several generic names in modern botanical literature. Another reason is the diversity of conceptions, that affects negatively the nomenclature used in syntaxonomy — however still uncodified —, where the correct genitive form of the name (in accordance with the correct grammatical gender) causes uncertainty and heterogenity.

Based on a great many generic plant names, both superior and inferior, having several concrete examples for the cases enumerated in our proposals here, we have drawn up these detailed recommendations, hoping they would be able to explain more easily and clearly to those botanists who have such problems.

Preparing these recommendations, we have had in view the following points:
- to remain in accordance both with the tendency of Rec. 75A (Code 1972) and the practice used in the past,
- to find easier possibilities to establish the correct grammatical gender, placing the names into one of the prescriptions included in these recommendations,
- to continue the Latin grammatical tendency in these solutions,
- to maintain the grammatical gender of those plant names having consistent grammatical gender in the ancient literature, which had been assumed in their unalterable forms, to avoid their too artificial and undesirable alteration,
- we must make difference between the second substantival compound of the name, that often is used as an adjective with 3, 2 or a single invariable form for all the grammatical genders.

Proposal 142. Appendix III: Nomina generica conservanda et rejicienda

Justification: Cf. Pritzel, Thesaurus p. 341: 'Dissertationem die 29 Martii 1780 sub praesidio J. Chr. Kerstens proposuit Fr. H. Wiggers, sed autorem se professus est cl. G. H. Weber'.

VARIOUS PROPOSALS


The nomenclature of the 'Fungi caeteri' is complicated by unique difficulties. Valid publication of those names begins January 1, 1821, which also is the arbitrarily fixed publishing date for Systema Mycologicum, vol. 1. But, alas, the major part of the Fungi caeteri are not treated in that volume, viz. the Phycomycetes, most Ascomycetes, and the Imperfecti. As a matter of fact, these large and important groups are in reality devoid of a starting-point book, in contrast to all other groups of plants. This situation has very annoying consequences for the workers on the fungi concerned — we have extraordinary trouble in ascertaining the place and date of valid publication of pre-starting-point names, i.e. the first valid publication after Jan. 1, 1821. We are charged with the heavy burden of scanning a great number of often very obscure and rare books, which have attained quite disproportionate importance only because of being published in the early 1820's. Even very peripheral papers must be considered, as the mere mention of a pre-starting-point name can constitute valid publication (Art. 32, Note 2). And even if we theoretically could get a complete inventory of all publications from that period mentioning a fungus name, we still be confronted with unsurmountable dating problems.

To take one example: Sphaeria concentrica Bolton is a well-known Pyrenomycete. Where is the name validly published? In the Seattle Code, p. 256, the validation is ascribed to S. F. Gray (A Natural Arrangement of British Plants, Nov. 1, 1821). But the name was also published by Fries in the same year, in his exsiccata Scleromyceti Sueciae, as No. 141, in sched. Nobody can tell whether Fries's validation was anterior or posterior to Gray's. There are no doubt numerous cases like this, something which is highly unsatisfactory, for a validated name must by typified in accordance with the protologue of the validating author. This state of affairs means in short that an enormous amount of precious time is wasted on scanning old literature — which to a great extent is mycologically irrelevant — and that these efforts nevertheless may be in vain, for often we have to bow before unsolvable problems of chronology.
I think we must get rid of this tragicomic situation. As far as the Ascomycetes are concerned I would suggest this procedure: It seems to be the natural solution to have a starting-point book where the great majority of the pre-starting-point names are listed. The evident choice is Systema Mycologicum vol. 2, which also functioned as starting-point book before the unfortunate decision at the Stockholm Congress. There is a minor inconvenience that vol. 2 was issued in two parts, in different years: part 1, dealing principally with the Discomycetes appeared in 1822, and part 2, treating the Pyrenomycetes, in 1823. This inconvenience can easily be overcome by arbitrarily fixing the date of part 1 as Dec. 31, 1822, and of part 2 as Jan. 1, 1823.

In short my proposal is to exclude the Ascomycetes from the ‘Fungi caeteri’ and to give them a real starting-point book.

This solution is not ideal: 1) Some Ascomycetes, viz. the Geoglossaceae were treated already in Syst. Mycol. vol. 1, and those few names will consequently be devalidated again. 2) A small number of relevant pre-starting-point names were not listed in Syst. Mycol. vol. 2. These inconveniences, however, seem to be small compared with the great simplification which will be won. And I do not think that there is any ideal solution.

Proposed by: LENNART HOLM, Institute of Systematic Botany, University of Uppsala, Uppsala, Sweden.

