

(221) Add a new Note after Art. 7.8 to read as follows:

“*Note 1.* For sanctioned names all references to ‘protologue’ (cf. Art. 9.4, 9.5, 9.17, 10.2, 10.5, 10.4, 59.2, 59.3 & 59.7 and Rec. 9A.2, 9A.3, 9A.4, 9B.1) are taken as referring to everything associated with the name in the sanctioning work.”

The above is editorial and should have been added when sanctioning first entered the *Code* in Sydney. It makes it clear that for a

sanctioned name it is the treatment of the sanctioning author not the protologue that determines typification.

(222) Replace the entry for “original material” in the glossary with:

“**original material.** The specimens and illustrations from which a lectotype may be chosen (see [the appropriate Notes] for details).”

(223–232) Proposals to amend articles regulating the typification of names in sanctioning works

Scott A. Redhead,¹ Lorelei L. Norvell² & Shaun R. Pennycook³

¹ *National Mycological Herbarium, Eastern Cereal and Oilseed Research Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, C.E.F., Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0C6*

² *Pacific Northwest Mycology Service, 6720 NW Skyline Blvd., Portland, Oregon 97229-1309, U.S.A.*

³ *Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research, Private Bag 92 170, Auckland, New Zealand*

Author for correspondence: *Scott A. Redhead, scott.redhead@agr.gc.ca*

Introduction. — What kind of nomenclatural type is the ‘type’ of a sanctioned name selected by invoking Art. 7.8, when original material that exists as documented by the earlier published protologue is not selected as ‘type’? Additionally, despite the existence of materials (including illustrations as allowed by Arts. 8.1, 9.2 and Note 2) documented in the protologue and/or sanctioning works, may a later author designate new materials as ‘type’ or ‘neotype’ as some have done when interpreting Art. 7.8? Articles 8 and 9 define the terms holotype, lectotype, neotype, syntype, paratype, isotype, isosyntype, and epitype, while Art. 14.9 deals with conserved types. Article 15.1 indicates that sanctioned names are to be treated as if conserved, but by default they do not have conserved types. As defined, none of these terms for types applies to a ‘type’ chosen as outlined in the first sentence here; parts of the *Code*, therefore, cannot be clearly interpreted.

Article 7.8 is ambiguous and open to differing interpretations because it may be thought to conflict with aspects of Arts. 9.1–9.12 and 10.1–10.5, which dictate what materials are available for typification at specific and infraspecific ranks and at the ranks of genus and generic subdivisions, respectively. Article 7.8 states, “Typification of names adopted in one of the [sanctioning] works [...] may be effected in the light of anything associated with the name in that work.” As first worded in the *St Louis Code* (Greuter & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 138. 2000), Art. 9.2 indicates that lectotypes may be chosen only from “original material.” Article 9, Note 2 (also added in that *Code*) defines “original material” as excluding materials examined after publication of the protologue, but it also ambiguously either (1) hints at possible deviation from this interpretation or (2) restricts it further via the phrase, “(but see also Art. [...] 7.8).” Article 10.2 restricts lectotypification of generic names to the types of species names (if such exist) cited in the protologue. The phrase “in the light of” in Art. 7.8 literally means “with the knowledge” gleaned from the sanctioning work, although some mycologists have interpreted it differently. Hence, although typification may be guided by such knowledge, it is not necessarily restricted by it. Article 7.8 does not explicitly allow for lectotypification of materials not available when the protologue was published, and therefore Art. 7.8 does not explicitly override Arts. 9.2 and 10.2. As defined in the *Code*, the protologue continues

to reside in the publication where the name was validated, *not* where it was sanctioned. The basis of the continuing ambiguity is apparent in “Principle 4” published by Korf (in *Mycotaxon* 16: 350. 1983) where in the discussion on the typification of sanctioned names, the protologue is specifically treated as an independent entity from the treatment in the sanctioning work. Even Korf’s “Principle 4” does not explicitly state that types of sanctioned names may be elements not included in the protologue. We believe that this ambiguity has led to nomenclatural instability and should be removed from the *Code* either by eliminating Art. 7.8 or by revising Art. 7.8 together with other impacted articles as corollaries. Article 7.8 does not specifically designate the ‘type’ of a sanctioned name as lectotype, neotype, or conserved type and there is no equivalent alternative.

