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the spelling *Anonna* is now accepted in preference to *Anona*; *Meliola albizziae* Hansford & Deighton, 1948, should be altered to *albizziae*, since the spelling *Albizia* is now accepted in preference to *Albizzia."

198. *New Recommendation 73I*: "Epithets composed of the stem of a substantive (often the generic name of a host plant) with the addition of either *incola* or *i-cola* (both derived from the stem of the Latin verb *colo*) are nouns in apposition, and epithets differing only in the spelling of the appended element ‘incola’ or ‘icola’ should be treated as orthographic variants. The epithet *corticola* is an error (perhaps now to be regarded as sanctioned by usage) for *corticicola*, and must be regarded as an orthographic variant of it.

**XVII. REGNUM AND SUBREGNUM?**

*Tyge Christensen (Copenhagen)*

In *Taxon* 7: 149 Fosberg proposes the introduction of a rank of subregnum for such groups as Fungi and Algae, subordinate to the Regnum Vegetabile, but comprising several divisions.

In the present author’s opinion, this proposal is inadvisable, as it will link the code more closely to an old and unnatural classification. On the contrary, it may now be time to detach the code from the Linnaean division of the living world into a Regnum Animale and a Regnum Vegetabile.

The primary division used by most present-day authors is a separation of organisms with a proper nucleus from organisms with a nuclear equivalent of different organisation. Among nuclear organisms the red algae are regarded by many palynologists as being primarily acontic, while organisms with flagella composed of eleven strands in all probability form a common natural group. Subdivision of the latter is on the basis of pigments and type of flagellation, an isoconic group comprising green algae and Cryptophyta, a heterocontic group uniting Chrysophyta, Phaeophyta, and Oomycetes, etc., and this subdivision, too, precedes any separation of plant and animal groups. Thus animal and algal euglenoids are currently grouped together, and so are algal and holozoic Chrysophyta. For the Metazoa a grouping together with the fungal chytrids and the algal *Pedinomonomas* has been proposed, all of which are opistoconic. Other animal groups show different types of flagellation, and must belong in other places. So, although much is highly uncertain in this sphere, there is little doubt that the categories named animals, algae, and fungi must be regarded as mere practical groups which, as such, have no place in a natural classification.

202. The code should be a formal guide to taxonomists, but should not favour any particular classification. So, instead of inserting a rank between division and regnum, it is proposed that Regnum Vegetabile should be removed from the enumeration of systematic ranks given in *Article 4*, thus leaving authors free to group the divisions as they think best, with more or fewer superior ranks, and with algal, fungal, and animal divisions arranged and connected as agrees best with the actual state of science.

**XVIII. PROPOSALS BY YAROSLAV PROKHANOV (U.S.S.R.)**

203. Add to *Article 53* the following examples: "*Stipa pennata* L. (Sp. Pl. 1753) has been split into several species all bearing other names. Mansfeld (Verzeichnis Pfl. Deutsch. 1940) rightly reintroduced this name for one of the species, namely *Stipa joannis* Cel. (Oesterr. Bot. Zeitschr. 34: 318. 1884). The latter has to be abandoned."

The introduction of this example, even at the expense of others, is highly desirable
because it would clarify this Article on one of the most usual steppe plants.

204. Add to Article 55 the following example (after Tsuga mertensiana): "The species comprising the cultivated soya-bean was published by Linnaeus twice: as Phaseolus max and as Dolichos soja. The species has been transferred to Glycine first by Siebold and Zuccarini (1843), who made use of the latter name, but misapplied it to the wild soya species of Japan, Glycine ussuriensis Regel and Maack. Nevertheless the name Glycine soja (L.) Sieb. and Zucc. is the correct one for the cultivated species in the original sense of Linnaeus."

The last part of Art. 55 is often insufficiently apprehended. I think a second example based on an important economic plant would be of good service.

205. Add to Article 57 the following example: "Fiori and Paoletti (Fl. Ital. I (1): 107. 1896) rightly united Triticum aestivum L. (Sp. Pl. 85. 1753) and T. hibernum L. (Lc.) into one species under one of these names, T. aestivum L. Consequently the latter name is obligatory for the combined taxon comprising common soft wheat. The creation of a new name or the use of an illegitimate one, such as Triticum vulgare Vill. (Pl. Dauph. 2: 153) is inadmissable. Furthermore T. vulgare has exactly the same circumscription as T. aestivum, originally also referring only to the summer varieties of soft wheat."

I think it is important to include this vital example (even, if necessary, at the expense of another, not so important). Such a significant example will not only help better understanding of the rule, but also it will stabilize the nomenclature of this leading food-plant, according to the Code.

206. Add to Article 60 the following example: "Valeriana locusta var. olitoria L. When transferred to Valerianella must not be named Valerianella olitoria (L.) Poll., because in the specific rank there is already an epithet available, namely locusta, the type of which is var. olitoria. The name must accordingly be Valerianella locusta (L.) Beteke."

It seems to me desirable to have in Art. 60 an additional example specially concerned with a complicated case of simultaneous change of rank and of transference to another genus.

207. Add to Article 62 the two following examples: ".... — The name Scilla sibirica Andrews (Bot. Repos. 5. pl. 304. 1804) must not be rejected because the species does not grow in Siberia. — The name Petrosimonia oppositifolia (Pall.) Zitw., based on Polycnenum oppositifolium Pall. (Reise 1: 422, 431, app. 484. 1771), must not be rejected because the species has leaves only partly opposite, and partly alternate, although there is another closely related species, Petrosimonia brachiat (Pall.) Bunge having all its leaves opposite."

The addition of these examples, I am convinced, is absolutely necessary, because all the available examples of Art. 62 are concerned merely with changes in orthography, which are not the main content of the article. Consequently none of the examples of Art. 62 directly pertain to this article.

