and, more disturbingly, with what is currently recognized for the other starting-point situations in the Code (Art. 13). Although the rationale for the proposal, to avoid giving lectotypifying status to post-1935 facsimile editions of much earlier works (e.g. those of Rafinesque), is understandable, it is questionable whether the definition proposed is indeed workable. One may also doubt the wisdom of introducing different rules for different starting-point situations.

*Prop. C* can stand independently from *Prop. A*, and would rule that lectotypification and neotypification can only be effected by the use of the term type "or equivalent" (presumably "linguistic equivalent"). It is in direct opposition to *Prop. P*, below, in that it would rule out typification by the residue method. Actually, it goes much farther in the opposite direction; the last portion of the last sentence brings in a new idea and is apparently aimed mainly at outlawing new lectotypifications first published in the *Index Nominum Genericorum*. The proposers evidently overlook the fact that most if not all such lectotypifications have been previously and effectively published in the card edition of that work. If the proposal is adopted, the Editorial Committee will have to correct the proposed example accordingly.

*Prop. D* would place serious constraints on those who want to propose lectotypifications from 1990 onwards. Although the avowed intent, to force future authors to do careful and well considered work, is in itself commendable, it may in many instances seriously hinder the selection of type specimens. It may also lead to uncertainty with respect to the status of many future lectotypifications, since it is hard to define what is a "comparative evaluation of original material", and even harder to prove whether or not an author has actually examined the cited type specimens. Of the three suggested

requirements, the third one is presumably the least controversial; those who favour only the latter should vote 'no' here, and 'ed. c.' for Art. 7 Prop. K.

*Prop. E* becomes relevant only if Prop. D is accepted. It is not favoured by the Committee for Lectotypification, which prefers to treat all lectotypifications identically.

*Prop. F* spells out a basic principle that was not hitherto explicitly mentioned in the Code. The same ground is covered, in a more general way, by Art. 29 Prop. A.

*Prop. G* would widen the scope and mandate of the proposed Committee for Registration. Obviously, the establishment of a lectotype register is highly desirable, although it is not directly relevant to registration as currently proposed -- which deals with names to be published in the future. (See, however, the rapporteurs' comments to General Proposals Prop. F.)

*Prop. H*, again, could stand independently from all other proposals on lectotypification. It would, however, have very different implications depending on whether or not Prop. A is accepted. When voting on it, one should consider the effect of the proposal in the present context of Art. 8. An 'ed. c.' vote would be interpreted as support, only if Prop. A were accepted. Prop. O, below, is designed to remedy some of the negative side effects of the adoption of Prop. H. The abolishment of the "mechanical method of selection" criterion would, obviously, resolve a number of difficulties that are inherent in the present situation.

*Prop. I* tries to bring some sense into a provision that is at present meaningless, since a specimen that is part of the original material cannot be in serious conflict with the whole protologue of which it is a part. The weakness of the proposed addition is the absence of a clear definition of what is "a major component of the protologue".

*Prop. J*, again independent of other proposals, aims at avoiding situations in which selection of an unsuitable lectotype would be enforced by the absence or loss of other original material. It would rule that in such a case a neotype may be chosen.

*Prop. K* is put forward by the Committee on Lectotypification, as a palliative in the event that Prop. J is not accepted.

Although *Prop. L* was favoured unanimously by the Committee on Lectotypification, some may feel that it provides too much scope for overturning existing lectotypifications while too loosely defining the criteria that would justify such actions.

*Prop. M* would, apparently, bring about the additional benefit of enabling those cases, where a former lectotypification is to be superseded, to be reopened for lectotypification, irrespective of other lectotypifications that may, more or less inadvertently, have been proposed in the meantime.

*Prop. N* is a complete re-writing of Art. 8.1, with several minor editorial modifications but also one new addition. The latter would be relevant if Prop. H should be defeated.

*Prop. O*, on the contrary, becomes relevant if Prop. H is carried, but not Prop. A. Even so, it would deal only with a very few generic names, possibly less than half a dozen (the proposer knows of three). It is questionable whether it is wise to burden the Code with a particular provision rather than to deal with those names by the way of conservation.

*Prop. P* is a fundamental issue, since it would legalize lectotypification by the residue method under certain conditions. The Committee on Lectotypification had considered a similar, more extreme proposal, their (312), which, however, received no support. Prop. P is directly opposed to Props. A and C, above, but would be in line with the interpretation of the current text of Art. 8 by some workers. Its adoption would impose a considerable burden of bibliographical research on anyone who wants to establish the correct typification of a name.

The accent of *Prop. Q* lies on the word "definite", although this is not necessarily obvious from the proposed text. The proposed rule (not a "note") might be useful as an addition to the present text of Art. 8, but would be made redundant by acceptance of Prop. C, above.

Article 9

*Prop. A (319 - Pedley, Taxon 35: 884):* Modify wording of Articles 7, 9 and 53:

7.3 Delete 'or other element'.

7.5 Delete 'or other element'.

7.8 Substitute 'specimens' for 'material'; substitute 'are either' for 'is'; add 'or were not designated'.

9.1 Delete 'or other element'.

Add 9.2a 'If no specimens were cited in the protologue then a specimen (neotype) is selected to serve as the nomenclature type'.

9.3 Delete 'or if such a name is without a type specimen'.

53.1 Delete 'description or figure'; substitute 'specimen' for 'element'.

*Prop. B (304 - McNeill, Taxon 35: 876):* Restrict "original material" to specimens:

a) Add a footnote defining "original material" at its first mention in Art. 7.4 as follows: "Original material: specimens examined by an author prior to publication of a name and used by him/her to establish the concept of the taxon as presented in the protologue."

b) Amend Art. 9.3 to read: "If it is impossible to preserve a specimen as the type of a name of a species or infraspecific taxon of non-fossil plants, the type may be a figure".

c) Make such other editorial changes as are consequent on restricting the use of illustrations as types to the situation described in Art. 9.3 as amended.

*Prop. C (305 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 876):* Alternatively to Proposal 304 add the words "or illustrations" after specimens in the definition of original material. [For clarification of Art. 9.3 see Proposal 306].

*Prop. D (306 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 876):* If Proposal 304 is not accepted:

a) Add new Art. 9.2*bis* to read: "When an author who described a species or infraspecific taxon prior to 1 Jan. 1958, did not designate a holotype specimen and can be shown to have based his knowledge of the taxon entirely or largely on the basis of a cited illustration, the type may be that cited illustration".

b) Amend Art. 9.3 as in Proposal 304 above.

*Prop. E (307 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 876):* If Proposal 306 is accepted, add a note to new Art. 9.2*bis* to read:

"Note 1. Where an illustration satisfying the requirements of Art. 9.2*bis* is inadequate for determination of the application of the name, the name is to be applied on the basis of the specimen(s) upon which the illustration was based. If this material is not extant, and no other material eligible for lectotypification exists, a neotype may be chosen."

*Prop. F (308 - McNeill, Taxon 35: 876):* Add a new Art. 9.2*bis* to read: "Where a name of a species or infraspecific taxon published prior to 1 Jan. 1958 is without an extant type specimen, the type may be an illustration published as part of the protologue, provided that it can be established that the illustration can fix the application of the name."

*Prop. G (92 - Farr, Taxon 35: 396-397):* Proposal that the following be added to the end of Art. 9.3:

"After 1 January 1990, it must be explicitly stated in the publication that the description or figure is the holotype because it is impossible to preserve a specimen that would be adequate to characterize the taxon. For species or infraspecific names published between 1 January 1958 and 1 January 1990 with cultures as stated types, a published figure (if any) is accepted as the type, otherwise the description is the type."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would rule that only specimens, but not illustrations or descriptions, can serve as types of names, a single exception being made in



cases where it is impossible to preserve a type specimen (Art. 9.3). (A second apparent exception is presumably due to an oversight: according to the proposal, a neotype could still be a specimen or other element.)

*Prop. B* would have a largely similar effect, but is slightly more involved. It offers a new definition of "original material" (which would require considerable editorial attention if accepted). In cases where it is impossible to preserve a type specimen, only illustrations but not descriptions would be eligible as types.

*Prop. C* comes closest to the present situation. It would maintain the possibility of having illustrations (but not descriptions) as holotypes, or as lectotypes, provided that no potential type specimens are available. The main difference with respect to the present state is, therefore, the outlawing of descriptions as potential types -- a provision that has a long history in the Code but is in apparent conflict with the very notion of neotypification.

*Prop. D*, if combined with the present wording of the Code, would split Art. 9.3 into two halves, which is logical since it deals with two entirely different situations. It would, more importantly, completely redefine the situation under which lectotypification of a name by an illustration is possible. At present, this is the case when no specimens eligible as types are extant. Under *Prop. D*, an illustration would become eligible if it could be demonstrated that it was the sole or main basis on which the new taxon had been defined. This means a complex shift in coverage, whose exact effect is difficult to determine. *Prop. D* can also be combined with any of the three foregoing proposals, with consequences that are similarly difficult to predict.

*Prop. E*, which is actually a rule not a "note", would give official status, for typification purposes, to material that had been used for the preparation of illustrations selected as types. This is what Dandy used to designate as a "typotype", a term that is not, however, employed here. The new rule might be of little consequence since the individual specimens that have been portrayed are often not preserved, and associated material is not covered by the proposed provision.

*Prop. F* again deals with a situation at present covered by Art. 9.3., and can be considered as either an alternative or a complement to the first portion of *Prop. D*. It would bring about two changes with respect to the present state: names for which no type material is extant could no longer be typified by descriptions, and only by illustrations that were published as part of the protologue. The benefit to be derived from the latter innovation is not obvious; possible negative side effects would, however, be avoided if *Props. C* and *F* were to be combined.

*Prop. G* aims at saving some names that were not validly published because their designated type was a living culture. It would, in a way, grant absolution to such names published between 1958 and 1990, apparently in the hope that after that date authors who have hitherto disregarded the Code would stick to it. Those sharing this optimistic view will obviously support the proposal. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens does not.

The Committee on Lectotypification lends unanimous support to *Props. C, D, and E*. Although their combined effect is not clear in every respect, they would certainly constitute an improvement on the present situation. They would not, however, achieve what some have suggested is desirable, i.e., to confer equivalent status to specimens and illustrations for the purpose of lectotypification, being more restrictive in their acceptance of illustrations (see final comment under *Prop. F* above).

## Article 10

*Prop. A (45 - Parkinson, Taxon 34: 328)*: Replace Art. 10 in the Sydney Code with the following:

10.1 The type of a name of a genus or of any subdivision of a genus (\*) is a specimen or illustration. When included species (10.2) are named in the protologue the type must be selected from among the types of the names of included species. When included species are not named in the protologue (10.3) a cited specimen or illustration must be selected as lectotype. When neither included species nor specimens nor illustrations are named or cited in the protologue a neotype must be selected (10.4).

10.2 "Included species" are those named and accepted by the validating author without any expression of doubt as elements of the genus, whether under the new generic appellation (or infrageneric appellation) or by citation of homotypic synonyms in lieu of recombinations. The types of all such names of included species are considered equally as syntypes. Whether named under the new generic appellation or not, species marked with a sign of doubt as to their position in the genus are ineligible as syntypes.

10.3 When no "included species" are indicated and a cited specimen or illustration is designated as lectotype it must be clear that the specimen (or the specimen on which the illustration was based) was assigned to the genus by the validating author.

10.4 A neotype must be selected from authentic material used in drawing up the protologue, where such material exists, even if the material is not cited in the protologue. A neotype must always be a specimen; it cannot be an illustration. When no original material exists any specimen may be designated as neotype, but such a neotype will be superseded if any original material is rediscovered.

10.5 Notwithstanding Art. 10.1-4 any specimen can be declared *typus conservandus* for a generic name (Art. 14.10).

10.6 The citation of a name as a nomenclatural type is considered equivalent to the citation of the type of that name.

10.7 The type of a name of a family or of any subdivision of a family (\*\*) is the same as that of the generic name on which it is based (Art. 18.1). The type of a name of a family or subfamily not based on a generic name is the same as that of the corresponding alternative name (Art. 18.5 & 19.7).

10.8 The principle of typification does not apply to names of taxa above the rank of family, except for names that are based on generic names; such names are typified on the type of the generic name on which they are based.

Note. 1. For typification of some names of subdivisions of genera see Art. 22.

*Prop. B (100 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 757):* Amend the first sentence of Article 10.1 to read:

"The type of a name of a genus or of any subdivision of a genus\* is the type of the name of an *included species* (except as provided by Art. 10.2 or 10.3)."

\* = footnote on p. 10 (ICBN)

*Prop. C (101 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 758):* Amend Art. 10.2 to allow for cases where a new generic name is a *nom. nov.* or *stat. nov.* which would be covered by Art. 7.10. (Example is *Rhodosaccion* - see Parkinson, *Taxon* 34: 325. 1985, 'Example 1.').

*Prop. D (102 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 758):* Amend Art. 10.2 to make it clear that a species name mentioned in the protologue cannot be the equivalent of the type of the name of the taxon if the species to which it applies was not definitely included in the taxon. (Example is *Argolasia* - see Parkinson, *Taxon* 34: 325. 1985, 'Example 3.').

*Prop. E (103 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 758):* Amend Art. 10.2 by eliminating the word 'reference'.

*Prop. F (104 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 759):* Combine the second and third sentence of Art. 10.2 into one using a semi-colon instead of a full stop.

*Prop. G (105 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 759):* Add to Article 10.2 after "otherwise chosen" in line 4 the words "(see Art. 7, Note 1)"

*Prop. H (202 - Brummitt, Taxon 35: 809):* In Art. 10.2 replace the second and third sentences by:

"If no species name is included in the protologue, either directly or indirectly, the type of a name of a genus or subdivision of a genus may be a specimen or other element used by the author in the preparation of the protologue".

*Prop. I (61 - Heath, Taxon 34: 540-541):* Insert into Art. 10.2 the following:

"The lectotype may not be the type of an excluded species name, nor may it be the type of a species name included only as a synonym."

Also, add the following example to Art. 10.2:

"*Echinocactus scheeri* SD. is available for selection as the type of the name *E. subg. Ancistrocactus* K. Sch., because this species name was included in that subgenus by Schumann. *Echinocactus megarhizus* Rose is not available for selection, because it was unknown to Schumann. *Echinocactus brevihamatus* Eng. is also not available because it was included by Schumann only as a synonym of *E. Scheeri* SD."

*Prop. J (62 - Heath, Taxon 34: 541):* Add a new paragraph after Art. 10.2 as follows:

"If the included species are designated by polynomials, then the type of the genus (or subdivision of a genus) should be referred to by citing the polynomial of which it is type, and *not* by citing a synonymous binary name."

"Ex. 3. The type of *Cereus* Mill. should be referred to as *Cereus erectus altissimus Syranamensis* Herm., and the type of *Opuntia* Mill. should be referred to as *Opuntia vulgo herbariorum* J. Bauh."

*Prop. K (263 - Wijnands, Taxon 35: 846):* Amend Art. 10.3 as follows: delete "a specimen" and insert instead "a specimen or other element".

*Prop. L (325 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 888):* Add a new paragraph at the end of Art. 10:

"The name of a genus (or subdivision of a genus) may not be lectotypified or neotypified by the type of the name of a nothospecies."

*Prop. M (64 - Heath, Taxon 34: 541):* If Prop. 325 is accepted, add the following example to Art. 10: "The first choice of lectotype for the genus *Rosa* L. was *R. centifolia* L. (Britton and Brown, Ill. Fl. N. U.S. ed. 2, 1913), but this selection is overruled because *R. centifolia* L. is a hybrid and hence the next oldest valid choice of lectotype must be taken up."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is a complete rewriting of the article, that reflects the proposer's terminology and philosophy. The wording is complex, but some of the ideas included in the proposal have been taken up by others in the proposals to follow. *Prop. A* has been considered by the Committee on Valid Publication which recommends its rejection.

*Prop. B* requests introduction of the word "included" before "species". The matter is basically editorial but the proposers may have failed to realize that the present wording is purposely chosen to establish a parallel between Art. 9.1 (dealing with the names of species and infraspecific taxa) and 10.1 (dealing with the names of genera and subdivisions of genera).

*Prop. C*, again, is based on a misunderstanding. Art. 7.10 already covers the question of new combinations and *nomina nova* in a general way, for all ranks. There is no need to repeat these provisions under either Art. 9 or Art. 10, each dealing with a specified subset of ranks.

*Props. D, E & F* suggest modifications of the wording of Art. 10.2. The present text presents, indeed, some semantic difficulties that might be taken care of by the Editorial Committee.

*Prop. G* would add a cross-reference to the new "note" (or rather, rule) of Art. 7 *Prop. A*, which is not favoured by the Committee on Valid Publication. The matter is editorial.

*Prop. H* involves a change with respect to the present rules. If adopted, generic names that were not upon publication associated with any binomial would be unambiguously and irreversibly fixed to a type specimen that was associated with the protologue. The disadvantages of the proposal are (a) the fact that type citations in the form of specimen citations tend to be lengthy and unwieldy, and not in the form that is customary for type citations after generic names; and (b) that under the new rule virtually all generic names

not originally associated with binomials, nor based on a single element, would have to be lectotypified anew. The pros and cons as outlined here, were obvious to the proposers of the present text, but were hardly discussed in Sydney. Reconsideration is therefore appropriate but these considerations should be borne in mind when a decision is taken now. If the present solution is maintained the Editorial Committee should consider introducing the term neotype for cases covered by Art. 10.2, second and third sentences.

The first half of *Prop. I* is a truism, and the second half, an unnecessary and undesirable restriction placed on lectotypification.

*Prop. J* is clearly unacceptable since polynomials are not names in the sense of the Code (Art. 6.6) and have not, therefore, types.

*Prop. K* is a welcome suggestion since it allows for more flexibility in the choice of the types of conserved names. It should, however, be acted upon in conformity with decisions taken on Art. 9 Props. A, B and C.

*Prop. L* may be difficult to apply in practice, since the boundary between species and nothospecies is far from clearcut. The positive effects of adopting it are not obvious.

*Prop. M*, an example associated with Proposal 63 (Heath, *Taxon* 34: 541), withdrawn in favour of *Prop. L*, is somewhat illustrative of the difficulty inherent in *Prop. L*, since the alleged hybrid, *Rosa centifolia*, lacks the hybrid sign in front of the epithet and is apparently considered to be a specific name. The proposal can nevertheless be referred to the Editorial Committee.

## Recommendation 10A

*Prop. A* (46 - Parkinson, *Taxon* 34: 328-329): Delete Rec. 10.A.

*Prop. B* (47 - Parkinson, *Taxon* 34: 329-330): Add new Recommendation 10.A:

"10.A.1 If the type of a generic name selected under Art. 10 is the type of the name of an included species (10.2) and it is found that the specimen is not conspecific with the remaining elements of the "included species" which includes it (so-called "misapplied type species name"), a revisor should choose the best of the following options for resolving the problem.

1) If there are other named included species, relectotypify the generic name on the type of one of these names, conserving the type under Art. 14.10 if this seems appropriate to end dispute, or

2) If there are no other named included species propose a specimen as *typus conservandus* under Art. 10.5, or

3) Propose as *typus conservandus* the type of a name of a species which although not included in the genus by the original author, does fit both his original concept and the current taxonomic interpretation of the genus, or

4) Allow the generic name, mistypified on the type of the misapplied type species name, to pass into synonymy, and adopt another existing name in place of it or propose a new name. It may be necessary to conserve a later synonym against the mistypified generic name if (as misapplied) it has no earlier synonyms."

*Prop. C* (60 - Heath, *Taxon* 34: 540): Add a new paragraph to Rec. 10A as follows:

"When the type of the name of a genus (or a subdivision of a genus) is referred to by the name of a species, that name should be the name adopted as correct by the author of the name of the genus (or the subdivision of a genus), not its basionym, nor a synonym.

"Ex. The type of *Cereus* subg. *Hylocereus* A. Berg. should be referred to as *Cereus triangularis* (L.) Haw., and the type of *Hylocereus* (A. Berg.) Br. & R. should be referred to as *Hylocereus triangularis* (L.) Br. & R."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- Parkinson is correct in stating that the present Rec. 10A addresses the Editorial Committee only, and not the common users of the Code. The rapporteurs see no harm in deleting the recommendation, as suggested in *Prop. A*.

*Prop. B* is an entirely new Recommendation whose introduction into the Code may be

considered useful by those favouring Art. 10 Prop. A

*Prop. C* would add yet another Recommendation to the Code, on a matter that is of little consequence. In some cases the Recommendation would ask the impossible, since it can happen that the specific name whose type typifies the generic name has never been combined under the latter.

### Article 13

*Prop. A (42 - Singer & Ponce de León, Taxon 33: 745):* Proposal to amend Art. 13.1(d) and add new paragraph.

Delete first sentence, and substitute:

FUNGI (including Myxomycetes and lichen-forming fungi and Uredinales, Ustilaginales, and Gasteromycetes, but excluding all other Basidiomycetes), 1 May 1753 (Linnaeus, *Species Plantarum*, ed. 1).

Change (e) to (f) and (f) to (g) and add a new paragraph (e):

(e) BASIDIOMYCETES (excepting Ustilaginales, Uredinales, Gasteromycetes), Jan. 1, 1821 (Fries, *Systema Mycologicum*, vol. 1; vol. 1 treated as having appeared on Jan. 1, 1821, and the *Elenchus Fungorum* (1828) is treated as part of the *Systema*). Names of Basidiomycetes (excepting Ustilaginales, Uredinales, and Gasteromycetes) published in other works between the dates of the first and last (vol. 3, part 2 of the Index) parts of the *Systema* which are synonyms or homonyms of names of any of the Basidiomycetes described in the *Systema* do not affect the nomenclatorial status of names accepted by Fries in this work; if they are names or epithets not accepted by Fries in *Systema* and not synonymous with any of these, but taken over from pre-1821 literature, they are considered as validating the respective pre-1821 names or epithets with the date of their actual publication (after Jan.1, 1821) if otherwise validly published.

*Prop. B (168 - Holm et al., Taxon 35: 787):* Delete the following phrase from Art. 13.1(d), lines 4-5: "and lichen-forming fungi".

*Prop. C (153 - Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens, Taxon 35: 779):* Proposal to alter Art. 13.1(d):

"FUNGI (including Myxomycetes), 1 May 1753 (Linnaeus, *Species Plantarum* ed. 1). Names in the Uredinales, Ustilaginales and Gasteromycetes adopted by Persoon (*Synopsis Methodica Fungorum*, 31 Dec. 1801) and names of Fungi Caeteri (excluding Myxomycetes) adopted by Fries (*Systema Mycologicum*, vols. 1 (1 Jan. 1821) to 3, with additional Index (1832), and *Elenchus Fungorum*, vols. 1-2), are sanctioned (see Art. 14.x)".

The dates might better be listed under 13.5 (?). The sentence "treated as if conserved against . . ." can then be omitted here.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would restore the pre-Sydney status, with respect to starting-point dates, for all groups of fungi (including Myxomycetes) except the Uredinales, Ustilaginales and Gasteromycetes. For the latter, where Persoon's *Synopsis* used to serve as the starting-point work, Linnaeus's *Species Plantarum* would now play that role, but the sanctioning power of Persoon's *Synopsis* would be removed. Whereas mycologists are familiar with the merits and drawbacks of the pre-Sydney situation, it is doubtful whether they fully foresee the consequences of removing the sanctioned status from the latter three groups. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens is unanimously opposed to the proposal.

*Prop. B* would introduce sanctioning through Fries for the lichen-forming fungi (formerly, Lichenes). This is an entirely new idea, since historically lichens have always had their starting point with Linnaeus's *Species Plantarum*. The motive of the proposers is biological consistency, since for nomenclatural purposes, lichens are considered to be reduced to their fungal component and are not any longer a taxonomic group of their own. This, however, is a theoretical not a practical problem, since, at least for the taxa that are dealt with in older literature, the distinction between fungi and lichens presents

no difficulty. The Section will have to decide whether a dozen or more name changes involving several familiar and widespread lichen species are "a small sacrifice to pay for avoiding the need to make biological decisions before applying the Code", as Hawksworth (*Taxon* 35: 787. 1986) puts it. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens, by a large majority, is of this opinion.

*Prop. C* includes *Prop. B* (above), although that proposal was not specifically considered by "Subcommittee C", and also proposes some changes linked to decisions on other proposals, of which the Editorial Committee can take care. The new, committee-supported material included in this proposal, and on which the mail ballot should bear, is the addition of the Index to Fries's *Systema Mycologicum* of 1832 to the list of sanctioning works. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens is in favour of this proposal.

#### Article 14

*Prop. A* (264 - Fosberg, *Taxon* 35: 847): In: Art. 14.1: Delete "and species" and replace "and" before "genera".

Art. 14.2: Delete the second sentence.

Art. 14.4: Delete the last sentence.

*Prop. B* (220 - Greuter et al., *Taxon* 35: 820): Re-number the present Art. 14.1 as 14.1(a), and add a new Art. 14.1(b) reading:

"A name may also be conserved in cases provided for by Art. 69". At the end of Art. 14.,2 add "except as allowed for under Art. 14.1(b)".

*Prop. C* (203 - Brummitt, *Taxon* 35: 809): Add to Art. 14 (perhaps as a second sentence of Art. 14.3) the following:

"When typification of the binomial given as the type of a conserved generic name is in dispute, the type of that binomial may be stated in Appendix 3 so that application of the generic name is not in doubt".

*Prop. D* (233 - Voss, *Taxon* 35: 828): Art. 14.10. At end of first sentence, add "or gender."

*Prop. E* (154 - Gams, *Taxon* 35: 780): Proposal to add the following paragraphs to Art. 14:

*Par. n.* "Fungal names adopted in the basic books (see Art. 13.1(d)) are sanctioned. Sanctioned names are protected against all older, non-conserved and non-sanctioned, fungal (excluding Myxomycetes) homonyms and competing synonyms of the same rank, whether they were listed in the basic books or not. Concerning typification of sanctioned fungal names, see Art. 7.17. Concerning citation of sanctioning authors, see Art. 50. Rec. E.2."

*Par. o.* "The date of sanctioning is irrelevant to the priority of sanctioned names. A name once sanctioned remains sanctioned even if the sanctioning author in later volumes or the indices of the basic books no longer recognized it."

*Par. p.* "When several serially or simultaneously sanctioned names compete for the same taxon, the earliest validly published name must be retained. Later homonyms when sanctioned are ruled by Articles 64 and 72 Note 1. Hence, new names with the same epithet are ascribed to the recombining author only."

*Prop. F* (155A - Gams, *Taxon* 35: 780): Add to Article 14: "Earlier names overridden by sanctioned homonyms are illegitimate (see Art. 64.1)." (Alternative to *Prop. 155B*)

*Prop. G* (155B - Gams, *Taxon* 35: 780): Add to Article 14: "Earlier names overridden by sanctioned homonyms are legitimate but unavailable in that particular combination." (Alternative to *Prop. 155A*)

*Prop. H (165 - Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens, Taxon 35: 781):* Add a paragraph to Art. 14: "Sanctioning does not conserve orthographic variants of the spelling used in the sanctioning works."

*Prop. I (322 - Scott & Zijlstra, Taxon 35: 885):* Add a new Art. 14.12 as follows:

"Part 1. Names of subgenera of the (Hepaticae) genus *Lejeunea* (except for *Eu-Lejeunea*) and the section *Strepsilejeunea*, introduced by Spruce in *Hepaticae Amazonicae et Andinae* (1884-1885), are to be treated also as genera dating from their first publication in that work. Hyphens in these names are to be treated as orthographic errors."

"Part 2. A. Combinations in *Lejeunea* under these names as infrageneric categories, are to be treated as combinations in them as genera also, up to *Hepaticae* (pre-print Sept. 1893.)"

"B. Species combinations in these names, introduced by Spruce in that work, are to be treated as combinations in *Lejeunea* also, even if the combinations in *Lejeunea* actually appeared one year later only, in the Index of the work."

"Part 3. Species combinations in the 'Sprucean' (sub)generic names, published up to Schiffner's *Hepaticae* (1893) should (if they otherwise fulfil the requirements of the Code) be treated as validly published, even if from the context it is clear that the author intended the 'Sprucean' names as deserving subgeneric rank only. These combinations should be treated as combinations in *Lejeunea* also, even in cases in which such a combination did not actually appear in print in the publication concerned."

"Part 4. Combinations in *Eulejeunea*, published in the 1884-1893 period (Spruce - Schiffner) should be taken as combinations in *Lejeunea*."

Part 2. A & B are alternatives depending on the outcome of Prop. 112 as against Props. 109 and 113.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- The aim of *Prop. A* is to reverse the decision of the Sydney Congress to permit the conservation of the names of species of major economic importance. The pros and cons have been extensively debated many times before, and nothing new can be added here. The rapporteurs' remarks under Art. 6 Prop. J apply equally to the present case.

*Prop. B* would introduce a considerable simplification into the Code by dealing with cases of rejection under Art. 69 by the well-known and well established mechanisms of conservation under Art. 14. Practical work in the committees concerned has demonstrated that the work load corresponding to the rejection of names is in no way less than that which would be required for conservation, that the mechanisms of conservation are in many cases better suited to deal with the situation than mere rejection (and in almost all others at least equally suited), and that much is to be gained by avoiding the need for additional appendices for rejected names with consequent multiple indexing and other drawbacks. Opponents of the principle of conservation will, of course, oppose this proposal, too.

*Prop. C* would add another instrument to the extant mechanism of conservation of generic names. Strictly speaking it is not, however, necessary. Its adoption would result, in essence, in the introduction of a new category of conserved names: species names with conserved types that are at the same time types of generic names, and would not be listed as such but under the generic entry only. The present Art. 10.3 takes care of such cases by permitting the conservation of the generic name as based on a type specimen, which seems a more elegant and straightforward solution.

*Prop. D* would, if accepted, introduce a new option into the Code, the conservation of generic names with a given gender. The need for such a provision would be less obvious if Rec. 75 Prop. C were to be adopted, and given the status of a rule, whereby "botanical tradition" would be the paramount criterion in fixing the gender of a generic name: conserving a generic name with a gender contrary to botanical tradition would hardly seem appropriate.

*Props. E - H* would redefine the term "sanctioning" (equivalent to conservation under the present rules.) This would make it necessary to devise a special set of rules for sanctioning as distinct from conservation. The main proposed differences are: sanctioned

names would be treated as conserved, not against all earlier homonyms, but only against fungal homonyms, and not against conserved names (Prop. E); and the spelling of sanctioned names would not be conserved (Prop. H). Alternative proposals (F and G) deal with the question of the appropriate nomenclatural status of earlier homonyms of sanctioned names, a question that is unanswered also for other rejected earlier homonyms. Whereas the present provisions are concise, clear and elegant, the proposed wording would introduce little effective change but considerable disharmony into the Code. (It is fair to state that much of the proposal is consequent on a misunderstanding, by the past Editorial Committee, of how sanctioning functions under the *present* rules, and by consequent ill-advised actions taken on Appendix III entries.) A search by Rauschert has revealed that restriction of the effect of sanctioning to fungal homonyms would serve no useful purpose: whereas it would avoid the need to conserve (or change) one or possibly two generic names, it would conversely make necessary two other conservation proposals! It would, therefore, seem that Props. E - G are largely unnecessary, and that only Prop. H is really relevant. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens favours Props. E and G, opposes Prop. F, and is still undecided on Prop. H.

*Prop. I* is a desperate attempt to dispose by means of special legislation of a hopeless nomenclatural mess caused by the unorthodox working methods of some hepaticologists -- which incidentally has nothing to do with conservation. Some botanists (with whom the rapporteurs do not always agree on other matters) would call this placing a premium on doing sloppy work. Irrespective of whether or not the proposed provisions really would fulfil their scope, one may doubt whether such exceptional rulings are really appropriate, in particular in the case of works that are less than 100 years old.

Props. E - I, in particular the last named, call for a general comment. Botanists have traditionally been extremely understanding with respect to particular wishes of specialist groups. They have accepted a Code that is patched up in many respects, partly in order to avoid the threat of having to deal with different codes for different plant groups. This tolerance is certainly justified when the problems leading to special provisions have their roots in the particular features of the organisms treated, such as is the case for fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle or specimens of fossil plants. It must not necessarily, however, be extended to cases where the peculiarities are not in the objects being studied but rather in the specialists themselves.

## Article 17

*Prop. A (2 - Reveal & Bedell, Taxon 32: 661-662):* Amend Art. 17 as follows:

In Art. 17.1 add a new first sentence: "If the name of a superorder is based on the stem of a name of a family based on a generic name, it must have the termination *-anae*."

In Art. 17.3 amend the first sentence by adding the word "superorder" as follows: "When the name of a superorder, order or suborder . . ."

*Prop. B (234 - Voss, Taxon 35: 828):* Art. 17.3. At end of first clause, insert "Latin" to read "improper Latin termination."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* becomes relevant if Art. 4 *Prop. A* is accepted (see comments under that proposal).

*Prop. B* is a necessary improvement and would bring the wording of Art. 17.3 into line with the analogous Art. 19.6. The Section will be asked to authorize a similar change in Rec. 16A.4, also.