Background. — Fungi are the only organisms covered by the *Code* that not only have a starting point date and publication but also have sanctioning publications (Art. 13.1d) that once served as starting point publications in earlier versions of the *Code*. Demoulin & al. (in *Taxon* 30: 52–63. 1981) and Korf (l.c.) published detailed synopses of the complex starting point history. Donk (in *Taxon* 10: 67. 1961) first introduced the concept of a ‘sanctioned’ status with regard to names published by Fries (*Syst. Mycol.* 1. 1821) at the time when the *Systema Mycologicum* still served as a later starting point publication. The term ‘sanctioned’ was implied (although not mentioned per se) in proposal 32 (which sought to push back the starting date to 1753) in the IMC2 subcommittee report on starting point dates (Van Warmelo in *Taxon* 28: 429–430. 1979). Support for proposal 32, published by Demoulin & al. (l.c.), refined the usage of the term ‘sanctioned’.

The concepts of sanctioning works and sanctioned names, approved in 1981, appeared in the *Sydney Code* (Voss & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 111. 1983). There the new Article 7.17, added to cover typification of sanctioned names, reads, “Typification of names adopted in one of the works specified in Art. 13.1(d), and thereby sanctioned, is based on everything associated with the name in that work.” That wording was deemed to be ambiguous as it could be interpreted two ways: either allowing for typification with materials cited in the sanctioning work that were not available when the protologue was published, or requiring all materials to be expressly cited in the original protologue as well

as in the sanctioning work. The issue was discussed by Subcommittee C of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens (Gams in Taxon 35: 779–782. 1986), who put forward three different alternative proposals. We find it noteworthy that none of the proposals or the additional discussion on typification of sanctioned names (Gams in Taxon 35: 784–785. 1986) specifically dealt with the conflict with Arts. 9 or 10. In fact, none of the wording of the three proposals was accepted. Instead, the approved proposal ‘164a’ was sent to the Editorial Committee who reworded the Article, changing “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” to the subsequent Art. 7.20, which reads “Typification of names adopted in one of the works specified in Art. 13.1(d), and thereby sanctioned, **may be effected in the light of** anything associated with the name in that work” [bold added by us]. The current wording of what is now Art. 7.8 dates from the *Berlin Code* (Greuter & al. in Regnum Veg. 118. 1988) and is little changed, involving only the addition of a reference to Art. 15 wherein sanctioning is discussed.

The remaining ambiguity has led to conflicting view points, editorially forcing some authors to argue that a name both was effectively lectotypified (Art. 7.8) and—as insurance—must be conserved with that same “lectotype” because of the conflict with Arts. 9.2 and 10.2. The case of *Isaria* Pers. : Fr. serves as an example. Hodge & al. (in Taxon 54: 485–489. 2005) favoured interpretation of Art. 7.8 to allow for lectotypification of *Isaria* with a named species not included in the protologue by the original author (Persoon, Disp. Meth. Fung. 1794) but included by the sanctioning author (Fries, Syst. Mycol. 1: xlviii. 1821; 3: 270. 1832) in his sanctioning publication series. As insurance, the same authors (Gams & al. in Taxon 54: 537. 2005) later successfully argued for conservation of the same ‘lectotype’; hence *Isaria farinosa* (Holmsk. : Fr.) Fr. is listed as a conserved type in Appendix IIIB of the *Vienna Code*. Additionally, interpretation of Art. 7.8 has led to continual debate and even reversal of opinion regarding independence of the typification process from the author citation for sanctioned names (Rauschert in Nova Hedwigia 45: 501–508. 1987 and Kuyper in Noordeloes & al., Fl. Agar. Neerl. 1: 50–51. 1988 vs. Gams & Kuyper in Symb. Bot. Upsal. 30(3): 25–31. 1995).

We do not know why the Editorial Committee for the *Berlin Code* changed the wording of the earlier published proposal ‘164a’ in such a way as to leave ambiguity, except to note that during the reported discussion (Gams in Taxon 35: 779–782. 1986), subcommittee votes were greatly divided. However, it is apparent that any “lectotypification” of a sanctioned name by an element that was not included in the original protologue corrupts the definition of “lectotype” (Art. 9.2 & Note 2; Art. 10.2–4 & Note 1). One solution to this dilemma is to create a new category of type, termed a **sanctiotype**, so defined as not to corrupt the definition of either a lectotype or a neotype. Additionally, we need to modify Art. 7.8 to allow for unambiguous typification (**sanctiotypification**) of sanctioned names by elements not necessarily present in the protologue. By distinguishing the different categories of typification, the botanical definition of ‘protologue’ is left uncorrupted. We further need to modify Art. 10.5 to prevent supersession under 10.5(a) but to permit supersession under 10.5(b) when sanctiotypes conflict with the protologues. If the term sanctiotype is adopted, several other articles will require modification to account for a different category of types.

