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NOMENCLATURE

TYPIFICATION OF MICROORGANISMS: A PROPOSAL

Ralph A. Lewin* & G. E. Fogg**

Rules and recommendations for the typification of many kinds of microorganisms, including microscopic algae and fungi, need to be updated for a variety of reasons. Improvements of fixation techniques normally make it unnecessary to invoke Article 9, Note 1, which relates to "the name of a species of infraspecific taxon of Recent plants of which it is impossible to preserve a specimen..." On the other hand, more and more taxonomy is being based on electron-microscopy, biochemistry, serology or other modern techniques for which living material may be needed, and for which a herbarium sheet is generally inadequate and a drawing, or even a photomicrograph, is for various reasons unsatisfactory. The following is therefore submitted as Recommendation 7.C, to be included in the ICBN.

PROPOSAL (9): Recommendation 7.C. "For microorganisms, type material should preferably be of a pure clone, preserved so as to conserve as many taxonomically important features as possible. In cases where taxonomically important microscopic or physiological features cannot be retained in dead and preserved specimens, every effort should be made to isolate, designate and conserve, in an established culture collection, viable material of a single pure type culture, if technically possible in a state (e.g., freeze-dried or under liquid nitrogen) which can be expected to minimize mutation or other change with time."

PROPOSAL (10) TO SUBSTITUTE THE TERM "PHYLUM" FOR "DIVISION" FOR GROUPS TREATED AS PLANTS


A growing appreciation of the unity of all organisms makes the current use of different terms—phylum and division—for a category of the same rank in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria, and International Code of Botanical Nomenclature increasingly undesirable. Within the unicellular eukaryotes, there are some groups that, being heterotrophic, are usually treated under the provisions of the zoological code, and others that, being autotrophic, are usually treated under the provisions of the ICBN. Thus, within this series of organisms, different taxa of the same rank will be differently referred to, as "divisions" or "phyla," depending merely on which code of nomenclature is applied to them—a anomalous and undesirable situation. As a consequence of this, some modern botanical texts (e.g., F. E. Round, "The Biology of the Algae," Ed. 2. St. Martin's Press, New York. 1973) have abandoned the term "division" for "phylum," a procedure which is, strictly speaking, contrary to the provisions of the ICBN, but one which is preferred by students of protists, who might be considered both zoologists and botanists.

There seems no advantage in maintaining two terms for an identical taxonomic category,
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and many disadvantages, particularly pedagogically. It is therefore proposed that the term "divisio" be replaced by the term "phylum" throughout the ICBN. This would necessitate the following changes: In Article 3, substitute the word "phylum" for "division"; in Article 4, substitute the word "phylum" for "division," and "subphylum" for "subdivision." The Editorial Committee is instructed to make comparable substitutions of "phylum" and "subphylum" for "division" and "subdivision" elsewhere in the Code, as for example in Recommendation 16A. Add a new Note 1 to Article 3: "Names originally published as divisions or subdivisions should be treated as if they had been published as phyla or subphyla, respectively."

**NOMINA CONSERVANDA ET REJICIENDA PROPOSITA.**


*Mesosphaerum* P. Browne, Hist. Jamaica, 257 (1756) (nomen rejic. prop.)

The genus Bystropogon, in its currently accepted sense, consists of probably not more than five species of shrubby Labiatae restricted to Madeira and the Canaries.

When the genus was originally proposed by l'Heritier in 1788, seven species were included, of which three are now placed in the genus *Hyptis*. One of these, *B. suaveolens*, now *Hyptis suaveolens*, is the type of the genus *Mesosphaerum* P. Browne, Hist. Jamaica: 257 (1756). Browne described only one species under his new genus *Mesosphaerum*, but having a polynomial, it is not validly published, although Browne's genera are accepted as valid. The genus was subsequently typified by Kuntze, who made the combination *M. suaveolens* (L.) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. Pl., 2: 525 (1891), and this is clearly the species referred to by Browne. The name *Mesosphaerum* has since been listed as a nomen rejiciendum under the conserved name *Hyptis* Jacquin, Collectanea 1: 101, 103 (1787), which is based on a different type, but, under Art. 14.6 it can be restored if considered a genus distinct from the nomen conservandum. In such circumstances, it would have priority over the name Bystropogon, and the latter name would have to be rejected as a nomen superfluum under Art. 63.

As there are no other names available for the genus, it seems important to ensure that the long-used name Bystropogon be kept to apply to it. In order to throw the problem open to discussion, and to stabilise the situation, it is here proposed that the name Bystropogon l'Herit. be conserved over *Mesosphaerum* P. Browne


(439) Proposal for the Conservation of the Diatom *Coscinodiscus argus* Ehrenberg as the type of the genus


Ehrenberg (1839) described Coscinodiscus as, "E Familia Bacillariorum. Lorica simplex bivalvis silicea, disciformis, cribrata. = Gallionella maxime depressa. Fossiles formae familiae catenam ex qua solutae videntur, nusquam retinuerunt." On the next page, he described five species: *C. argus, C.? centralis, C. lineatus, C. minor*, and *C. patina*, with figures only for the last two. The genus has been typified differently in Boyer (1927), Jousé (1963), and Ross & Sims (1974). This article supports the last typification and proposes conservation for the following reasons:

1. Boyer's choice of *C. radiatus* Ehrenb. (Boyer, 1927, p. 41) is untenable because it is not one of the five species described at the time the genus was first published, as previously pointed out by Ross and Sims (1974).

2. Jousé's choice of *C. lineatus* (Jousé, 1963, p. 98), one of the five original species Ehrenberg described, will be shown below to require extensive nomenclatural changes if it is accepted, although it has priority.