## Article 18

*Prop. A (37A - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 472-473):* In Art. 18.1 change "stem of a legitimate name of an included genus" to read "stem of a validly published generic name".

Delete the unnecessary cross reference to Art. 10.



Delete Art. 18.3. Alter the reference to "18.3" in Art. 6.4 to read "Art. 18.1"

*Prop. B (171 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 795):* Replace Art. 18.1 and examples with:

"The name of a family is a plural adjective used as a substantive; it is formed from the genitive singular of a legitimate name of an included genus (see also Art. 10) by replacing the genitive singular inflection (Latin *-ae*, *-us*, *-is*; transliterated Greek *-ou*, *-os*, *-es*, *-as*, and *-ous*, including the latter's equivalent *-eōs*) with the termination *-aceae*. For generic names of nonclassical origin, when analogy with classical names is insufficient to determine the genitive singular, *-aceae* is added to the full word. For generic names with alternative genitives the one implicitly used by the original author must be maintained."

"Ex. Classical: Rosaceae (from *Rosa*, *Rosae*), Salicaceae (from *Salix*, *Salicis*), Plumbaginaceae (from *Plumbago*, *Plumbaginis*), Rhodophyllaceae (= Entolomataceae) (from *Rhodophyllus*, *Rhodophylli*), Rhodophyllidaceae (from *Rhodophyllis*, *Rhodophyllidos*), Sclerodermataceae (from *Scleroderma*, *Sclerodermatos*), Aextoxicaceae (from *Aextoxicon*, *Aextoxicou*), Potamogetonaceae (from *Potamogeton*, *Potamogetonos*)."

"Ex. Nonclassical: Nelumbonaceae (from *Nelumbo*, *Nelumbonis*, genitive by analogy with *umbo*, *umbonis*), Ginkgoaceae (from indeclinable *Ginkgo*)."

*Prop. C (173 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 795):* In Art. 18.3 replace:

". . . based on the stem of an illegitimate generic name" with "based on an illegitimate generic name." Also, in Art. 19.5 replace "based on the same stem of a generic name" with "based on the same generic name".

*Prop. D (43 - Singer & Ponce de León, Taxon 33: 745):* Proposal to add to Art. 18.4 and replace Ex. 5.

Add to Art. 18.4:

Scientific family names ("pseudovernacular" in contrast to vernacular names) of fungi with non-Latin endings such as "acés," "ées," or "azeen," must be corrected to bear the ending *-aceae*. Under these conditions the valid publication of the family is that of the original author.

Replace Example 5 with:

Ex. 5. Tricholomataceae Roze (as Tricholomées), Bull. Soc. Mycol. Fr. 23: 113. 1876 first corrected to Tricholomataceae by Van Overeem, Bull. Jard. Bot. Buitenzorg 9: 19. 1927 is considered to have been validly published in 1876, not as Tricholomataceae Heim ex Pouzar, Česká, Mykologie 37: 175. 1983.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would become relevant if Parkinson's proposal to abolish the concept of illegitimacy (see Art. 6 *Prop. B - E*, and correlated proposals) should gain acceptance.

*Prop. B* is an amplification of the present provision, and would achieve two goals: to eliminate the controversial term "stem" from the article and to provide guidance as to how exactly the termination *-aceae* is to be fitted onto the generic name from which the family name is derived. Not all who are in favour of the latter aspect may wish to support the former issue. After all, the term "stem" still persists elsewhere in the Code, in particular in Art. 17.1, and would aptly provide a link for cross-referencing the latter to Art. 18.1. Those in favour of maintaining the term "stem" may nevertheless vote for the present proposal, but should vote against *Prop. C*, where replacement of the term "stem" elsewhere in Art. 18 and in Art. 19 is suggested.

*Prop. D* is a curious attempt to introduce a special rule in order to save a couple of family names which, the proposers themselves admit, could more aptly be dealt with by conservation. They might better have published a conservation proposal instead. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens is unanimously opposed to the proposal.

## Article 19

*Prop. A (172 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 795):* Replace Art. 19.1 with:

"The name of a subfamily is a plural adjective used as a substantive; it is formed in the same manner as a family name (Art. 18.1) but with the termination -oideae."

*Prop. B (318 - Davies & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 884):* Add to Art. 19.2 a new sentence:

"Names of any other subdivisions of a family must also be based on the stem of a legitimate name of an included genus".

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* should be acted upon in the same way as Art. 18 Prop. C.

*Prop. B* aims at introducing a rule on names at ranks that are authorized but not otherwise defined or regulated by the Code. The wisdom of this is questionable.

## Article 20

*Prop. A (174 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 796):* Provide for capitalization of generic names in Art. 20.1 and ensure that this remains a question of typography, not validity, by:

(a) Add a new final phrase (here italicized) to Art. 20.1 so that it reads; "The name of a genus is a substantive in the singular number, or a word treated as such, and is written with an initial capital letter (see Art. 73.2)."

(b) Add a new parenthetical cross reference (here italicized) to the final sentence of Art. 73.2 so that it reads: "They do not refer to the use of an initial capital or small letter, this being a matter of typography (see Arts. 20.1, 21.2, Rec. 73F)."

*Prop. B (248 - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 837):* Revise Art. 20.3 to read:

"The name of a genus may not consist of more than one word. If a name of a genus was originally published as two or more words hyphenated together, it is to be corrected to read as one word with the hyphen(s) deleted and, where necessary, the second word element decapitalized."

Adjust Example 7 to read:

". . . *Sebastiano-Schaueria*, and *Neves-Armondia* (both hyphenated when originally published) are validly published, and the latter are to be written as *Sebastianoschaueria* and *Nevesarmondia*".

Delete Note 3 and Ex. 14 under Art. 73.9 and adjust second sentence of Rec. 73G Note 1 to read: "For the use of hyphens in epithets see Art. 23.1."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would, if accepted, remove an inconsistency from the Code: Art. 21.2 prescribes that epithets of names of subdivisions of genera are written with a capital initial letter, but no similar provision yet exists for generic names (or, incidentally, for names at higher ranks).

To quote the authors of *Prop. B* themselves: "some may consider the proposal . . . to represent needless meddling with the Code". Others may be less critical and support it, as part of the current (computer inspired?) trend to avoid all hyphenation.

## Article 21

*Prop. A (277 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 852):* Modify wording of Article 21.3 to read:

"21.3. The epithet of the name of a subgenus or section is not to be formed from the name of the genus to which it belongs by adding the prefix *Eu-*. Names incorporating such epithets are to be rejected as not validly published."

*Prop. B (261 - Parkinson, Taxon 35: 845-846)*: Replace the present Art. 21 Note 1 with the following new text based on present 64.3:

"21.4 An epithet may not be used in names for differently typified names of subdivisions of a genus, whether or not they are of the same rank, although it may be used in names for subdivisions of different genera. Priority determines the nomenclaturally correct use of the epithet within a genus."

"Ex. 2: Under *Verbascum* the sectional epithet *Aulacospermae* Murbeck (1933) is allowed, although there was already a section *Aulacospermae* Murbeck (1926) within *Celsia*. This is not a practice to be emulated since it is contrary to Rec. 21B.2. If the section *Aulacospermae* of *Celsia* were to be transferred to *Verbascum* at any rank it could not bear the epithet *Aulacospermae* in its new position."

Comment: Ex. 2 is presently Art. 64 Ex. 12.

*Prop. C (249A - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 837)*: Insert new Art. 21.3:

"When an author publishing an infrageneric epithet in the form of a plural adjective indicates (by way of a parenthetical author citation or basionym reference) that the epithet is based on an earlier published infrageneric epithet with the same stem but in the form of a substantive (or vice versa) he is deemed to have published a substitute name (nom. nov.) and not a new combination (or stat. nov.)."

Renumber present Art. 21.3 as 21.4 and insert further Example:

"Ex. 2. *Pinus* series *Balfourianae* E. Murray (Kalmia 13: 12, 1983) is to be treated as a nom. nov. for *Pinus* subsect. *Balfouriana* Engelm. and is not to be cited as ser. *Balfourianae* (Engelm.) E. Murray, since these two forms (plural adjective and substantive) represent independent epithets."

*Prop. D (249B - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 837)*: (Alternative to 249a above.)  
Insert new Art. 21.3:

"When an author publishing an infrageneric epithet in the form of a plural adjective indicates (by way of a parenthetical author citation or basionym reference) that the epithet is based on an earlier published infrageneric epithet with the same stem but in the form of a substantive (or vice versa) the original form of the epithet is to be restored (the change in form being regarded as an error) and the name treated as a new combination (or stat. nov.)."

Renumber present Art. 21.3 as 21.4 and insert further Example:

"Ex. 2. *Pinus* series *Balfourianae* (Engelm.) E. Murray (Kalmia 13: 12, 1983), based on *Pinus* subsect. *Balfourianae* Engelm., is to be corrected to read '*Balfouriana*' as it was intended as a stat. nov., not a new epithet in plural adjective form."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- The first addition suggested by *Prop. A* is an editorial improvement that will be taken care of by the Editorial Committee. The second and major addition is superfluous since it is already explicitly taken care of by Art. 32.1 (b).

*Prop. B* is a consequence of the proposer's objection to considering homonyms as different names with identical spelling. Since he prefers to treat them as one name with more than one type, he finds it more convenient to remove the present Art. 64.3 from under the homonym rule and to add corresponding provisions, in a completely new wording, under Arts. 21 and 24. Those who think this to be desirable should realize that the nomenclatural consequences are not identical in the two cases: names that are now treated as illegitimate later homonyms would thereby become invalid through the action of Art. 32.1(b).

*Prop. C* spells out what would seem to be obvious, whereas *Prop. D*, put forward as an alternative, would introduce a most unwelcome innovation into the Code. Both proposals, apparently, rest on a misapprehension. This is obvious from the example which is, in both versions, defective. The epithet *balfouriana* (derived from *Pinus balfouriana*) is an adjective not a noun, and the name *Pinus* subsect. *Balfouriana* Engelm. is a correctable error under Art. 75.3 and is to be read *Pinus* subsect. *Balfourianae*. *Pinus* ser. *Balfourianae* is a new combination based on this. On the other hand a hypothetical *Pinus* subsect. *Balfouria* (where the epithet would be a noun) could obviously not be the

Article 23

*Prop. A (93 - Friis, Taxon 35: 399-400)*: Proposal to modify Article 23.1, substantially re-word Article 23.6, add a new Article 23.7, and modify Article 75.1, as follows:

Article 23.1. After "rejected", insert: "(except as provided for under Art. 23.6)".

Article 23.6. Delete the Article and replace by the following:

23.6. The following designations are not to be regarded as specific names:

(a) Descriptive designations consisting of a generic name followed by a descriptive phrase name (Linnaean *nomen specificum legitimum*) of one or more words.

*Ex. 5.* The name *Abutilon album* Hill (Brit. Herb. 49. 1756) is a descriptive designation reduced to two words, not a binary name in accordance with the Linnaean system, and is therefore to be rejected (Hill's other species was *Abutilon flore flavo*).

*Ex. 6.* The works by Miller (Gard. Dict. Abr. Ed. 4. 1754) and W. Kramer (Elench. Veg. 1756) are examples of works, the names in which are such descriptive designations and therefore to be rejected.

*Note 1.* Phrase names or apparent phrase names used by Linnaeus as specific epithets (*nomina trivialia*) are to be treated as orthographic errors to be corrected in accordance with later usage by Linnaeus himself.

*Ex. 7.* *Apocynum fol. androsaemi* L. (Sp. Pl. 213. 1753), is to be cited as *A. androsaemifolium* L. (Sp. Pl. 213. 1753) corr. L. (Syst. Nat. ed. 10,2: 946. 1759), and *Mussaenda fr[uctu] frondosa* L. (Sp. Pl. 177. 1753) as *M. frondosa* L. (Sp. Pl. 177. 1753) corr. L. (Syst. Nat. ed. 10,2: 931. 1759).

(b) Other designations of species consisting of a generic name followed by one or more words not intended as specific epithets.

*Ex. 8.* *Viola 'qualis'* Krocker (Fl. Siles. 2: 512, 517. 1790); *U. 'dubia?'* Forsskål (Fl. Aegypt.-Arab.: cxxi. 1775), the word 'dubia?' being repeatedly used in that work for species which could not be reliably identified.

*Ex. 9.* *Boletus vicesimus sextus*, *Agaricus octogesimus nonus*, ordinal adjectives used for enumeration.

*Ex. 10.* *Atriplex 'nova'* Winterl (Index horti Bot. Univ. Pest. fol. A.8, recto et verso. 1788), the word 'nova' being here used in connection with four different species of *Atriplex*.

*Ex. 11.* However, in *Artemisia nova* A. Nelson (Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 27: 274. 1900) *nova* was intended as a specific epithet, the species having been newly distinguished from others.

*Ex. 12.* *Cornus 'gharaf'* Forsskål (Fl. Aegypt.-Arab.: xci. 1775) is an interim designation not intended as a specific epithet. It appears only in a list of useful plants; both in the flora list and in the descriptive part of this work, this designation was replaced by the name *Cornus sanguinea* Forsskål (Fl. Aegypt.-Arab.: cv, 33. 1775). *Elcaja 'roka'* Forsskål (Fl. Aegypt.-Arab.: cxc. 1775) is another example of such an interim designation; in other parts of the work (p. cxc and p. 127), this species is not named.

*Ex. 13.* *Smilax 'caule inermi'* Aublet (Hist. Pl. Guiane 2, Table: 27. 1775) is an abbreviated reference to an imperfectly known species which is not given a binomial in the text but referred to merely by a phrase name cited from Burmann.

(c) Designations of species consisting of a generic name followed by two or more adjectival words in the nominative case, or by one or more such words and a substantive in the genitive case.

*Ex. 14.* *Salvia 'africana coeruled'* L. (Sp. Pl.: 26. 1753); *Gnaphalium 'fruticosum parvum'* Forsskål (Fl. Aegypt.-Arab.: cxix. 1775) are generic names followed by two adjectival words in the nominative case.

*Ex. 15.* *Agaricus 'albus corticis'* Secretan (Mycogr. Suisse 2: 229. 1833) is a generic name followed by an adjectival word in the nominative case and a substantive in the genitive case.

*Ex. 16.* However, *Anthyllis Barba jovis* L. (Sp. Pl.: 720, 1753) is to be regarded as a specific name, since the epithet consists of a substantive in the nominative case followed

by a substantive in the genitive case, and these terms are to be hyphenated (*A. barba-jovis* L.) under the provisions of Art. 23.1. Similarly *Narcissus Pseudo Narcissus* L. (Sp. Pl.: 289, 1753) is corrected to *Narcissus pseudonarcissus* according to Art. 23.1.

*Ex. 17.* Likewise *Hyacinthus non scriptus* L. (Sp. Pl.: 3167, 1753) is to be hyphenated under the provision of Art. 23.1, as it consists of a negative particle and a past participle used as an adjective. *Impatiens noli tangere* L. (Sp. Pl. 938, 1753) is to be hyphenated as it consists of two verbs.

*Note 2.* Where the status of a designation of a species as a specific name is uncertain, it is to be accepted or rejected as such in accordance with established custom.

*Ex. 18.* In accordance with established custom, Linnaean species designations the epithets of which are compounded with *Trichomanes* and *M.(elilotus)*, e.g. *Asplenium Trichomanes dentatum* L. (Sp. Pl.: 1080. 1753), *Trifolium M. indica* L. (Sp. Pl.: 765. 1753), are not to be regarded as specific names.

*Ex. 19.* *Polypodium F. mas* L. (Sp. Pl.: 1090. 1753), *Polypodium F. femina* L. (l.c. 1753) and *Polypodium F. fragile* L. (op. cit.: 1091. 1753) are, in accordance with established custom, to be treated as *P. filix-mas* L., *P. filix-femina* L. and *P. fragile* L. respectively.

(d) Formulae designating hybrids (see Art. H.10.3).

(e) All designations of species in the works listed under Art. 23.7.

Article 23.7: Add a new Article after the above, as follows:

23.7. The following works, in which the nomenclature of species is ambiguous, are, in addition to those works in which only designations are employed (Art. 23.6(a)), to be rejected as sources of validly published specific names: Garsault, Fig. Pl. Med. 1764. Garsault, Descr. Pl. 1767. Gilibert, Fl. Lit. Inch. 1781. Gilibert, Exerc. Bot. 1782. Gilibert, Syst. Pl. Eur. 1785-87. Gilibert, Exerc. Phyt. 1792. Secretan, Mycogr. Suisse. 1833.

Article 75.1: after "(conserved spellings)," insert: "Art. 23.6 Note 1 (phrase names or apparent phrase names used by Linnaeus as specific epithets)".

*Prop. B (175 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 796):* Replace the first sentence of Art. 23.1 with:

"The name of a species is a binary combination consisting of the name of the genus followed by a single specific epithet in the form of an adjective, a name in genitive or a word in apposition but not a phrase in ablative."

*Prop. C (176 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 796):* Amend Art. 23.3 by adding the italicized text so that it reads:

"Symbols forming part of specific epithets proposed by Linnaeus *do not invalidate the relevant names but must be transcribed.*"

*Prop. D (332 - Taylor et al., Taxon 35: 893):* Proposal to add italicized text to Article 23.4 so that it reads:

"The specific epithet may not exactly repeat the generic name with or without the addition of a transcribed symbol (tautonym). *Specific names of phytoflagellates, validly published under the zoological code, are excepted from this rule.*"

*Prop. E (44 - Singer & Ponce de León, Taxon 33: 747):* Proposal to delete Ex. 10 "Secretan . . ." in Art. 23.6 (c).

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* — *Prop. A* is the result of an extremely careful analysis, by Friis, of the question of complex bi- or pluriverbal specific epithets and their bearing on the validity of names. Art. 23.6 is currently unsatisfactory and, moreover, in evident conflict with Art. 23.1 if taken literally. The proposal is involved and, although carefully worded, still includes a number of seeming illogicalities and questionable details that would have to be smoothed out. Linnaean biverbal epithets, for instance, are treated under three different headings (Note 1 Ex. 7, (c) Ex. 14, and Note 2 Ex. 18 and 19), although the rationale of such a distinction is far from evident. Ex. 15, under (c), belongs

to a work listed as rejected under (e). Ex. 12, dealing with the important case of Forsskål, does not make it clear how "interim designations" are to be distinguished from true epithets in that work. Some form of the proposed new Art. 23.7 is, however, to be preferred to the present "voted examples" in Art. 23.6 and this could be considered independently by the Section. Those who, while being basically in sympathy with the proposal, feel that it may not be possible to take care of all these questions of detail at the section meeting, might favour having a special committee set up for detailed study of its implications. They should vote 'sp. c.' on the present proposal.

*Prop. B* would provide an easy solution to at least a majority of cases of apparent conflict between Art. 23.1 and Art. 23.6. Whereas it could not, obviously, solve all problems inherent in the latter (see above), it might provide an acceptable palliative pending further study of *Prop. A*.

*Prop. C* is an editorial improvement. It would eliminate what purists might consider the conflict between the present Art. 23.3 and Art. 32.1(b).

*Prop. D* belongs to a series of proposals (see also Principle I *Prop. A*, Art. 36 *Prop. B*, Art. 65 *Prop. B*) made in view of the difficulties arising from the treatment of many "phytoflagellates", by different authors, under different codes. This proposal would exempt the "phytoflagellates" from the tautonym rule. The proposers cite a single example, which is far from being straightforward, in support of such a change. They would have a stronger case if they could claim that parallel examples are numerous. The Committee for Algae will have to advise whether the proposed change is indeed essential. They might consider whether suitable guidance for a case such as the one cited could not, more usefully, be provided through the addition of an apposite example under Art. 45.4.

*Prop. E* seeks to remove reference to Secretan's *Mycographie Suisse* from among the works listed as rejected as sources of validly published specific names. The present Ex. 10. is a "voted example" that was introduced by the Leningrad Congress in 1975. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens has been asked for an opinion as to whether it is indeed in the interest of nomenclatural stability to reverse, after twelve years, the decision made in Leningrad and not challenged in Sydney. The reply is unanimously negative.

### Recommendation 23B

*Prop. A (82 - Rajwar, Taxon 34: 720)*: Proposal to amend recommendation 23B.1(e) of ICBN, to read:

"To avoid those which have the same meaning as the generic name (pleonasm), particularly those that could be considered having the same origin or as a variant spelling of the generic name (paratautonyms)."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would achieve little if anything, since what the author terms "paratautonyms" do not, as a rule, result from the creation of new names but from the transfer of epithets to other genera -- and such transfers are enforced by the rule of priority.

### Article 24

*Prop. A (278 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 852)*: Correct wording of Article 24.3 to read:

"24.3. Intraspecific epithets such as *typicus*, *originalis*, *originarius*, *genuinus*, *verus*, and *veridicus*, purporting to indicate the taxon containing the nomenclatural type of the name of the next higher taxon, are inadmissible and cannot be validly published except where they repeat the specific epithet because Art. 26 requires their use."

*Prop. B (262 - Parkinson, Taxon 35: 846)*: Add the following new provision 24.6 (parallel to new 21.4) and examples (present 64. Ex. 14 and 16) to Art. 24, deleting present Art. 24. Note 1:

"24.6 An epithet may not be used for forming differently typified names of

intraspecific taxa, even of different rank, within one species. Priority determines the correct usage of the epithet."

"Ex. 6 Rouy & Foucaud (Fl. France 2: 30 1895) published the name *Erysimum hieracifolium* var. *longisiliquum* with two different types for two different taxa under two different subspecies (*E. hieracifolium* subsp. *strictum* and subsp. *pannonicum*). Only one of these names, which are distinct only when cited in full, can be maintained and it is that selected under Art. 64.4."

"Ex. 7: the name *Anagallis arvensis* var. *caerulea* (L.) Gouan (Fl. Monsp. 30 1765) based on *Anagallis caerulea* L. makes the name *Anagallis arvensis* subsp. *caerulea* Hartman (Sv. Norsk, Exc.-Fl. 32, 1846) incorrect for the taxon for which Hartman adopted it."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- Prop. A would introduce redundancy into Art. 24.3. The expression "nomenclatural type of a taxon" is the exact equivalent of "type of a name of a taxon". The latter wording (without the adjective "nomenclatural") might be preferable and the proposal could be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. B parallels Art. 21 Prop. B and should be acted upon by analogy.

## Article 29

Prop. A (230 - *Isoviita*, *Taxon* 35: 827): Amend Art. 29.1 by adding the italicized words so that the first sentence begins:

"Publication of any action affecting nomenclature is effected . . ."

Prop. B (235 - *Voss*, *Taxon* 35: 828): Art. 29.2. Delete the paragraph.

Prop. C (226 - *Brummitt et al.*, *Taxon* 35: 824): Add a new Art. 29.6 reading:

"On or after 1 January 1990 (date to be confirmed by Editorial Committee) names published in Spermatophyta, Pteridophyta, Bryophyta and Fungi (including myxomycetes and lichen-forming fungi) are effectively published only if they appear in publications approved by the General Committee (see Guide to Approved Publications, pp. 000-000).

Further groups may be added at the discretion of the General Committee.

Prop. D (229 - *Hnatiuk*, *Taxon* 35: 826): Add to Article 29 the following new paragraphs.

"29.6. For names to be effectively published on or after 1 Jan. 1990, the place of publication must be listed in the Register of Publications maintained by the General Committee (Division III). The cumulative list of registered publications to date appears as Appendix ' . . . of this Code."

"29.7. Any application for registering publications must be submitted by the editors of the publication, or their equivalent to the General Committee."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- The intent of Prop. A is indeed commendable. Nomenclatural actions involving priority, such as lectotypification, selection between names of equal priority or between alternative orthographic variants, should indeed date from their effective publication. This is standard nomenclatural practice, but is nowhere spelled out in the Code so far. It is, however, questionable whether Art. 29 is the right place for such a provision. After all, the requirements for scientific names to be validly published are not found under Art. 29, but under Art. 32.1 (a). The proposal to make effective publication a requirement for lectotypification purposes has been made elsewhere (Art. 7 Prop. C and Art. 8 Prop. E). An 'ed. c.' vote on the present proposal would instruct the Editorial Committee to introduce this provision appropriately in the Code (e.g. also in relation to Arts. 57.2, 64.4 and 75.2).

Acceptance of Prop. B would eliminate a superfluous if not misleading provision from the Code.

*Prop. C* depends on the acceptance of General Proposals *Prop. A*, and should be acted upon by analogy.

*Prop. D* has the same intent as the series of proposals to which *Prop. C* belongs, but is much less elaborate. As worded here, it would almost certainly be unworkable, burdening the General Committee with tasks for which it is in no way suited. Like the foregoing, *Prop. D* could be referred for further study to the Committee for Registration by those who favour its general intent, provided that such a committee is set up (see Div. III *Prop. A*).

## Article 30

*Prop. A (228A - Brummitt et al., Taxon 35: 824-825)*: In Art. 30.1, at the end of the first sentence add: "except as required by Art. 30.3."

Add a new Art. 30.3 reading "For names appearing in publications approved under Art. 29.6 the date of effective publication is the date of receipt at the documenting centre (see Guide to Approved Publications pp. . . . )."

*Prop. B (228B - Brummitt et al., Taxon 35: 825)*: Make the same addition to Art. 30.1 as is proposed in Proposal 228A.

Add a new Art. 30.3 reading as in Proposal 228A but with the words "other than journals" before "approved".

Proposal 228B is an alternative to Proposal 228A

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Props. A & B* are alternative proposals belonging to the same package as General Proposals *Prop. A*, and should be acted upon accordingly.

## Article 32

*Prop. A (215 - Comm. Registration, Taxon 35: 819)*: Add a new item to Art. 32.1:

"(e) in addition, names (autonyms excepted) published on or after a date to be established by the XV International Botanical Congress must be registered."

*Prop. B (106 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 759)*: In Art. 32, paragraph 1 delete "(direct or indirect)" and add at the end of the paragraph "From 1 Jan. 1973 such a reference must be full and direct as defined in Art. 33."

*Prop. C (107 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 760)*: Add a new note to Art. 32 saying:

"Names published between 1 Jan. 1953 and 1 Jan. 1973 as avowed new combinations or *nomina nova* but without the full and direct reference required by Art. 33.2 should not be regarded as valid names for new taxa under Art. 32.1."

*Prop. D (108 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 760)*: Add to Art. 32.1 the following:

"Where the descriptive text is so short as to raise doubts as to whether it constitutes a description or diagnosis at all, the apparent intentions of the author should be taken into account; if there is apparently no intention to give distinguishing characters from other taxa, the name should not be treated as validly published."

Add the following examples:

Ex. 1. In Sweet's *Hortus Britannicus* (ed. 3, 1839) for each species listed the flower colour, duration of the plant and a translation into English of the specific epithet are given in tabular form. In many genera the flower colour and duration may be identical in all species and clearly are not intended as validating descriptions. The same criteria apply throughout the work. (Some names, however, are validated in that work by reference to earlier descriptions or as new combinations).

Ex. 2. In Welwitsch's *Apontamentos Phyto-Geographicos* (Annaes do Conselho Ultramarino 1: 527-592. 1858) the author provides (pp. 584-592) brief descriptions for



each of 116 species of which he has supplied seed. His intention seems to be to provide sufficient data for recipients to identify the species, and the descriptions may be considered to validate names of new species."

*Prop. E (66 - Heath, Taxon 34: 542):* Add the following example to Art. 32.1(c): "*Cereus smithianus* was published by Sweet (Hort. Brit. 2nd ed., 237, 1830) and was briefly described with abbreviations and is not a nomen nudum."

*Prop. F (250 - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 838):* Add the following Example beneath Art. 32.2:

"*Ex. 4.* The name *Mammillaria dixanthocentron* Backeberg (Descr. Cact. Nov. III: 8, 1963), *nom. inval.* (Arts. 9.5 & 37) was not validated by Mottram (Mammillaria Index 24, 1980), since although he satisfied the requirements of Art. 32.1, the type he designated (Backeberg, Kakteenlexicon, fig. 212. 1966) was not selected from the context of Backeberg's validating diagnosis.

*Prop. G (317 - Perry, Taxon 35: 883):* Proposal to clarify typification of a name published by one author on the basis of a description provided by another

Add a new paragraph to Art. 32 as follows:

"32.2**bis.** A name validly published by a description or diagnosis provided by another is to be typified by an element selected from the context of the validating description or diagnosis, unless the publishing author has definitely designated a different type."

In Art. 7.4., replace "If no holotype was indicated by the author who described a taxon . . ." by "If no holotype was indicated at the time of publication of a name of a taxon . . ."

In Art. 7.7, replace "A syntype . . . cited by the author . . ." by "A syntype . . . cited by the publishing author . . ."

*Prop. H (279 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 852):* Correct spelling of names in Article 32 Ex. 6. to accord with Articles 32.5, 73.7 and 73.10.

*Prop. I (280 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 852):* Add to end of Article 32.5. "(see also Art. 73.10)."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is correlated with Art. 6 *Prop. A*, and is a necessary complement if the latter is accepted.

*Props. B & C* are submitted by the Committee on Valid Publication. Taken together, they aim at closing a loophole arising from the fact that full and direct reference has been required for the validation of new combinations since 1953, but that no corresponding requirement exists for the validation of the names of new taxa by reference to previously and effectively published material. This has led to the undesirable situation that names that were invalid as new combinations have been validated, often inadvertently, as the names of new taxa. Under *Prop. B*, this loophole would now be completely closed, retroactively, from 1973 onward. *Prop. C* would cover the remaining period, from 1953 to 1972. It is proposed as a new note, is worded as a recommendation, and should indeed, if anything, be a rule. It is more limited in scope than *Prop. B*, since it would cover only avowed new combinations or *nomina nova*. This might, in practice, lead to uncertainty, and would apparently spare only a few names that were validated under the provisions of Art. 45.1. Many will doubtless feel that a straightforward solution would be more satisfactory, whereby the effect of the *Prop. B* rule would be retroactive to 1953 not 1973. A 'yes' vote on *Prop. C* will be interpreted as being in favour of its being worded in the form of a rule, whereas an 'ed. c.' vote would instruct the Editorial Committee to incorporate it in *Prop. B* by changing the 1973 date to 1953.

*Prop. D*, originally suggested by Brummitt, is not supported by the Committee on Valid Publication, on the grounds that its effects are not sufficiently clear-cut (the "apparent intentions" of authors are often difficult to ascertain). Presumably, the examples that are part of the proposal would give clearer guidance to users of the Code than the

proposed provisions. They might usefully be referred to the Editorial Committee by an 'ed. c.' vote.

The further example offered in *Prop. E* is exactly contrary in effect to Ex. 1 in Prop. D. The proposer believes that the recording of flower colour and provision of a symbol for the life form, in a horticultural list, are sufficient descriptive material for validating a name. Those who agree should vote 'yes', thereby instructing the Editorial Committee to insert an example into the Code that illustrates this situation. It should be noted that this could result in the validity of names in a number of older lists, such as Muhlenberg's *Catalogus* (1818) -- names that have been consistently treated as not validly published.

*Prop. F* offers an example to be added under Art. 32.2, a rule which is, incidentally, misplaced under Art. 32 and belongs under Art. 7, where it finds its counterparts and direct complements in Arts. 7.12 and 7.13. The proposal can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

The new Art. 32.2*bis* of *Prop. G* would make explicit what is currently, sound typification practice and is implicit if not spelled out in the Code at present. It does not belong here, but (together with the present Art. 32.2) under Art. 7. An 'ed. c.' vote will instruct the Editorial Committee, which will also consider the other suggestions of the proposal, to incorporate its thrust into the present Art. 32.2.

*Prop. H* advocates a correction of spelling that would be contrary to Rec. 73C.2 and not covered by Art. 73.10.

*Prop. I* is purely editorial.

## Recommendation 32B

*Prop. A* (315 - McNeill et al., *Taxon* 35: 882): Add to Rec. 32B.1, the sentence: "Where a full description is provided these points should be indicated clearly, either by the provision of a separate diagnosis, or by some typographical emphasis.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* proposes an addition to the present recommendation, reflecting sound taxonomic practice. Such recommendations probably belong in a taxonomic textbook rather than in a nomenclatural code, but this is equally true of most of the existing recommendations under Art. 32.

## Article 33

*Prop. A* (109 - *Comm. Valid Publ.*, *Taxon* 35: 761): Amend Art. 33.1 to read: "A combination (autonyms excepted) is not validly published unless the author actually associates the (final) epithet with the name (or its abbreviation) of the next higher taxon."

*Prop. B* (110 - *Comm. Valid Publ.*, *Taxon* 35: 761): In Art. 33.1, amend Ex. 1 to read:

"Ex. 1. Combinations validly published: In Linnaeus' *Species Plantarum* the placing of the epithet in the margin opposite the name of the genus clearly associates the epithet with the name of the genus. The same result is attained in Miller's *Gardener's Dictionary* ed. 8, by the inclusion of the epithet in parenthesis immediately after the name of the genus, in Steudel's *Nomenclator Botanicus* by the arrangement of the epithets in a list headed by the name of the genus, and in general by any typographic device which associates an epithet with the name of its next higher taxon."