Finally, we note that **ailing clarification** of how one may typify names in sanctioning works with elements outside of the protologue of the name, then **Article 7.8 should be deleted** to forestall continued confusion. Confusion in mycological nomenclature regarding

sanctioned names never ceased. Note the instability in author citation in the following example of the commonly used generic name, *Peziza*.

With regard to names in current use, the authority for *Peziza* was listed as “L. : Fr.” by Jarvis & al. (in Regnum Veg. 127: 75. 1993) contrary to its listing as *Peziza* “Fr. : Fr.” by Greuter & al. (in Regnum Veg. 129: 847. 1993). Inconsistent with the supposed rationale that sanctioned names may be typified by elements in the sanctioning work including non-original elements, Yao & al. (in Syst. Ascomycetum 14: 17–24. 1995) suggested treating *Peziza* L. (Sp. Pl.: 1180. 1753) as distinct from *Peziza* “Fr.” (Syst. Mycol. 2(1): 52. 1822), each differently typified despite the linkage of the names in the sanctioning work and their overlapped taxonomic coverage. No article in the *Code* was cited to allow for this interpretation, nor does one exist. Those authors incorrectly assumed that Fries had published a later homonym. However, Art. 48.1, the applicable article that should have been cited (by way of its precursor) if this were the case, applies only when an “original” type is excluded. Additionally, Yao & al. (l.c.) concluded that the earliest typification [Note: not utilizing the “American Code”] of *Peziza* was ineffective because the type designated by Clements & Shear (Gen. Fung.: 328. 1931) was not an original element in 1753. The argument that Clements & Shear’s lectotypification was ineffective can only be upheld if Art. 7.8 does not allow for typification by any element in the sanctioning work. Interpreted as Yao & al. (l.c.) did, there would be no reason to include Art. 7.8 within the Code. Clements & Shear’s selected type species, *Peziza vesiculosa* Bull. : Fr., was an element of the sanctioned generic name *Peziza* and, furthermore, Fries (in Syst. Mycol. Index: 126. 1832) attributed the generic name to Linnaeus. Application of a reworded Art. 7.8 to allow clearly for typification using nonprotologue elements would eliminate the need to differentiate nomenclaturally between *Peziza* L. and *Peziza* “Fr.”.

We also note that despite the passage of 29 years since sanctioning became a reality, it is exceedingly difficult to find a clear cut case of the typification of a species name in accord with the sanctioning description that is not linked to the protologue for the name. This raises a question as to whether Art. 7.8 is needed for ranks below that of genus. Instead mycologists have sometimes opted to “neotypify” sanctioned species names using the sanctioning author’s concept and often ignoring either original materials consisting of published illustrations or illustrations cited in the sanctioning work (e.g. Hallenberg in Mycotaxon 18: 182. 1983). It is difficult to reconcile application of the term “neotype” with the current wording of Arts. 7.8 and 9.6.

We therefore, propose two solutions to the typification process for sanctioned names: (1) either eliminate Art. 7.8, or (2) adopt a modified Art. 7.8 together with modifications of other affected articles.

Alternative 1:

(223) Delete Art. 7.8.

Alternative 2: Enact the following series of proposals:

(224) Amend Art. 7.8 to read as follows (new text in bold):

7.8. Typification, **termed sanctiotypification**, of names **lacking a holotype** adopted in one of the works specified in Art. 13.1(d), and thereby sanctioned (Art. 15), **may be effected in the light of anything based on any element** associated with the name in that work.

(225) Add a new Art 9.6bis and two examples:

“9.6bis. A **sanctiotype** is a specimen or illustration selected to serve as the nomenclatural type of a sanctioned name (see Arts. 7.8

and 15) from among any element associated with the name in the sanctioning work (see Art. 13.1(d)) and may be an element explicitly or implicitly excluded by, or from, the protologue. Lectotypes for sanctioned names designated before 1 January 2013 become sanctiotypes if associated with and included within the taxon bearing the name in the sanctioning work.”