Proposal 144. In Art. 14, Note 3, in line 2 read ‘exact synonym’ instead of ‘nomenclatural synonym’ and in line 4 read ‘qualified synonym’ instead of ‘taxonomic synonym’.

**Argument.** An adjective qualifies a noun, it circumscribes it. ‘Nomenclatural synonym’ can only mean, in English, a synonym to do with nomenclature. This is meaningless, its only possible construction being ‘another name to do with naming’. Likewise a taxonomic synonym can only mean one to do with taxonomy. As taxonomy is dependent on nomenclature, that too is meaningless. It cannot mean a synonym dependent on taxonomic judgement. If it is to be so interpreted, then it would have to read ‘taxonomic-judgement synonym’.

Other possibilities exist which could be used e.g. instead of ‘exact’, ‘precise’ would do; and for ‘qualified’ ‘imprecise’. The proposal, or these alternatives, at once alert the mind on the right lines, the present adjectives being meaningless in themselves, do not.

Proposed by: W. L. TJADEN Welling, Kent, U.K.

Proposal 145. To add a new note to the proposed new Art. 16.

In phycology it is customary to shorten away the second part of a certain type of two-membered generic names in front of the endings -phyceae and -phyta. The following proposal aims at including such shortened class and division names among the automatically typified names for which the principle of priority should be recommended according to the proposal by the committee Cronquist (Taxon 23: 422).

*Add a new Note to the proposed new Art. 16: ‘Where one of the stems -monado-, -cocco-, -nemato- or -clado- as second part of a generic name has been omitted in front of the ending -phyceae or -phyta, the shortened class or division name is still regarded as based on the generic name in question if such derivation is obvious or is indicated at establishment of the group name.’

‘Examples: The class name Prasinophyceae is regarded as being based on the generic name Prasinocladus in agreement with the indication by Chadefaud (Rev. sci. 85: 862. 1947). The division name Chrysophyta may be regarded as automatically typified by the generic name Chrysococcum if reintroduced as based on that name.’

The proposed addition will make it possible to avoid replacement of many existing shorter names with longer alternatives for the purpose of automatic typification, and will also allow for formation of shorter new names where no automatically typified names exist. Thus one may maintain the class names Cryptophyceae, Dinophyceae, Rhaphidophyceae, Chrysophyceae, Prasinophyceae and Chlorophyceae with the division names corresponding with many of them, and introduce shorter new names such as Tribophyceae and Pedinophyceae where no automatically typified names exist, avoiding longer forms as Cryptomonadophyceae, Tribonematophyceae and Pedinomonadophyceae. It is thought to be important for teaching as well as for other purposes that names of major groups should not be long and complicated. The shortened forms are relatively easy to handle both...
orally and written, and are also easily assimilated to most modern languages (though less so with English) by a change of the ending, as for instance in French 'une Dinophycee'. This proposal presupposes acceptance of that put forward by the committee Cronquist. Such acceptance, on the other hand, is independent of views on the present proposal.

Proposed by: Tyge Christensen, Copenhagen.

Proposal 146: Article 23. After the word 'tautonym' and examples (paragraph 7, also line 16), add:

A name is regarded as a tautonym if an orthographic variant of the specific epithet exactly repeats the generic name.

Example: *Lycopersicon lycopersicum* (L.) Karst. ex Farwell has the earlier orthographic variants *Lycopersicum lycopersicum* (L.) Karst. and *Lycopersicon lycopersicon* (L.) Karst. ex Britton et Brown.

The name *Lycopersicon lycopersicum* (L.) Karst. ex Farwell is so close to being a tautonym that it violates the intention of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (1972), Article 23, to reject tautonyms. The specific epithet has the Latin ending of the Greek generic name differs only in the final two letters. Both spellings are orthographic variants and have been used for both the generic name and the specific epithet. As in the past, workers would confuse the two terminations.

This amendment would help to preserve usage of established names against unfamiliar combinations that are almost tautonyms. The number of names affected probably is small. Another example is *Inga ynga* (Vell.) J. W. Moore.


Proposal 147. To add a new paragraph to Rec. 23B.

In the botanical nomenclature of the past there are, as is well known, many orthographic variants among names and epithets derived from the names of localities or from the names of the persons. In the floristic works of the Middle Asian botanists we can find many examples of such variants, for instance: dschungaricus, dshungaricus, dsungaricus, songaricus, soongaricus and soongoricus; saravschanicus, sarawschanicus, saravshamicus, sarawshamicus and the generic name Zeravschania; severtzovii, severzovii, sewerzovii, sewerzowii etc.