*Prop. C* (111 - *Comm. Valid Publ.*, *Taxon* 35: 761): In Art. 33.1, amend Ex. 2 to read:

"Ex. 2. Combinations not validly published: Rafinesque's statement under *Blephilia* that 'Le type de ce genre est la *Monarda ciliata* Linn.' (*J. Phys. Chim. Hist. Nat. Arts* 89: 98. 1819) does not constitute valid publication of the combination *Blephilia ciliata* since he did not actually associate the epithet *ciliata* with the generic name *Blephilia*. Similarly, the combination *Hebepetalum humiriiifolium* is not to be ascribed to Bentham

on the basis of the listing of '*Roucheria ? humiriifolia* Planch.' under *Hebepetalum* (in Bentham & Hooker's *Gen. Pl.* 1: 245. 1862). The combination *Hebepetalum humiriifolium* was not published until B.D. Jackson, *Index Kewensis* 1: 1097. 1893 ('*humiriifolid*'; corr. 2: 743 (under *Roucheria humiriifolia*), 1286 (Add. et Emend.). 1895). This even though Jackson seems to suggest that the combination was made by Bentham himself."

*Prop. D (112 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 762):* Amend Art. 33.1 to read:

"The name of a species is validly published only if the author actually associates the epithet with the generic name (or its abbreviation). A combination in the rank of a subdivision of a genus or in infraspecific rank is validly published if the author clearly indicates that the epithet(s) is (are) to be used in that particular combination."

Rewrite Ex. 1 and Ex. 2 (replacing *Eulophus* by *Hebepetalum* as in Proposal 111, above) and add a third example to Ex. 2 as follows:

". . . The combination *Lejeunea subrufula* was not validly published by Spruce 1884 (*Trans. & Proc. Bot. Soc. Edinburgh* 15: 289) because Spruce only made a combination consisting of subgeneric and specific epithets: '*Microlejeunea subrufula*'. Spruce validly published the species in the index of the book one year later *ibid.* 585."

Add a third example as follows:

Ex 3. St. John, in *Pacific Sci.* 14: 229. 1960, in a paper entitled 'A revision of the genus *Pandanus* Stickman, key to the sections', clearly indicated that the sectional epithets were sections of the genus *Pandanus* and therefore validly published the sectional names (for example *Pandanus* sect. *Mammillarisia* St. John), although not actually giving them in that combination."

*Prop. E (113 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 762):* Add a third example to Art. 33.1 as follows:

"Ex 3. Publication of '*Mammillarisia* St. John sect. nova' in *Pacific Sci.* 14: 229. 1960, in a paper entitled 'A revision of the genus *Pandanus* Stickman, key to the sections', clearly associates the sectional epithet with the generic name *Pandanus* and constitutes valid publication of the name *Pandanus* sect. *Mammillarisia* St. John."

*Prop. F (115 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 763):* In Art. 33.2, in lines 4-5 alter "indicated" to "cited".

*Prop. G (123 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 765):* Add a Note to Art. 33.2 as follows:

"Note 1. If before 1953 a new combination is proposed without citation of the basionym, an indirect reference to the basionym is sufficient, such as mere citation of the name of the author of the basionym, or the citation of the basionym itself only. If there is no reference to the basionym, the name concerned cannot be accepted as a new combination, unless it is obvious the author concerned was not referring to a new taxon, and if it is unambiguous from circumstantial evidence which name is the basionym."

Add the examples as follows:

"Ex. \*. *Helianthemum nummularium* Miller, *Gard. Dict.* ed. 8, sine pag. 1768, is treated as a new combination based on *Cistus nummularius* Linnaeus, *Sp. Pl.* 527. 1753. Despite the fact that Miller did not cite the basionym nor even refer to Linnaeus under this species, Miller's reference to Linnaeus' *Cistus* in the synonymy of *Helianthemum*, and especially citation of the same pre-Linnaean reference by both authors, are conclusive that Miller was taking up Linnaeus' epithet.

Ex. \*. *Cincinnulus trichomanis* Dumortier, *Comment. Bot.* 113. 1822, is treated as a new combination based on *Mnium trichomanis* Linnaeus, *Sp. Pl.* 1114. 1753. Despite the fact that Dumortier did not cite the basionym nor even refer to Linnaeus under this species, the context in Dumortier's publication is unambiguous to conclude that Dumortier was taking up Linnaeus' epithet; moreover, in later publications Dumortier gave a clear reference, e.g. in *Syll. Jungermannidearum Eur.* 72. 1831."

*Prop. H (125 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 767):* In Art. 33.2 add a Note and Example as follows:

"Note: A page reference must be to the page or pages on which the basionym is validly published, not to the complete pagination of the work if that is greater."

"Ex. In publication of the name *Artemisia tridentata* subsp. *spiciformis* (Osterhout) Goodrich & McArthur in *Great Basin Nat.* 45: 99 (1985) a reference was included to the place of publication of the basionym as Osterhout G.E., 1900. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club* : 506-508, which is the complete publication of the relevant paper. The basionym actually appeared on p. 507, and the proposed combination is not validly published."

Proposal 127 is an alternative to this proposal.

*Prop. I (127 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 768):* Place a new Note under Art. 33.2, with an example as follows:

"Note \*: A page reference must be to the page or pages on which the basionym is validly published, not to the complete pagination of the whole work if that is greater. An exception may be made in the case of works which do not have sequential pagination, such as Miller's *Gardeners' Dictionary* ed. 8 or Lindley's *Folia Orchidaceae*.

Ex. In publication of the name *Artemisia tridentata* subsp. *spiciformis* (Osterhout) Goodrich & McArthur in *Great Basin Nat.* 45: 99. 1985 a reference was included to the place of publication of the basionym as Osterhout G.E., 1900. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club*: 506-508, which is the complete pagination of the relevant paper. The basionym actually appeared on p. 507, and the proposed combination is not validly published."

This proposal is an alternative to 125.

*Prop. J (124 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 766):* Add a Note to Art. 33.2 as follows:

"A new name including the same epithet as that of a name referred to its synonymy with a question mark or other indication of doubt is regarded as a new combination based on that name."

*Prop. K (236 - Voss, Taxon 35: 828):* Art. 33.2. At end of last sentence, add "or nomen novum."

*Prop. L (117 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 763):* Alter the last sentence of Art. 33.2 to read:

"Bibliographic errors of citation, and comparable errors as specified in Note \*, do not invalidate the publication of a new combination or a nomen novum."

Add the following Note \* to be placed between Ex. 4 and 5:

"In this context, the citation of an 'isonym' instead of a basionym is comparable to a bibliographic error."

In Ex. 5 and 6, delete the word 'bibliographic', and add the following to read (in Ex. 5): " . . . Tryon's error of citing only an isonym does not invalidate . . ." and (in Ex. 6): " . . . Raitviir's error of citing only an isonym does not invalidate . . . ".

*Prop. M (118 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 764):* Upon acceptance of Proposal 117, add a phrase in the Note to read:

"In this context, the citation of an 'isonym' instead of the basionym and the citation of a later nomenclatural synonym instead of the earliest basionym are comparable to bibliographic errors."

Add a suitable Example.

*Prop. N (119 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 764):* Upon acceptance of Proposal 117, add a phrase in the Note to read:

"In this context, the citation of an 'isonym' instead of the basionym and the citation of an earlier illegitimate name instead of the basionym are comparable to bibliographic errors."

Add the Example:

"Ex. Fernald, in making the combination *Echinochloa muricata* Michx. (Rhodora 17: 106. 1915), cited *Panicum muricatum* Michx. (1803) as basionym, although the latter is illegitimate, being a later homonym of *Panicum muricatum* Retz. (1786). Beauvois (Ess.

Agrost. 51, 170, 178. 1812) had previously made the combination *Setaria muricata* with basionym *Panicum muricatum* Michx. Under the provisions of Art. 72, *Setaria muricata* Beauv. is treated as a new name, not a new combination. The correct name of the species in the genus *Echinochloa* is *E. muricata* (Beauv.) Fernald, and the date of valid publication is that by Fernald in 1915, although the publication by Beauvois was not cited by Fernald in making the new combination.

*Prop. O (120 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 764):* Add a Note to Art. 33.2 to read (to be placed at the end of the Examples to Art. 33.2):

"A reference to a name not validly published instead of to a basionym does not constitute a bibliographic error unless it is clear from the whole context that the author knows the name concerned was not yet validly published, but only effectively published, and the author gives a direct reference to the publication in which the basionym was validly published." Add the example:

"Theodoridis (INA Newsl. 5: 19. 1983) published the name "*Helio-discoaster barbadiensis* (Tan, 1927 ex Tan, 1931) n. comb.". For the basionym he gave a full and direct reference to the 1927 publication (in which the description and the - for fossils obligatory - illustration can be found), not to the 1931 publication (in which the generic name of the basionym and the basionym itself were validated). From the discussion four pages earlier, as well as from the presentation of the new combination, it is clear that Theodoridis accepted the basionym as validly published in 1931, thus the new combination was validly published in 1983."

*Prop. P (251A - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 839):* Revise the second sentence of Art. 33.2 to read:

"Bibliographic errors in the citation of the place of publication of the basionym or replaced synonym, or reference to the wrong place of publication of such names given in good faith, do not invalidate publication of a new combination or *nomen novum*." Include the new examples given above, indicating that *Machaerina iridifolia* (Bory) Koyama and *Saxifraga dichotoma* subsp. *albarracinensis* (Pau) D.A. Webb are valid (perhaps deleting the present Example 6 which is too similar to the present Example 5).

Add to Art. 33.3 "except as allowed under the second sentence of Art. 33.2".

*Prop. Q (251B - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 839):* (alternative to 251a above). Revise the second sentence of Art. 33.2 to read:

"Bibliographic errors in the citation of the place of publication of the basionym or replaced synonym do not invalidate publication of a new combination or *nomen novum*."

Transfer Examples 5 and 6 to Art. 33.3 with changed wording indicating that *Alsophila kalbreyeri* and *Lasiobelonium corticale* were not validated by Tryon and Raitviir respectively (or delete Example 6 altogether), and add the further examples indicating that *Machaerina iridifolia* and *Saxifraga dichotoma* subsp. *albarracinensis* were not validated by Koyama and D.A. Webb respectively.

*Prop. R (121 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 765):* Alter Art. 33.3 to read:

"Mere reference to the Index Kewensis, the Index of Fungi or any other work, as an indication of a full and direct reference to a name validly published elsewhere, does not in itself constitute a full and direct reference to the original publication of a name."

*Prop. S (212 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 815):* In Art. 33.2, alter the last sentence to read:

Bibliographic errors of citation and incorrect forms of author citation (see Recs. 46D and 46E [or corresponding parts of Art. 46 if Props. 204 and 206 are accepted]) do not invalidate publication of a new combination.

*Prop. T (83 - Kovanda, Taxon 34: 721):* Proposal to supplement Art. 33 of the Code:

33.6. A new combination, or an avowed substitute (*nomen novum*), published on or after 1 Jan. 1988 for a previously and validly published name, is not validly published unless accompanied by a reference to the type of the name or to any particular specimen of the taxon in question.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A*, favoured by a majority of the Committee on Valid Publication, is a rephrasing of the present Art. 33.1, aiming at bringing it into line with current practice. It eliminates the vague verb "indicates" and replaces it by "associates". The proposed text is in general satisfactory, but needs an amendment: instead of "the next higher taxon", it should read "the corresponding genus or species".

*Props. B & C* are rewordings of the present examples that will be required if *Prop. A* is adopted; *Prop. C* also offers a new example to replace one of those currently listed. Both proposals are editorial.

*Prop. D* would exempt names of subdivisions of genera and infraspecific names from the requirements of Art. 33.1. It is not supported by the Committee on Valid Publication, perhaps partly because it is not clear why infraspecific names, that do not present major difficulties in this respect, should also be exempted. The main problem is at the ranks between genus and species, and the present proposal (as well as *Prop. E*, that would simply list an appropriate example) is inadequate as a solution. The crux is that, by tradition, many authors have treated such names as if they were univocal nouns not epithets in combination with a generic name. This is contrary, not principally to Art. 33.1, but to Art. 21.1. Unless a special exemption for such cases is included under Art. 21 (paralleling Art. 24.4 that salvages malformed infraspecific names), the problem will remain.

*Prop. F*, left over from the Sydney Congress, is recommended for rejection by a majority of the Committee for Valid Publication. Its adoption would invalidate numerous names that are perfectly acceptable under the present rules.

*Prop. G*, favoured unanimously by the Committee on Valid Publication, is puzzling in several respects. It would deal, in a "note" under Art. 33.2, with subject matter that is already covered extensively -- both for names of new taxa and for new combinations -- under Art. 32.4 and correlated examples. What is worse, it is partly in conflict with that provision. In particular, the statement that the citation of a basionym alone, without author citation or reference to a published source, would be sufficient to validate a new combination might be dangerous. The proposers had in mind a situation where a name, if not acceptable as a new combination, would be validly published as the name of the new taxon. This, however, is not made clear. As long as these points have not been fully elucidated, the rapporteurs are hesitant to recommend the proposal.

*Prop. H*, on which the vote of the Committee on Valid Publications is split, would specify by a "note" (rather a rule) what is meant by "page reference" in Art. 33.2. The proposed definition would be acceptable if it was made clear, by the aid of appropriate examples, that the "page or pages on which the basionym is validly published" can mean, alternatively, the place where the basionym appears in print or the pagination of the whole protologue. The proposed example would have to be reworded accordingly.

*Prop. I*, favoured by the Committee on Valid Publications, is the same as *Prop. H* but with the addition of a sentence that generously permits the omission of page numbers if no page numbers exist.

*Prop. J*, on which the Committee on Valid Publications is divided, would rule that a synonym cited only with a question mark or other indication of doubt would nevertheless have to be accepted as the basionym of a newly validated name provided that the epithets are the same. This would enforce a highly questionable practice and would mean, in terms of the type method, that a name would have to be typified by an element that was not definitely included in the corresponding taxon by its author.

No less than eight different proposals (K - R) deal with the question of "bibliographical errors of citation". The first of these, *Prop. K*, is independent of the others (it is also incorporated in *Props. Q* and *R*), and is a straightforward case. The addition of the words "or *nomen novum*" at the end of Art. 32.2 is logical, and their omission was presumably unintentional.

The other seven proposals are partly overlapping and conflicting, and the opinion of the Committee on Valid Publication on them is not known to date. The rapporteurs intend to propose to the Section, either to refer the whole matter back to an appropriate special committee, or to set up an *ad hoc* committee in Berlin, to report back to the Section. Those in favour of such a procedure should vote 'sp.c.' on *Props. L - R*.

*Prop. S* would state what is at present obvious, that incorrect forms of author citations do not invalidate a new combination; the proposal might become relevant if the

proposals to turn Recs. 46D and 46E into rules should gain acceptance.

*Prop. T* is based on a commendable intent but would, if adopted, have undesirable consequences. It could foreseeably lead, on the one hand, to a multiplication of hasty and ill-considered lectotypifications, and on the other, to a proliferation of not validly published, but nevertheless widely used, names.

#### Recommendation 33A (new)

*Prop. A (126 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 767):* Add a new Recommendation 33A after Art. 33.2 as follows:

"Recommendation 33A: The full details of the reference to a place of publication of a basionym or replaced synonym should be given adjacent to a proposed new combination or *nomen novum*, and should not be placed only in the bibliography at the end of a publication or indicated by '*op. cit.*', '*loc. cit.*' etc."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would insert into the Code a statement of what is indeed sound practice, and should be favoured by those who believe in the usefulness of such recommendations in the Code.

#### Article 34

*Prop. A (128 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 769):* In Art. 34.1 delete "(c) when it is merely mentioned incidentally," and delete 34.3 which attempts to define "incidental mention".

*Prop. B (129 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 769):* Delete Art. 34.3 and add a new Note as follows:

"Note: If one doubts if Art. 34.1 (c) should be applied to a name, one should follow established custom."

Add the following examples;

Ex. A. The names *Lomatophyllum sandersii* and *Billbergia chlorosticta* were published incidentally in a report of a Floral Committee (*Gard. Chron.* 1871: 1421. 1871), accompanied with vague descriptions as plants for which certificates had been awarded to their nursery-gardeners. These names, which until recently have been ignored (see Read, *Taxon* 34: 341. 1985), were not validly published.

Ex. B. The name *Lejeunea austrina* was not validly published by Stephani (*Hedwigia* 28: 261. 1889), as it was only mentioned incidentally under *Strepsilejeunea luehmanni*; (the species concerned was described one page earlier as *Strepsilejeunea austrina*, which is an invalid name as well, under Art. 43).

Ex. C. *Lejeunea microstipula*, reported in the Index of *Hedwigia* 29 (p. xvii. 1890, referring to p. 89 of this volume; ed. K. Prantl) has to be considered as an incidentally mentioned name, and not as the validly published name for the species which on p. 89 had been described by Stephani under the invalid name of *Microlejeunea microstipula* (invalid because *Microlejeunea* was not at generic rank there)."

*Prop. C (130 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 770):* Add a new example in Art. 34 as follows, between Ex. 3 and Ex. 4, to illustrate cases which are not regulated as invalid by (a) and/or (b) of Art. 34.1:

"Ex. Williamson proposed the 'provisional genus' *Sporocarpon* in a footnote (*Philos. Trans.* 169: 347. 1879), with 4 species, all of them being new. In subsequent publications of the same author, several more new species were described in *Sporocarpon*. Williamson nowhere explicitly stated that the genus was no longer provisional. Apparently it was his intention to publish a provisional taxon, not a provisional name, hence *Sporocarpon* was validly published in Williamson 1879."

*Prop. D (131 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 770):* In Art. 34.4 delete the second sentence beginning "This rule does not apply . . .", and delete Ex. 11.

*Prop. E (132 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 771):* Amend Art. 34.4 to read:

"When on or after 1 Jan. 1953, two or more different names are proposed simultaneously for the same taxon (same circumscription, same type) by the same author (so called alternative names), none of them is validly published. When such alternative names simultaneously published before 1 Jan. 1953 involve names at different ranks then only one is validly published - the name at the lowest rank."

Add a new example to illustrate the second sentence.

Make a separate paragraph of the old second sentence of Art. 34.4 to be placed after Note 1 and Ex. 12 to read:

"When an author publishes the same combination at different ranks, either for infraspecific taxa within a species or for subdivisions of a genus within a genus (see Rec. 22A.1-2, 26A.1-3, the lowest rank name being a so-called pseudo-autonym), by providing one quadrinomial 'name' and one description or diagnosis or one reference to a basionym or replaced synonym only, each of these names is validly published."

Place present Ex. 11 here and renumber.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* had been referred by the Sydney Congress to the Committee on Valid Publication which now recommends that it be accepted. During the past twelve years it has not been possible for those in favour of maintaining "incidental mention" within Art. 34.1, to bring forward a single example of a name that falls within that category and is considered as not being validly published, whereas, on the contrary, a great number of names in current use were only incidentally mentioned when first validated.

*Prop. B*, put forward as an alternative but not favoured by the Committee on Valid Publication, consists of a "note" that is worded as a recommendation but would only make sense as a rule, plus three examples of names that were by no means incidentally mentioned when first published. If accepted, the proposed "note" could easily be misused to reject any purportedly undesirable name as being contrary to "established custom".

*Prop. C* offers a new example to illustrate the alleged difference between a "provisional taxon" and a "provisional name". It is by no means certain that, especially in the last century, the distinction between taxa and names has always been clearly understood. Even though one may agree with the proposers on this concrete individual case, one should nevertheless carefully consider whether it would really provide suitable guidance to those using the Code.

*Props. D & E* deal with the question of alternative names. Following an addition made in Sydney (that *Prop. D* would remove), this provision in the Code does not actually present any problems. It has, however, obviously been misunderstood by the committee members as is borne out by their published comments. Perhaps the Section should instruct the Editorial Committee to add a clarifying note, explaining that Art. 34.4 does not apply to single names published with a dual or multiple indication of rank (such names are governed by Art. 35.2). The major innovation included in *Prop. E*, ruling pre-1953 alternative names at different ranks to be validly published only at the lower rank, would presumably apply in a few cases only -- and when applicable have a destabilizing rather than stabilizing effect.

## Article 35

*Prop. A (163A - Gams, Taxon 35: 781):* Add new Art. 35.5

"Infraspecific names adopted in one of the works specified in Art. 13.1(d) and thereby sanctioned are considered to have the rank of *varietas* if denoted by Greek letters, and the rank of *forma* if denoted by Roman letters, unless this would be contrary to the statements of the sanctioning author."



*Prop. B (163B - Gams, Taxon 35: 781):* Add new Art. 35.5 as Proposal 163A but with the last clause:

"even if this would be contrary to the statements of the sanctioning author."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Props. A & B* are alternatives, reflecting diverging opinions within Subcommittee C of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens. From the comments included in the published report, it is not obvious whether either of these alternatives is indeed desirable. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens has expressed some revolutionary thoughts on this, apparently favouring a generalization of the proposed new rule to all groups of plants -- surely a dangerous idea.

## Article 36

*Prop. A (316 - McNeill et al., Taxon 35: 882):* Proposal to provide for the use of English as an alternative to Latin for the validation of the names of new taxa.

a) Add a new Article 36.3 to read: "36.3. In order to be validly published, a name of a new taxon, published on or after 1 Jan. 1990, must be accompanied by a Latin or by an English description or diagnosis or by reference to a previously and effectively published Latin or English description or diagnosis.

b) Add after the dates in Articles 36.1 and 36.2 the words "and until 31 Dec. 1989".

*Prop. B (333 - Taylor et al., Taxon 35: 893):* Proposal to add italicized text to Article 36.2 so that it reads:

"In order to be validly published, a name of a new taxon of non-fossil algae, *the phytoflagellates excepted*, published on or after 1 Jan. 1958 must be accompanied by a Latin description or diagnosis or by reference to a previously and effectively published Latin description or diagnosis."

*Prop. C (133 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 772):* In both Art. 36.1 and Art. 36.2 add to the end of the paragraphs "From 1 Jan. 1973 such a reference must be full and direct as defined in Art. 33."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A*, suggesting that from 1990 onwards, English should be acceptable along with Latin as the language validating diagnoses and descriptions, has already engendered lively discussion among plant taxonomists and will continue to do so. In their comments, the authors of the proposal have outlined the main reasons for opposition -- the most important of which, in the long run, is presumably the enhancement of a loss of contact with our scientific heritage that results from the gradual disappearance of the knowledge of Latin. It is true that a reading knowledge of that language does not necessarily suffice to write one's own diagnoses. Some may, therefore, want to introduce the option of providing new validating descriptions in English, but would not wish to allow validation by reference to a previously published English description or diagnosis; an 'ed. c.' vote will be interpreted as expressing such a preference. It should be noted that the proposal also has the effect of restricting to English or Latin the languages in which the names of new taxa of fossil plants may be validly published.

*Prop. B* would remove the obligation of providing a Latin description or diagnosis for new taxa of the "phytoflagellates" (see Prin. I Prop. A), thereby eliminating difficulties that result from many of these organisms being treated by different workers under different nomenclatural codes. Acceptability of the proposal will depend on the number of name changes that would result from its adoption. The Committee for Algae will be asked for an opinion.

*Prop. C*, unanimously supported by the Committee on Valid Publication, is unnecessary if Art. 32 Prop. B is carried, and undesirable if it is not.

## Article 37

*Prop. A (135 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 772):* In Art. 37, alter "family" to "genus".

*Prop. B (134 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 772):* In Art. 37, alter "family" to "genus", and "indicated" to "designated" and add the sentence: "Designation is by the use of the word 'type' or by the inclusion of a single typifying element."

*Prop. C (136 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 772):* In Art. 37 replace "the nomenclatural type" by "the holotype of the name".

*Prop. D (137 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 773):* After Art. 37 add the following note:

"Note \*. For types of names of species and lower ranks, citation of a single element may be assumed to be an indication of the holotype even without a direct statement that this is so. When the holotype is a specimen, mere citation of a locality without further reference to a herbarium specimen does not constitute indication of a holotype. Citation of a collector's name or collecting number, or a date of collection, or any other reference to a detail of a specimen, may be assumed to be an indication of a holotype."

*Prop. E (142 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 775):* Add a further paragraph to Art. 37 as follows:

"On or after 1 Jan. 1990 for purposes of valid publication of a name of a new taxon of the rank of species or below when the holotype is a specimen, some detail of the specimen, such as the locality of its collection or the collector's name (preferably with a collecting number as well) or date of collection or a unique number assigned by a herbarium, which will facilitate its identification as the specimen referred to, must be given."

*Prop. F (145 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 776):* Add a further paragraph to Art. 37 as follows:

"On or after 1 Jan. 1990 for purposes of valid publication of a name of a new taxon of the rank of species or below, when the holotype is a specimen, details to allow its identification should be given (if available): locality of its origin, collector's name and collecting number, the name of the herbarium or other institution in which the specimen is permanently conserved and the herbarium number. Such a statement of an herbarium or other institution may be in an abbreviated form such as recommended in *Index Herbariorum* or similar work."

*Prop. G (144 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 775):* i) Add a further paragraph to Art. 37 as follows:

"On or after 1 Jan. 1990, when the nomenclatural type of a taxon is a specimen, the herbarium or other institution in which a type specimen is permanently conserved must be stated. Such a statement of an herbarium or other institution may be in an abbreviated form such as is recommended in *Index Herbariorum* or similar work."

*Prop. H (95 - Meerow, Taxon 35: 608):* Proposal to supplement Art. 37 regarding valid publication.

37.2. No name will be considered validly published after 1 Jan. 1989 unless an isotype or phototype is deposited in an herbarium with an active and consistent loan policy.

*Prop. I (255 - Constantinescu, Taxon 35: 841):* 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."

*Prop. J (141 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 775):* i) Add a further paragraph to Art. 37 as follows:

"On or after 1 Jan. 1990 for purposes of valid publication indication of the holotype must include explicit use of the word 'holotypus' or 'typus', their abbreviations or their direct equivalent."

ii) Delete accordingly that part of Recommendation 37A.1. after the word 'diagnosis'.

*Prop. K (313 - McNeill et al., Taxon 35: 882):* Amend Art. 37.1 to read "Publication on or after 1 Jan. 1958 of the name of a new taxon of the rank of family or below is valid only when the holotype is indicated; on or after 1 Jan. 1990 this indication must take the form of specific citation using the word 'typus' ('holotypus') or its linguistic equivalent (see . . . ."

*Prop. K (314 - McNeill et al., Taxon 35: 882):* Add a new Art. 37.2 to read "37.2 Publication on or after 1 Jan. 1990 of the name of a new taxon of the rank of family or below is valid only if the author clearly indicates an intent to publish a new taxon by the use of a phrase such as 'gen. nov.' or 'new species' etc."

*Prop. M (138 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 773):* After Art. 37 add the following note:

"Note \*. For names of genera and subdivisions of genera, if only a single named species binomial is included in the protologue this may be assumed to be the full equivalent of the holotype."

*Prop. N (139 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 774):* In Art. 37 add a Note:

"Note \*. The combination of Art. 10.1 and 37.1 implies that from 1 Jan. 1958 on, a generic name can be validly published only if the species concerned has a validly published name (in the new genus or as a basionym only). The same applies for names of subdivisions of genera."

*Prop. O (140 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 774):* Add a Note to Art. 37 as follows:

"Note \*. From 1 Jan. 1958 on, the nomenclatural type of the name of a genus must have a validly published species name (in the new genus or as a basionym). The same applies to names of subdivisions of genera."

*Prop. P (146 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 776):* Add a new Note to Article 37 as follows:

"Note \*. Typification of a name of a subdivision of a genus whose epithet is taken from or derived from the epithet of one of its constituent species, is treated under Art. 22.4."

*Prop. Q (147 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 776):* Add a new Note to Art. 37 as follows:

"Note \*. With the exception of Note \* (Proposal 146 above), for purposes of valid publication the holotype of a name is not indicated merely by the choice of the epithet adopted."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A*, favoured by the Committee on Valid Publication, is implicit in the present rule. Adopting it would constitute a useful clarification

*Prop. B* includes *Prop. A* (which would then become essential), and further would require that a type be designated and not merely indicated. Since the rule would be retroactive, this might lead to the invalidity of many names that are now accepted. The Committee on Valid Publication is opposed to the proposal.

*Props. C & D* have the unanimous support of the Committee on Valid Publication. They should be considered as a single package, since acceptance of *Prop. C* alone (although in itself a useful clarification of the extant text) would lead to the invalidity of numerous accepted names (i.e., of names whose type specimen has duplicates, none of which has been stated to be the holotype). The "note" of *Prop. D*, which is actually a rule, gives a clear and adequate definition of what is intended by "indication of the holotype".

*Prop. E* largely corresponds to *Prop. D*, except that it includes a starting-point date. Those supporting this proposal, which is not favoured by the Committee on Valid Publication, should not support *Props. C* and *D*. Those who are in favour of the future starting-point date, but prefer the wording of *Prop. D*, should indicate this by voting 'ed. c.'

*Prop. F*, on which the opinion of the Committee on Valid Publication is split, is worded as a recommendation not as a rule. It is clearly unacceptable in its present form. It might, however, be useful as a recommendation if *Props. D* and *E* both fail. Those who would be in favour of such a recommendation should indicate it by an 'ed. c.' vote.

*Prop. G* would require that, from a future date, the herbarium in which a type of specimen is deposited be indicated. The opinion of the Committee on Valid Publication on this is split, but the reasons for the opposition are not clear. If adopted, the new rule would replace the present *Rec. 37B*.

*Props. H & I* have the same general thrust. Both would be harmful if adopted. It would be hard to define uncontroversially a "herbarium with an active and consistent loan policy", or a "permanent, responsible institution". Would a name become invalid if and as long a herbarium discontinues its loans, or an institution become "irresponsible"? (The rapporteurs realize that "responsible institution" is already present in the Code, in *Rec. 7A* -- but in a recommendation it can do little harm).

*Prop. J* is put forward by the Committee on Valid Publication. Its purpose is clear and can be commended, although it would become even clearer by addition of the words "in a modern language" after "direct equivalent". *Prop. K* is virtually the same proposal but with reference to "linguistic" equivalent and also incorporating *Prop. C*.

*Prop. L* would become particularly relevant if *Art. 36 Prop. A* were to be adopted, which would entail the risk of unintentional validations of the names of new taxa by English speaking authors. Some may consider this a useful addition even under the present rules. A 'yes' vote would be interpreted to signify the latter, whereas support conditional on acceptance of *Art. 36 Prop. A* should be indicated by an 'ed. c.' vote.

*Prop. M* would presumably be useful, especially if *Prop. C* is adopted. However, the wording is unsatisfactory (which may account for the split vote in the Committee on Valid Publication). Replacing the words "named species binomial" by "type of a name of a species" would presumably be desirable. Those in favour of such a revised wording should express this by voting 'ed. c.'

*Props. N & O* are virtually the same, but the first, a real note, rests on the assumption that *Art. 10 Prop. II* is defeated (it would then be an editorial matter), whereas the second is based on the opposite assumption (this would then be a new rule, limiting the effect of the change in *Art. 10* to the period prior to 1958). Neither proposal is supported by the Committee on Valid Publication.

*Prop. P* is editorial, and *Prop. Q*, as already indicated in the Report of the Committee on Valid Publication, superfluous.

#### Recommendation 37B

*Prop. A (256 - Constantinescu, Taxon 35: 841)*: 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."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would become relevant only if *Art. 37 Prop. I* were to be adopted. Those who are in favour of the basic idea but do not want to support the two proposals may, by an 'ed. c.' vote, encourage the Editorial Committee to replace, in *Rec. 7A*, the words "permanent, responsible institution" by "public herbarium".

## Article 40

*Prop. A (324 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 888):* Change the first part of the second line to read:  
"x*Agroelymus* as the name of a nothogenus, without".

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is an improvement of wording and can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

## Article 41

*Prop. A (148 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 776-777):* Add a new Art. 41.3 as follows:

"41.3. In order to be validly published, a name of a species must be accompanied (a) by a description or diagnosis of the species (but see Art. 42), or (b) by a reference (direct or indirect) to a previously and effectively published description or diagnosis at specific rank or below, or (c) under certain circumstances, by a reference (direct or indirect) to a previously and validly published description or diagnosis of a genus whose name was published simultaneously with its description or diagnosis. A reference as mentioned under (c) is acceptable only if the author of the generic name as well as the author of the epithet give no indication that more than one species might be involved in the genus."

Add the following example:

"Ex. *Trilepisium* Du Petit Thouars (Gen. Nov. Madag. 22. 1806) was validated by a generic description but without indication of a name of a species. *T. madagascariensis* DC. (Prodr. 2: 639. 1828) was subsequently proposed without a description of the species. Du Petit-Thouars' generic name was validly published (Art. 41.2); de Candolle referred to Du Petit-Thouars' publication and neither Du Petit-Thouars nor de Candolle gave any indication that there was more than one species in the genus. De Candolle's specific name is therefore acceptable as validly published under Art. 41.3."