“*Ex. 3bis.* Clements & Shear (Gen. Fung.: 348. 1931), the first to designate a type not using an “American Code” rule, selected *Agaricus infundibuliformis* Schaeff.: Fr. [ut ‘*C. infundibulis* (Schaeff.) Fr.’] as ‘type’ of *Agaricus* ‘trib.’ *Clitocybe* Fr. (Syst. Mycol. 1: 78. 1821) [ut ‘*Clitocybe* Fr.’]; therefore *A. infundibuliformis* is the sanctiotype of *Clitocybe* (Fr.) Staude and its Friesian subgeneric ‘tribus’ basionym.”

“*Ex. 3ter.* Weber (in Wiggers, Fl. Holsat. Suppl.: 12–14. 1787), when publishing *Patella stercorea*, included *Helvella lentiformis* Scopoli (in Fl. Carniol., ed. 2: 481. 1772) in synonymy. Independently Bulliard (Herb. France: pl. 438 f. 4. 1790) validated (Art. 42.3) the names *Peziza stercorea* and *Peziza ciliata* (l.c.: pl. 438, fig. 2). Persoon (Observ. Mycol. 2: 89. 1799) cited Wiggers (l.c.) when he proposed the name *Peziza stercorea*, yet simultaneously listed *H. lentiformis* as a synonym of *Peziza lenticularis* (l.c.: 86). Fries (Syst. Mycol. 2: 87. 1822), citing Persoon (l.c. 1799) as the earliest treatment under the binomial, effectively sanctioned *Peziza stercorea* (Weber in Wigg.: Fr.) Pers. The basionym, *Patella stercorea* Weber in Wigg., is not to be automatically typified by the type of *H. lentiformis* (Art. 7.5). Denison (in Mycologia 56: 727. 1964) proposed as “lectotype” of “*Peziza stercorea* Persoon ex Fries” an undated Persoon specimen, not reliably linked to either the protologue or the sanctioning work. Moravec (in Czech. Mycol. 47: 11. 1993) superseded Denison’s typification (Art. 9.6*bis*) and effectively sanctiotypified *Peziza stercorea* (Weber in Wigg.: Fr.) Pers. with non-original material, an illustration (Bulliard, l.c.: pl. 438, f. 2. 1790, ‘*P. ciliata*’ as differentiated from ‘*P. stercorea* Bull.’) cited by the sanctioning author. Moravec (l.c.) additionally epiotypified the sanctiotype.”

(226) Add a new Art. 9.17*bis* and example:

“9.17*bis.* The author who first designates a sanctiotype (whether as such or when using earlier Codes, either by previously recognizing or by designating a ‘type’ now eligible as a sanctiotype – see Art. 9.6*bis*) must be followed unless (a) the designation may be superseded by being largely based upon a mechanical means (Art. 10.5(b)); or (b) it is in serious conflict with the sanctioning treatment.”

“*Ex. 8bis.* Seaver (in Mycologia 19: 88. 1927 and in N. Amer. Cup-Fung., Operc.: 219. 1928) proposed *Peziza cochleata* L.: Fr. as type of “*Peziza* (Dill.) L.” explicitly utilizing the “American Code of Botanical Nomenclature”. His choice, although based upon an original species, was superseded by Clements & Shear (Gen. Fung.: 328. 1931), who chose *P. vesiculosa* Bull.: Fr., a non-original element but one included in the genus in the sanctioning publication (Fries in Syst. Mycol. 2(1): 40. 1822; see also Art. 10 *Ex. 2bis*)”

(227) In Art. 10.5(a) add:

“except in the case of sanctiotypes where the sanctioning treatment is treated with equivalence to a protologue” before the comma in the phrase “which is not in conflict with the protologue.”

(228) Implement the following corollary changes:

In Art. 7.5, add “, nor to their basionyms.” after the phrase “does not apply to names sanctioned under Art. 15.”

In Art. 8.1 add: “, sanctiotype” after the word “lectotype”.

In Rec. 8A add: “, a sanctiotype” after the word “lectotype”.

In Art. 9.6 add at the end: “, or in the case of sanctioned names, no specimen or illustration would qualify to serve as a sanctiotype”.

In Art. 9.7, add: “, sanctiotype,” after each use of “lectotype”.

In Art. 9.11 add: “, or for sanctioned names, if all elements qualified to serve as a sanctiotype are missing” after the word “missing” and add “or sanctiotype” after the word lectotype.

In Art. 9.14 add: “or sanctiotype” after the word lectotype, and add “, or for sanctioned names, all other elements qualified to serve as a sanctiotype” after the phrase “original material”.