In order to avoid in the future the creation of new orthographic variants I propose to add to the Recommendation 23B a new paragraph:

'(k) In making specific epithets derived from geographical names or from the names of persons to follow the generally accepted spelling or, in cases of the names of persons, the spelling which was commonly used by these persons themselves.'

Proposed by: V. P. Goloskokov (Alma-Ata, 480100 USSR).

Proposal 148. Change Article 28, second paragraph to read:

'Variants that arise in cultivation through hybridization, mutation, selection or other processes, and which are of sufficient interest to cultivators to be distinguished by a name, receive cultivar epithets in common language (i.e. fancy epithets) markedly different from the Latin epithets of species and infraspecific taxa.'

The above changes bring Article 28 of the Botanical Code into harmony and accord with the International Code of Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants. Furthermore, the deletion of the phrase 'of infraspecific rank' in the first line of this paragraph eliminates the inference that variants worthy of recognition as cultivars must comprise or potentially constitute an infraspecific taxon. The use of 'infraspecific taxa' to replace 'varieties' as the last word in this paragraph also eliminates any confusion between varieties in the horticultural sense and botanical *varietas*, and also includes within its context names of other ranks below the level of species, such as *formae*.


Proposal 149. Art. 35. Add example to clarify application. The following example is suggested to the Editorial Committee:
Orobanche * Gymnocaulis Nuttall (Gen. N. Amer. Pl. 2: 59. 1818) was first assigned a definite rank (section) by Pfeiffer (Nomencl. Bot. 1: 1523. 1874), thus becoming post facto Orobanche sect. Gymnocaulis Nuttall 1818.

While the Editorial Committee undoubtedly believes that the present wording is unequivocal, recent published work indicates otherwise. For instance, Thieret (J. Arnold Arb. 52: 425. 1971) interprets Art. 35 to mean that the date of valid publication of the name of a rankless taxon is that date when a definite assignment of rank was made. Tracing the development of Art. 35 from Rec. XXI in the Cambridge Code to its present form will show that this interpretation is erroneous. Following the choice of the person who first assigned a definite rank to a rankless taxon is a specific case of the principle of 'first reviser', as it is called in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (a document to which I frequently turn for clarification of our own Code). Other specific cases are (1) following the first choice made among competing alternative names published before 1 Jan. 1953 (Art. 34, part 2) and (2) following the first choice when two or more taxa bearing names or epithets of the same date are united (Art. 57).

Proposed by: Paul C. Silva, Department of Botany, University of California, Berkeley 94720.

Proposal 150. Change Article 35 to read:

'A new name published without indication of rank of the taxon concerned is not validly published. Valid publication of such names (provided that other requirements for valid publication are fulfilled) is accomplished by the first author to assign a definite rank, and such names are dated from the publication by the rank-assigning author, who is also the publishing author.'

Examples: 'Orobanche * Gymnocaulis Nuttall (Gen. N. Amer. Pl. 2: 59. 1818) was first assigned a definite rank by Pfeiffer (Nomencl. Bot. 1: 1523. 1874); the sectional epithet Gymnocaulis thus dates from 1874, not 1818, and the combination is cited as Orobanche sect. Gymnocaulis Nutt. ex Pfeiffer, or, if only the publishing author is cited, as Orobanche sect. Gymnocaulis Pfeiffer (cf. Recommendation 46C). Similarly, the name Anoplanthus a. Euanoplon Endlicher (Gen. Pl. 727. 1839) was validated by Walpers (Repertorium 3: 480. 1844) at the rank of section. As a result, Euanoplon is an older sectional epithet than Gymnocaulis, and the correct name for this section of Orobanche in the circumscription adopted by Thieret is Orobanche sect. Euanoplon (Endl. ex Walp.) Thieret (Jour. Arnold Arb. 52: 425. 1971).'

'The name Triticum junceum * pungens Persoon (Syn. Pl. 1: 109. 1805) is not in any definite rank and is not validly published. The epithet pungens was taken up at specific rank and validly published in the combination Triticum pungens by De Candolle (Fl. Fr. ed. 3. 5 (Suppl.): 283. 1815). The name is cited as Triticum pungens Pers. ex. DC. or as Triticum pungens DC.'

Considerable confusion has resulted from differing interpretations of Article 35 of the International Code, since it is not clearly stated there whether a name competes for priority from the date of assignment of rank or from the date of the original publication without rank. The modifications proposed above would remove the ambiguity of Article 35 and bring it into line with the spirit of the Code by providing that any name proposed without indication of rank is not validly published until it has been assigned a rank. Since names compete for priority only within their own rank it is highly illogical that names without rank can be validly published and compete for priority until they have been assigned ranks. In addition, under the present wording, only the original author is cited even after rank has been assigned, and there is no means of reference to the author who assigned the rank that allows the name to compete for priority within that rank. The changed wording above would bring such names into accord with both Article 11 and those articles that deal with the conditions of valid publication.