*Prop. B (149 - Comm. Valid Publ., Taxon 35: 777):* Add a part 4 to Art. 41 as follows:

"41.4. In paragraphs 41.1, 41.2 and 41.3, after 1 Jan. 1973 a reference must be full and direct as defined in Art. 33."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is put forward by the Committee on Valid Publication as an alternative to Art. 42 *Prop. B*. Both proposals are identical in effect and have the same threefold rationale: (a) recognition of the fact that, surprisingly for many, the name of a species can have been validated, under the present rules, by reference to the description of a genus, provided that both taxa are co-extensive; (b) awareness of the undesirability of having this abolished since this would lead to the loss of at least 100 specific names; and (c) the feeling that some restriction should nevertheless be placed on this option. There can be little doubt on the first two points. The third one has not been thoroughly investigated yet, but, given the complexity of determining whether or not two taxa were indeed co-extensive when the names were published, the proposal is understandable, even if its acceptance could lead to the loss of some names that are now validly published (e.g., of species that were judged to be coextensive with a previously described genera but were placed in another, more comprehensive genus; or of species that were judged by their authors to be coextensive with genera that had been described but not validly named). It is possible that the number of such cases is very small -- but in that case a special provision eliminating them may seem hardly worthwhile. Those who are not in favour of the proposal may nevertheless want the corresponding example be taken up in the context of Art. 32; they should vote 'ed. c.'

*Prop. B*, favoured by the Committee on Valid Publication, is unnecessary if Art. 32 *Prop. B* is adopted, and undesirable if it is not.

## Article 42

*Prop. A (150 - Chapman, Taxon 35: 777):* In Art. 42 replace Note 1 with:

"A genus, published before 1990, is monotypic if there is an indication of the holotype under the provisions of Art. 7, Note 1."

Add the following example:

"Ex. In publishing *Widdringtonioxylon raskyas* with a specific description only, Greguss (Foss. Gymnosp. Woods Hungary 52. 1967) did not validly publish the generic name nor the species name, because he also described "*Widdringtonioxylon* sp." (l.c. 54). The new genus is not monotypic under Art. 7, Note 1, so Art. 42 cannot be applied."

*Prop. B (94 - Friis, Taxon 35: 400-403):* Proposal to replace Art. 42.2 with a new Art. 42.2 and Art. 42.3

Art. 42.2. The name of a new species may be validated by reference to an earlier validating description of a genus with a simultaneously proposed generic name, previously without validly published binomials, if all of the following conditions obtain: (a) the generic name was validly published, (b) the author of the new species name repeats (fully or in part) the validating description of the generic name or makes a direct or indirect reference to it, and (c) the genus was monotypic at that time.

Note 2. The definition of a monotypic genus given in Note 1 also applies here.

Ex. 4. *Trilepisium* Du Petit-Thouars (Gen. Nov. Madag. 22. 1806) was validated by a generic description but without indication of a name of a species. *T. madagascariense* DC. (Prodr. 2. 639. 1828) was subsequently proposed without a separate description or diagnosis of the species. Du Petit-Thouars' generic name was validly published (Art. 41.2). De Candolle referred to Du Petit-Thouars' publication and repeated the validating generic description in part, the genus was monotypic according to Note 2, and therefore, Art. 42.2 applies and the species name proposed by De Candolle is therefore acceptable as validly published.

Art. 42.2 then becomes Art. 42.3, with the numbering of Notes and Examples adjusted accordingly.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* depends on the acceptance of Art. 7 Prop. A (the reference to "Art. 7 Note 1" is not to the present note, but to the one proposed there) or at least of the principle illustrated by Art. 10 Prop. H. Even taking for granted that approval, one may consider it rash to modify the definition of "monotypic" for the purposes of Art. 42, freshly introduced in Sydney, without having previously investigated the effect of such a change through case studies. The Committee on Valid Publication does not recommend acceptance of the proposal.

*Prop. B* is virtually the same as Art. 41 Prop. A (q.v.). Whatever one may think of the desirability of such a provision, it would undoubtedly be better placed under Art. 41.

## Article 45

*Prop. A (157 - Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens, Taxon 35: 780):* Add to Art. 45.3: ". . . (unless the latter are conserved or sanctioned)."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* depends on the acceptance of the proposals on sanctioning under Art. 14, and can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

## Article 46

*Prop. A (213 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 815):* In the heading of Section 3 (Sydney Code, p. 42) delete the words 'and of literature' since they do not apply (the table of contents (p. VI) will also have to be altered).

*Prop. B (169 - Holm & Santesson, Taxon 35: 793):* Replace Art. 46.1 with: "The author(s) who validly published a name should be indicated when it is necessary or useful".

*Prop. C (208 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 815):* Delete Art. 46.1 and replace it with a new Rec. 50A in Sect. 4 (later recommendations being re-numbered accordingly) to read as follows:

"The name of a taxon is neither unambiguous nor traceable with certainty to its protologue unless the author's name is cited. This is obligatory under Art. 33.2 but should be done in other contexts, at least when the name is first mentioned. Alternatively an indication can be given that the writer is adhering to some particular work of reference in which the names with their author citations can be found."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* concerns a change in the Section heading preceding this article and can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

The rewording of Art. 46.1 suggested by *Prop. B* would, in effect, turn the rule into a recommendation. Those who are in sympathy with this should nevertheless realize, not only that this would be a major break with tradition, but that it would leave the following articles (47 to 50) with little justification. Those who, while sharing the view of proposers that the present wording is too bombastic, would like to maintain a provision in the form of a rule, should vote 'ed. c.', thereby indicating that a rewording of *Prop. B* is considered necessary (e.g. by substituting "are to be cited" for "should be indicated").

*Prop. C* might be considered if the proposals to transform Recs. 46D and 46E into rules are accepted -- but even in that case it is not strictly speaking necessary. The text of the recommendation that would replace the present Art. 46.1 is more cumbersome than the present text, and the suggested placement with the recommendations following Art. 50 is rather artificial.

#### Recommendation 46A

*Prop. A (67 - Heath, Taxon 34: 542):* Add the following to the existing Rec. 46A.5: "SD. for Joseph, Furst und Altgraf zu Salm-Reifferscheidt-Dyck."

*Prop. B (68 - Heath, Taxon 34: 542):* Add the following to the existing Rec. 46A.5: "Br. & R. for N.L. Britton and J.N. Rose."

*Prop. C (211 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 815):* Re-designate Rec. 46A as a Note (it will be Note 2 if Props. 204 and 205 are accepted) and label its paragraphs accordingly.

Delete the words 'to be' in the first sentence of para. 3 and change the first part of the first sentence of para. 1 to read:

Authors' names put after names of plants are customarily abbreviated.

If this proposal is accepted the cross-reference to Rec. 46A at the end of Prop. 204 will need to be changed.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- Do the abbreviations SD. and Br. & R. really correspond to "well established custom", as claimed in *Props. A & B*? Those who have recognized the underlying authors without looking them up in the text of the proposals may consider supporting these proposals.

As noted in *Prop. C*, the present wording of Rec. 46A is mostly not in the form that is usual for recommendations. The contents are, however, inappropriate for a mere note, and even more so for being turned into a rule. Rather than changing the status of this recommendation, one might consider adapting its language to its present status. Those favouring this should vote 'ed. c.'.

#### Recommendation 46B

*Prop. A (210 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 815)*: Subject to acceptance of Prop. 209 [Rec. 46F Prop. A], place Rec. 46B after Rec. 46F and interchange the two paragraphs so that the one applying to authors of new names comes first.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* may be referred to the Editorial Committee by those who favour it.

#### Recommendation 46D

*Prop. A (206 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 815)*: Make Rec. 46D into an article, altering the wording so that "should" is changed to 'must' in both of its occurrences. The word 'most' should also be changed to 'more'.

*Prop. B (252 - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 839)*: Amend Rec. 46D (or the appropriate Article if Yeo's Proposal 206 should be accepted) to read:

"When a name and its description or diagnosis (or reference to a description or diagnosis) are published by one author in a work by another author . . ."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A*, to reword this recommendation as a rule, has some merit.

The improved wording of *Prop. B* would be particularly appropriate if *Prop. A* is carried, but would also be relevant if the provision is retained as a recommendation.

#### Recommendation 46E

*Prop. A (204 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 814)*: Make Rec. 46E into an article with the following wording:

"When an author who validly publishes a name ascribes it to another person who either has not published it or who published it before the starting date of the group concerned (see Art. 13.1), the correct author citation is the name of the publishing author, but the name of the other person, which must be followed by the word 'ex', may be inserted before the name of the publishing author. The same holds for names of garden origin ascribed to 'hort' (hortulanorum). (See also Rec. 46A [but see Prop. 211] and 50A.2)." Examples 1 and 2 are to be retained.

*Prop. B (205 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 814)*: Add to Rec. 46E (or corresponding article if Prop. 204 is accepted) a new Note, as follows:

"The name *Lichen debilis* was published by Smith, *Engl. Bot.* 35: tab. 2462 (1812), with '*Calicium debile*. Turn. and Borr. Mss.' cited as a synonym. *L. debilis* is not on that account attributable to "Turner & Borrer ex Smith."

*Prop. C (207 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 815)*: Add a new Recommendation to follow Rec. 46E (or article corresponding to Rec 46E if Prop. 204 is accepted), to read as follows:

"Authors of new names and combinations should refrain from attributing them to others who may have used them in an invalidly published, ineffectively published or unpublished context, either as sole authority or together with their own name preceded by 'ex'. When an author citation of the latter form has been supplied by a publishing author, subsequent citations should omit 'ex' and the name(s) preceding it. Neither part of this recommendation applies when the new name is ascribed to author(s) who published it before the starting point of the group concerned provided the starting-point is later than that for Spermatophyta and Pteridophyta (Art. 13.1(a))."

"Ex. 1. *Geranium rubescens* P.F. Yeo was published as a new species in Bol. Mus.



Munic. Funchal 23: 32 (1969), with acknowledgment (op. cit. p. 25-26) to W. Jackson, who had named and described it as an unpublished thesis, but without citation of Jackson's name as author."

"Ex. 2. The name that was published as '*Tephrosia interrupta* subsp. *elongatiflora* Harms ex Gillett' (Kew Bull. 13: 128, 1958) should be written '*T. interrupta* subsp. *elongatiflora* Gillett'."

*Prop. D (253 - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 840):* Add to Rec. 46E:

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

*Prop. E (48 - Laundon, Taxon 34: 333):* Proposal to amend Recommendation 46E.1.

The initial clause of Recommendation 46E.1 "When an author who validly publishes a name ascribes it to another person" is amended to read "When an author who validly publishes a name ascribes it unaltered to another person."

The following example is added to become Ex. 2: "*Lichen debilis* Smith (Eng. bot. 35: t. 2462. 1812) should not be cited as *Lichen debilis* Turner & Borrer ex Smith because the name ascribed to Turner & Borrer was *Calicium debile*."

*Prop. F (49 - Guédès, Taxon 34: 333):* Meaning of *ex*: a proposal to amend Rec. 46E.1 of the code.

When the author B that publishes a name ascribes it to another author A, and provided he at the same time publishes proper documentation to make clear that this name had been suggested by A for the taxon under consideration at the now published rank, the latter author may be quoted in the first place with his name followed by *ex* and the name of the publishing author: A *ex* B. If the rank is changed by the publishing author (B), the original rank must be mentioned by him and the original author A may only be quoted in the form (A *ex* B) B.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* should be acted upon in the same way as Rec.46D *Prop. A*.

*Prop. B* is not a note but an example that can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

The need for, or indeed the usefulness, of the new recommendation in *Prop. C* is not obvious.

*Prop. D* spells out what is a common nomenclatural practice but one that is not explicitly covered by Rec. 46E. In view of the consequent recent uncertainty as to how such cases should be handled, it may be useful to address this issue specifically. This could be done, irrespective of whether or not *Prop. A* is accepted. The intent of the proposal might be even better achieved by a sentence added under Rec. 46D to make it clear that, where a name has at least one author in common with the publication, "in" and not "ex" should be used. Those who favour this option should vote 'ed. c.'

As convincingly demonstrated by Yeo (Taxon 35: 813-814), *Prop. E* is superfluous, and *Prop. F*, undesirable.

#### Recommendation 46F

*Prop. A (209 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 815):* Place Rec. 46F before Rec. 46B and re-arrange it to read as follows:

"Authors of new names of taxa should cite their own names in each instance; the expression 'nobis' (nob.) or a similar reference to themselves should be avoided."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

## Article 48

*Prop. A (158 - Gams, Taxon 35: 780):* Add to Art. 48, Note 2: "Retention of a name in a sense that excludes the type can be effected only by conservation (see Art. 14.8) or sanctioning (see Art. 7.17 and 13.1(d))".

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* has apparently been devised in the event that Art. 7 Prop. I is carried. Even in that case, however, it is far from clear that the proposed addition would be appropriate, something which is also evident from the Subcommittee report itself. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens is opposed to the proposal.

## Article 49

*Prop. A (254A - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 841):* 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.

*Prop. B (254B - Taylor & Brummitt, Taxon 35: 841):* In Art. 49 change the word genus" in the first line only to "family", and instruct the Editorial Committee to have all the family names in Appendix 2 checked and parenthetical authors inserted where appropriate.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Props. A & B* are alternatives. Adoption of either of them would clarify a matter that is currently open in the Code, following rejection of a proposal on Art. 49 by the Sydney Congress (see the "Comments Rapporteurs" in *Taxon* 30: 123). Arguments both for and against parenthetical author citations after suprageneric names can be produced (Art. 41.1 is also relevant in this context). Whichever opinion prevails, a clarification would no doubt be welcome.

## Article 50

*Prop. A (55 - Parkinson, Taxon 34: 337):* Change Art. 50 to read:

"50. When a taxon in a category having the rank of species or below is transferred to the hybrid category of the same rank (Art. H.10.2), or vice versa, the author citation is unchanged but may be followed by an indication in parentheses of the category in which the name of the taxon was originally published."

Examples unchanged, except that in the *Salix glaucops* example, change "altered the status of the taxon to that of a" to "considered the taxon to be."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* can be referred to the Editorial Committee, with a charge to incorporate appropriate elements of the proposed rewording into the present text.

## Recommendation 50A

*Prop. A (237 - Voss, Taxon 35: 829):* Rec. 50A. In each paragraph, insert "(invalid)" after "name".

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* can be referred to the Editorial Committee for appropriate action.

## Recommendation 50E

*Prop. A (166 - Hawksworth, Taxon 35: 786):* Insert "as a form of shorthand in nomenclatural discussions" after "desirable" in Rec. 50E.2.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- The purpose of *Prop. A* is not immediately apparent, but from the published comments it is obvious that the proposed addition is intended as a desultory statement to discourage the use of the colon and mention of the sanctioning author in publications other than esoteric nomenclatural discussions. One should note, however, that the proposal is not supported by a majority of Subcommittee B of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens, and is opposed by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens itself.

## Recommendation 50F

*Prop. A (177 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 796):* Delete the first two sentences of Rec. 50F.

*Prop. B (199 - Weber & Adolphi, Taxon 35: 803):* Change Rec. 50F.1 to read:

"Names should be spelled exactly as originally published except for changes imposed by the rules but names cited in synonymy may be maintained in their original spelling. If a name is cited with alterations from the form originally published, it is desirable that in full citations the exact original form be added preferably between quotation marks.

Ex. 1: *Pyrus calleryana* Decne. (*Pirus mairei* H. Lévêille, Repert. Spec. Nov. Regni Veg. 12: 189. 1913).

Ex. 2: *Xanthoxylum cribosum* Sprengel, Syst. Veg. 1: 946 (1825), '*Xanthoxylon*' (*Xanthoxylum caribaeum* var. *floridanum* (Nutt.) A Gray, Proc. Amer. Arts 23: 225. 1888).

Ex. 3: *Spathiphyllum solomonense* Nicolson, Amer. J. Bot 54: 496 (1967), '*solomonensis*'.

Ex. 4: *Rubus platyacanthus* P.J. Muller & Lef. (*R. carpinifolius* f. *crispa* G. Braun ex Kretzer in Baenitz, Herb. eur. 7427. 1894)."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A*, by the Committee on Orthography, draws the logical conclusion from the changes in Art. 75 that have been accepted in Sydney. Adoption of the proposal would result in eliminating the apparent discrimination between accepted names and synonyms for citation purposes.

*Prop. B*, disapproved of by the Committee on Orthography, tends in the opposite direction. It is at variance with the letter and spirit of the present Art. 75, and would encourage the citation of names that, for nomenclatural purposes, do not exist.

## Article 57

*Prop. A (3 - Johnston, Taxon 33: 124-125):* Amend Article 57.3 to read:

"57.3 A name is treated as having priority over any autonym established by its publication".

[Appropriate changes to existing examples, Ex.7 and Ex.8, see Taxon 33: 124.]

*Prop. B (238 - Voss, Taxon 35: 829):* Art. 57.3. Add at the end of Ex. 7: "if ssp. *lecokii* is not treated as distinct"; or, in the preceding line, insert "single" before "subspecies."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would transform the effect of the rule on the "priorability of autonyms" into the reverse, and abolish its main purpose and advantage to no useful effect. Contrary to the proposer, many taxonomists have experienced the stabilizing effect of the so-called 'Demoulin rule' on infraspecific nomenclature, particularly for "old" taxa.

*Prop. B* can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

## Article 62

*Prop. A (159 - Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens, Taxon 35: 780):* Add to Art. 62.2: ". . . whose names are conserved or sanctioned later homonyms, and which had earlier been assigned to the genera under the rejected homonymic names, are legitimate under the conserved or sanctioned names without change of authorship . . .".

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would become relevant upon adoption of Art. 14, Props. E to H, and can be referred to the Editorial Committee for appropriate action.

## Article 63

*Prop. A (303 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 875):* "That a Special Committee be set up to study the question of whether a name is to be considered to have a type from its date of publication ("retroactivity of typification"), in relation to superfluity and illegitimacy under Art. 63 and to the autonym rules (Arts. 22 and 26, in relation to Art. 32.1(b)). The Special Committee is also empowered to review the whole question of the concept of illegitimacy in view of its absence from other Codes and in relation to nomenclatural stability."

*Prop. B (84 - Rauschert, Taxon 34: 721-726):* Delete in Art. 63.1 the words ". . . included the type of a name or epithet . . ." and substitute ". . . included the holotype, all syntypes or the previously designated lectotype of a name or epithet . . .".

*Prop. C (85 - Rauschert, Taxon 34: 721-726):* Add after Art. 63.1 Ex. 5:

"Note 1. The inclusion of a later designated lectotype does not retroactively render an earlier name illegitimate."

*Prop. D (245 - Zijlstra, Taxon 35: 833):* Make the following changes in Art. 63:

a. Replace Art. 63.1 with the following: "If a taxon, as circumscribed by its author, included the type of a name which ought to have been adopted, or whose epithet ought to have been adopted, under the rules, its name is illegitimate and to be rejected as nomenclaturally superfluous, unless through typification by Art. 7.9, 7.10, second sentence of 7.11 or 10.4 another type is provided. In the latter category of cases the name is taxonomically superfluous when published (see Art. 63.3)."

b. In the Examples 1, 2 and 4, add the word "nomenclaturally", to have it read: ". . . nomenclaturally superfluous . . .".

c. Replace Art. 63.3 with the following: "A name which was taxonomically superfluous when published becomes a correct name as soon as the superfluity is removed by another circumscription of the taxon, now excluding the type of the name which would have had to be adopted originally (or whose epithet would have had to be adopted)."

d. Delete Ex. 11.

*Prop. E (282 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 852):* Add to Article 63:

"63.5. The inclusion of an existing published name with a question mark does not render the published name superfluous.

Ex. 13. In publishing *Blandfordia grandiflora* in 1810 Robert Brown (prodr. 296) included "*Aletris punicea*. Labill. ---?" in his protologue indicating his species may be that

Labillardière described as *A. punicea* in 1805. *Blandfordia grandiflora* is treated as legitimate. Labillardière's species is taxonomically distinct from Brown's."

*Prop. F (281 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 852)*: Correct wording of Article 63 Example 7 to read:

"Ex. 7. Exclusion of type by implication: *Cedrus* Duhamel (1755) is a legitimate name even though *Juniperus* L. was cited as a synonym. Only some of the species of *Juniperus* L. were included in *Cedrus* by Duhamel and the differences between the two genera were discussed, *Juniperus* (including the type of its name) being recognized in the same work as an independent genus."

*Prop. G (65 - Heath, Taxon 34: 542)*: Add the following example to Art. 63.3: "Tribe Cereastreae SD. (Cact. Hort. Dyck. anno 1844, p. 23. 1845) is corrected to Cereaceae with the rank and author citation unchanged."

*Prop. H (13 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-478)*: Replace Art. 63 with two articles, 63 dealing with superfluously introduced generic names and suprageneric names based on them and 63bis dealing with superfluous basionyms and recombinations derived from them.

*Prop. I (14 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-478)*: Define nomenclatural superfluity and 'inclusion of a type' in respect of generic names thus:

63.1 A new generic name is nomenclaturally superfluous if the taxon for which it was introduced, as constituted in the protologue includes the type of an available generic name (or all of its syntypes, if it has not been lectotypified) which ought to have been adopted in accordance with the priority principle. A superfluous generic name must be rejected for the taxon for which it was proposed, in favour of the earlier available name unless it is conserved against this priorable synonym.

63.2 The inclusion of a type is here understood to mean the citation (explicitly or implicitly) of the type or all of the syntypes of the priorable name or the citation of the name itself unless its type is at the same time excluded either explicitly or by implication.

*Prop. J (15 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-479)*: Prescribe procedures for typification of superfluous generic names by the following:

63.3 Superfluous generic names are subject to conventional nomenclatural typification as set out in Art. 10. A superfluous generic name may be typified on the type of the name which ought to have been adopted, but not in a mechanical manner and not if this typification would be contrary to the protologue (Art. 8). An avowed substitute name is automatically typified (Art. 7.9). If the superfluous name is holotypified the holotype must be accepted as the type of the superfluous name. If a lectotype must be chosen and the choice is contentious Art. 14.8 may be used to settle the typification in the interests of stability.

*Prop. K (16 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-479)*: Confirm the retroactivity of lectotypification:

63.4 A name which becomes superfluous through the lectotypification of a name which had not been typified at the time that the newer name was proposed is treated as if it had always been superfluous.

*Prop. L (17 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-479)*: Alternative to Prop. 16. Declare that lectotypification is not retroactive.

63.4 A name which is lectotypified has a nomenclatural type only from its typification, not from its valid publication; the lectotypification of a name cannot make superfluous another name published after the validation of the earlier name but before its lectotypification. Since the later name will, when treated as a synonym of the earlier name, contravene priority after the earlier name is typified, the later name becomes superfluous only from the lectotypification of the earlier synonym.

*Prop. M (18 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-479):* Differentiate between the handling of homotypic and heterotypic superfluous generic names.

63.5 An initially superfluous name which is a homotypic synonym of the name which ought to have been adopted is always a junior synonym of the earlier name and consequently can only become correct if conserved against it. Unless conserved it is permanently incorrect, unless the earlier synonym is itself made unavailable for some reason (e.g. homonymy).

63.6 An initially superfluous name which is a heterotypic synonym of the name which ought to have been adopted will initially be an incorrect junior synonym of that name, unless it is conserved against it. While the names remain treated as taxonomic (heterotypic) synonyms, use of the junior synonym remains incorrect since it contravenes the priority principle (Principle III). If the names cease to be treated as synonyms the initially superfluous junior synonym becomes available as a possible correct name for the taxon including its type.

*Prop. N (19 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-479):* Miscellaneous proposals on superfluity

63.7 An existing name adopted in a manner which contravenes the priority principle (e.g. Art. 57) does not become nomenclaturally superfluous.

63.8 Combinations made under a superfluous (priority contravening) generic name are necessarily incorrect when made, but are not themselves superfluous.

*Prop. O (20 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-479):* Clarify the concept of superfluous family names.

63.9 A new familial name is superfluous if the family for which it is proposed, as constituted in the protologue includes the type of an earlier available family name which ought to be adopted under the priority rule. Such a superfluous family name must be rejected as incorrect for the family for which it was proposed, unless conserved against the correct name. An initially superfluous familial name may become the correct name for a family with a somewhat different circumscription.

Note. In all cases the type of a superfluous family name is the type of the generic name on which it is based.

*Prop. P (21 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-479):* Additional miscellaneous provisions on superfluity.

63.10 An existing infrageneric epithet which is adopted as a generic name becomes a superfluous name in the new rank if an earlier synonym is available (cf. 57.1); it is incorrect unless conserved against the priorable synonym, unless the priorable synonym must itself be rejected for some reason (e.g. homonymy).

*Prop. Q (28 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-482):* Add examples to Arts. 63 and 63bis.

[For details see Taxon 33: 480-482.]

*Prop. R (160 - Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens, Taxon 35: 780):* Insert Art. 63.4 (before the present 63.4):

"A name sanctioned under Art. 13.1(d) is only considered nomenclaturally superfluous and is to be rejected when it includes the type of another sanctioned name which ought to have been adopted because it was validly published earlier."

*Prop. S (51 - Parkinson, Taxon 34: 335):* Replace Art. 63.4 with the following Note;

"Note. When different names are proposed which are synonymous by the operation of Art. H.4.1 (having identical or reciprocal hybrid formulae), the nothotaxon designated by each name includes, logically, all the material (and therefore the type) of that designated by the other. However since such inclusion of a type is achieved by the citation of a hybrid formula and not by the citation of the type itself or a name based on it, the later of any two such names does not fulfill the conditions laid down in Art. 63.2, and is therefore exempt from the effects of Art 63.1."

*Prop. T (52 - Parkinson, Taxon 34: 335):* If the previous proposal is adopted, transfer the note to Art. H.4.1.

*Prop. U (53 - Parkinson, Taxon 34: 335):* If Proposal 51 is adopted and the series of proposals by Parkinson (Taxon 33: 469-492, 1984) for reform of Art. 63 are adopted, change "Art. 63.1" and "Art. 63.2" in Proposal 51 respectively to "Art. 63bis.1" and "Art. 63bis.2" (or whatever they are called in the following edition of the Code), and add the Note to Article H.4.1.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* seeks to set up a special committee on retroactivity of typification and on illegitimacy. The proposal should be supported by those who feel either (a) that the case for explicitly anchoring the principle of retroactivity of typification in the Code is sufficiently strong to call for a detailed investigation of its consequences, or (b) that abolishing the notion of illegitimacy -- a move that many would favour, at least in principle -- deserves serious consideration now, in spite of the far-reaching destabilizing effect that it might have on nomenclature.

*Prop. B* would firmly establish in the Code that, for purposes of the legitimacy or illegitimacy of names, lectotypification has no retroactive effect. This, for many, is what the Code currently says or at least should say, and to a large extent reflects traditional procedure. Art. 7 Prop. C would also have this effect but is more comprehensive in its scope and implications, which have not been assessed. Prop. B can be accepted irrespective of action on Art. 7 Prop. C, and spells out adequately what has, for most working taxonomists, been normal procedure (the double reference to "epithet" should be editorially eliminated if the proposal is carried).

*Prop. C* reinforces the point made by Prop. B, and may be a useful clarification if the latter is accepted. It can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

*Prop. D* becomes relevant only if Art. 7 Prop. G should be carried. Even in that case, its unaltered adoption would present major problems. Abolition of the present Art. 63.3 would not, as the proposer believes, affect only names of genera and subdivisions of genera not covered by the rule before 1975, but would have similar and possibly more disturbing effects at the specific and infraspecific level. Those who, while in general sympathy with the proposal, are unwilling to support it as it stands may, by an 'ed. c.' vote, indicate that the Editorial Committee should be charged with devising a provision to exempt from illegitimacy names covered by the new second sentence of Art. 7.11, while maintaining unaltered the present wording of Art. 63.1 and Art. 63.3.

*Prop. E* spells out what many would have considered as being implicit in the present rule, but others would have challenged. The proposer's point is well taken, although the wording requires editorial attention. Perhaps a more elegant solution would be slightly changing the present Art. 63.1, introducing the word "definitely" in front of "included" in line 3, and transforming the text of the present proposal into a note. Those who are in favour of the latter option should vote 'ed. c.'

*Prop. F* is editorial.

*Prop. G* offers an example that would be out of place under Art. 63.3, but could be used under Art. 19 to illustrate that the name of a tribe that is based on a sectional epithet rather than on a generic name is contrary to the rules and, therefore, not validly published.

*Props. H - Q* are parts of a package beginning with Art. 6 Props. B, C and D, and should be acted upon in the same way as these. Note, however, that Props. K and L are alternatives, and that only one of them can be accepted.

*Prop. R* becomes relevant if Art. 14 Prop. E (in particular the second and third paragraphs) is adopted. If so, it is presumably a desirable clarification and can, as such, be referred to the Editorial Committee.

*Props. S - U* can be referred to the Editorial Committee even if Parkinson's other proposals on illegitimacy, on which the proposed wording depends, should not be carried, since some rewording of the present Art. 63.4 might be thought to be useful.

**Article 63bis (new)**

*Prop. A (22 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-480):* Define superfluous basionyms and inclusion of a type.

**63bis.1** A new basionym is nomenclaturally superfluous if the taxon for which it is proposed, as constituted by the author, includes the type of a basionym of which the epithet has priority over that newly proposed, and so is available for adoption in a recombination. A superfluous basionym must be rejected and the older epithet adopted to form the correct name for the taxon, provided there is no obstacle under the rules (e.g. tautonymy, homonymy).

**63bis.2** The inclusion of a type is here understood to mean the citation (explicitly or implicitly) of a type specimen, an illustration of a type specimen or the citation of a combination typified upon the type specimen unless the type specimen is at the same time excluded either explicitly or by implication.

*Prop. B (23 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-480):* Prescribe procedures for typification of superfluous basionyms.

**63bis.3** A basionym which is nomenclaturally superfluous is subject to conventional nomenclatural typification as set out in Arts. 7-9. An avowed substitute is automatically typified (Art. 7.9). A superfluous basionym which is not an avowed substitute may be typified on the type of the basionym containing the epithet which ought to have been adopted, but such a typification is not mandatory and the combination must not be typified in a mechanical manner (Art. 8). If a holotype for the superfluous basionym was designated then this is its type; if not a lectotype must be chosen. Holotypification overrules automatic typification under Art. 7.9.

*Prop. C (24 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-480):* Confirm the retroactivity of lectotypification.

**63bis.4** A basionym which, after publication, becomes superfluous as the result of the lectotypification of an earlier basionym containing a priorable epithet is treated as if it had always been superfluous.

*Prop. D (25 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-480):* Alternative proposal to Prop. (24) declaring that lectotypification is not retroactive.

**63bis.4** A basionym which, after publication, becomes superfluous as a result of the lectotypification of another basionym is treated as if it was not superfluous on introduction but is superfluous from the typification of the basionym containing the priorable epithet.

*Prop. E (26 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-480):* Proposal to differentiate between the handling of homotypic and heterotypic superfluous basionyms.

**63bis.5** If the type of a superfluous basionym is the same as that of the basionym which contains the epithet which should have been adopted (i.e. if they are homotypic synonyms) then the substitute epithet can never become the correct epithet, since the other will always be priorable. The correct combination must be restored, or if it is not already published, must be introduced.

**63bis.6** If the type of a superfluous basionym is not that of the basionym which contains the epithet which ought to have been adopted (i.e. if they are homotypic synonyms) then the substitute epithet will only be incorrect as long as the taxonomic treatment of the two types named as synonyms is maintained. If the types are segregated into different taxa then both epithets may become available and correct for the combinations for the taxa including their distinct types.

*Prop. F (27 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 476-480):* Miscellaneous provisions:

a) Delete Art. 7.11 (automatic typification of non-holotypified superfluous names).

b) Add **63bis.7** An epithet from an existing basionym adopted to form a recombination in a manner which violates the priority principle (cf. Art. 57.1) is adopted incorrectly, but this does not make the resulting combination a superfluous name.



*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Props. A - F* are part of a package beginning with Art. 6 Props. B, C and D, and should be acted upon in the same way as these. Note, however, that Props. C and D are alternatives, and that only one of them can be accepted.

#### Article 64

*Prop. A (161 - Subcomm. C, Fungi Lichens, Taxon 35: 780):* Add Note 2 to Art. 64.1:

"A sanctioned name is illegitimate if it is a later homonym of another sanctioned name."

*Prop. B (259 - Parkinson, Taxon 35: 843-844):* Replace Art. 64.1 and its Examples 1-4 with the following text and revise Art. 64.4 and its Example 1 replacing them with new 64.2:

"64.1 All subsequent homonymous usages of a validly published name are to be rejected (unless conserved), even if the original usage of the name must also be rejected under the rules."

"Note 1. A name is considered to be used homonymously if it has been adopted independently into botanical nomenclature in association with different nomenclatural types in its different usages."

"Note 2. Even if it was not holotypified when first validly published, a name subsequently lectotypified is correctly applied only to taxa including its lectotype, and any taxon not including that lectotype establishes an homonymous usage of the name (Art. 48.)"