In Art. 9.15 add: “, sanctiotype” after the word lectotype, and add “, sanctiotypification” after the word “lectotypification”.

In Art. 9.16 replace: “or lectotype” with “, lectotype or sanctiotype”.

In Art. 10 Note 1, replace: ‘and “lectotype”’ with ‘, “lectotype”, and “sanctiotype”’.

In Art. 10.2 add: “, or if it is a sanctioned name (cf. Art. 15)” at the end of the first sentence.

Add in Art. 10: “*Ex. 2bis.* Clements & Shear (Gen. Fung.: 328. 1931) selected as ‘type’ of the sanctioned name, *Peziza* Dill. ex L.: Fr. [ut *Peziza* (Dill.) L.] (Sp. Pl. 2: 1180. 1753; Syst. Mycol. 2: 40. 1822), *Peziza vesiculosa* Bull.: Fr. (Herb. France 10: t. 457, fig. 1. 1790; Syst. Mycol. 2: 52. 1822), even though *P. vesiculosa* was not an original Linnaean taxon and several original Linnaean species were included in the sanctioning work. Clements & Shear effectively sanctiotypified *Peziza* Dill. ex L.: Fr., which retains its priority dating back to 1753.”

“In Art. 10.5(b) add: “, including that of sanctioned names.”

(229) Add a new Art. 15.7 and example:

“15.7. A sanctioned name may be a later homonym automatically created under Art. 48.1 prior to publication in the sanctioning work, attributable to the author who originally excluded the type, as defined by 48.1, or a later homonym attributable only to the sanctioning author, specifically when the holotype, as defined by Art. 8.1, was first excluded explicitly when the name was sanctioned.”

“*Ex. 4bis.* Tode (in Schriften Berlin. Ges. Naturf. Freunde 5: 53. 1784) published the generic name *Hysterium* Tode with a single species, *H. quadrilabiatum* Tode, which is therefore the original type (Arts. 9.1, 10.1). Tode (in Fung. Mecklenb. Sel. 2: V–VI, 4. 1791) excluded the original type and published a new generic description, thereby creating a later homonym (Art. 48.1). Fries (Syst. Mycol. 2: 594. 1823) also excluded *H. quadrilabiatum* while specifically citing Tode’s 1791 publication. Bisby (in Trans. Brit. Mycol. Soc. 8: 186. 1923) designated *Hysterium pulicare* (Lightf.: Fr.) Pers. (in Mag. Bot. 1: 85. 1794), a species accepted by Fries (l.c.), as ‘type’ of “*Hysterium* Fries”, which action effectively sanctiotypified *Hysterium* Tode (1791): Fr. (1823), non *Hysterium* Tode 1784.”

(230) In Art. 15 add a new Note:

“Note 2. The type of a sanctioned name that is conserved need not be a sanctiotype (cf. Art. 15.6).”

(231) Add the following new Recommendation:

“9C.1. It is recommended that, when not nomenclaturally destabilizing and not in conflict with the sanctioning treatment, a sanctiotype be selected from original materials.”

(232) Add the following two examples in Art. 9:

“*Ex. 6bis.* Rossman & al. (in Stud. Mycol. 42: 86. 1999) effectively sanctiotypified the name *Sphaeria rufa* Pers.: Fr. (Persoon, Observ. Mycol. 1: 20. 1796; Fries, Syst. Mycol. 2(2): 335. 1823) when

they designated the exsiccatum Fries Scler. n. 303 (UPS) cited by Fries (l.c.) to be the ‘neotype’.”

“*Ex. 8ter.* Hallenberg (in Mycotaxon 18: 182. 1983) proposed as a ‘neotype’ a modern specimen for *Hericium coralloides* (Scop. : Fr.) Pers. Illustrations published by Micheli (1729) and Schaeffer (1762) cited in the protologue of the basionym, *Hydnum coralloides* Scop. : Fr.

(Fl. Carniol., ed. 2, 2: 472. 1772) and other illustrations cited by Fries (Syst. Mycol. 1: 408–409. 1821) eligible to serve as sanctiotype (Art. 9.6*bis*) were overlooked. The designation of a ‘neotype’ contravened Art. 9.6 and furthermore, because the designated specimen was not associated with the sanctioning work, it is not a sanctiotype.”

