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emulated since it is contrary to Rec. 21B.2. If the section Aulacospermae of Celsia were to be transferred to Verbascum at any rank it could not bear the epithet Aulacospermae in its new position.”

Comment: Ex. 2 is presently Art. 64 Ex. 12.

(262) Proposal to add the following new provision 24.6 (parallel to new 21.4) and examples (present 64 Ex. 14 and 16) to Art. 24, deleting present Art. 24 Note 1:

“24.6. An epithet may not be used for forming differently typified names of infraspecific taxa, even of different rank, within one species. Priority determines the correct usage of the epithet.”

“Ex. 6. Rouy and Foucaud (Fl. France 2: 30. 1895) published the name Erysimum hieracifolium var. longisiliquum with two different types for two different taxa under two different subspecies (E. hieracifolium subsp. strictum and subsp. pannonicum). Only one of these names, which are distinct only when cited in full, can be maintained and it is that selected under Art. 64.4.”

“Ex. 7. The name Anagallis arvensis var. caerulea (L.) Gouan (Fl. Monsp. 30. 1765) based on Anagallis caerulea L. makes the name Anagallis arvensis subsp. caerulea Hartman (Sw. Norsk. Exc.–Fl. 32. 1846) incorrect for the taxon for which Hartman adopted it.”

Comment: The present Art. 64 Ex. 13 is irrelevant and has been dropped.
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Proposed by: P. G. Parkinson, Alexander Turnbull Library, P.O. Box 12349, Wellington, New Zealand.

(263) Proposal to amend Art. 10.3.

Amend Art. 10.3 as follows: Delete “a specimen” and replace with “a specimen or other element.”

The type-method is the main instrument by which the Code pursues its objective to provide for a stable method of nomenclature. Throughout the Code the circumscription of the concept “type” is constant, as given in Art. 7.2: “a nomenclatural type is that element to which the name of a taxon is permanently attached”. In Art. 7.3 and 7.5 “type” is specified as “a specimen or other element”. At least it is clear what constitutes a type, and it should be so with the conceptual core of the Code. However, in Sydney Art. 10.3 was accepted where the circumscription of “type” was restricted to “specimen”. This restriction serves no useful purpose. It constitutes a relapse to unsatisfactory previous editions of the Code, e.g. the Stockholm one, which left room for doubts on the meaning of Art. 18 Note 3 and Art. 21 Note 2, the precursors of our present Art. 7.4 + 7.5 + 7.8 and 9.3, respectively (see De Wit in Webbia 11: 219). In later editions these ambiguities have been removed. I suppose that the wording “specimen” crept in inadvertently in Art. 10.3. I tend to consider it a lapsus calami, the more so since rigid application of Art. 10.3 makes Art. 10 contradictory in itself as Art. 10.1 states that the type of a genus is the—unqualified—type of a species, whereas Art. 10.3 requires the conserved type to be a specimen. Moreover, Rec. 10A refers to the type selected under Art. 10.3 as “element”, and in the Preface to the Sydney Code (p. XIV), the Rapporteur-général Edward G. Voss wrote “Changes in Art. 10 necessitated changes in format of a number of entries in Appendix III, where a type must now be stated as a binomial (meaning, the type of that binomial) or (under certain conditions) as a specimen (or other element)” [italics mine D.O.W.].

There is room for different interpretations of Art. 10.3. Does it deal with the types of all conserved names or only with those with conserved types that differ from the type of an included species. I read it as dealing with all nomina conservanda but discussed this problem with colleagues interpreting it in the second sense. In other words, I read Art. 10.3 as . . . , the type of the name of a genus can only be a specimen . . . , but others read . . . , the type of the name of a genus can even be a specimen . . . . The Committee for Spermatophyta has interpreted the Sydney Art. 10 as ruling out an illustration as the conserved type of a genus (see Taxon 32: 625), thereby demonstrating the ineptness of the present wording. By consequence, the entries in Appendix III 4882 Colubrina and 5411 Mammillaria are
incorrect since the conserved type species of these genera are typified by illustrations (see Wijnands, The Botany of the Commelins p. 56, 180. 1983).

The proposed change from “specimen” to “specimen or other element” will remove a useless complication and restore the consistency of the Code in its basal type concept.

The stimulus to formulate this proposal has been conservation proposal 785 (Taxon 34: 309) on the citation and nomenclature of the conserved type of 2406 Talinum. I feel obliged to read “element” for “specimen” since the type of Talinum is an illustration, not a specimen. Rigid application of Art. 10 would make the typification of Talinum an unsolvable problem.

Proposal 45 by Dr. P. G. Parkinson (Taxon 34: 328–329) deals with Art. 10 as well. In particular his proposed Art. 10.5 covers the same ground. There is, however, as far as I can see no real overlap, so that the proposals can be considered independently.
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(264) Proposal to abolish conservation of specific names.

Summary
Definition of “major economic importance” is an indefinable concept, and leads to endless or inconclusive arguments on proposals to conserve particular specific names. Conservation of specific names has, in the past, been regarded as an unwise weakening of the ICBN, and still seems to be so. Hence the present proposal to restore the pre-1981 status quo limitation of Art. 14.

(264) Proposal to delete “and species” and replace “and” before “genera” in Art. 14.1; delete the second sentence in Art. 14.2; and delete the last sentence in Art. 14.4.

Rationale: The addition of conservation of specific names to Art. 14 was the subject of much debate and accepted by a close vote at the Sydney Congress. There seems little doubt that the proposal would have been defeated if an amendment had not been offered from the floor to restrict such conservation to names of “species of major economic importance.” The only example offered to illustrate the meaning of this amendment was wheat, Triticum aestivum. Later in the discussion Lycopersicum esculentum was mentioned.

From the first it seemed clear to some of us that “major economic importance” is indefinable and would be a continuing matter of controversy, and this has been the case. We voted for the amendment because of the possibility that the proposal for conservation might pass without such a restriction, rather than with any idea that the restriction was workable.

It is my opinion that we should have in the Code neither an unworkable provision nor a blank check to wholesale proposals for conservation of specific names. I do not feel that the conditions behind the wisdom of the nomenclature sections of earlier congresses in rejecting the idea of conserved species names have changed. Only an unworkable compromise led to the adoption of this proposal at Sydney. I feel that it is not too late to go back to the pre-Sydney status quo. Therefore, I propose appropriate alterations in the present wording of the Code.

Proposed by: F. R. Fosberg, Botany Dept., Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

(265) Proposal regarding autonyms.

Summary
Actions at the Sydney Congress, especially the addition to the Code of Art. 57.3, have given rise to strong differences of opinion and forced decisions regarding certain infraspecific names that went against the judgement of the proposers of the combinations affected. A discussion of the nature of autonyms, their logical nomenclatural status and limitations is provided. Modifications, especially in