"Ex. 1. *Astragalus rhizanthus* is a homonym originally introduced by Royle (1835) and subsequently by Boissier (1843). The former usage was nomenclaturally correct and the latter must be rejected, as it was by Boissier (1849) who introduced a new name *A. cariensis* for the taxon concerned."

"Ex. 2. *Tapeinanthus* was originally introduced (Herbert, 1837) for a genus of Amaryllidaceae, and subsequently by Boissier ex Bentham (1848) for a genus of Labiatae; the misuse of the name for the latter was rejected by T. Durand (1888) who provided a new name in the form of an anagram, *Thuspeinanta*."

"Ex. 3. The names *Torreya* and *Warmingia* have been conserved in order to preserve usages different from those for which these names were originally published."

"64.2 When a name is simultaneously adopted for more than one taxon, the first author who adopts it in one sense (i.e. by lectotypification) rejecting the other, or who provides a new name for one or other of the taxa must be followed."

"Ex. 4. Linnaeus (1753) published simultaneously *Mimosa 10 cinerea* and *Mimosa 25 cinerea*. Later (1759) he renamed the first as *Mimosa cineraria* and retained the name *Mimosa cinerea* for species 25. In this usage of the homonym *Mimosa cinerea* he must be followed."

"Note 3. Names which are similarly but distinctly spelled and differently typified are not homonyms, but parahomonyms."

"Note 4. Names which are similarly spelled and have the same nomenclatural type are orthographic variants of a single name (see Art. 75.)."

"Ex. 5. *Calymenia* Persoon and *Kallymenia* J. Agardh are parahomonyms, and the rejection of the latter by Kuetzing (1843) who replaced it with the name *Euhymenia* on the grounds of "homonymy" was nomenclaturally incorrect. Two later orthographic variants of *Kallymenia* (*Callymenia* and *Kalymenia*) are rejected under Art. 75.1."

"64.4. A validly published name is not to be rejected merely because it is homonymous with a rejected orthographic variant of another name."

"64.5. A validly published name is to be rejected if it is homonymous with a conserved orthographic variant of another name."

*Prop. C (260 - Parkinson, Taxon 35: 844-845)*: Replace Art. 64.2 of the Sydney Code, and examples 5-11 with the following new Article, dealing specifically with parahomonyms, and add the companion recommendation.

"64bis.1. When two or more generic names or combinations are similarly but distinctly spelled and differently typified, they are parahomonyms."

"Ex. 1: *Arostemma* Bentham 1880 and *Asterostemma* Decaisne 1838; *Pleuropetalum* T. Durand 1888 and *Pleuropetalum* J.D. Hooker 1846 and *Pleuropetalon* Blume 1850."

"64bis.2. The existence of an earlier parahomonym shall not in itself cause the rejection of a later name. However, when the continued use of two or more parahomonyms is likely to lead to confusion over their applications to taxa, e.g. because the taxa are closely related, it is provided (Art. 14) that one or more of the names may be rejected in order that the name retained can be applied without confusion."

"Ex. 1: *Acanthoica* Lehmann and *Acanthoeca* W. Ellis (both phytoflagellate algae) are confusable (see *Taxon* 22: 313 [1973]); *Acanthococos* Barb. Rodr. (Palmae) and *Acanthococcus* Lagerheim (Algae), are not likely to be confused (see *Taxon* 18: 735 [1969])."

"64bis.3. Rejection of a generic parahomonym can be accomplished only by a vote of the Special Committee of the names of the taxa concerned. If the Committee votes that the parahomonyms are confusable then the earliest is to be retained, unless a later parahomonym is conserved against it, and the later parahomonyms are to be listed as *nomina utique rejicienda*, although they remain validly published and operative in matters of homonymy. If the Committee votes that the parahomonyms are not confusable all are to be retained as nomenclaturally correct and available for taxa including their types."

"64bis.4. Parahomonymous combinations for specific and infraspecific taxa are similarly treated. Of confusable parahomonymous combinations only the earliest can be retained; the others are *nomina utique rejicienda*, unless conserved under the *nomina specifica conservanda* provision in Art. 14.2."

"Ex. 2: The combinations *Solanum saltense* and *Solanum saltiense* are confusable (see General Committee report, *Taxon* 22: 153 [1973], but *Sanecio napiaefolius* (DC.) Schultz-Bip. and *S. napifolius* MacOwan are not likely to be confused."

New Recommendation 64bisA.

"64bisA.1 Authors should avoid adopting parahomonymous names for closely related taxa, unless the rules themselves compel this, for example in the formation of recombinations where there is no choice in the epithet."

"Ex. 1: *Iridea papillosa* Bory de St Vincent (1826) and *Sphaerococcus papillatus* C.Ag. (1822) must be known under *Gigartina* respectively as *Gigartina papillata* (C. Ag.) J. Ag. (1846), while under *Iridea* the latter must be known as *Iridea papillata* (C. Ag.) Harvey (1833). These names, correct under the rules, have not been confused in phyiological literatures."

"Ex. 2: Epithets which are so similar that they are likely to be confused if combined under the same generic name, and so should be avoided for related taxa are pairs or multiples such as *chinensis* and *sinensis*, *ceylanica* and *zeylanica*, *zelandica* and *zealandica*, *zealandiae* and *zelandiae*, *napaulensis*, *nepalensis* and *nipalensis*, *polyanthemos* and *polyanthemus*, *macrostachys* and *macrostachyus*, *poikilanthos* and *poikilantha*, *trinervis* and *trinervis*, *smithii* and *smithiae* etc.

*Prop. D (179 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 797)*: Amend Art. 64.2 by amending the beginning so that it reads:

"When two or more otherwise legitimate names based on different types are so similar that they are likely to be confused . . . ."

*Prop. E (180 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 797)*: Amend Art. 64.2 by incorporating its footnote in the main text and require the Committee decision to invoke confusability.

*Prop. F (181 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 797):* Amend Art. 64.2 by replacing "they are to be treated as homonyms" by the italicized text so that it reads:

"When . . . names . . . are so similar that they are likely to be confused, . . . , *the later name, unless conserved, is listed in Appendix IV.*"

Additionally, modify the caption of Appendix IV (rejected names) to make clear it that includes names rejected under both Art. 64.2 (confusable) and 69.

*Prop. G (182 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 797):* Add the following to Prop. 181 to amend Art. 64.2 by adding: ". . . , *if deemed necessary by the appropriate committee.*"

*Prop. H (201A - Eichler, Taxon 35: 806-807):* Amend Art. 64 by inserting the following new paragraphs between 64.1 and 64.2:

"64.4. When two or more legitimate names based on different types are so similar that they are likely to be confused, some or all of them can be rejected by applying the procedures prescribed in Art. 64.5 - 64.8. (The various forms of one name as a result of different spellings, only one nomenclatural type being involved, are dealt with in Art. 75; they are orthographic variants of one name which are not affected by Art. 64.)"

"Note: Similar illegitimate names and generic names not in current use are considered not to cause confusion for reasons of similarity. When similar generic names now not in use come into use later, they may cause confusion and Art. 64.5 becomes applicable."

"64.5. When two or more legitimate currently used names of genera based on different types are so similar that they are likely to be confused, and elimination from use of one or more of them is required, conservation (Art. 14) is necessary."

"64.6. When the epithets in two or more otherwise legitimate names, based on different types, of subdivisions of one genus, or of species within one genus, or of infraspecific taxa within one species are so similar that the combinations are likely to be confused, they are treated as if they were homonyms (i.e. the later names are rendered illegitimate) if the epithets differ only in one of the following (but see also Art. 64.7):"

"(a) interchange between the terminal inflexions *-us, -a, and -um;*"

"(b) interchange of the terminal inflexions *-on* and *-um*, or *-e* and *-a*, or *-os, -us, and -as*, or *-us, -es*, respectively;"

"(c) interchange between the terminations in the genitive based on the name of a person *-i, -ae, -ii, and -iae;*"

"(d) interchange between the terminations of adjectives with alternative masculine forms, such as in the following pairs: *acer, acris, campester, campestris, paluster, palustris; silvester, silvestris; triqueter, triquetrus;*"

"(e) interchange of the suffixes *-ites* and *-itis*, or *-opis* and *-opsis*, or *-oides* and *-odes*, or *-fer* and *-ferus*, or *-ger* and *-gerus;*"

"(f) interchange of the prefix *'mc'* and *'mac';*"

"(g) interchange of *'c'* with *'k'*; *'v'* with *'u'* or *'w'*; *'ph'* with *'f'*; *'i'* with *'j'* or *'ei'*; *'y'* with *'i'*, *'j'*, *'ei'*, *'ej'*, *'ij'*, or *'u'*; or *'ae'* with *'oe'* or *'e';*"

"(h) having either a single or a double consonant;"

"(i) presence or absence of a connecting vowel, or in having a different connecting vowel, or in substitution of more than one connecting vowel or diphthong for a single vowel, between two syllables;"

"(k) presence or absence of the letter *"h"*, except when *'h'* is the initial or follows *'s';*"

"(l) presence or absence of *'c'* before *'k'* or *'t'*, or *'t'* before *'z'*, or after a consonant and before *'r';*"

"(m) presence or absence of *'r'* before *'rh';*"

"(n) presence or absence of a hyphen; or "

"(o) if they belong to one of the following pairs or triplets of geographical epithets: *caspicus* and *caspicus*, *ceylanicus*, *ceylonicus* and *zeylanicus*, *chinensis* and *sinensis*, *dahuricus* and *davuricus*, *genavensis* and *genevensis*, *napaulensis*, *nepalensis* and *nipalensis*, *saghalinensis* and *sakhalinensis*, *sibericus* and *sibiricus*, or *tianschanicus* and *tianshanicus*; or"

"(p) if they are derived from orthographic variants of one generic name and differ only in the difference in spelling of these variants."

"64.7. If the application of the criteria laid down in 64.6 leads to undesirable name

changes because a well-established name has to be treated as if it were a later homonym, the similar earlier (little-used) name(s) can be rendered illegitimate by listing in Appendix IV as *nom. rej.* following the procedures prescribed in Art. 14.11 for the listing of names for conservation."

"64.8. When two or more legitimate names of taxa of ranks lower than that of genus are so similar that they cause confusion but are not covered by Art. 64.6, some or all can be rendered illegitimate and placed on the list of *nomina rejicienda* in Appendix IV following the procedures prescribed in Art. 14.11 for the listing of names for conservation."

*Prop. I (201B - Eichler, Taxon 35: 807-808):* Alternative proposal to 201A:

"64.6\*. When the epithets in two or more otherwise legitimate names, based on different types, of subdivisions of one genus, or of species within one genus, or of infraspecific taxa within one species are so similar that the combinations would be regarded as orthographic variants were they based on the same type and are likely to be confused, the names are treated as if they were homonyms."

If 64.6\* is preferred, 64.7 would need to be altered to read:

"64.7\*. If the application of 64.6 leads to undesirable changes because . . . [as in 64.7] . . . for conservation."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is contingent upon acceptance of Art. 14 *Prop. E*. If the latter is accepted, it will constitute a useful clarification. It has the support of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

*Props. B & C* are complete rewordings of Art. 64, except for Art. 64.3 that would have to be transferred elsewhere (see Art. 21 *Prop. B* and Art. 24 *Prop. B*). A similar proposal was submitted to the Sydney Congress and defeated there. The Committee on Orthography has declined to recommend them now. Those who like the proposal, take exception to the "logically convoluted language of Art. 64", and find the wording of these proposals clearer and easier to use, may consider supporting them.

*Prop. D*, by the Committee on Orthography, would effect two changes: it would extend the rule on "confusingly similar names" to cover the names of subdivisions of genera (which is hardly controversial), and it would restrict it to "otherwise legitimate names". The latter point is problematic. The committee has not apparently investigated how many names that have traditionally been rejected because of the existence of confusingly similar, although illegitimate, earlier homonyms would now have to be resurrected. Apparently, the committee has tacitly assumed that stability is best served by limiting rejection under Art. 64.2 to a minimum. This need not now, however, be necessarily true.

*Prop. E* is not, as it might seem, entirely editorial. The present footnote provides for the submission of doubtful cases to the judgement of the General Committee on whether or not the names in question are confusable. The new provision replacing the footnote would, apparently, stipulate that the request be to declare a name confusable, not for an arbitration on whether or not a name is indeed confusable.

The difference is further borne out by *Prop. F*, that names believed to be confusable could now be listed as rejected. This would, in essence, mean that all unlisted names would have to be considered as unconfusable.

*Prop. G*, under these circumstances might have the effect of shortening the proposed appendix, but certainly not to promote security among the users of the Code.

In summary, the rapporteurs are hesitant to recommend the Committee proposals for adoption as long as their implications are not fully understood.

*Prop. H* presents a minority opinion of the Committee on Orthography. It would result in the abolition of the arbitrating function of the General Committee. Confusingly similar generic names would be dealt with by conservation and rejection under Art. 14. For infrageneric names, a detailed list of criteria of confusability would apply. Rejection under this provision would also be possible, in individual cases, by a procedure analogous to that of Art. 69. The Sydney Congress had declined to accept a specific set of rules on confusability which was not, then, limited to the infrageneric categories.

*Prop. I* is an alternative to the foregoing proposal, whereby the confusing similarity would be declared to be the same as those for defining orthographic variants. Such a rule might lead to unforeseen complications in practice.

#### Article 65

*Prop. A (29 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 482-483):* Amend Art. 65 (deleting the present Note) to read:

65.1 The treatment of any taxon as a member of the plant kingdom automatically establishes the name adopted for the taxon as a 'botanical name' and thus precludes the future usage of that name with a different type for any other plant taxon even if the taxon to which the name was first assigned is not generally assigned to the plant kingdom. A name heterotypically reused for another plant taxon in this way is used incorrectly, as a homonym: the usage must be rejected unless conserved.

65.2 The use of a name for the plant taxon precludes the heterotypic subsequent use of the same name in the plant kingdom for another taxon treated as a plant, even if the name is the correct name for the latter taxon when it is not treated as a plant.

*Prop. B (334 - Taylor et al., Taxon 35: 893):* Proposal to add a new clause to Article 65:

"(c) The name of a phytoflagellate is illegitimate and is to be rejected if it is a later (junior) homonym of the name of a taxon of the same rank validly published under the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature or the International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is part of a package beginning with Art. 6 Props. B - D, and should be acted upon in the same way as these.

*Prop. B* belongs to the series related to the "phytoflagellates" (see Prin. I Prop. A). If it has the support of the specialists of the groups concerned, the present proposal would no doubt be acceptable.

#### Article 66

*Prop. A (30 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 483):* Delete Art. 66.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is to delete the whole article as being superfluous. The Article is indeed a leftover from former Codes where the circumscription method prevailed. Not only is it superfluous as to intent, but would be extremely harmful if taken literally, since -- depending on taxonomic judgement -- it would rule that a great number of otherwise acceptable names be made illegitimate.

#### Article 67

*Prop. A (31 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 484):* Delete Art. 67.

*Prop. B (98 - Eichler, Taxon 35: 609):* Add a new paragraph in Art. 67 to read:

"67.2. An infraspecific combination is illegitimate and is to be rejected if it was published in contravention of Art. 75.1 in such a manner that the epithet of an earlier legitimate name of a species is transferred as an infraspecific epithet under a later legitimate name of a species."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would again have the Article deleted as superfluous. The comments given under Art. 66 Prop. A also apply here.

*Prop B* would extend the illegitimacy to a new category of infraspecific names. It is not obvious what useful purpose it would serve, since the corresponding combinations are incorrect anyhow and cannot be used. Nomenclatural stability would hardly be served by acceptance of this proposal since it could change the priority of names at infraspecific ranks. If nevertheless accepted, the new rule would better be placed under Art. 63.

#### Article 68

*Prop. A (32 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 484):* Delete Art. 68.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- Contrary to the proposals to delete Arts. 66 and 67, *Prop. A* does not claim that the present article is superfluous. Rather, it is part of the package of proposals affecting illegitimacy and would be the consequence of the transfer of the present provisions to other articles. The proposal may therefore be referred to the Editorial Committee.

#### Article 69

*Prop. A (268 - Fosberg, Taxon 35: 850):* Art. 69: Delete the entire article (alternative to Props. 266-267 [Props. F & G]).

*Prop. B (221 - Greuter et al., Taxon 35: 820):* Revise Art. 69 to read:

"Where a name has been widely and persistently used for a taxon or taxa not including its type, and would be the correct name for another taxon, an appropriate proposal for conservation may be made under Art. 14.1(b). Until a decision has been made on such a proposal, the name is not to be used in its correct sense."

*Prop. C (222 - Greuter et al., Taxon 35: 820):* Add under Art. 69 a Note reading:

"The name proposed for conservation under Art. 14.1(b) may be either the name which has been widely and persistently misapplied or another against which the latter is rejected."

*Prop. D (223 - Greuter et al., Taxon 35: 821):* Names rejected, or recommended for rejection, under Art. 69 prior to the Berlin Congress are to be reconsidered by relevant committees, which are instructed to recommend for each case conservation of that name which will best serve stability, such names to be listed as an Appendix of the Berlin Code.

*Prop. E (224 - Brummitt, Taxon 35: 822):* Amend the first sentence of Art. 69 to read:

"A name may be ruled as rejected if it has been widely, consistently and persistently used for a taxon or taxa not including its type."

*Prop. F (266 - Fosberg, Taxon 35: 849):* In Art. 69.1: In place of "widely and persistently" substitute "widely, persistently *and consistently*."

*Prop. G (267 - Fosberg, Taxon 35: 849):* In Art. 69.2: After the second sentence, insert "Proposals to reject names of only limited geographical interest, or of little concern outside of technical taxonomic circles, will not be entertained or considered."

*Prop. H (239 - Voss, Taxon 35: 829):* Art. 69. In first sentence, delete "ruled as"; begin the second sentence, "A request for a ruling on such a name may be submitted to the General Committee and a name rejected by ruling, or its basionym . . ."

*Prop. I (330 - McNeill, Taxon 35: 890):* Alter the first line of Art. 69.1 to read:

"A name must be ruled as rejected if it is judged to have been widely and persistently . . ."

*Prop. J (328 - McNeill, Taxon 35: 889):* Add a note to Article 69 to read:

Names rejected under the equivalent Articles of previous editions of the International Code, whether explicitly or implicitly, are not to be reinstated unless a proposal to list them as rejected names under Article 69 has been rejected by the General Committee."

*Prop. K (329 - McNeill, Taxon 35: 889):* Add a new paragraph in Article 69.

Names rejected, formally or informally, under previous provisions of the Code, and which met, at the time of their rejection, the present requirements of Art. 69.1, may also be proposed for inclusion on the list of rejected names."

*Prop. L (69 - Heath, Taxon 34: 542):* Add the following note and examples to Art. 69: "The mere statement (or proposal) by an individual botanist that a particular name is a 'nomen rejiciendum', 'nomen ambiguum', 'nomen confusum' or 'nomen dubium' does not in any way affect the validity of that name and its continued use when it is the earliest legitimate name applicable remains obligatory under Art. 11.

[For examples see Taxon 34: 542]

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* — *Prop. A* is to delete the Article. It is an evergreen at botanical congresses. The fact that, in spite of acknowledged weaknesses of the Article and its forerunners, proposals to delete it have always been defeated is in itself an excellent demonstration of the importance of and vital need for such a rule.

*Prop. B* is contingent upon acceptance of Art. 14 *Prop. B*. It can either be substituted for the present article as here proposed, or editorially combined with its present first sentence as modified by any or all of Props. E, F, H, and I, below.

Provided that *Prop. B*, and Art. 14 *Prop. B*, are accepted, *Prop. C* may be judged useful as an explicit statement of the available options. It can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

*Prop. D* is not an addition to the Code. Upon adoption of *Prop. B* and Art. 14 *Prop. B*, it would be an instruction by the Nomenclature Section to the Permanent Nomenclature Committees. The Editorial Committee might consider the insertion of this instruction into the next edition of the Code.

*Props. E & F* are identical. They are surprising in that they apparently misunderstand the actual purpose of the whole article. This is not designed for the benefit of nomenclaturalists and committee members, but for the users of plant names throughout the world. Whereas it is normal to require wide and persistent misuse of a name before having it banished, it would be perfectly illogical to require that such misuse be consistent. For the user of plant names, consistent misapplication of a name is bearable, since it is less confusing than use of a name in different senses including the correct one. Such persistently, but not consistently, misused names are the worst source of confusion in plant nomenclature, and lead to situations where users of plant names revert in despair to vernaculars as the only reliable carriers of scientific information.

*Prop. G* is similarly unacceptable. Even granting the restriction to be desirable, who, if not the appropriate committee, should consider whether a proposal does or does not meet the stated requirements? Who should be entrusted with the responsibility for declining consideration? What is of limited interest to one may be of vital concern to the other. The Permanent Nomenclature Committees must remain an open forum for those seeking their advice and recommendations.

*Prop. H* would have the effect that names coming under the provisions of Art. 69 could be rejected on the base of individual judgement without requiring the submission of a proposal and the whole committee procedure each time. The proposal is obviously right in stating that this reflects what is currently being done by many workers.

*Prop. I* reintroduces the idea that the rejection of names coming under the provisions of Art. 69 is mandatory and not just optional. It could be most usefully combined with

Prop. H (to read "a name is to be rejected . . ."), and also with Prop. B.

*Prop. J* is stated to be a note, which it is not, and may be felt to be too loosely worded to be suitable as a rule. It might, however, be useful as a recommendation after suitable rewording. Those favouring such a solution should vote 'ed. c.'

*Prop. K* has a similar concern as Prop. J, and would empower rejection of names although they may have fallen into disuse. Those favouring the idea might consider whether a similar effect could not simply be achieved by inserting the words "was or" ahead of "has been" in the first sentence of the present article (vote 'ed. c.' if you agree).

The statement in *Prop. L* is indeed true, at least under the present rules. It is questionable, however, whether it is appropriate to write it into the Code.

## Article 72

*Prop. A (33 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 484-485):* Change Note 1 to Art. 72 to read:

"When a new epithet is required an author may adopt an epithet previously applied to the taxon in an incorrect combination if there is no obstacle to its adoption (e.g. tautonymy, homonymy); the epithet is then treated as newly introduced and the combination in which it appears is treated as a basionym, not as a recombination from a basionym.

[With modification of existing examples; see Taxon 33: 484-485.]

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is part of the package of proposals by Parkinson to remove the concept of illegitimacy from the Code (cf. Art. 63 Props. H - J). If these proposals were accepted by the Section, changes to Art. 72 along the lines proposed could be made by the Editorial Committee.

## Article 73

*Prop. A (183 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 797):* Amend Art. 73.1 (on correction of orthographic errors) by adding:

" . . . and the standardizations imposed by Arts. 73.8 (compounding forms), 73.9 (hyphens) and 73.10 (terminations)."

*Prop. B (70 - Heath, Taxon 34: 543):* Amend the second word of Art. 73.1 Ex. 3 to "errors" and add the following: "The name *Huernia* R. Br. commemorates J. van Heurn (J. Heurnius) and must therefore be corrected to *Heurnia* R. Br. Also, *Huerniopsis* N.E.Br., *xHuerniorbia* Rowl. and *xHuernivalia* Bruyns must be similarly corrected."

*Prop. C (71 - Heath, Taxon 34: 543):* Insert the following new note and example after Art. 73.1. Ex. 3:

"A name or epithet should not be corrected to conform with an unproven etymology."

"Ex. *Cereus jamacaru* DC. should not be corrected to *Cereus mandacaru* DC., even though *jamacaru* is believed to be a corruption of the vernacular name 'Mandacaru'."

*Prop. D (190 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 800):* Add a new sentence to Art. 73.4:

"Other letters, appearing in some modern alphabets, are to be transcribed, e.g. the German double s ['ß'] in *bl'ßfeldiana* becomes *blossfeldiana*.

*Prop. E (189 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 800):* Delete Art. 73 Note 2 and, at the end of Art. 73.6, replace 'the diaeresis, however, is permissible' by:

" . . . the diaeresis, indicating that the vowel is to be pronounced separately from the preceding vowel (*Cephaëlis*, *Isoëtes*), and the ligatures -ae- and -oe- (*Arisaema*, *Schoenus*), indicating that the letters are to be pronounced together, are permissible but seldom used nowadays."



*Prop. F (72 - Heath, Taxon 34: 543):* Add the following new Note and Example to Art. 73: "Note 2. The unnecessary replacement of *w* by *v*, or of *y* by *j* does not by itself constitute an intentional latinization under Art. 73.7, and is therefore an orthographic error that must be corrected.

"Ex. 5. Thus *Mammillaria woburnensis* Scheer must be corrected to *Mammillaria woburnensis* Scheer, because the epithet refers to Woburn Abbey, where the plant was first cultivated."

*Prop. G (73 - Heath, Taxon 34: 543-544):* Replace Art. 73.7 with the following: "When a name or epithet is determined by the General Committee to be an intentional latinization, then it may not be corrected. Such names and epithets are placed in Appendix V."

Establish an Appendix V, and list the following: *Clutia* L., *Echeveria* DC., *Gleditsia* L., *Rajania* L., *Sarracenia* L., *Satureja* L., *Tabernaemontana* L., *Valantia* L., *Scirpus tabernaemontani* Gmelin, and any other names which the General Committee may see fit to add.

*Prop. H (184 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 798):* Replace Art. 73.8 by:

"Usage of a First Declension genitive singular (-ae-) in an epithet (pseudocompound) is to be changed to -i-. Exceptions are: well-established genitive pseudocompounds (as *aquaeductus*, *Tabernaemontanus*) and those revealing an etymological difference (as *caricaefolius*, not *caricifolius*, from *Carica* vs. *caricifolius* from *Carex*)."

"Note 1: The use of -ae- as a latinization of Greek -ai- is not a genitive pseudocompound and is not to be changed (e.g., *chamaebuxus*)."

*Prop. I (240 - Voss, Taxon 35: 829):* Art. 73.8. Insert "adjectival" before "epithet".

*Prop. J (269 - Fosberg, Taxon 35: 850):* In Art. 73.8: Insert the word *grammatically* before "incorrect", and delete "(see Rec. 73G)".

*Prop. K (270 - Fosberg, Taxon 35: 850):* In Art. 73.8: Delete examples 11 and 12 and substitute others which are not incorrect grammatically.

*Prop. L (191 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 800):* Delete Note 4 and reword 73.9 as:

"The use of a hyphen in a compounded epithet is treated as an orthographic error to be deleted but is permitted if the epithet is formed of words that usually stand independently (see Art. 23.1 and 23.3)."

*Prop. M (187 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 799):* Replace Art. 73.10 with:

"Epithets derived from modern personal names (not already Latin or possessing a well established latinization) must be formed with the addition of an -i- (stem augmentation) if the personal name ends in a consonant (see Rec. 73C.1), with the exception of substantive epithets formed from names ending in -er for which a Second Declension genitive is used on the model of *puer*, *pueri* (*hookeri* for Hooker) or *ager*, *agri* (*solandri* for Solander). Epithets differently formed are to be treated as orthographic errors, except for the use of Third Declension genitives (in -is) which should be discouraged but cannot be a posteriori modified."

*Prop. N (188 - Demoulin & Nicolson, Taxon 35: 799):* Add to the preceding proposal:

"Substantive epithets based on personal names with terminations inappropriate for the gender or number of the person(s) to whom the name is dedicated are to be treated as correctable."

*Prop. O (170 - Rauschert, Taxon 35: 794):* Add a Note in Art. 73.1 or 75.1 and add a new Rec. 50G:

"Note 2. If the sanctioning author of a fungal name, Persoon or Fries (see Art. 13.3(d)), used a spelling different from the form as originally published, the original author must be followed (see Rec. 50G.1)."

\*Rec. 50G.1. If a name is adopted by Persoon or Fries (see Art. 13.1 (d)) with alterations from the form as originally published, it is desirable that in full citations the exact form used by the sanctioning author should be added, preferably between single quotation marks.

Ex. 1. *Dacryomyces* Nees, Syst. Pilze 89, 1816 : Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 210, 218. 1821. ('*Dacryomyces*').

Ex. 2. *Tricholoma vaccinum* (Schaeff. : Fr.) P. Kumm., Führer Pilzk. 1871 ('*vaccinum*') (*Agaricus vaccineus* Schaeff., Fung. Bavar. Palat. nasc. IV: 13. 1774 : Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 42. 1821 ('*vaccinus*').

Ex. 3. *Dacryomyces tortus* (Willd.) Fr., Elench. Fung. 2: 36. 1828 : Fr. *ibid.* ('*Dacryomyces*').

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* takes note of the fact that the corrections authorized in Art. 73.8 - 73.10 are often not typographical or orthographic errors; it adds an adequate factual statement to the present rule.

*Prop. B* provides a controversial example. A 'yes' vote would indicate agreement that *Huernia* is a correctable typographic error, whereas a 'no' vote would indicate preference for placing it under Art. 73.3 as an error not to be corrected.

*Prop. C* seeks to emphasize what seems already evident from Art. 73.1 (and 73.3), that the spelling of a name can only be corrected if an error has been made, and not because of some arguable derivation of the name. The "note" is inappropriate since it is worded as a recommendation, but an 'ed. c.' vote would ensure that the example was considered by the Editorial Committee.

*Prop. D* is probably a useful addition at least in so far as the example is concerned, although we wonder how many "other letters appearing in modern alphabets" can be permitted for a name still to be "treated as Latin" (Prin. V). Would a full transcription (transliteration) of scientific binomials printed in Cyrillic script be permitted by this proposal?

*Prop. E* provides a useful clarification of the role of the diaeresis, (and incidentally distinguishes it from the unacceptable umlaut) and, realistically, recognizes its declining use, as well as that of ligatures.

*Props. F & G* are concerned with what is an "intentional latinization". The rapporteurs are disturbed by the "back-door" attempts in *Prop. G* to require that the General Committee give rulings on such cases. The intent of *Prop. F* is specifically to prohibit latinizations that involve the use of *v* rather than *w*, and *j* rather than *y*, but *Prop. G* has wider scope; indeed, from the list of examples, one might conclude that the proposer seriously considers a "correction" of *Tabernaemontana* to "*Bergzabernia*".

*Prop. H* would remove an anomaly from the Code, in that the existing wording of Art. 73.8 allows a Recommendation (73G) to have the force of an Article. It would also severely restrict the obligation (or faculty) to correct defectively formed epithets by changing the present general rule ("any incorrect compounding form") to the special, uncontroversial case of "-ae-" vs. "-i-" connecting vowels. Many other corrections, routinely made and now well established, would thereby be lost (e.g., whereas *salviaefolius* would be correctable to *salviifolius*, *salvifolius* would not).

*Prop. I* seeks to exempt non-adjectival epithets from the provisions of Art. 73.8, because it could lead to a noun in apposition being spelled differently from the generic name from which it was derived. The proposal becomes virtually meaningless if *Prop. H* is accepted.

*Props. J & K* are associated with a proposal to delete Rec. 73G and are predicated on the view that the analysis of compounding contained therein is faulty, and that a form such as *opuntiaeflora* from *Opuntia -ae* is grammatically correct. It is contradictory to *Prop. H* and the existing wording.

*Prop. L* combines the present Note 4 with Art. 73.9, which is clearly an improvement, although as noted by the proposers in the context of *Prop. A*, editorial changes to the wording seem desirable.

*Props. M & N*, like *Prop. H*, deal with another portion of the Code that permits a Recommendation (73C.1) to have the impact of an Article. These proposals, like *Prop. H*,

remove the "back door" approach, which is to be welcomed, but in this case there is a complication in that the Committee on Orthography was divided as to the extent to which correction of terminations should be allowed. Prop. M is a compromise which has the support of two-thirds of the committee, but it deliberately excludes one category of correction (and perhaps inadvertently another, see below) which is required by the present Art. 73.10. The deliberate exclusion relates to terminations inappropriate to the sex and number of the persons being commemorated (for example, *Astragalus matthewsii*, named after Victoria Matthews, now correctable to *A. matthewsiae*). Prop. N, supported by only half the Committee, would retain correctability of such errors, something which has been in the Code since 1952 (and which has been recommended practice since 1906). The wording of Prop. M does not appear to cover personal names ending in a vowel, as provided for in Rec. 73C.1(c). As the Committee does not refer to this situation it is perhaps an oversight. In the mail ballot, those who favour the status quo should vote 'ed. c.' on Prop. M and 'yes' on Prop. N, whereas those who believe "it unscientific to oblige taxonomists to examine the biography of persons to whom an epithet has been dedicated" will vote 'no' on Prop. N.

Prop. O addresses the question of variant orthography between an original and a sanctioning author of a fungal name. The proposed new note is contingent upon acceptance of Art. 14 Prop. H. Those favouring only the note should vote 'ed. c.', those also supporting the recommendation should vote 'yes'. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens has not yet given its opinion on this proposal.

#### Recommendation 73B

Prop. A (192 - *Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 801*): Delete from Rec. 73B.1(b):

"... , except when the name ends in -er, when a is added (e.g. *Kerneria* after Kerner)."