208. Add to Article 64(1) the following example: "Picea excelsa (Lam.) Link is illegitimate, because it is based on Pinus excelsus Lam. (Fl. fran9. 2: 202. 1778), a superfluous name for Pinus abies L. (Sp. Pl. 1002. 1753). Under Picea the proper name is Picea abies (L.) Karst. (Deutsch. Fl. 325. 1880)."

The inclusion of this example concerning the name of this highly important timber-tree will help to overcome one of the most persistent nomenclatural errors. And besides, this example and the proposed example to Art. 57, both stabilizing the two names required by the Code, which are most embarrassing to the laymen, will tend to reduce the ill-founded desire for a special list of Nomina specifica conservanda.

209. Change Article 65 to be read as follows: "A name must be rejected as ambiguous (nomen ambiguum) if it originally referred to a taxon vaguely circumscribed or ill-defined and subsequently persistently restricted or typified in two or more irreconcilable manners."

"Examples: Lavandula spica L. (Sp. Pl. 572. 1753) included ....... must be rejected (see Kew Bull. 1932: 295. — Betula alba L. (Sp. Pl. 982. 1753) comprises in its original sense the two species Betula pendula Roth (Tent. fl. germ. 1: 405. 1788) and B. pubescens Ehrh. (Beitr. 6: 98. 1791). The name Betula alba was typified by Roth (1788) in the sense of B. pubescens and somewhat earlier by Du Roi (1771) in the sense of B. pendula. Subsequently it was used in either sense. It has
therefore become ambiguous and must be rejected. — *Funaria bulbosa* L. was typified by Miller in two opposite ways, at first (Gard. Dict. ed. 8. 1768) in the sense of *Funaria cava* (L.) Mill., or *Corydalis cava* (L.) Schweigg. et Kuerte, and then (Card. Dict. Abr. ed. 6. 1771) in the sense of *Funaria solida* (L.) Mill., or *Corydalis solida* (L.) Sw. Consequently the name must be rejected."

"This does not apply to the name of a taxon, originally well defined and circumscribed, so as to leave no doubt about its exact application but subsequently misapplied to other taxa outside its original limits. Such a name, if neglected, must be reinstated in its original sense, in view of the temporary character of the confusion involved, presenting no serious obstacle to the usage of the original name. If it is desirable to exclude all possible confusion from the beginning, the reinstating author may be cited after the name of the original author, preceded by the word rest. (restituit)."

"Examples: *Rhinanthus major* L. (Amen. Ac. 3: 53. 1756) originally referred strictly to one species, subsequently known as *Rhinanthus electorolophus* (Scop.) Poll. Unfortunately, the name *Rhinanthus major* was used by Ehrhart (Beitr. 6: 144. 1791), and persistently later on, outside its original circumscription, to indicate a different species. Nevertheless the latter must bear another name, *Rh. vernalis* (Zing.) B. Schischk. (the name *Rh. glaber* Lam. being illegitimate), and the name *Rhinanthus major* L. must be reinstated and used in its original sense. — Pugsley rightly reinstated *Orchis latifolia* L. (Sp. Pl. 941. 1753) in its original sense, because its original diagnosis leaves no ambiguity. The name *O. latifolia* L. rest. Pugsley must not be replaced by any later one, such as *Orchis strictifolia* Opiz (1825) or its misapplied conventional name *O. incarnata* auct., non. L."

The reason for advocating this amendment of Art. 65 is to create some certainty in the application of this article, by removing from it the unnecessary rejection of any originally well defined name on the ground of subsequent misapplications for which the original author is in no way responsible. At the same time any name of a taxon where there is ambiguity brought about by an original vague description which usually leads to various incompatible applications of the name must be permanently rejected.

210. Add to Article 74 the following examples:

1) At the end of paragraph (1) incorporate as follows: "...... e.g. *Thuja* (not *Thuya*), *Prunella* (not *Brunella")."

2) At the end of paragraph (2) incorporate as follows: "...... e.g. *Agrostemma* (not *Agrostema*), *Euonymus* (not *Evonymus")."

The addition of these very short examples, especially the one dealing with the spelling of *Euonymus*, I think, is highly desirable because it will help to overcome the continuous fluctuation in the orthography of the names. And besides, the presence of two examples at the end of Art. 74 paragraph (4) shows that there is no reason to object to the similar inclusion of second examples into the paragraphs (1) and (2) of Art. 74.

211. Add to Recommendation 75A the following examples:

1) At the end of paragraph (1) incorporate as follows:

"Examples: *Atriplex* should be neuter (not feminine) according to its classical gender, e.g. *Atriplex tataricum* L. — The names *Euonymus* and *Celastrus* should be feminine (not masculine) according to their classical gender, e.g. *Euonymus verrucosa* Scop. and *Celastrus orbiculata* L. — *Bidens* should be masculine as the words *dens*, *tridens* and the like are masculine."

2) Under (2), incorporate into the partial paragraph, beginning with the words: Examples of names formed from Greek words, at the head of the examples, the following:

"Examples of names formed from Greek words: *Parthenocissus* Planch. (in A. DC. Monogr. Phaner. 5(2): 446: 1887) formed from *parthenos* (fem.) and *Cissos*, or *cissus*, (masc.) must be masculine, in accordance with the gender of the last word, e.g. *Parthenocissus quinquefolius* (L.) Planch."

It is inconsistent that in Rec. 75A there should be conventional examples only under paragraph (3), whilst under paragraph (2) there are only special ones, and under paragraph (1) none at all. Also, by incorporating conventional examples, especially some controversial ones, it is possible not only to demonstrate the true gender of the names, but also to stabilize it.