While the opposing viewpoint is supported by a proposal submitted by colleagues from California, we think that our alternative is more in keeping with the other articles of the Code. The basic arguments advanced by Brummitt & Chater (Taxon 16: 403-406. 1967), who demonstrate some of the absurdities possible under the present wording of Article 35 if assignment of rank is retroactive to the original date of publication, appear
to us to be both logical and pertinent. We think, however, that the merits of their proposal to the Seattle Congress (1969) were obscured by confusion between publication of epithets and publication of combinations, and that it was this confusion that led to the defeat of their proposal at the Congress (although it had been overwhelmingly endorsed by the mail vote).

The wording of Article 35 that we propose is more drastic than that of Brummitt & Chater, but it avoids altogether the confusion between epithets and combinations and places the emphasis where we think it belongs – on the conditions for valid publication of any new name, not just those published since 1953.

Although some will argue that to require indication of rank before 1953 as a condition for valid publication will result in numerous nomenclatural changes, we have been able to find little evidence to this effect.


Proposition 151. De modification à l’article H 10.


Il y a lieu d’établir deux rangs différents pour les ‘groupes de formes hybrides’ et pour les ‘formes hybrides’, ces dernières gardant le rang ‘nothomorphes’.

On pourrait employer le rang ‘subhybrides’ pour les ‘groupes de formes hybrides’. ‘Subhybr.’ a déjà été utilisé par R. A. Graham (Watsonia, t. 1: 276-278, 1950) qui a distingué notamment Mentha × gentilis L. subhybr. gentilis, groupant plusieurs nothomorphes, de M. × gentilis subhybr. gracilis (Sole) R. A. Graham, ce dernier groupant les nothomorphes (‘var.’) gracilis et cardiaca (Baker) Briquet.

Le rang ‘subhybrides’ permettrait aussi de séparer les nothomorphes issus de deux sous-espèces différentes d’une même espèce parente. Ex. dans tous les croisements interspécifiques où intervient soit Mentha × spicata L. subsp. spicata, soit M. spicata subsp. glabratā (Lej. et Court.) Lebeau, les diverses ‘formes hybrides’ issues de la sous-espèce spicata diffèrent de celles issues de la sous-espèce glabratā par un ensemble de caractères qui donnent aux deux groupes de formes hybrides une individualité indéniable. Chacun de ces 2 groupes de formes hybrides pourrait être dénommé au rang de subhybrides, chaque subhybride comportant les diverses ‘formes hybrides’ au rang de nothomorphes (Voir J. Lebeau, Bull. Jard. nat. Belgique, 44, sous presse).

En conséquence, je propose pour les quatre premiers paragraphes de l’Article H 10 le nouveau texte suivant:

‘When different hybrid forms or groups of hybrid forms derived from the same parent species (including their infraspecific taxa) are treated as belonging to a collective hybrid taxon of rank equivalent to species, they are classed under the binary name applied to this taxon (see Art. H 3) like infraspecific taxa under the binary name of the species. The hybrid forms are termed nothomorphs and the group of hybrid forms are termed subhybrids; when it is desirable, a nothomorph or a subhybrid may be designated by an epithet preceded by its binary name and the term nothomorpha (abbreviated as nm.) or the term subhybrida (abbreviated as subhybr.).

In the hierarchy of ranks, nothomorph is equivalent to variety, and subhybrid is equivalent to subspecies (see also Art. 55).

Examples: Mentha × piperita L. (pro sp.) subhybr. piperita [= M. aquatica L. × spicata L. subsp. glabratā (Lej. et Court.) Lebeau] nm. piperita, et nm. piperoides Malinv. (pro var.) et nm. crispa Koch (pro var.); M. × piperita subhybr. nepetoides (Lej.) Lebeau (== M. aquatica × spicata subsp. spicata); Mentha × villosa Huds. (pro sp.) subhybr. villosa (= M. spicata L. subsp. spicata × suaveolens Ehrh.) nm. villosa, et nm. nemorosa (Willd.) Briq. (pro var.), et nm. gratissima (Web.) Rouy (pro var.), et nm. alopecuroides (Hull) Briq. (pro var.); M. × villosa subhybr. lamyi (Malinv.) Lebeau (== M. spicata subsp. glabratā (Lej. et Court.) Lebeau × suaveolens] nm. lamyi et nm. cordinifolia (Opiz) Lebeau.’

Proposed by: J. Lebeau (Brussels).