Prop. B (193 - *Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 801*): Delete the last sentence of Rec. 73B.1(b) and add to Rec. 73B.1 a new paragraph (c):

"In latinized personal names ending in -us this termination is dropped (*Dillenia* for *Dillenius*) before applying the procedure described in (a) and (b)."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- Prop. A reflects the view that *Sesleria* (from Lionardo Sesler) is a better construction than *Kerneria*, and is analagous to the change in Rec. 73C adopted in Sydney, which accepted *hasslerianus*, *hookeriana* etc. in preference to *hassleranus*, *hookerana* etc. -- but perhaps at the generic level both options should better be treated as equivalent.

Prop. B is an editorial clarification.

#### Recommendation 73G

Prop. A (271 - *Fosberg, Taxon 35: 850*): Delete the recommendation 73.G.1:

Prop. B (185 - *Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 798*): Replace Rec. 73G.1(a) with:

"In a true compound, a noun or adjective in nonfinal position appears as a combining form generally obtained by: (1) removing the case ending of the genitive singular (Latin -ae, -i, -us, -is; Greek -os, -es, -as, -ous and the latter's equivalent -eos) and (2) before a consonant, adding a connecting vowel (-i- for Latin elements, -o- for Greek elements). Exceptions are common and one should review earlier usages of a particular combining form."

*Prop. C (272 - Fosberg, Taxon 35: 850):* Rewrite Recommendation 73G.1 so that it contains neither inconsistencies nor requirement for grammatical incorrectness in compounding forms. (Alternative to Prop. 271 [Prop. A]).

*Prop. D (273 - Fosberg, Taxon 35: 850):* In Rec. 73.G.1: Rewrite the definitions of "compound" and "pseudocompound" so that they can be clearly understood by non-linguists, if the proposal to delete the recommendation is not accepted.

*Prop. E (186 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 799):* Amend Rec. 73G.1(b) by replacing the sentence "Some irregular forms . . . *purpureus cum atro*" with:

"In epithets where tingeing is expressed, the modifying initial colour often is in the ablative because the preposition *e, ex* is implicit, e.g., *atropurpureus* from *ex atro purpureus* (blackish purple from purple tinged with black)."

Start the next sentence by "Other irregular forms . . ."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Props. A - D* all reflect dissatisfaction with the present wording of the Recommendation which currently has the force of an Article, although this would cease if Art. 73 Prop. H is accepted. Prop. A suggests its deletion in entirety. Prop. B would radically reduce para (a), but retain paras (b) and (c) intact. Props. C and D are based on a dissatisfaction with the distinction made in the Recommendation between a "true compound" and a "pseudocompound". Prop. C is concerned particularly with the requirement to write an epithet such as *brassicifolia* (not *brassicaefolia*) from the feminine *Brassica*, and the fact that an epithet such as *magnoliaeflora* should be "corrected" to *magnoliiflora*, whereas *cannaefolia* is correct. While some will share Fosberg's confusion, it would seem desirable, if Art. 73 Prop. H is accepted, to retain in the Code guidance (as opposed to rules) on appropriate compounding forms. Prop. B has the unanimous support of the Committee on Orthography, which does not, therefore, share the concerns that prompt Props. C and D.

*Prop. E* is a clarifying rephrasing that corrects an erroneous discussion of one example.

## Article 75

*Prop. A (194 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 801):* Add a new sentence to Art. 75, Note 1: "Confusingly similar names based on the same type are to be treated as orthographic variants."

*Prop. B (195 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 801):* Replace Art. 75.2 with:

"If orthographic variants of a name appear in the original publication, the one which heads the description (or diagnosis) or is most closely associated with it is to be retained."

*Prop. C (178 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 797):* Add the italicized cross reference to the first sentence of Art. 75.3 so that it reads:

"The orthographic variants of a name are to be automatically corrected to the validly published form of that name. In full citations it is, however, desirable that the original form should be added (*see Rec. 50F.1*)."

*Prop. D (200 - Weber & Adolphi, Taxon 35: 803):* Add to Art. 75.3 the following sentence:

"For citation of variants of accepted names and synonyms, see Rec. 50F.1."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* clarifies that *all* confusingly similar names based on the same type are to be treated as orthographic variants, even if they might be considered not to meet strictly the current definition. The intention is good even if only a very few names are likely to be affected. The proposed sentence would, however, have

to become a rule not merely part of a note.

*Prop. B*, although claiming only to remove the need to determine the usage of the first author to adopt a particular variant, reads as though it were an exception to the provisions for correcting variants that appear in Art. 73. The rapporteurs welcome the attempt to remove the first usage provision, always so difficult to apply with certainty, but suggest that an editorial change is necessary if the Committee on Orthography's intent is to be achieved.

*Props. C & D* are linked to Rec. 50F *Props. A & B* which address the issue of the spelling of names cited in synonymy. Both are strictly editorial, the choice between them being determined by the choice between Rec. 50F *Props. A* and *B*.

## Recommendation 75A

*Prop. A (5 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 348-350)*: Proposal to replace Rec. 75A & 75B with the following new Art. 76 and Recs. 76A & 76B:

76.1 Generic names which are compounds ending in *-codon*, *-myces*, *-odon*, *-panax*, *-pogon*, *-stemon* or other nouns of masculine gender in classical Latin or Greek are masculine.

Examples: *Andropogon L.* and *Oplopanax* (Torr. et Gray) Miquel are masculine although their authors originally treated them as neuter.

76.2 Generic names which are compounds ending in *-achne*, *-chlamys*, *-daphne*, *-mecon*, *-osma* or other nouns of feminine gender in classical Latin or Greek are feminine.

Examples: *Dendromecon* Benth. and *Hesperomecon* E.L. Greene are feminine although their authors originally treated them as neuter.

76.3 Generic names which are compounds ending in *-gaster* are masculine in accordance with botanical custom, although *gaster* is feminine in classical Latin.

Example: *Choanogaster A.* Pochmann.

76.4 Generic names which are compound ending in *-cera*, *-dendron*, *-nema*, *-stigma*, *-stoma* and other nouns of neuter gender in classical Latin or Greek are neuter.

Examples: *Aceras R. Br.*, *Xanthoceras* Bunge and *Nemastoma J. Agardh* ('*Nemostoma*') are neuter although their authors originally treated them as feminine.

76.5 Generic names which are compounds ending in *-anthos*, *-anthus*, *-chilos*, *-cheilos*, or *-chilus* are masculine, although the classical gender of the Greek words *anthos* and *cheilos* is neuter.

Examples: *Acianthus R. Br.*, *Gastrochilus D. Don.*

76.6 Generic names ending in *-us* and now used to designate trees are feminine in botanical Latin if they are feminine names for trees in classical Latin or if they are derivatives of such names. Otherwise they take the gender assigned them by their validating authors.

Examples: [see *Taxon 33: 349*]

Note: Generic names ending in *-us* but not used to designate trees take the gender assigned to them by their authors even if they are derived from classical Latin feminine names for trees.

Examples: [see *Taxon 33: 349*]

Note: Names of vines ending in *-us* were often treated as feminine by classical writers.

Examples: [see *Taxon 33: 349*]

76.7 Generic names ending in *-oides* or *-odes* are feminine irrespective of the gender assigned them by their original authors.

76.8 Generic names ending in *-ites* are masculine irrespective of the gender assigned them by their original authors.

76.9 Arbitrarily formed names or vernacular names and adjectives used as generic names take the gender assigned to them by their authors. When the original author has failed to indicate the gender the choice of the next subsequent author to designate a gender must be followed.

Examples: [see *Taxon 33: 349*]

76.10 Unless Art. 76.1-6 applies the classical gender of a classical Greek and Latin

noun adopted as a generic name is irrelevant to its gender in botanical nomenclature; if the gender assigned to it on adoption as a generic name is not its classical gender the latter is not to be restored.

Examples: [see Taxon 33: 349]

76.11 Other cases of generic names compounded from two or more Greek or Latin words and not covered under Art. 76.1-8 take the gender indicated in the termination.

Examples: [see Taxon 33: 349]

Recommendation 76A

76A.1 Persons adopting a Greek or Latin word as a generic name should retain its classical gender. If the classical gender varies the author should choose one of the alternative genders. In doubtful cases general usage should be followed.

Recommendation 76B

76B.1 When a genus is divided and the segregates are to be given new names, the new names should have the same gender as the former name for the group as a whole.

Examples: *Boletus* is masculine. The names *Boletellus* and *Xerocomus* for segregates from *Boletus* sensu lato conform to the recommendation being masculine also.

*Prop. B (196 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 802):* Convert Rec. 75A into Art. 76.

*Prop. C (197 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 802):* Replace Rec. 75A.1 and examples with:

"A generic name retains the gender assigned to it by its author, unless this is contrary to botanical tradition. Botanical tradition usually consists of maintaining the classical gender of a Greek or Latin word, when this was well established. The following names, however, must be treated as feminine in accordance with botanical custom, irrespective of classical usage or the author's original usage: *Adonis*, *Diospyros*, *Hemerocallis*, *Orchis*, *Stachys* and *Strychnos*. *Lotus* and *Melilotus* must be treated as masculine."

"Ex. 1. *Cedrus* and *Fagus* are feminine like other classical tree names, despite their -us ending; this is also true of *Rhamnus*, despite the fact that Linnaeus gave it masculine gender. *Eucalyptus* is also feminine, a neologism retaining the gender assigned by its author. *Phyteuma* (neuter), *Sicyos* (masculine), *Erigeron* (masculine) are other cases where botanical usage has reestablished the classical gender despite another choice by Linnaeus. The classical gender of *Atriplex* varied (feminine in Columella, neuter in Pliny) and Linnaeus' choice of feminine stands."

*Prop. D (198 - Comm. Orthogr., Taxon 35: 803):* Reword the first sentence of Rec. 75A.2 to read:

"Compounded generic names take the gender of the last word in the nominative case in the compound."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* — *Props. A & B* both propose to transform Rec. 75A into a new Art. 76, a status held by similar text in the Cambridge Code. The wording is already basically that of an Article, and this is particularly appropriate in view of the correctability of wrong gender terminations under the post-Sydney Art. 75. *Prop. A* proposes a detailed rewriting of the Recommendation, whereas *Prop. B* accepts the present form (with modifications incorporating some of the points in *Prop. A* presented as *Props. C* and *D*). The intent of *Props. A* and *B* is to be welcomed; those who find the details in *Prop. A* an improvement will vote for it, whereas those who are basically happy with the present wording will prefer *Prop. B* and can choose whether or not to vote for the modifications proposed in *Props. C* and *D*. Editorial changes if *Prop. B* is accepted can be assumed.

*Prop. C* is inspired by *Prop. A* and introduces the concept of botanical tradition, which seems appropriate even if some of the conclusions as to appropriate gender drawn from this may be controversial (see also Art. 14 *Prop. D* that would provide for conserving the gender of generic names).

*Prop. D* is an improvement taking into account the fact that some rare compound nouns such as *Cornucopiae* take the gender of the first part of the name (cornu, neuter) since the second part (copiae, from copia, feminine) is in the genitive case.

### Division III

*Prop. A (216 - Comm. Registration, Taxon 35: 819):* In Div. III.2, after (1), insert:

"Committee for Registration, including the ex-officio members of the General Committee".

*Prop. B (167 - Hawksworth, Taxon 35: 786):* Change the name of the "Committee for Fungi and Lichens" to the "Committee for Fungi" in Division III.2(4).

*Prop. C (4 - Johnston, Taxon 33: 125):* Proposal to amend Division III, Provision 1 by addition of the following:

"Furthermore, after 1 January 1988, a modification to the Code will be considered a part of the Code only after its approval at two successive International Botanical Congresses. A modification approved by only one International Botanical Congress will be inserted in the subsequently published edition of the code within brackets in distinctive typography and clearly marked as 'Provisional, to take effect only if subsequently approved at the next International Botanical Congress.'"

*Prop. D (38 - Dörfler & Braun, Taxon 33: 533):* After Div. III.4., add:

"Div. III.5. At least 80% of the votes are necessary for the acceptance of proposals on modification of the code."

*Prop. E (39 - Kalkman, Taxon 33: 535):* Proposal to add new provision to Division III:

"Proposals for modification of the Code are only taken into consideration by the Nomenclature Session if and when they were submitted beforehand by a group of at least ten practicing plant taxonomists residing in at least five different countries."

*Prop. F (50 - Guédès, Taxon 34: 334):* Proposal to add a provision to Division III.

"Starting from [as soon as possible] no Congress shall enact any retroactive emendation to the Code."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is a necessary corollary to Art. 6 *Prop. A*, formally establishing the Committee for Registration. It should be supported by those who support the principle of registration of newly published plant names.

*Prop. B* reflects the deletion from Art. 13.1 at Sydney of "Lichenes" as a separate group. Although the biological concepts that motivate the proposal are understandable, lichens and other fungi are not generally studied by the same botanists and are often covered by distinct societies and journals. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens is opposed to the change.

*Props. C - F* are all concerned in one way or another with limiting the power of International Botanical Congresses to amend the Botanical Code. The practice since the X International Botanical Congress in Edinburgh in 1964 has been to require a 60% majority in the Nomenclature Section for a proposal to be accepted; this has been the subject of a decision at the beginning of the meetings of each Nomenclature Section (e.g., prior to 1964, only a simple majority was required in Stockholm and Montreal, whereas a two-thirds majority was needed in Paris). No other formal restriction exists, although the procedure by which proposals are submitted in advance of the Congress and reviewed by a rapporteur (or rapporteurs) goes back to Briquet and the Vienna Congress of 1905. Members of the Section will have to decide whether the present procedure with the advance review of which this report forms part and the requirement for a 60% majority are sufficient safeguard against precipitous action on the part of Congresses, six years apart.

*Prop. C* involves what is sometimes called a "Barrier Act" procedure, to provide a period of reflection before decisions are implemented. While this probably has merit in cases where the legislative body meets frequently, a delay of six years, with all the uncertainty that this would involve, is much more questionable. The suggestion of including the provisionally approved modifications in the Code would seem to aggravate

this uncertainty.

The high percentage vote demanded in *Prop. D* might well inhibit all action by the section even on issues that were creating serious problems. On the other hand, the "entrenchment" in Division III of a percentage vote requirement (e.g. the present 60%) might have some merit.

*Prop. E* has two elements: the obligation for proposals to be submitted beforehand and for this to be by taxonomists from at least five different countries. The latter could present problems for taxonomists in some parts of the world, and, although it would probably have the merit of reducing the number of proposals (an aspect that has a particularly strong appeal to the rapporteurs at the end of their marathon session that has led to the present synopsis!), it might do so at the cost of discouraging involvement in nomenclature on the part of these botanists. The future acceptance of rules of nomenclature is dependent on the continuing involvement of as broad a spectrum of taxonomists as possible, and any discouragement is unwise. The issue of requiring advanced submission is superficially appealing, but if taken in its most extreme form, that of precluding any amendments to proposals during the sessions of the Nomenclature Section, it would have a very negative effect. Present procedures virtually ensure that no separate proposal that has not been reviewed by the rapporteurs and submitted to mail ballot will be considered favourably by the Section. Situations do arise, however, in which from the informed debate in the Section, an amendment can be found that will appeal to 60% of those voting as a more satisfactory solution than the original proposal(s).

The way in which *Prop. F* would be applied is hard to envisage and is not made any easier by the comments accompanying the proposal. Would this mean that proposals, such as those adopted at Sydney to amend Art. 10, would only apply to genera described after 1981, or is the proposal really saying that the Articles of the Code must stay unchanged in their present form and amendments confined to the Recommendations, the only part of the Code that does not inherently have some retroactive component? The rapporteurs believe the proposal to be ill-conceived.

### Appendix I Article H.3

*Prop. A (283 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 853):* Correct Art. H.3.1 to read:

"H.3.1. Hybrids between representatives of two or more taxa may receive a name. The hybrid nature of the taxon is indicated by placing the multiplication sign X before the name of an intergeneric hybrid or before the epithet of the name of an interspecific hybrid, or by prefixing the term 'notho-' (optionally abbreviated 'n-') to the term denoting the rank of *hybrids between infraspecific taxa* (see Art. 4.1). All such taxa are designated nothotaxa."

*Prop. B (284 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 853):* Correct Article H.3.3 to read:

"H.3.3. The epithet of a nothospecies' name is termed a collective epithet."

*Prop. C (326 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 888):* To Art. H.3, Note 1, Ex. 3. Add:

"*Rosa canina* L., a polyploid believed to be of ancient hybrid origin, is treated as a species."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* — *Props A & B* can be referred to the Editorial Committee in so far as they constitute improvements of the wording. However, the prefix notho- is not used only at infraspecific ranks (see Art. H.7).

*Prop. C* may be referred to the Editorial Committee.

### Appendix I Article H.5

*Prop. A (89A - Yeo, Taxon 35: 186):* Article H.5 to read:

A nothotaxon has the same rank as its postulated or known parent taxa. The



manner in which the ranks of parental taxa determine the form of the name of the nothotaxon is, however, subject to the provisions of Art. H.11.2-3.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* involves a change that would be made necessary if Art. H.11 Props B and C are accepted. It can be referred to the Editorial Committee, to take appropriate action depending on the outcome of the vote on these proposals

#### Appendix I Article H.5bis

*Prop. A (75 - Heath, Taxon 34: 544):* Add a new Article H.5bis as follows:

"The name of a nothotribe is a condensed formula formed by adding the termination (-*cae*) to the stem of the nothogeneric name, which is itself a condensed formula of the generic names on which the parental tribe names are based. If there is no known hybrid between the genera on which the tribe names are based, then a nothogeneric name must nevertheless be formed. This nothogeneric name does not become valid until the hybrid is found or produced, but the nothotribe name derived from it is valid if any hybrid between the tribes exist.

"The names of nothofamilies, nothosubfamilies, and nothosubtribes are formed in the same manner as those of nothotribes, but have the terminations -*aceae*, -*oideae*, and -*inae* respectively."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- No examples of nothotaxa above the rank of genus are provided in *Prop. A*, and the procedures proposed are tortuous, e.g. declaring nothogeneric basionyms for higher nothotaxa not "valid" is strange and in conflict with Art. 12.1. Art. 3 *Prop. B* is an alternative proposal limiting the nomenclature of nothotaxa to nothogeneric and nothoinfrageneric ranks.

#### Appendix I Article H.6

*Prop. A (76 - Heath, Taxon 34: 544):* Delete the following phrase from Art. H.6.3: "the name of a collector, grower, or student of the group" and insert instead "the name of a person."

*Prop. B (77 - Heath, Taxon 34: 544):* In Art. H.6, Exs. 6 and 7 replace the abbreviation "hort." each time it occurs with the name of the author of the nothogeneric name. Thus, amend "x*Potinara* hort." to x*Potinara* Charlesworth & Co.", "x*Sophrolaeliocattleya* hort." to "x*Sophrolaeliocattleya* Hurst", "x*Vascostylis* hort." to "x*Vascostylis* Takakaura", and "x*Wilsonara* hort." to x*Wilsonara* Charlesworth & Co."

*Prop. C (78 - Heath, Taxon 34: 544):* Add a new paragraph to Art. H.6 as follows:

"If, when originally published, a condensed formula contains a hyphen not present in the names of the parental genera, then that hyphen must be removed without a change in the author citation."

"Ex. x *Muirio-Gibbaeum* Jacobsen is corrected to x *Muiriogibbaeum* Jacobsen."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would allow a name of an intergeneric hybrid derived from four or more genera to be formed from the name of any person, not necessarily someone involved with the group. The proposed simplification has some merit since non-adherence to the rule is penalized by invalidity under Art. 32.1(b). (See also Rec. H.6A *Prop. A*.)

*Prop. B* can be referred to the Editorial Committee, to be handled in conformity with advice from the Committee for Hybrids.

*Prop. C* is claimed to exempt names of nothogenera from the provisions of the Code

that specify that a generic name published with a hyphen can be changed only by conservation (Art. 73, Note 3). In fact the proposal would have the effect of validating names otherwise not validly published under Art. 32.1(b), because Arts. H.6.2 and H.6.4 make it clear that only a connecting vowel may be inserted between the components of a condensed formula. A simpler solution might be to validate the names concerned by publishing them in the correct form.

#### Appendix I Recommendation H.6A

*Prop. A (327 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 888):* To H.6A add:

"Rec. H.6A. When a nothogeneric name is formed from the name of a person by adding *-ara*, the person concerned should preferably be a collector, grower or student of the group."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is predicated on the acceptance of Art. H.6 Prop. A.

#### Appendix I Article H.8

*Prop. A (285 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 853):* Correct Article H.8.1 to read:

"H.8.1. When the name or epithet of a *name* of a nothotaxon is a condensed formula (Arts. H.6 and H.7), the parental names used in formation of that name must be those which are correct for the particular circumscription, position, and rank accepted for the parental taxa."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

#### Appendix I Article H.10

*Prop. A (54 - Parkinson, Taxon 34: 336):* Replace Art. H.10.1 with the following:

H.10.1 In order to be validly published names of nothotaxa at the rank of nothospecies and below must conform to the provisions (a) in the Code applicable to the same specific and infraspecific ranks and (b) Art. H.3.2, Art. H.5 and Art. H.11.

Examples: The name *Polypodium xshivasiae* Rothmaler, 1962 was published with a statement of parentage (*P. australe* x *P. vulgare* subsp. *prionodes*) which requires it to have nothosubspecific rank (Art. H.5.2). Since the name employed has the form appropriate to a nothospecies it is not validly published (Art. 24.1, Art. 32.1). The name *Polypodium xmantoniae* Rothmaler was published with a statement of parentage (*P. vulgare* subsp. *vulgare* x *P. vulgare* subsp. *prionodes*) which requires the taxon to have nothosubspecific rank (Art. H.5.2). Since the name employed has nothospecific form it is not validly published (Art. 24.1, Art. 32.1). The name was validated subsequently in the appropriate form for its rank as *P. vulgaris* nothosubsp. *mantoniae* Schidlay."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* would rule that names of hybrids at nothospecific and lower ranks are invalid if contravening Arts. H.3.2, H.5 and H.11. This would be an aberration. The provisions for valid publication of all names, including those of hybrids, are given (in full or by cross-reference) in Arts. 32 to 45. Names of hybrids at nothospecific and subordinate ranks are subject to exactly the same requirements as the names of non-hybrid taxa. Ruling otherwise would mean that names that are invalid as the names of nothotaxa would nevertheless remain valid as the names of non-hybrid taxa (and transferable at any time to hybrid status without loss of priority). (See also Art. H.11 Props. B and C, addressing the same issue.)

## Appendix I Recommendation H.10B

*Prop. A (321 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 884):* Amend Rec. H.10B to read:

"When contemplating the publication of names for hybrids between named infraspecific taxa, authors should consider carefully whether they are really needed, bearing in mind that formulae, though more cumbersome, are more informative."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- This proposal rephrases the current factual statement in Rec. H.10B on a more admonitory note. It is certainly more appealing than the previous wording and those who favour minimizing use of hybrid formulae will vote 'yes', permitting the Editorial Committee to modify the wording if necessary.

## Appendix I Article H.11

*Prop. A (90 - Yeo, Taxon 35: 187-188):* Revise Art. H.11.1, to add authorities to plant names in Ex. 1, now to read as follows:

x*Heucherella tiarelloides* (Lemoine) Wehrh. ex Stearn (considered to be *Heuchera xbrizoides* hort. x *Tiarella cordifolia* L., for which *Heuchera xtiarelloides* Lemoine is incorrect).

*Prop. B (89B - Yeo, Taxon 35: 186):* Replace Art. H.11.2 with the following:

The name of a nothotaxon, at the rank of species and below, must be published in the highest-ranking category (up to that of species) at which the named parent taxa differ and in which a name is not already available. The application of such a name is not restricted by the mention of any lower-ranking taxa in the statement of parentage.

Examples: [see Taxon 35: 187.]

Note 1. In cases such as those in Example 3 and 5, the infraspecific nothotaxon whose existence is implied by each statement of parentage cannot be described separately from the named nothospecies and the rules therefore make no provision for naming them unless other nothotaxa of appropriate rank are described within the same nothospecies (as has happened in the case described in Ex. 4, where *Mentha x piperita* nothosubsp. *pyramidalis* is recognized).

*Prop. C (89C - Yeo, Taxon 35: 187):* Add new H.11.3 as follows:

Names published at higher or lower ranks than required by this article are incorrect but may become correct by alterations to the ranks of the parent taxa.

Examples: [see Taxon 35: 187.]

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

*Props. B & C*, in association with Art. H.5 *Prop. A*, address the issue also discussed under Art. H.10 *Prop. A* above, and provide an acceptable solution. The requirement that a nothotaxon with parental taxa of unequal rank be published at the lower rank is removed, and instead nothotaxon names are to be published at the highest rank required. This makes sense. The new "rule" of *Prop. C* is in fact a note, making explicit what is already inherent in the rules. The initial "must" in *Prop. B* appears to be unnecessarily harsh under these circumstances. The "note" should be omitted, since nothing precludes the valid publication, by a description, of a name in the form of an autonym subsequent to the validation of the corresponding nothospecific name.

## Appendix I Recommendation H.11A (new)

*Prop. A (89D - Yeo, Taxon 35: 187):* Add new Rec. H.11.A as follows:

The author of the name of a nothotaxon at the rank of species or below should furnish any available information on the taxonomic identity at lower ranks of the parent

plants of the type of the name.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- This is related to Art. H.11 Props. B and C (above) and is acceptable as a recommendation.

## Appendix II

*Prop. A (8 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 473-475):* Reject the Montreal rules for the conservation of family names and reestablish the list of *Nomina Familiarum Conservanda* in the format of *Nomina Generica Conservanda*, establishing a Special Committee to oversee the work of editing the existing list so as to preserve as far as possible the established application and priority of the conserved names included in it.

*Prop. B (9 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 473-475):* Provide for rejected heterotypic synonyms of conserved family names to be listed opposite their corresponding conserved names in Appendix II as contemplated under Art. 14.4.

*Prop. C (10 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 473-475):* Provide for earlier, rejected, homonymous applications of conserved family name homonyms to be listed against the conserved usages of the homonyms.

*Prop. D (11 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 473-475):* Provide for rejected original spellings of conserved family names to be listed against the authorized spelling.

[For examples to illustrate Proposals 8-11 see Taxon 33:475]

*Prop. E (12 - Parkinson, Taxon 33: 473-475):* Edit Appendix II to purge unnecessarily legitimized familial names which are not (a) conserved against earlier heterotypic or homotypic synonyms, (b) conserved against earlier homonyms, (c) conserved merely to authorize a particular spelling. Remove from the list family names which were conserved merely to legitimize them on account of their being technically illegitimate under Art. 63 before this was amended at Sydney.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is the key proposal in this package. It would have conservation of familial names follow the same procedures as conservation of generic names, i.e. instead of there just being a list of family names conserved over all unlisted synonyms and homonyms, each family name would be conserved only against competing names (if any), which would then be listed opposite (as in Appendix III). The main disadvantage of the present system rests in the fact that relatively complete lists of conserved names exist only for the Gymnospermae and Angiospermae, so that in the other groups (in which only 11 names in all are conserved) the fact that a familial name cannot be conserved only against a particular competing name may give it unwanted precedence over other family names. This could be easily remedied if the Section were to authorize use of the format suggested by the proposer, for the cryptogamic groups alone. It is hard to imagine that the Committee for Spermatophyta would volunteer to revise the present list of some 430 entries of family names for little if any useful purpose.

*Props. B-D* are essentially corollaries of *Prop. A*.

*Prop. E* goes further in specifically requiring the pruning of unnecessarily conserved names, a procedure contrary to Art. 14.11, second sentence, which was explicitly confirmed by the Sydney Congress.

## Appendix VI (new)

*Prop. A (79 - Heath, Taxon 34: 544-545):* Add a new Appendix VI.

Incorporate the current edition of the International Code of Nomenclature for

Cultivated Plants into the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature as Appendix VI and cross-reference the two Codes extensively.

Suggest to the International Commission for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants that it would be advantageous if the two Codes were revised at approximately the same time in future.

Suggest also that the publication of the ICNCP as a separate entity should cease.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* is heterogenous. It starts with an instruction to include the International Code of Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants in the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, something that is not within the power of the Nomenclature Section, in that the International Code of Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants is produced quite independently by the IUBS International Commission for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants. This and the two following suggestions could be explored by the General Committee, through consultation with the Commission for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants, if the Nomenclature Section so wished -- keeping in mind that, although the nomenclature of cultivated plants follows the Botanical Code in so far as it is applicable, the nomenclature of cultivars themselves is quite a separate matter from the rules governing the scientific names of plants.

#### Guide for the Determination of Types T.1

*Prop. A (310 - Comm. Lectotyp., Taxon 35: 877-878):* Delete the entire "Guide for the Determination of Types" and insert the following new Notes and Recommendations:

a) After Art. 7.3,

"*Note 1.* The choice made by the original author, if definitely expressed at the time of the original publication of the name of the taxon, is final. If he included only one element, that one must always be accepted as the holotype. If a new name is based on a previously published description of the taxon, the same considerations apply to material cited by the earlier author (cf. Art. 32.2 but also Arts. 7.12 & 7.13)."

b) After Art. 7.5,

"*Note 2.* A lectotype must be chosen from among elements that were definitely studied by the author up to the time the name of the taxon was published. Material that was not seen by the author or that was only seen after publication of the name, even if indicative of its application, is not eligible for selection as a lectotype."

*Ex. 1.* Linnaeus's publication of the name *Atriplex rosea* is based entirely on Haller's description of *Atriplex caule herbaceo, foliis incanis*, . . . in *Enumeratio plantarum horti regii et agri Gotingensis*. The choice by McNeill *et al.* (*Taxon* 32: 552-553. 1983) of a Haller specimen upon which this phrase-name is apparently based is that of a neotype, not a lectotype, as Linnaeus did not see the specimen.

c) "Recommendation 7B

*7B.1.* If no holotype was designated by the original author and if no syntypes are extant, the lectotype should be chosen from among duplicates\* of the syntypes (isosyntypes), if such exist. If neither an isotype, a syntype, nor an isosyntype is extant, a paratype\*\* if such exists, may be chosen as lectotype."

[Include footnotes, as indicated (\*, \*\*), from the second page of the Guide for the Determination of Types]

d) "Recommendation 8A

*8A.1.* Designation of a lectotype should be undertaken only in the light of an understanding of the group concerned. In choosing a lectotype, all aspects of the protologue should be considered as a basic guide. Mechanical methods, such as the automatic selection of the first species or specimen cited or of a specimen collected by the person after whom a species is named, should be avoided as unscientific and productive of possible future confusion and further changes.

*8A.2.* In choosing a lectotype, any indication of intent by the author of a name should be given preference unless such indication is contrary to the protologue. Such indications are manuscript notes, annotations on herbarium sheets, recognizable figures,

and epithets such as *typicus*, *genuinus*, *vulgaris*, *communis*, etc.

**8A.3.** In cases where two or more heterogeneous elements were included in or cited with the original description, the lectotype should be so selected as to preserve current usage. In particular, if another author has already segregated one or more elements as other taxa, the residue or part of it should be designated as the lectotype provided that this element is not in conflict with the original description or diagnosis (see Art. 8.1).

**8A.4.** For the name of a fossil species, the lectotype, when one is needed, should, if possible, be a specimen illustrated at the time of the first valid publication (Art. 7.15.).

e) "Recommendation 8B

**8B.1.** In selecting a neotype particular care and critical knowledge should be exercised, because the reviewer usually has no guide except his own judgement as to what best fits the protologue, and if his selection proves to be faulty, it will inevitably result in further change."

*Prop. B (320 - Pedley, Taxon 35: 884):* Amend Guide for the determination of types:

T.1. substitute 'cited' for 'included'; substitute 'specimen' for 'element'.

T.4.(a) Substitute 'specimen' for 'element'.

T.4.(b) Delete entirely.

T.4.(c) Add 'if no specimen was cited in the protologue a neotype must be selected'.

T.4.(e) Substitute 'specimens' for 'elements'; substitute 'specimen(s)' for 'element(s)' throughout; delete 'included in or'.

T.5. Substitute 'no specimen was originally cited or those cited or studied by the author and their' for 'all the originally cited material or material seen by the author but not cited, and its'.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Prop. A* has the unanimous support of the Committee on Lectotypification and is designed to remove real or apparent inconsistencies between the Guide for the Determination of Types and the articles of the Code by integrating the Guide into the main body of the Code. The present wording of the Guide is preserved in the form of Notes and Recommendations added to the relevant provisions of the Code. The proposal seems non-controversial, except for portion (b) that is partly in conflict with the present Art. 7.4 (see comments under Art. 7 Prop. B) and for which the status of a recommendation might be more appropriate. (Those in favour of this suggestion should express it by voting 'ed. c'.)

*Prop. B* is a corollary of Art. 9 Prop. A which seeks to restrict type material to specimens. This proposal can be referred to the Editorial Committee, for appropriate action depending on the vote on that proposal and on Prop. A.

