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PROPOSALS TO REVISE ICBN

(91) A proposed recommendation for labelling type specimens.

Most herbaria are rightly proud of having type material in their possession, they take special care of it, often filing it separately or in special folders. Authors in the last century usually did not indicate on their herbarium sheets what they considered their original material when they established new taxa, such as is now required. In many cases it has been possible for later students by different means to prove what specimens could with certainty be considered the type, and the sheet has then been labelled “type” (isotype etc.).

Great care has to be taken before such a determination is made. Study of the original literature must be combined with taxonomic study of the specimen in question, evaluation of the different labels attached, the handwriting, etc. To attach a type label should involve a firm judgment based on all circumstantial evidence so as to ensure that the specimen in question is actually the one the original author had in his hand. Is a specimen with a Wall. Cat. number in Wallich’s herbarium the type, or is the type specimen rather the one with the same number in Lindley’s herbarium? Are the many specimens in the Reichenbach herbarium now marked with a red type label actually Reichenbach’s type?

This reminder is not just intended to encourage students to consider carefully the responsibility they undertake when they attach any kind of type indication to an old herbarium sheet. It is also a proposal that we all agree that a student, when undertaking this action, should add his name and a date for his choice.

This could probably best be done as a recommendation to Art. 7 of the ICBN, as proposed below. Alternatively, such a recommendation could be added to Art. 8 or incorporated into the Guide for the determination of types. As the ICBN is now, there is no requirement or recommendation on this matter.

(91) 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.

Proposed by: Gunnar Seidenfaden, Botanical Museum, University of Copenhagen, 130 Gothersgade, DK-1123 Copenhagen K, Denmark.

(92) Proposal to amend Art. 9.3.

Names of several recently published genera of fungi are based on living cultures rather than permanently preserved specimens as the holotype of the type species. Three genera are yeasts or yeast-like fungi—Hyphozyma De Hoog and Smith (1981), Clavispora Rodrigues de Miranda (1979), and Sterigmatosporidium Kraepelin and Schulze (1982). The fourth, Bartaliniopsis Singh (1972), is in the Sphaeropsidales.

These names are not validly published under Art. 37.1 because Art. 9.5 requires that “Type specimens of names of taxa must be preserved permanently and cannot be living plants or cultures.” However, under Art. 9.3, “If it is impossible to preserve a specimen as the type of a name of a species . . . , or if such a name is without a type specimen, the type may be a description or figure.”

In none of these publications did the author state that it would have been impossible to permanently
preserve a type specimen that would communicate anything about the distinguishing characters of the
taxon. However, one might assume that this is the case, at least with the yeasts and yeast-like fungi.
My question then, as editor of Index Nominum Genericorum, was whether these names are validly
published. If it is true that it was impossible to permanently preserve a type specimen, then under
Art. 9.3, the description or figure would suffice. If, however, the requirement for a permanently
preserved specimen was simply overlooked by the authors, the names are not validly published under
Art. 37.1 and consequently, the generic names are not validly published under Art. 10.1 as revised at
Sydney. As the deadline for the first Supplement to ING approached, I decided to give these names
the benefit of a doubt and include them in the Supplement.

Prop. (92) To avoid such ambiguity in the future and to provide a way of dealing with names published
between 1 January 1958 and 1 January 1990, I propose 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."
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**Proposed by:** Ellen R. Farr, Department of Botany, NHB 166, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

(93) The problem of non-binary species names in works published after 1 May 1753, with a proposal
to amend ICBN.

The problems concerning validity of names proposed in works in which both binary and other kinds
of nomenclature for species are used have recently been considered in *Taxon* and elsewhere, but in
fact these problems have a long history in association with the International Code of Botanical
Nomenclature and its predecessors.

Congress in Vienna that works in which anything but binary nomenclature for species was used should
not be taken into consideration, even when these works were published after 1753. The proposal was
debate that it was the fate of the generic names published in the works with non-binary nomenclature
for species that was the stumbling-block of the proposal.

Wilmott (Int. Bot. Congr. Cambridge, Proposals by British Botanists: 201. 1929) made a similar
proposal, summarized in the table of contents of the Proposals as “Names proposed by non-binaryist
authors to be rejected.” The proposal was not recommended by the Rapporteur général, J. Briquet
(Recueil synoptique . . . du 5. Congr. Int. Cambridge: 12. 1930), again because the proposal would
lead to rejection of well established generic names, and at the Congress the proposal was not carried

the same content, but with an actual list of works to be rejected. The list contained 24 works not
employing “Linnaean biverbal nomenclature for species”; 3 works containing generic names only, but