(233–237) Five “housekeeping” proposals to amend the *Vienna Code*

Nicholas J. Turland

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

(233) Amend Art. 9.4 as follows (new text in bold):

“9.4. A syntype is any specimen cited in the protologue when there is no holotype, or any one of two or more specimens simultaneously designated as types. **For this purpose, citing or designating a gathering, or part thereof, is considered citation of the included specimens.**”

If this proposal is rejected, Art. 37 Note 1, the word “(syntypes)” in Art. 37 Ex. 2, and the phrase “(see also Art. 37 Note 1)” in Art. 9.4 could be deleted editorially, just as they were added editorially by the Editorial Committee of the *Vienna Code*. However, I would prefer the Nomenclature Section of the Melbourne Congress to decide whether the consequence of citing a gathering (or part thereof) that consists of more than one specimen renders those specimens syntypes.

(234) Amend Art. 9.4 and 9.5 as follows (new text in bold):

“9.4. A syntype is any specimen cited in the protologue when there is no holotype, or any one of two or more specimens simultaneously designated **in the protologue** as types (see also Art. 37 Note 1).”

“9.5. A paratype is a specimen cited in the protologue that is neither the holotype nor an isotype, nor one of the syntypes if two or more specimens were simultaneously designated **in the protologue** as types.”

These minor additions are to prevent any possible misunderstanding that specimens could be designated as syntypes subsequent to the protologue.

(235) Add a new Note to Art. 46 (after Art. 46.3):

“*Note n.* A name or its validating description or diagnosis without an ascription is treated as ascribed to the author or authors of the publication as defined in Art. 46.5.”

This is already implicit in Art. 46.3, in that the direct association between the author(s) of a publication and any names and validating descriptions or diagnoses therein constitutes ascription by default, i.e., in the absence of any evidence of a different ascription. This is also standard practice, e.g., the names and validating diagnoses published by Linnaeus in *Species plantarum* are not explicitly ascribed to him but are treated as if they were. I believe a Note would be helpful to make explicit what is implicit.

(236) Add a new Note to Art. 46 (after Art. 46.3):

“*Note nn.* When the name of a new taxon is validly published by reference to a previously and effectively published description or diagnosis (Art. 32.1(d)), that description or diagnosis retains the same ascription as in the earlier publication.”

Again, this is implicit in Art. 46.3, for the reasons given above. This is, in fact, already illustrated by Art. 46 Ex. 6, 9, 12 and 13, at least one of which Examples could be moved to follow the new Note.

(237) Append a sentence to Art. 60.9:

“60.9. [...] Except to separate identical letters, a hyphen is not permissible in adjectival epithets that should agree in gender with the generic name.”

This proposal is aimed at reducing uncertainty as to whether a hyphen should be used in a compound epithet. When an epithet is formed from words that usually stand independently, it should be apparent that a hyphen is to be used to separate the words, e.g., in *Aster novae-angliae* (adjective-noun, “of New England”) or *Impatiens noli-tangere* (verb-verb, “don’t touch”) or even *Huernia saudi-arabica* (adjective-adjective, “Saudi Arabian”). Conversely, it should be apparent that a hyphen is not to be used when one or more parts of a compound epithet are not words that stand independently. For example, the compounding form *pseudo* in *Acer pseudoplatanus* is not an independent word but the modified stem of the Greek adjective ψευδής (*pseudēs*, “false”), while *platanus* stands independently as a noun (Greek πλάτανος, “plane tree”). Similarly, in *Cinnamomum austro-yunnanense*, the compounding form *austro* is not an independent word but a modified stem of the Latin adjective *australis* (“southern”) or noun *auster* (“south”), while *yunnanense* stands independently as an adjective (“relating to Yunnan”). Even though some might perceive no ambiguity at all in these examples, far from all taxonomists are linguists. I believe that the additional sentence proposed here for Art. 60.9 will considerably reduce the number of cases where taxonomists need to ponder on whether a compound epithet is composed of words that “usually stand independently” and therefore should be hyphenated. Instead, a relatively simple mechanical rule can be applied. The slight difference to the status quo would be epithets such as “*saudi-arabica*”, which agree in gender with the generic name but are formed of words that stand independently. These would lose a hyphen under the revised Art. 60.9.

Incidentally, I have used the words “*should* agree in gender” because an adjectival epithet could be published with the wrong gender, which is of course an error correctable under Art. 32.7. If this Proposal is passed, the Editorial Committee could include suitable Example(s), which may already exist in Art. 60.

Acknowledgements

I thank John McNeill (E) for advice in the formulation of this set of proposals. Proposal 237 resulted from a suggestion by Werner Greuter (B, PAL).