### Guide for the Determination of Types T.3

*Prop. A (286 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 853):* Modify T.3 of the Guide for Determination of Types to read:

"T.3 A lectotype may be chosen only when an author failed to designate a holotype, or when, for species or taxa of lower rank, the type of its name has been lost or destroyed, or the designated holotype is found to consist of material of more than one taxon (Art. 7.4)."

*Prop. B (241 - Voss, Taxon 35: 829-830):* T.3. The Editorial Committee should bring the wording of T.3 into closer agreement with Art. 9.2.

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* -- *Props. A & B* both address the same issue, one in which a paragraph of the Guide does not conform in entirety with the wording of an Article of the Code. This emphasizes the desirability of not having two separate parts of the Code dealing with typification. Whatever the outcome on T.1 Prop A, these proposals can be referred to the Editorial Committee. (See also Art. 7 Prop. B.)

#### Guide for the Determination of Types T.4

*Prop. A (287 - Henderson, Taxon 35: 853):* Correct T.4.(c) of the Guide for Determination of Types to read:

"(c) If a holotype was designated by the original author and has been lost or destroyed, an *isotype* (Art. 7.6), if such exists *and was part of the original material*, must be chosen as the lectotype. If no holotype was designated by the original author and if syntypes (Art. 7.7) exist, one of them must be chosen as the lectotype. If no holotype was designated by the original author and if no syntypes are extant, the lectotype should be chosen from among duplicates of the syntypes (*isosyntypes*), if such exists *and formed part of the original material*. If neither an isotype *that was part of the original material*, a syntype, nor an isosyntype *that was part of the original material* is extant, a paratype if such exists, may be chosen as lectotype. Duplicates of the original material (i.e. duplicates not seen by the publishing author) can be eligible for selection as a neotype only. (See T.5, Art. 7.4, Art. 7.8)."

*Prop. B (242 - Voss, Taxon 35: 830):* T.4. Add the following after (e):

"When a combination at the rank of subdivision of a genus has been published prior to lectotypification of the generic name, the lectotype should be selected from the subdivision that was designated as nomenclaturally typical, if that is apparent."

*Prop. C (311 - McNeill, Taxon 35: 878):* Add a new paragraph to proposed Recommendation 7B (currently Guide for the Determination of Types) to read:

"7B.2. Typification of names for which no holotype was designated should only be carried out with an understanding of the author's method of working; in particular it should be realized that some of the material used by the author in describing the taxon may not be in the author's own herbarium or may not even have survived, and, contrarily, that not all the material surviving in the author's herbarium/herbaria, was necessarily used in describing the taxon."

*Rapporteurs' Comments.* — *Prop. A* parallels Art. 7 Prop B, and is equally controversial in that it would define "original material" in a sense that excludes isotypes not seen by the original author (see comments given under Art. 7 Prop. B, and also under T.1 Prop. A, above).

*Prop. B* seeks to add a recommendation on the selection of lectotypes of generic names. If adopted it could readily be incorporated in the Code if T.1 Prop. A were to be accepted (as part of the proposed Rec. 8A).

*Prop. C* stems from the experience of the Committee on Lectotypification in reviewing lectotypifications and seeks to add another advisory component to their Rec. 7A (at present part of the Guide). It seeks to promote good taxonomic practice.

## REPORT ON THE STATUS OF NOMINA CONSERVANDA ET REJICIENDA PROPOSITA

NOTE: The previous comprehensive report on Nomina Conservanda Proposita appeared as Appendix A of the Sydney Synopsis (*Taxon* 30: 142–154, 1981) and listed proposals up to no. 600. The Nomenclature Section of the XIII International Botanical Congress, Sydney 1981, approved all names recommended for conservation or rejection by the General Committee, as listed in Appendix A of the Synopsis. Names approved for conservation by the General Committee up to early 1983 (5 familial and 3 generic names of Bryophyta, see *Taxon* 31: 316–317, 1982) were included in Appendices II and III of the Sydney Code but prefixed with an asterisk. They are also listed below with an asterisk by the proposal number.

The lists below include all proposals on which Committee action was not completed prior to the Sydney Congress, as well as all proposals made subsequently. The additional number in square brackets following the number of some proposals reflects the double numbering of a few proposals between 1975 and 1978. (See *Taxon* 27: 546–548 (1978); 30: 142 (1981). A plus sign (+) indicates that a proposal or recommendation for conservation or rejection was *accepted*; a minus sign (–) indicates that it was *not accepted*. Action reported but not yet published is listed by + or – without a reference or with an incomplete one. References in square brackets without a + or – imply published discussion but deferral of a decision by the Committee concerned. In the columns for References, numbers below 36 indicate volumes of *Taxon*; higher numbers indicate volumes of *Regnum vegetabile*.

The proposals are divided into four categories: *Nomina familiarum conservanda proposita*, *Nomina generica conservanda proposita*, *Nomina specifica conservanda proposita*, and *Nomina rejicienda proposita*. The Sydney Congress provided that the procedures for rejection of names under Art. 69 should be the same as those for conservation under Art. 14. It also, for the first time, provided for the conservation of names of species, but restricted this to those “of major economic importance”. As part of the same proposal it restricted the ranks in which conservation of names is permissible to family, genus and species. (The one tribal name proposed for conservation in the period under review, which, by necessity, was rejected, is listed under *Nomina generica conservanda proposita*.)

## NOMINA FAMILIARUM CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(428)	Sperm.	Salsolaceae Moq.-Tand.	Scott	26: 246		
*(437)	Bry.	Ditrichaceae Limpricht	Magill	26: 597	+31: 316	+35: 551
*(438)	Bry.	Pottiaceae Schimper	Magill	26: 597	+31: 316	+35: 551
*(439)	Bry.	Sematophyllaceae Brothorus	Magill	26: 598	+31: 316	+35: 551
*(440)	Bry.	Entodontaceae Kindberg	Magill	26: 598, 27: 593	+31: 316	+35: 551
(453)	Algae	Rhodomelaceae Harvey (cf. 644)	Guiry	27: 193	+36: 66	
(455)	Pter.	Dicksoniaceae Bower	Tryon	27: 554	(+30: 163) <sup>1</sup>	–35: 551
					(+35: 698) <sup>1</sup>	



NOMINA FAMILIARUM CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA—Continued

No.	Group	Norm. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.	References
*(465)	Bry.	Lophoziaceae (Joerg.) Vanden Berghen	Grolle	28: 423	+31: 316	+35: 551	
(518)	Pter.	Pteridaceae Reichenb. (cf. 822)	Tryon	29: 161	(-30: 163) <sup>1</sup>	-35: 551	
(543)	Pter.	Adiantaceae Ching (cf. 834)	Pichi Sermolli	30: 320	(-35: 688) <sup>1</sup>	-35: 551	
(544)	Pter.	Aspidiaceae Frank	Pichi Sermolli	30: 320	(-35: 689) <sup>1</sup>	-35: 551	
(545)	Pter.	Dryopteridaceae Ching	Pichi Sermolli	30: 321	(+30: 164) <sup>1</sup>	-35: 551	
(546)	Pter.	Peranemataceae Ching (cf. 831)	Pichi Sermolli	30: 321	(+35: 689) <sup>1</sup>	-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Acrostichaceae Mettenius ex Frank (cf. 838)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164	(+30: 167) <sup>1</sup>	-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Actiniopteridaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164	(+35: 690) <sup>1</sup>	-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Adiantaceae Ching (cf. 543)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Alsophilaceae K. B. Presl	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Anemiaceae Link	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Angiopteridaceae Fé ex Bommer	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Antrophyaceae Ching	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Aspidiaceae Mettenius ex Frank (cf. 544)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Aspleniaceae Mettenius ex Frank	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Athyriaceae Ching (cf. 821)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Azollaceae Wettstein	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Blechnaceae Copeland (cf. 832)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Bolbitidaceae Ching (cf. 837)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Botrychiaceae Nakai	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Cheiropleuriaceae Nakai	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Christenseniaceae Ching	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Cryptogrammeaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	
(-)	Pter.	Culcitaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		-35: 551	

## NOMINA FAMILIARUM CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA — Continued

		<i>References</i>				
No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	Perm.	Gen.
					Comm.	Comm.
(—)	Pter.	Cyatheaceae Kaulifuss	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 164		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Danaeaceae K. B. Presl	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Davalliaceae Mettenius ex Frank	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Dennstaedtiaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Dicksoniaceae Bower (cf. 455)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Dipteridaceae Seward et Dale	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Drynariaceae Ching	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Dryopteridaceae Ching (cf. 545)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Elaphoglossaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Equisetaceae Rich. ex DC.	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Gleicheniaceae K. B. Presl	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Grammitaceae K. B. Presl (cf. 836)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Gymnogrammitidaceae Ching	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Helminthostachyaceae Ching	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Hemioitidaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Huperziaceae Rothmaler	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Hymenophyllaceae Link	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Hymenophyllopidaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Hypodematiaceae Ching	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Hypolepidaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 165		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Isoëtaceae Reichenbach	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Lindsaeaceae Pichi Sermolli (cf. 835)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Lomariopsidaceae Alston	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Lophosoriaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Loxogrammeaceae Ching ex Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Loxomataceae Presl	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Lycopodiaceae Beauvouis ex Mirbel	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Lygodiaceae Presl	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Marattiaceae Burchtold et Presl	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551

NOMINA FAMILIARUM CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA—Continued

		<i>References</i>				
No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	Perm.	Gen.
					Comm.	Comm.
(—)	Pter.	Marsileaceae Mirbel	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Matoniaceae Presl	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Metaxyaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Mohriaceae Reed	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Monachosoraceae Ching	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Negripteridaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Nephrolepidaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Oleandraceae Ching ex Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Onocleaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Ophioglossaceae Agardh	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Osmundaceae Berchtold et Presl	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Parkeriaceae Hooker	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 166		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Peranemataceae Ching (cf. 546)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Phylloglossaceae Kunze	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Pilulariaceae Wettstein	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Plagiogyriaceae Bower	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Platyneriaceae Ching	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Platyzomataceae Nakai	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Pleurosoriopsidaceae Kurita et Ikebe ex Ching	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Polypodiaceae Berchtold et Presl	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Psilotaceae Kanitz	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Pteridiaceae Ching	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Salviniaceae Reichenbach	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Schizaeaceae Kaulfuss	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Selaginellaceae Milde	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Sinopteridaceae Koidzumi	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Stenochlaenaceae Ching	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Stromatopteridaceae Bierhorst	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551

## NOMINA FAMILIARUM CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA—Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(—)	Pter.	Taenitiaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Thelypteridaceae Pichi Sermolli	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Thyrsopteridaceae Presl	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 167		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Tmesipteridaceae Nakai	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 168		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Trichomanaceae Kunkel	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 168		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Vittariaceae Ching (cf. 833)	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 168		—35: 551
(—)	Pter.	Woodsiaceae Herter	Subcomm. Fam. N. Pter.	30: 168		—35: 551
(601)	Algae	Epithemiaceae Grunow	Silva	30: 487 (103: 21–22, 99)	—36: 66	
(602)	Algae	Eupodiscaceae Ralfs	Silva	30: 487 (103: 22, 100)	[36: 66]	
(603)	Algae	Surirellaceae Kützing	Silva	30: 487 (103: 22–45, 100)	—36: 66	
(604)	Algae	Bodonaceae Bütschli	Silva	30: 487 (103: 26, 100)	[36: 66]	
(605)	Algae	Chlorococcaceae Blackman & Tansley	Silva	30: 487 (103: 31, 100)	[36: 66]	
(606)	Algae	Cladophoraceae Wille	Silva	30: 487 (103: 32, 100)	[36: 66]	
(607)	Algae	Codiaceae Kützing	Silva	30: 487 (103: 32–33, 100)	[36: 66]	
(608)	Algae	Coelastraceae Wille	Silva	30: 487 (103: 33, 101)	[36: 66]	
(609)	Algae	Dictyosphaeriaceae G. S. West	Silva	30: 488 (103: 34, 101)	[36: 66]	
(610)	Algae	Scenedesmaceae Oltmanns	Silva	30: 488 (103: 39, 101)	[36: 66]	
(611)	Algae	Tetrasporaceae (Nägeli) Wittrock	Silva	30: 488 (103: 40, 101)	[36: 66]	
(612)	Algae	Trentepohliaceae Hansgirg	Silva	30: 488 (103: 41, 102)	[36: 66]	
(613)	Algae	Udoteaceae J. Agardh	Silva	30: 488 (103: 41, 102)	—36: 66	
(614)	Algae	Valoniaceae Kützing	Silva	30: 488 (103: 41, 102)	[36: 66]	
(615)	Algae	Chromulinaceae Engler	Silva	30: 488 (103: 42–43, 102)	[36: 66]	
(616)	Algae	Ochromonadaceae Lemmermann	Silva	30: 488 (103: 45, 102)	[36: 66]	
(617)	Algae	Codosigaceae Kent	Silva	30: 488 (103: 47, 102)	[36: 66]	
(618)	Algae	Oscillatoriaceae Engler	Silva	30: 488 (103: 53–54, 103)	[36: 66]	
(619)	Algae	Stigonemataceae (Bornet et Flahault) Borzi	Silva	30: 488 (103: 55, 103)	[36: 66]	
(620)	Algae	Glenodiniopsidaceae Schiller	Silva	30: 488 (103: 60, 63, 103)	—36: 66	
(621)	Algae	Heteraulaceae A. R. Loeblich Jr. et Drugg	Silva	30: 488 (103: 60–61, 103)	[36: 66]	

NOMINA FAMILIARUM CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA—Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	References		
				Orig. Pub.	Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(622)	Algae	Phytodiniaceae Klebs	Silva	30: 488 (103: 62, 103)	—36: 66	
(623)	Algae	Astasiaceae H. J. Carter	Silva	30: 488 (103: 64, 104)	[36: 66]	
(624)	Algae	Euglenaceae H. J. Carter	Silva	30: 488 (103: 65, 104)	[36: 66]	
(625)	Algae	Hymenomonadaceae Senn	Silva	30: 488 (103: 68, 104)	—36: 66	
(626)	Algae	Isochrysidaceae Bourrelly	Silva	30: 488 (103: 68, 104)	[36: 66]	
(627)	Algae	Cystoseiraceae Kützing	Silva	30: 488 (103: 71, 105)	[36: 66]	
(628)	Algae	Giraudiaceae Hamel ex J. Feldmann	Silva	30: 488 (103: 72, 105)	[36: 66]	
(629)	Algae	Hormosiraceae Fritsch	Silva	30: 488 (103: 76, 105)	—36: 66	
(630)	Algae	Nephroselmidiaceae Skuja ex P. C. Silva	Silva	30: 488 (103: 76, 105)	—36: 66	
(631)	Algae	Vacuolariaceae A. Luther	Silva	30: 488 (103: 79, 105)	[36: 66]	
(632)	Algae	Acrochaetiaceae Fritsch ex W. R. Taylor	Silva	30: 488 (103: 78-79, 106)	[36: 66]	
(633)	Algae	Bangiaceae Engler	Silva	30: 488 (103: 80, 106)	[36: 66]	
(634)	Algae	Gracilariaceae Nägeli	Silva	30: 488 (103: 83, 106)	—36: 66	
(635)	Algae	Helminthocladiaceae J. Agardh	Silva	30: 488 (103: 84, 106)	[36: 66]	
(636)	Algae	Hildenbrandiaceae Rabenhorst	Silva	30: 488 (103: 84, 106)	[36: 66]	
(637)	Algae	Kallymeniaceae (J. Agardh) Kylin	Silva	30: 488 (103: 84, 107)	[36: 66]	
(638)	Algae	Lemnaceae C. Agardh	Silva	30: 488 (103: 85, 107)	[36: 66]	
(639)	Algae	Lomentariaceae J. Agardh	Silva	30: 488 (103: 81, 85, 107)	[36: 66]	
(640)	Algae	Nemaliaceae (Farlow) De Toni et Levi	Silva	30: 488 (103: 85, 107)	[36: 66]	
(641)	Algae	Nemastomataceae Schmitz	Silva	30: 488 (103: 83-85, 107)	[36: 66]	
(642)	Algae	Plocamiaceae Kützing	Silva	30: 488 (103: 86, 108)	[36: 66]	
(643)	Algae	Polydaceae Kylin	Silva	30: 488 (103: 86, 108)	[36: 66]	
(644)	Algae	Rhodomelaceae J. E. Areschoug (mod. 453)	Silva	30: 488 (103: 87, 108)	[36: 66]	
(645)	Algae	Rhodymeniaceae Harvey	Silva	30: 488 (103: 87-88, 109)	—36: 66	
(646)	Algae	Solieriaceae J. Agardh	Silva	30: 489 (103: 88, 109)	—36: 66	
(647)	Algae	Polymastigaceae Bütschli	Silva	30: 489 (103: 90, 109)	—36: 66	
(648)	Algae	Retortamonadaceae Wenrich	Silva	30: 489 (103: 90, 109)	[36: 66]	
(649)	Algae	Gloeobotryaceae Pascher	Silva	30: 489 (103: 93, 109)	—36: 66	
(650)	Algae	Tribonemataceae G. S. West	Silva	30: 489 (103: 95, 109)	—36: 66	

266 NOMINA FAMILIARUM CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA—Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(651)	Algae	Bicosoecaceae Stein	Silva	30: 489 (103: 96, 110)		
(797)	Fungi	Tricholomataceae Heim ex Pouzar	Pouzar	34: 709		
(798)	Fungi	Cortinariaceae Heim ex Pouzar	Pouzar	34: 710		
(799)	Fungi	Agaricaceae Chevallier	Pouzar	34: 711		
(800)	Fungi	Corticaceae Herter	Pouzar	34: 711		
(801)	Fungi	Thelephoraceae Chevallier	Pouzar	34: 712		
(822)	Pter.	Peridaceae Reichenb. (cf. 518)	Panigrahi	35: 385		
(831)	Pter.	Peranmataceae Presl (cf. 546)	Panigrahi	35: 602		
(832)	Pter.	Blechnaceae Presl	Panigrahi	35: 602		
(833)	Pter.	Vittariaceae Presl	Panigrahi	35: 603		
(834)	Pter.	Adiantaceae Presl (cf. 543)	Panigrahi	35: 603		
(835)	Pter.	Lindsaeaceae Presl	Panigrahi	35: 603		
(836)	Pter.	Grammitaceae (Presl) Ching	Panigrahi	35: 604		
(837)	Pter.	Bolbitaceae (Pichi Serm.) Ching	Panigrahi	35: 604		
(838)	Pter.	Acrostichaceae (Presl) Mett. ex Frank	Panigrahi	35: 604		

† Subcommittee for Family Names of Pteridophyta.

NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(317)	— see 397					
(386 412 )	Fungi	<i>Epidermophyton</i> Sabourand (cf. 583)	Loeffler	25: 208	-29: 148	
*390 410 )	Bry.	<i>Pellia</i> Raddi	Grolle	24: 693	+31: 316	+35: 551
(391)	Fungi	<i>Peridermium</i> (Link) Schmidt & Kunze	Laundon	24: 389		
(396)	Algae	<i>Sphaerzosoma</i> Ralfs	Gerloff	25: 200	+36:	
(397 317 )	Algae	<i>Tetraedriella</i> Pascher	Kováčik & Komárek	25: 202	+36:	

NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA—Continued

		References				
No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(398)	Algae	<i>Tetraëdron</i> Korsikov (cf. 424bis)	Kováčik & Komárek	25: 201	—36:	
(399)	Pter.	<i>Trichomanes</i> L.	Holtum	25: 203	—30: 161	—31: 313
(400)	Fungi	<i>Dothiora</i> Fr.	Holm	24: 486	+29: 148	+31: 313
(401)	Fungi	<i>Leptosphaeria</i> Ces. & De Not.	Holm	24: 486	+29: 148	+31: 313
(402)	Fungi	<i>Lophiostoma</i> Ces. & De Not.	Holm	24: 486	+29: 148	+31: 313
(403)	Fungi	<i>Phyllachora</i> Fuckel (cf. 406)	Holm	24: 486	+29: 148	+31: 313
(406 403 )	Sperm.	<i>Relhania</i> L'Héritier	Bremer	28: 411	+31: 313	+35: 552
(407)	Sperm.	<i>Phelpaea</i> L.	Nicolson	24: 653, 691	withdrawn	
(410)	—see 390					
(412)	—see 386					
(418)	Fungi	<i>Tomentella</i> Pat. (emend.)	Stalpers	25: 364	+29: 148	+31: 313
(419)	Foss.	<i>Czekanowskia</i> Heer	Kiritchkova & Samylnina	25: 515	—30: 473	
(420)	Fungi	<i>Hydnum</i> Fr.	Petersen	26: 144	+29: 148	+31: 313
(420bis)	Fungi	<i>Penicillium</i> S. F. Gray	Hawksworth et al.	25: 670	—29: 148	
(422)	Sperm.	<i>Toona</i> (Endl.) Roem.	Styles	25: 673	—29: 489	
(424bis)	Algae	<i>Tetraëdron</i> Kützing (typ. cons.)	Compère	26: 331		
(427)	Fungi	<i>Racodium</i> Fr.	Hawksworth & Riedl	26: 208	+29: 148	+31: 313
(—)	Fungi	<i>Hypoderma</i> St. Amans	Darker	A <sup>2</sup>	—29: 148	
(—)	Fungi	<i>Lophodermium</i> Chev.	Darker	A <sup>2</sup>	+29: 148	—31: 313
(—)	Fungi	<i>Scutellinia</i> (Cooke) Lamb	Rifai	B <sup>2</sup>	+29: 148	—31: 313
(431)	Fungi	<i>Drechslera</i> Ito	Sutton	26: 591	+35: 552	
(432)	Sperm.	<i>Banisteriopsis</i> Small (typ. cons.)	Gates	26: 593		
(433)	Sperm.	<i>Eustylis</i> Engelm. & Gray	Ravenna	26: 593	—29: 489	
(434)	Sperm.	<i>Griselinia</i> G. Forster	Edgar & Philipson	26: 594	—29: 490	
(435)	Sperm.	<i>Petiphyllum</i> (Engler) Engler (repeated as 444)	Raven	26: 595 (27: 304)	—29: 490	
(436)	Bry.	<i>Pleurozium</i> Mitt.	Crosby & Crum	26: 596	+31: 316	+35: 551
(438bis)	Sperm.	<i>Bystropogon</i> L'Hérit.	Harley	27: 122	+29: 490	+31: 313
(439bis)	Algae	<i>Coscinodiscus</i> Ehrenb. (typ. cons.)	Fryxell	27: 122	[36: 000]	
(440bis)	Bry.	<i>Jubula</i> Dumort.	Guerke	27: 125		
(442)	Bry.	<i>Heteroscyphys</i> Schiffn.	Grolle	27: 127	+31: 316	+35: 551
(444)	(see 435)					

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(445)	Sperm.	<i>Peyrousea</i> DC. (emend. typ. cons.)	Bremer	27: 305	+29: 491	
(446)	Fungi	<i>Debaryomyces</i> Lodder & Kreger-van Rij	Lodder & Kreger-van Rij	27: 306		
(447)	Sperm.	<i>Fittonia</i> Coemans	Brummitt	27: 307	+29: 491	+31: 313
(448)	Fungi	<i>Encoelia</i> (Fr.) Karst.	Eckblad et al.	27: 309		
(450)	Sperm.	<i>Triguera</i> Cav. (emend.)	Hansen & Hansen	27: 314	-29: 491	+31: 313
(451)	Sperm.	<i>Vigna</i> Savi	Verdcourt	27: 220	+29: 491	+31: 313
(452)	Sperm.	<i>Macrotyloma</i> (Wight & Arn.) Verd.	Verdcourt	27: 221	+29: 492	
(454)	Fungi	<i>Ceratocystis</i> Ell. & Halst.	Upadhyay	27: 553		
(458)	Sperm.	<i>Chamaedorea</i> Wild.	Moore	27: 555	+31: 541	+35: 552
(459)	Sperm.	<i>Cystisus</i> Desf. (typ. cons.)	Polhill et al.	27: 556	+31: 541	+35: 552
(460)	Sperm.	<i>Glycine</i> Willd. (emend.)	Lackey	27: 560	+31: 541	+35: 552
(461A)	Sperm.	<i>Cochlospermum</i> Kunth (emend. typ.)	Nicolson	28: 369	+31: 542	+35: 552
(461B)	Sperm.	<i>Bombax</i> L. (typ. cons.)	Nicolson	28: 371	+32: 623	-35: 552
(461C)	Sperm.	<i>Dendrobium</i> Sw. (emend. typ.)	Holtum et al.	28: 409	+31: 542	+35: 552
(462)	Sperm.	<i>Calanthe</i> R. Br. (emend. typ.)	Panigrahi & Das	28: 419	+31: 543	+35: 552
(463)	Sperm.	<i>Agalinis</i> Raf. (emend.)	D'Arcy	28: 419	+31: 543	+35: 552
(464)	Sperm.	<i>Asperula</i> L. (typ. cons.)	Adema & Rauschert	28: 422	+31: 543	+35: 552
(466)	Algae	<i>Grateloupia</i> C. A. Ag.	Dixon & Irvine	28: 605 (cf. 29: 133 & 30: 315)	[36: 000]	
(467)	Fungi	<i>Helminthosporium</i> Fr. (emend.)	Weresub & Hughes	28: 605	+35: 553	
(468)	Bry.	<i>Calyptogeia</i> Raddi (typ. cons.)	Grolle	28: 607		
(469)	Pter.	<i>Doryopteris</i> J. Sm.	Tyron	28: 609	+30: 162	+31: 313
(470)	Sperm.	<i>Bouteloua</i> Lag.	Gould	28: 609	+31: 544	+35: 552
(471)	Sperm.	<i>Tapinanthus</i> (Blume) Reichenb.	Tölkén & Wiens	28: 610	+31: 544	+35: 552
(477)	Algae	<i>Abedinium</i> Loeblich & Loeblich	Silva	29: 121	[36: 66]	
(478)	Algae	<i>Amphilothus</i> Poche	Silva	29: 122	[36: 66]	
(479)	Algae	<i>Anabena</i> Borner & Flahault	Silva	29: 122	+36: 66	
(480)	Algae	<i>Anadyomene</i> Lamouroux	Silva	29: 123	+36: 66	
(481)	Algae	<i>Anthophysa</i> Bory	Silva	29: 123	+36: 66	



NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA — Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(482)	Algae	<i>Audouinella</i> Bory	Silva	29: 123	+36: 66	
(483)	Algae	<i>Botrydiopsis</i> Borzi	Silva	29: 123	+36: 66	
(484)	Algae	<i>Botryocladia</i> (J. Agardh) Kylin	Silva	29: 124	-36: 66	
(485)	Algae	<i>Centrtractus</i> Lemmermann	Silva	29: 125	+36: 66	
(486)	Algae	<i>Charcotia</i> M. Pergallo	Silva	29: 125	-36: 66	
(487)	Algae	<i>Chilomastix</i> Alexeieff	Silva	29: 125	[36: 66]	
(488)	Algae	<i>Chlamydomonas</i> Ehrenberg	Silva	29: 125	+36: 66	
(489)	Algae	<i>Cladophora</i> Kützing	Silva	29: 130	+36: 66	
(490)	Algae	<i>Corynomorpha</i> J. Agardh	Silva	29: 130	+36: 66	
(491)	Algae	<i>Debarya</i> Witttr.	Silva	29: 131	-36: 66	
(492)	Algae	<i>Dinamoebidium</i> Pascher	Silva	29: 131	[36: 66]	
(493)	Algae	<i>Dogelodinium</i> Loeblich & Loeblich	Silva	29: 131	[36: 66]	
(494)	Algae	<i>Falklandiella</i> Kylin	Silva	29: 131	-36: 66	
(495)	Algae	<i>Gloeococcus</i> Braun	Silva	29: 132	+36: 66	
(496)	Algae	<i>Griffithsia</i> C. Agardh	Silva	29: 134	[36: 66]	
(497)	Algae	<i>Gyrodinium</i> Kofoid & Swezey	Silva	29: 135	+36: 66	
(498)	Algae	<i>Haematococcus</i> C. Agardh (emend. typ.)	Silva	29: 136	+36: 66	
(499)	Algae	<i>Halymenia</i> C. Agardh	Silva	29: 136 (cf. 30: 314)	[36: 66]	
(500)	Algae	<i>Hildenbrandia</i> Nardo	Silva	29: 137	+36: 66	
(501)	Algae	<i>Karotomorpha</i> Travis	Silva	29: 137	[36: 66]	
(502)	Algae	<i>Keppenodinium</i> Travis	Silva	29: 137	[36: 66]	
(503)	Algae	<i>Latifascia</i> Loeblich & Loeblich	Silva	29: 137	[36: 66]	
(504)	Algae	<i>Leptonematella</i> Silva	Silva	29: 138	[36: 66]	
(505)	Algae	<i>Monodus</i> R. Chodat	Silva	29: 138	[36: 66]	
(506)	Algae	<i>Nemastoma</i> J. Agardh	Silva	29: 139 (cf. 30: 315)	+36: 66	
(507)	Algae	<i>Neurocaulon</i> Kützing	Silva	29: 139	[36: 66]	
(508)	Algae	<i>Prasiola</i> (C. Agardh) Meneghini	Silva	29: 141	+36: 66	
(509)	Algae	<i>Schizogonium</i> Kützing	Silva	29: 141	[36: 66]	
(510)	Algae	<i>Rivularia</i> Bornet & Flahault	Silva	29: 141	+36: 66	

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(511)	Algae	<i>Schizymenia</i> J. Agardh	Silva	29: 142 (cf. 30: 317)	[36: 66]	
(512)	Algae	<i>Sphacelaria</i> Lyngbye	Silva	29: 142	withdrawn	
(513)	Algae	<i>Sphaeripara</i> Poche	Silva	29: 143	[36: 66]	
(514)	Algae	<i>Trentepohlia</i> Martius (emend.)	Silva	29: 143	+36: 66	
(515)	Algae	<i>Urospora</i> Areschoug	Silva	29: 144	+36: 66	
(516)	Sperm.	<i>Rhagadiolus</i> Juss.	Meikle	29: 159	+31: 544	+35: 552
(517)	Pter.	<i>Notholaena</i> R. Br. (typ. cons.)	Tryon & Tryon	29: 160	-30: 162	
(520)	Sperm.	<i>Notodanthonia</i> Zotov	Veldkamp	29: 293 (30: 657)	-32: 280	
(521)	Sperm.	<i>Bignonia</i> L. (typ. cons.)	Wilbur	29: 303	+32: 280	+35: 552
(522)	Algae	<i>Pseudobryopsis</i> Berthold	Chihara Diaz-Piferrer & Papenfuss	29: 329	-36: 66	
(523)	Algae	<i>Pocockiella</i> Papenfuss	Papenfuss	29: 330	-36: 66	
(524)	Sperm.	<i>Freesia</i> Klatt	Goldblatt	29: 331	+32: 280	+35: 552
(525)	Sperm.	<i>Cunila</i> L.	Reveal & Strachan	29: 332	+32: 281	+35: 552
(526)	Sperm.	<i>Odontonema</i> Nees ex Kuntze	Baum & Reveal	29: 334	+33: 297	+35: 552
(529)	Sperm.	<i>Petalacte</i> D. Don	Hilliard & Burt	29: 507	-32: 282	
(530)	Sperm.	<i>Picrodendron</i> Griseb.	Hayden & Reveal	29: 507	+33: 297	+35: 552
(531)	Sperm.	<i>Hagenia</i> J. F. Gmelin	Jansen et al.	29: 511	-32: 282	
(532)	Pter.	<i>Dennstaedtia</i> T. Moore	Tryon & Tryon	29: 512	-31: 314	
(533)	Sperm.	<i>Rotbelleia</i> L. f. (emend.)	Clayton	29: 691	+32: 624	+35: 552
(534)	Sperm.	<i>Rotbelleia</i> L. f. (emend. typ.)	Clayton	29: 692	-32: 624	
(535)	Fungi	<i>Melanella</i> Essl.	Esslinger	29: 692		
(536)	Sperm.	<i>Stelis</i> Sw. (emend. typ.)	Garay	29: 692	-32: 282	
(537)	Sperm.	<i>Lampranthus</i> N. E. Br.	Glen	29: 693	+32: 282	+35: 552
(538)	Fungi	<i>Caloplaca</i> T. Fries (emend.)	Hafellner	29: 694	+35: 553	
(541)	Foss.	<i>Cordaites</i> Unger	Storch	30: 213		
(542)	Foss.	<i>Calamites</i> Brongn. (emend. typ.)	Storch	30: 215		
(547)	Sperm.	<i>Cordialis</i> DC. (emend. typ.)	Lidén	30: 323	+33: 705	+35: 552
(548)	Sperm.	<i>Xanthostemon</i> F. Mueller	Wilson & Dawson	30: 326	+33: 298	+35: 552

NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA—Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(549)	Sperm.	<i>Milletia</i> Wight & Arnott	Geesink	30: 328	+33: 298	+35: 552
(550)	Sperm.	<i>Pongamia</i> Vent. (emend.)	Geesink	30: 328		
(551)	Fungi	<i>Hypoloma</i> (Fr.) Kummer	Farr & Farr	30: 332	+35: 554	
(552)	Fungi	<i>Nematoloma</i> Karst.	Farr & Farr	30: 332	-35: 556	
(553)	Fungi	<i>Psathyrella</i> (Fr.) Quél.	Farr & Farr	30: 333	-35: 556	
(554)	Bry.	<i>Notothylas</i> Sull.	Grolle	30: 334		
(555)	Sperm.	<i>Kohautia</i> Cham. & Schlecht.	Mabberley	30: 335	+33: 298	+35: 552
(556)	Fungi	<i>Pythium</i> Pringsh. (emend.)	van der Plaats-Niterink	30: 336		
(557)	Fungi	<i>Laetinaevia</i> Nannf.	Hein	30: 336		
(558)	Sperm.	<i>Aspidosperma</i> Mart. (emend.)	Fallen	30: 337	+33: 299	+35: 552
(559)	Fungi	<i>Amphisphaeria</i> Ces. & de Not. (emend. typ.)	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 338		
(560)	Fungi	<i>Anisomeridium</i> (Müll. Arg.) M. Choisy	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 339	+35: 554	
(561)	Fungi	<i>Chlorociboria</i> Ramam. Korf & Batra	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 340	-35: 556	
(562)	Fungi	<i>Phaeotrema</i> Müll. Arg. (emend.)	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 340		
(563)	Fungi	<i>Graphina</i> Müll. Arg.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 340		
(564)	Fungi	<i>Karstenia</i> Fr.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 341	+35: 554	
(565)	Fungi	<i>Mycoporium</i> Nyl.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 342	+35: 555	
(566)	Fungi	<i>Phacidium</i> Fr. (typ. cons.)	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 342	+35: 555	
(567)	Fungi	<i>Phaeographina</i> Müll. Arg.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 343		
(568)	Fungi	<i>Phaeographis</i> Müll. Arg.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 343		
(569)	Fungi	<i>Phaeostoma</i> v. Arx. & E. Müller	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 344		
(570)	Fungi	<i>Phillipsia</i> Berk.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 344	+35: 555	
(571)	Fungi	<i>Phlyctis</i> Wallr.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 345		
(572)	Fungi	<i>Physconia</i> Poelt	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 345	withdrawn	
(573)	Fungi	<i>Psora</i> Hoffm.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 346	+35: 555	
(574)	Fungi	<i>Pyrenula</i> Massal.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 346		
(575)	Fungi	<i>Spilomela</i> (Sacc.) Keissler	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 347	-35: 556	
(576)	Fungi	<i>Winteria</i> (Rehm) Sacc.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 347	-35: 556	
(580)	Sperm.	<i>Cenotheca</i> Desv.	Reeder	30: 348	+33: 705	+35: 552

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(581)	Pter.	<i>Stigmatopteris</i> C. Chr.	Tryon & Tryon	30: 349	-31: 315	
(582)	Sperm.	<i>Kunzea</i> Reichb.	Tölken	30: 350	+33: 299	+35: 552
(583)	Fungi	<i>Epidermophyton</i> Sabouraud (cf. 386)	McGinnis et al.	30: 350		
(584)	Fungi	<i>Triplosporium</i> (Thaxter) Batko	Humber et al.	30: 353	-35: 556	
(585)	Fungi	<i>Stemonitis</i> Roth	Farr & Alexopoulos	30: 357		
(586)	Sperm.	<i>Curcuma</i> Roxb.	Burt	30: 360	+33: 706	+35: 552
(587)	Sperm.	<i>Nicolaia</i> Horan.	Burt	30: 361	+33: 706	+35: 552
(652)	Sperm.	<i>Pseudelephantopus</i> Rohr	Nicolson	30: 489	+33: 706	+35: 552
(653)	Sperm.	<i>Hapaline</i> Schott	Nicolson	30: 494	+33: 707	+35: 552
(654)	Bry.	<i>Preiszia</i> Corda	Grolle	30: 495		
(655)	Sperm.	<i>Polygonum</i> L.	McNeill	30: 630	+33: 299	+35: 552
(656)	Sperm.	Tribe <i>Psychotriaceae</i> Dumortier ex J. Hooker	Dillenburg	30: 659	-33: 300	
(657)	Foss.	<i>Callipteris</i> Brongniart	Kerp	30: 660	withdrawn	
(658)	Bry.	<i>Chrysothrix</i> Mont. (nom. cons.)	Laundon	30: 663		
(659)	Sperm.	<i>Burtonia</i> R. Brown	Stern	30: 664	+33: 300	+35: 552
(662)	Sperm.	<i>Cordylina</i> Comm. ex Juss.	Brummitt & Marais	30: 825	+33: 300	+35: 552
(663)	Fungi	<i>Phomopsis</i> (Sacc.) Bubák	Riedl et al.	30: 820		
(664)	Sperm.	<i>Kunzea</i> Reichenbach	Tölken	30: 828	+33: 299	+35: 552
(665)	Sperm.	<i>Glechoma</i> L.	Adolphi	31: 118	+33: 301	+35: 552
(666)	Sperm.	<i>Sorbus</i> L.	Kovanda & Pouzar	31: 340	-34: 659	
(668)	Sperm.	<i>Galearia</i> Zoll. & Mor.	Forman	31: 565	+34: 660	
(669)	Sperm.	<i>Pericampylus</i> Miers	Forman	31: 566	+34: 660	
(670)	Sperm.	<i>Gillenia</i> Moench	Hunt	31: 568 (32: 306)		
(671)	Sperm.	<i>Bellevalia</i> Lapeyr.	Meikle	31: 568	+34: 660	
(672)	Sperm.	<i>Trachyantra</i> Kunth	Obermeyer	31: 569	+34: 660	
(673)	Sperm.	<i>Stenocactus</i> (K. Schum.) Berger	Tjaden	31: 570 (33: 507)		
(674)	Fungi	<i>Hyphodontia</i> Eriksson	Eriksson et al.	31: 744		
(675)	Bry.	<i>Lopholejeunea</i> (Spruce) Schiffn.	Gradstein et al.	31: 748		
(676)	Bry.	<i>Acrolejeunea</i> (Spruce) Schiffn.	Gradstein et al.	31: 748		

NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA — Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(677)	Bry.	<i>Trachylejeunea</i> (Spruce) Schiffn.	Gradstein et al.	31: 749		
(678)	Bry.	<i>Taxilejeunea</i> (Spruce) Schiffn.	Gradstein et al.	31: 750		
(679)	Sperm.	<i>Oncidium</i> Swartz	Dressler & Williams	31: 752	+34: 661	
(680)	Sperm.	<i>Torularia</i> (Cosson) O. E. Schulz	Basak & Mishra	31: 754	-34: 661	
(681)	Sperm.	<i>Rinorea</i> Aublet	Hekking	31: 754	+34: 661	
(682)	Sperm.	<i>Libanotis</i> Haller ex Zinn.	Rauschert	31: 755	+34: 661	
(683)	Sperm.	<i>Curtisia</i> W. Aiton	Ferguson	31: 756	+34: 661	
(684)	Sperm.	<i>Odontonema</i> Nees	Baum & Reveal	31: 757	+33: 297	+35: 552
(688)	Algae	<i>Haplocladium</i> (K. Mueller Hal.) K. Mueller Hal.	Ochrya	32: 133	-36: 66	
(689)	Sperm.	<i>Astronidium</i> A. Gray	Veldkamp	32: 134	+34: 662	
(690)	Bry.	<i>Mannia</i> Opiz	Grolle	32: 135		
(691)	Bry.	<i>Pellia</i> Raddi	Grolle	32: 136		
(692)	Sperm.	<i>Urnularia</i> Stapf	Zarucchi & Cannon	32: 306	+34: 662	
(693)	Foss.	<i>Eusphenopteris</i> W. Gothan ex E. O. Novik	Panigrahi & Singh	32: 307		
(694)	Pter.	<i>Lygodium</i> Swartz (emend.)	Panigrahi & Singh	32: 310	-35: 685	
(698)	Algae	<i>Cerataulina</i> H. Pergallo	Hasle	32: 474	+36: 66	
(699)	Fungi	<i>Chondropsis</i> Nylander	Cannon & Hawksworth	32: 475		
(700)	Fungi	<i>Melanospora</i> Corda	Cannon & Hawksworth	32: 476		
(701)	Fungi	<i>Nectria</i> (E. M. Fries) E. M. Fries	Cannon & Hawksworth	32: 476		
(702)	Fungi	<i>Pezicula</i> L. R. Tulasne et C. Tulasne	Cannon & Hawksworth	32: 477		
(703)	Fungi	<i>Trailia</i> Sutherland	Cannon & Hawksworth	32: 478		
(704)	Fungi	<i>Valsa</i> E. M. Fries (emend.)	Cannon & Hawksworth	32: 478		
(706)	Fungi	<i>Tomentella</i> Persoon ex Patouillard (emend.)	Jülich	32: 481		
(707)	Fungi	<i>Craterellus</i> Persoon (emend.)	Jülich	32: 483		
(708)	Sperm.	<i>Dioon</i> J. Lindley	Vovides & Moreno	32: 484 (30: 728)	+36: 66	
(709)	Sperm.	<i>Pseudolarix</i> Gordon	Hara & Yü	32: 485	+36: 66	
(710)	Sperm.	<i>Trisetum</i> Persoon	Veldkamp	32: 487	-36: 66	
(711)	Sperm.	<i>Plathymenia</i> Bentham	Barneby	32: 489	+36: 66	

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(712)	Sperm.	<i>Peltogyne</i> Vogel	Barneby	32: 489	+36: 76	
(713)	Sperm.	<i>Becium</i> J. Lindley	Codd	32: 490	+36: 76	
(714)	Sperm.	<i>Jankaia</i> Boissier	Skog	32: 491	-36: 76	
(716)	Fungi	<i>Hypoderma</i> De Not.	Cannon & Minter	32: 581		
(716A)	Fungi	<i>Lophodermium</i> Chev.	Cannon & Minter	32: 582		
(717)	Fungi	<i>Suhria</i> J. Agardh	Parkinson	32: 583		
(718)	Fungi	<i>Baeomyces</i> Persoon	Sérusiaux	32: 646		
(719)	Fungi	<i>Cystodium</i> J. Smith	Parris	32: 648	+35: 719	
(720)	Sperm.	<i>Piptochaetium</i> K. B. Presl	Clayton	32: 649	+36: 76	
(721)	Sperm.	<i>Arabidopsis</i> Heynh.	Stepánek	32: 649	+36: 77	
(722)	Sperm.	<i>Billia</i> Peyritsch	Skog	32: 650	+36: 77	
(723)	Sperm.	<i>Iphiaona</i> Cassini	Anderberg	32: 651	+36: 77	
(724)	Sperm.	<i>Heliopsis</i> Persoon	Reveal	32: 653	+36: 77	
(728)	Algae	<i>Arthrodesmus</i> Archer	de M. Bicudo	33: 107	-36: 66	
(729)	Fungi	<i>Nodulosphaeria</i> Rabenhorst	Barr & Holm	33: 109		
(730)	Fungi	<i>Cladonia</i> Hill ex Browne (emend.)	Laundon	33: 109		
(731)	Bry.	<i>Callicostella</i> (C. Müller Hal.) Mitten	Koponen & Isoviita	33: 112		
(732)	Sperm.	<i>Fictinia</i> Schrader (emend.)	Goetghebeur & Arnold	33: 114		
(733)	Sperm.	<i>Garphorkis</i> Du Petit-Thouars	Friis & Rasmussen	33: 114		
(734)	Sperm.	<i>Diamorpha</i> Nutt.	Wilbur	33: 116		
(735)	Sperm.	<i>Butea</i> Roxburgh ex Willdenow (emend.)	Panigrahi & Mishra	33: 119		
(736)	Sperm.	<i>Buchenavia</i> Eichler	Alwan Al-Mayah & Stace	33: 120		
(737)	Sperm.	<i>Jacquinia</i> L.	Nicolson	33: 121		
(738)	Sperm.	<i>Carlowrightia</i> A. Gray	Daniel	33: 122		
(739)	Fungi	<i>Roccella</i> DC.	Ahti	33: 330 (34: 709)		
(740)	Fungi	<i>Hemimycena</i> Singer	Gulden et al.	33: 331		
(741)	Sperm.	<i>Oberonia</i> Lindley (emend.)	Panigrahi & Dubey	33: 333		
(746A)	Fungi	<i>Rutstroemia</i> Karsten	Kohn & Schumacher	33: 508		
(746B)	Fungi	<i>Rutstroemia</i> Karsten	Kohn & Schumacher	33: 508		
(747)	Sperm.	<i>Stylochiton</i> Lepr.	Nicolson & Mayo	33: 509		

NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA—Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(748)	Sperm.	<i>Amaryllis</i> L.	Goldblatt	33: 511		
(749)	Sperm.	<i>Eucharis</i> J. E. Planchon	Meerow & Dehgan	33: 516		
(750)	Sperm.	<i>Barclaya</i> Wallich	Crusio & Bogner	33: 517		
(751)	Sperm.	<i>Medicago</i> L.	Soják & Pouzar	33: 519		
(752)	Sperm.	<i>Blepharocalyx</i> Berg	Landrum	33: 521		
(755)	Algae	<i>Cymbella</i> C. Agardh	Håkansson & Ross	33: 523	+36: 67	
(756)	Algae	<i>Cyclotella</i> (Kützting) Brébisson	Håkansson & Ross	33: 525	+36: 67	
(757)	Algae	<i>Rhopalodia</i> O. Müller	Håkansson & Ross	33: 525	+36: 67	
(758)	Fungi	<i>Amanita</i> Persoon	Hawksworth	33: 731		
(759)	Fungi	<i>Vaginarius</i> Roussel	Hawksworth	33: 731		
(760)	Fungi	<i>Clavulinopsis</i> van Overeem	Hawksworth	33: 731		
(761)	Fungi	<i>Coriolus</i> Quélet	Hawksworth	33: 732		
(762)	Fungi	<i>Delicatula</i> Fayod	Hawksworth	33: 732		
(763)	Fungi	<i>Glocephylum</i> P. Karsten	Hawksworth	33: 732		
(764)	Fungi	<i>Gyrodon</i> Opat.	Hawksworth	33: 733		
(765)	Fungi	<i>Lactarius</i> Persoon	Hawksworth	33: 733		
(766)	Fungi	<i>Lentinus</i> E. M. Fries	Hawksworth	33: 733		
(767)	Fungi	<i>Leptoglossum</i> P. Karsten	Hawksworth	33: 734		
(768)	Fungi	<i>Phellinus</i> Quélet	Hawksworth	33: 734		
(769)	Fungi	<i>Pleurotus</i> (E. M. Fries) Kummer	Hawksworth	33: 734		
(770)	Fungi	<i>Pulcherricum</i> Parmasto	Hawksworth	33: 735		
(771)	Fungi	<i>Pycnoporus</i> P. Karsten	Hawksworth	33: 735		
(772)	Fungi	<i>Ramaria</i> (E. M. Fr.) Bonorden	Hawksworth	33: 735		
(773)	Fungi	<i>Spongipellis</i> Patouillard	Hawksworth	33: 736		
(774)	Fungi	<i>Volvariella</i> Spegazzini	Hawksworth	33: 736		
(775)	Bry.	<i>Rhodobryum</i> (Schimper) Limpricht	Isoviita & Koponen	33: 736		
(776)	Sperm.	<i>Amorphophallus</i> Blume ex Decaisne	Nicolson et al.	33: 740		
(777)	Sperm.	<i>Homoglossum</i> Salisbury	de Vos	33: 740		
(778)	Sperm.	<i>Tephrosia</i> Persoon (emend.)	Geesink	33: 742		
(779)	Sperm.	<i>Lonchocarpus</i> Kunth (emend.)	Geesink	33: 742		

NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA—Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(780)	Sperm.	<i>Brachyterum</i> (Wight & Arnott) Bentham	Geesink	33: 743		
(781)	Foss.	<i>Trochiliscus</i> A. P. Karpinsky	Samoilova	34: 157		
(782)	Algae	<i>Hemiaulax</i> Heiberg	Ross	34: 301	+36: 67	
(783)	Algae	<i>Lithothamnion</i> Heydrich	Woelkerling	34: 302	+36: 67	
(784)	Fungi	<i>Mycena</i> (Pers.: Fr.) Roussel	Redhead	34: 303		
(785)	Sperm.	<i>Talinum</i> Adanson (emend.)	Wijnands	34: 309		
(788)	Sperm.	<i>Nesaea</i> Kunth	Panigrahi et al.	34: 315		
(789)	Sperm.	<i>Osmorhiza</i> Raf.	Lowry	34: 316		
(790)	Sperm.	<i>Brachystelma</i> Sims	Forster	34: 318		
(791)	Sperm.	<i>Rhynchoglossum</i> Blume	Skog	34: 319		
(793)	Bry.	<i>Papillaria</i> (C. Müller Hal.) Lorentz (emend.)	Isoviita	34: 534		
(794)	Sperm.	<i>Grevillea</i> R. Br. ex Knight	McGillivray	34: 536		
(795)	Sperm.	<i>Ludwigia</i> L.	Nicolson & Suresh	34: 537		
(796)	Sperm.	<i>Prismatocarpus</i> L'Héritier de Brutelle	Thulin	34: 538		
(802)	Fungi	<i>Leccinum</i> S. F. Gray	Rausheert	34: 713		
(803)	Sperm.	<i>Entada</i> Adans.	Panigrahi	34: 714		
(804)	Sperm.	<i>Glycosmis</i> Correa	Nicolson & Suresh	34: 715		
(805)	Sperm.	<i>Hiptage</i> J. Gaertner	Panigrahi	34: 717		
(806)	Sperm.	<i>Gaertnera</i> Lam. (emend.)	Panigrahi	34: 717		
(809)	Sperm.	<i>Heydia</i> Dennstedt ex Kostelezky	Nicolson & Suresh	35: 177		
(810)	Sperm.	<i>Tiliacora</i> Colebr.	Nicolson & Suresh	35: 178		
(811)	Sperm.	<i>Tinospora</i> Miers	Nicolson & Suresh	35: 179		
(813)	Sperm.	<i>Salacia</i> L.	Nicolson & Suresh	35: 181		
(815)	Fungi	<i>Mucor</i> Fresenius	Kirk	35: 375		
(816)	Fungi	<i>Rhizopus</i> Ehrenberg	Kirk	35: 376		
(817)	Fungi	<i>Melanoleuca</i> Patouillard	Kuyper	35: 377		
(818)	Fungi	<i>Scutellinia</i> (M. C. Cooke) Lambotte	Korf & Schumacher	35: 378		
(820)	Fungi	<i>Lecanactis</i> Körber	Theiler	35: 382		
(821)	Pter.	<i>Athyriaceae</i> Alston	Panigrahi	35: 384		
(823)	Sperm.	<i>Tectea</i> Delile	Gibert	35: 386		



NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA — Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(824)	Sperm.	<i>Nialel</i> Andanson	Nicolson & Suresh	35: 388		
(825)	Sperm.	<i>Peltaea</i> (K. Presl) Standley	Fryxell & Krapovickas	35: 389		
(827)	Sperm.	<i>Chascanum</i> E. Meyer	Gilbert et al.	35: 391		
(829)	Fungi	<i>Propolis</i> (E. M. Fries) Corda	Holm et al.	35: 599		
(840)	Sperm.	<i>Blachia</i> Baillon	Wilmott-Dear	35: 606		
(841)	Sperm.	<i>Canthium</i> Lamarck	Nicolson & Suresh	35: 607		
(842)	Algae	<i>Tetracyclus</i> Ralfs	Williams	35: 730		
(843)	Algae	<i>Phymatolithon</i> Foslie	Irvine & Woelkerling	35: 731		
(844)	Fungi	<i>Battarraea</i> E. M. Fries	Rauschert	35: 733		
(845)	Fungi	<i>Clitocybe</i> (E. M. Fries) Staude	Rauschert	35: 736		
(847)	Fungi	<i>Lepiota</i> Persoon ex S. F. Gray	Rauschert	35: 738		
(848)	Fungi	<i>Otidea</i> (Persoon) Bonorden	Rauschert	35: 740		
(849)	Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia</i> R. Heim	Kuyper & Bas	35: 740		
(850)	Fungi	<i>Schizoplyllum</i> E. M. Fries	Rauschert	35: 743		
(851)	Fungi	<i>Thelebolus</i> Tode ex E. M. Fries	Rauschert	35: 743		
(852)	Fungi	<i>Zasmidium</i> E. M. Fries	Rauschert	35: 744		
(853)	Sperm.	<i>Courtoisia</i> C. G. D. Nees	Vorster	35: 745		
(854)	Sperm.	<i>Umbellularia</i> (C. D. G. Nees) Nuttall	Rohwer	35: 747		
(855)	Sperm.	<i>Calliandra</i> Bentham	Hernandez & Nicolson	35: 747		
(856)	Sperm.	<i>Petunia</i> A. L. Jussieu	Wijnands et al.	35: 748		
(857)	Sperm.	<i>Antennaria</i> J. Gaertner	Rauschert	35: 749		
(859)	Fungi	<i>Botrysporium</i> Corda	Vincent & Blackwell	36: 158		
(861)	Fungi	<i>Hexagona</i> E. M. Fries	Ryvarden	36: 160		
(862)	Fungi	<i>Laetiporus</i> Murrill	Ryvarden	36: 160		
(863)	Fungi	<i>Schizoptera</i> Velenkovsky	Ryvarden	36: 161		
(864)	Fungi	<i>Siphula</i> E. M. Fries	Brusse	36: 162		
(865)	Fungi	<i>Trametes</i> E. M. Fries	Rauschert	36: 164		
(866)	Fungi	<i>Lethocolea</i> Mitten	Scott & Beckmann	36: 165		
(867)	Pter.	<i>Cheilanthes</i> Swartz (emend.)	Panigrahi	36: 167		

NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA—Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(868)	Sperm.	<i>Genyorchis Schlechter</i>	Vermeulen	36:		
(869)	Sperm.	<i>Trimenia B. C. Seemann</i>	Philipson	36:		
(667)	Sperm.	<i>Rottboellia exaltata</i> L. f.	Simon	31: 564	-34: 659	
(695)	Sperm.	<i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i> P. Miller	Terrell et al.	32: 310	-36: 74	
(715)	Sperm.	<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.	Hanelt et al.	32: 492	+36: 76	
(753)	Sperm.	<i>Acacia cambagei</i> L.	Pedley	33: 523		
(808)	Sperm.	<i>Carya illinoensis</i> (Wang.) K. Koch	Grauke et al.	35: 174		

2 A = Can. J. Bot. 45: 1417. (1967); B = Verh. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wetensch., Afd. Natuurk., Tweede Sect. 57: 107-111. (1968).

NOMINA REJICIENDA PROPOSITA (sub Art. 69)

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(441)	Fungi	<i>Phialea</i> (Pers.) Gillet	Dumont & Korf	26: 598	+35: 553	
(441bis)	Sperm.	<i>Nonea echioides</i> (L.) R. & S.	Edmondson	27: 126	-29: 492	
(443)	Sperm.	<i>Limonia acidissima</i> L.	Panigrahi	26: 576	-31: 540	
(443bis)	Sperm.	<i>Orchis latifolia</i> L.	Vermeulen	26: 600	-29: 493	
(449)	Sperm.	<i>Gomphrena ficoidea</i> L. ( <i>Alternanthera ficoidea</i> (L.) Beauv.)	Veldkamp	27: 310	+31: 540	+35: 552
(456)	Sperm.	<i>Solanum indicum</i> L.	Hepper	27: 555	+32: 279	+35: 552
(457)	Sperm.	<i>Solanum sodomeum</i> L.	Hepper	27: 555	+32: 279	+35: 552
(461)	Sperm.	<i>Ptercephalus papposus</i> (L.) Coulter ( <i>Sca-biosa papposa</i> L.)	Meikle	27: 560	+31: 542	+35: 552
(472)	Sperm.	<i>Carex rosea</i> Willd.	Webber & Ball	28: 614	-32: 623	
(473)	Sperm.	<i>Carex radiata</i> (Wahlenb.) Small	Webber & Ball	28: 614	-32: 623	

NOMINA REIJIENDA PROPOSITA (sub Art. 69)—Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(474)	Sperm.	<i>Lupinus varius</i> L.	Lee & Gladstones	28: 616	-32: 624	
(475)	Sperm.	<i>Lupinus hirsutus</i> L.	Lee & Gladstones	28: 618	+32: 624	+35: 552
(476)	Sperm.	<i>Stipa columbiana</i> Macoun	Barkworth & Maze	28: 624	+36: 72	
(519)	Sperm.	<i>Rotala decussata</i> DC.	Cook	29: 161	+32: 279	+35: 552
(527)	Bry.	<i>Grimmia alpicola</i> Hedw.	Bremer	29: 337		
(527)	Bry.	<i>Schistidium alpicola</i> (Hedw.) Limpr.	Bremer	29: 337		
(528)	Sperm.	<i>Paspalum distichum</i> L.	Renvoize & Clayton	29: 339	-32: 281	
(539)	Sperm.	<i>Pulicaria undulata</i> (L.) C. A. Meyer	Jeffrey et al.	29: 694	-32: 282	
(540)	Sperm.	<i>Amaranthus blitum</i> L.	Brenan & Townsend	29: 695	-33: 298	
(577)	Fungi	<i>Lichen jubatus</i> L.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 347	+35: 555	
(578)	Fungi	<i>Arthonia lurida</i> Ach.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 348	+35: 556	
(579)	Fungi	<i>Phacidium musae</i> Lév.	Hawksworth & Sherwood	30: 348	+35: 556	
(588)	Sperm.	<i>Aegilops ovata</i> L.	Lambinon	30: 361	-35: 557	
(589)	Sperm.	<i>Bromus hordeaceus</i> L.	Lambinon	30: 362	-35: 558	
(590)	Sperm.	<i>Carex muricata</i> L.	Lambinon	30: 362	-35: 558	
(591)	Sperm.	<i>Crataegus × media</i> Bechst.	Lambinon	30: 362	-35: 558	
(592)	Sperm.	<i>Crataegus oxyacantha</i> L.	Lambinon	30: 362	+35: 559	
(593)	Sperm.	<i>Dipsacus fullonum</i> L.	Lambinon	30: 362	-35: 559	
(594)	Sperm.	<i>Euphorbia verrucosa</i> L.	Lambinon	30: 363	-35: 559	
(595)	Sperm.	<i>Medicago polymorpha</i> L.	Lambinon	30: 363	-35: 560	
(596)	Sperm.	<i>Pileum exaratum</i> Hochst. ex Griseb.	Lambinon	30: 363	-35: 561	
(597)	Sperm.	<i>Potamogeton pusillus</i> L.	Lambinon	30: 363	-35: 561	
(598)	Sperm.	<i>Salix × smithiana</i> Willd.	Lambinon	30: 364	-35: 562	
(599)	Sperm.	<i>Spergularia media</i> (L.) C. Presl	Lambinon	30: 364	-35: 562	
(600)	Sperm.	<i>Vulpia membranacea</i> (L.) Dum.	Lambinon	30: 364	-35: 562	
(655A)	Sperm.	<i>Polygonum aviculare</i> L.	McNeill	30: 638	-33: 299	
(660)	Sperm.	<i>Rhododendron japonicum</i> (Bl.) Schneid.	Aldén	30: 665	-36: 72	
(661)	Sperm.	<i>Epilobium brachycarpum</i> Presl	Hoch & Raven	30: 666	-33: 300	
(685)	Sperm.	<i>Anthospermum ciliare</i> L.	Puff	31: 759	+36: 73	
(686)	Bry.	<i>Mnium trichomanis</i> L.	Stotler & Crotz	32: 73		

## NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA—Continued

No.	Group	Nom. Cons. Prop.	Prop. by	Orig. Pub.	References	
					Perm. Comm.	Gen. Comm.
(687)	Bry.	<i>Mnium fassum</i> L.	Stotler & Crotz	32: 73		
(696)	Sperm.	<i>Ononis spinosa</i> L.	Jarvis et al.	32: 314	+34: 662	
(697)	Sperm.	<i>Gomphrena ficoidea</i> L. (reconsider 449)	Kanis	32: 316	34: 662 <sup>3</sup>	35: 552 <sup>3</sup>
(705)	Fungi	<i>Lecidea synochea</i> Acharius	Cannon & Hawksworth	32: 479		
(725)	Sperm.	<i>Aristolochia longa</i> L.	Nardi	32: 654		
(726)	Sperm.	<i>Epilobium junceum</i> Spreng.	Garnock-Jones	32: 656		
(727)	Sperm.	<i>Justicia verticillaris</i> L. f.	Brummitt et al.	32: 658		
(743)	Sperm.	<i>Linus salsoloides</i> Lam.	Lopez González	33: 334		
(743)	Sperm.	<i>Cynoglossum brassicifolium</i> Lag.	Lopez González	33: 336		
(744)	Sperm.	<i>Omphalodes amplexicaulis</i> Lehm.	Lopez González	33: 337		
(745)	Sperm.	<i>Pinus dammara</i> Lamb.	Veldkamp & de Laubenfels	33: 337		
(754)	Sperm.	<i>Musa humilis</i> Aublet	Andersson	33: 524		
(786)	Sperm.	<i>Varronia alba</i> Jacquin	Wijnands	34: 310		
(787)	Sperm.	<i>Melianthus minor</i> L.	Wijnands & Tansley	34: 314		
(792)	Fungi	<i>Lichen subfuscus</i> L.	Vitkainen & Brodo	34: 533		
(807)	Pter.	<i>Polypodium pteridioides</i> Reichard	Nardi & Reichstein	35: 172 (36: 166)		
(812)	Sperm.	<i>Humboldtia Ruiz et Pavon</i>	Geesink & Sanjappa	35: 180		
(814)	Algae	<i>Zooxanthella</i> Brandt	Blank & Trench	35: 289		
(819)	Fungi	<i>Stilbum cinnabarinum</i> Mont.	Seifert	35: 381		
(826)	Sperm.	<i>Buchnera euphrasioideis</i> Vahl	Hepper	35: 390		
(828)	Sperm.	<i>Solanum verbascifolium</i> L.	D'Arcy	35: 393		
(830)	Fungi	<i>Scleroderma aurantium</i> (L.: Pers.) Pers.	Rauschert	35: 600		
(839)	Pter.	<i>Asplenium laciniatum</i> Don	Viane & Reichstein	35: 605		
(846)	Fungi	<i>Helotium</i> Tode: Fries	Korf	35: 737		
(858)	Sperm.	<i>Utricularia caerulea</i> L.	Bhattacharyya	35: 750		
(860)	Algae	<i>Conferva comoides</i> Dillwyn	Ross	36: 159		
(870)	Sperm.	<i>Fumaria bulbosa</i> L.	Greuter	36: 169		

<sup>3</sup> Proposal to reconsider rejected; the name remains rejected (see 449).

*Appendix B.*

REVIEW OF REPORTS OF NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEES

The composition of the Permanent Nomenclatural Committees for special groups (see ICBN Div. III. 2) established at the XIII International Botanical Congress in Sydney appears in *Taxon* 31: 310–313 (1982) and that of the special committees on lectotypification, orthography, valid publication, and effective publication in *Taxon* 31: 718 (1982).

*Reports involving actions since the XIII IBC, Sydney, 1981*

Committee	Publication ( <i>Taxon</i> )	Report General Committee
Spermatophyta 22	29: 489–493	31: 313–314
Spermatophyta 23	30: 155–161	not required
Spermatophyta 24	31: 540–544	35: 552
Spermatophyta 25	32: 279–284	35: 552
Spermatophyta 26	32: 623–625	35: 552
Spermatophyta 27	33: 705–707	35: 552
Spermatophyta 28	33: 297–301	35: 552
Spermatophyta 29	34: 659–697	
Spermatophyta 30	35: 556–563	
Spermatophyta 31	36: 72	
Pteridophyta 1	30: 161–163	31: 313–314
Pteridophyta 2	31: 314–315	36: 70
Pteridophyta 3	31: 315–316	36: 70
Pteridophyta 4	35: 685–686	
Subcommittee, Family Names of Pteridophyta	30: 163–168	35: 551
Subcommittee, Family Names of Pteridophyta	35: 686–691	
Subcommittee, Family Names of Pteridophyta	36: 70	not required
Bryophyta	31: 316–317	35: 551
Bryophyta	34: 275	not required
Algae	36: 66	
Fungi & Lichens	29: 148–149	31: 313–314
Fungi & Lichens	30: 472–473	not required
Fungi & Lichens	31: 318	not required
Fungi & Lichens	35: 552	
Fungi & Lichens	36: 69	not required
Fossil Plants	30: 473–475	not required
Fossil Plants	31: 317–318	not required
Lectotypification	35: 867–880	not required
Orthography	35: 795–803	not required
Valid Publication	35: 756–779	not required
Effective Publication	awaited	
General	31: 310	
General	31: 313–314	
General	35: 551–552	

Note added in proof: No. 821 Athyriaceae, now under *Nomina Generica Conservanda*, should be listed under *Nomina Familiarum Conservanda*.