

## SYNOPSIS OF PROPOSALS

## Synopsis of Proposals on Botanical Nomenclature - Vienna 2005. A review of the proposals concerning the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature submitted to the XVII International Botanical Congress

John McNeill (Rapporteur général)<sup>1</sup> & Nicholas Turland (Vice-rapporteur)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Royal Ontario Museum & Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh; address: Royal Botanic Garden, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh, EH3 5LR, Scotland, U.K. [jmcneill@rbge.org.uk](mailto:jmcneill@rbge.org.uk)

<sup>2</sup> Missouri Botanical Garden, P. O. Box 299, Saint Louis, Missouri 63166, U.S.A. [nicholas.turland@mobot.org](mailto:nicholas.turland@mobot.org)

### NOTICE

Each personal member of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy is entitled to participate in the Preliminary Mail Vote on nomenclature proposals, as stated in Division III of the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* (Greuter & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 138, 2000). No institutional votes are allowed in the mail ballot. Authors of proposals to amend the *Code* and members of the Permanent Nomenclature Committees (described in Div. III.2) are also entitled to participate. A voting form is inserted in this issue of *Taxon*.

The voting forms (ballots) should be returned to the Recorder, Professor Tod Stuessy, Department of Higher Plant Systematics and Evolution, University of Vienna, Rennweg 14, A-1030, Vienna, Austria, by 31 May 2005, so that they may be included in the tabulation to be made available to members of the Nomenclature Section.

The sessions of the Nomenclature Section, which will take definitive action on proposals, will be held at the Uni-Campus Lecture Hall C1, University of Vienna, Spitalgasse 2, A-1090 Vienna, from Tuesday, 12 July (09:00 hours) to Saturday, 16 July 2005.

Each registered member of the Congress is entitled to enroll as a member of the Nomenclature Section. Registration for the Congress should be done in advance (see <http://www.ibt2005.ac.at/>); the confirmation received will be the evidence of eligibility for registration for the Nomenclature Section, which will start on Monday, 11 July, at 16:00 hours at the Institute of Botany, University of Vienna, Rennweg, 14, A-1030 Vienna; Nomenclature Section registration will continue on Tuesday, 12 July at 08:00 hours at the Uni-Campus Lecture Hall C1. Late registration for the Congress will also be possible at these times.

Each member of the Nomenclature Section is entitled to one personal vote in the sessions. Personal votes can neither be transferred nor accumulated; a single person never receives more than one personal vote. A member of the Nomenclature Section may be the official delegate of more than one institution, but no one person will be allowed more than 15 votes (including his or her personal vote). Official delegates are required to submit their credentials and to col-

lect their voting cards when registering for the Nomenclature Section. Institutions are being advised of their votes in February 2005, in accordance with Division III of the *Code*.

### INTRODUCTION

This Synopsis repeats the exact wording of the proposals, along with reference to the published justification. The numbered sequence of proposals extends to 312. The comments by the Rapporteurs were drafted during a working meeting in Saint Louis, 8–14 November 2004. The Rapporteurs have endeavoured to outline the foreseeable consequences of each of the proposals, irrespective of their personal opinions on desirability. The comments are the result of a consensus between the Rapporteur and the Vice-rapporteur, and both have equal responsibility for them.

As noted on the ballot, there are four voting options: “yes”, “no”, “ed.c.”, and “sp.c.”; all proposals accepted by the Congress will be reviewed by the Editorial Committee prior to the production of the next edition of the *Code*, and any necessary editorial changes will be made; consequently, a “yes” vote only implies approval in principle of the proposal, not necessarily of its exact wording. Unless otherwise noted, an “ed.c.” vote instructs the Editorial Committee to consider inclusion in the *Code* of material in the proposal but does not necessarily require it to do so. A “sp.c.” vote refers the proposal to a Special Committee to review the matter, either during the Nomenclature Section meetings, or, more likely, prior to the next Congress; it implies the desire to establish such a Committee. In order to make the result of the ballot as meaningful as possible, instructions have been added in several cases as to how special expressions of opinion, such as certain “ed.c.” votes, will be interpreted.

All proposals that relate to particular groups have been referred to the Permanent Nomenclatural Committees for those groups (*Code*, Div. III.2) in order that they may give their opinions prior to the meetings of the Nomenclature Section. When these opinions are already known, the votes have been included and tabulated as follows: the first digit stands for the “yes” votes (sometimes with additional [+]

“ed.c.” votes), the second for the “no” votes, the third (when present) for abstentions or “continue discussion” votes. Such votes were tabulated only if more than half of the committee members expressed an opinion.

Two Special Committees established at the Saint Louis Congress have submitted reports that include proposals. Only those proposals favoured by at least 60% of the voting Committee members are included in the report submitted in that Committee’s name; other proposals favoured by at least 50%, but less than 60%, appear in the names of the supporting Committee members.

The proposals are arranged in the sequence of the provisions of the *Code* that they affect, general proposals being listed first. Within each of the provisions, the proposals have been lettered sequentially in the order in which the Rapporteurs believe they might usefully be discussed by the Section. Needless to say, the Section or its chairman are completely free to adopt another sequence for their deliberations.

Examples, Notes and paragraphs of Articles or Recommendations proposed as new have been given unique numbers in this Synopsis to permit direct and unambiguous reference. Items that would precede the present first item were given the number 0, those placed at the end received a running-on number, and those to be intercalated received *bis*, *ter*, *quater*, *quinquies*, *sexies*, or *septies* numbers. This numbering system is not of course intended to bind the future Editorial Committee in any way.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The preparation of the **Synopsis of Proposals** with the Rapporteurs’ Comments was made possible by the support of IAPT and the facilities provided by the Missouri Botanical Garden and by members of its staff.

## PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CODE

### General Proposals

*Prop. A (219 – Silva in Taxon 53: 852)* The Editorial Committee is instructed to provide a glossary of technical terms in the *ICBN*.

*Prop. B (258 – Hawsworth in Taxon 53: 1089)* Proposal to replace the term “effective publication” by “publication”.

*Prop. C (259 – Hawsworth in Taxon 53: 1089)* Proposal to replace the term “valid publication” by “establishment”.

*Prop. D (260 – Hawsworth in Taxon 53: 1090)* Proposal to replace the terms “legitimate” and “illegitimate” by “acceptable” and “unacceptable”.

*Prop. E (055 – Rijkvovorsel in Taxon 52: 384)* Adjust Art. 16.1–2, 17.1–2, 18.2, 19.2, Rec. 20A.1, 21B.2, Art. 23.3, 23.6–7, Rec. 23A.1, 23A.3, Art. 24.2–3 and 28.1 to use singular mode throughout when referring to a name or epithet.

*Prop. F (100 – Rijkvovorsel in Taxon 53: 579)* Throughout the *Code* replace “forming” with “coining” (and “naming” with “coining a name”) where “forming a name or epithet” (or “naming”) is used in the sense of “deciding to publish a newly formed name or epithet”.

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – The intent of *Prop. A* is altogether desirable, but the likely concomitant delay in publication of a new edition of the *ICBN* raises questions as to whether this is the best approach to achieve the desired outcome. The one previous Glossary (McVaugh & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 56. 1968), was produced separately from the *Code*. An “ed.c.” vote will be interpreted as a request to the Editorial Committee to seek means of production of a Glossary that will not delay publication of the *Vienna Code*.

*Prop. B–D*, which were also proposed at the Saint Louis Congress, stem from attempts to clarify terminology between the various *Codes* regulating biological nomenclature (see, e.g., *Taxon* 47: 150. 1998). Undoubtedly this was, and is, a very valuable initiative. It would facilitate communication substantially if botanists, zoologists and bacteriologists used the same terms for the same concepts, and if the quite different meanings of the same terms, e.g. “valid” and “available” in botany and zoology, became a thing of the past. It may, however, be questioned whether this is the time to take this initiative in the *ICBN* when the most recent (1999) edition of the *ICZN* has scarcely paid lip-service to the concept of common terminology. The role of the proposals in “improving the clarity of the botanical *Code*” is a different matter, and, on that, each proposal should be judged on its merits.

*Prop. E* and *F* are part of Rijkvovorsel’s first and additional sets of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 Prop. D–P and Q–S, respectively.

### Article 3

*Prop. A (065 – Moore & al. in Taxon 53: 214)* Add the following Note and Example to Article 3.1:

“*Note 1.* This provision does not preclude the placement of taxa as *incertae sedis* with regard to higher ranks. Subdivisions of genera and species must be assigned to genera, and infraspecific taxa to species, because these names are combinations (Arts. 21.1, 23.1, 24.1).”

“*Ex.1.* The genus *Haptanthus* Goldberg & Nelson (Syst. Bot. 14: 16. 1989) was originally described without being assigned to a family.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* is one of three proposals designed to clarify that the provisions of the *ICBN* are not incompatible with phylogenetic classification. The proposed Note accurately reflects the provisions of the *Code* and would seem a useful clarification.

### Article 4

*Prop. A (246 – Committee on Suprageneric Names in Taxon 53: 1086)* Replace Art. 4.3 with the following paragraph:

“4.3. If a still greater number of ranks is desired, the terms for these are made by adding the prefix “super-” to the terms denoting the principal or secondary ranks, which are immediately subordinate to them.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* arises from a concern that the existing Art. 4.3 permitting “ranks to be intercalated or added, providing that confusion or error is not thereby introduced” could lead to an unlimited number of ranks. Some may question the Committee’s concern, while welcoming the specific recognition of “super” as the first prefix to be used in the formation of ranks additional to the more familiar ones specified in Art. 4.2. An “ed.c.” vote will be interpreted as supporting the wording proposed, but as a paragraph preceding, and not replacing, Art. 4.3.

### Recommendation 5A (new)

*Prop. A (240 – Kiesling & Metzger in Taxon 53: 858)* Add a new Recommendation 5A.1:

“5A.1. With the aim of standardizing abbreviations of ranks, the following abbreviations are recommended: cl. (class), ord. (order), fam. (family), tr. (tribe), gen. (genus), sect. (section), ser. (series), sp. (species), var. (variety), f. (forma). The abbreviations for additional ranks created by addition of the prefix sub-, or for nothotaxa with the prefix notho-, should be formed by adding the prefixes, e.g. subsp. (subspecies), nothosp. (nothospecies).”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – No problems are foreseen if *Prop. A* were to be accepted.

### Article 7

*Prop. A (261 – Brummitt in Taxon 53: 1090)* In Art. 7.5, replace “designated or definitely indicated” by “cited” in the last phrase of the first sentence (the portion beginning “or by a different type” and following the third comma of the sentence).

*Prop. B (262 – Brummitt in Taxon 53: 1090)* In Art. 7.5, replace the last phrase of the first sentence (the portion beginning “or by a different type” and following the third comma of the sentence) by: “unless the author of the illegitimate name designated or definitely indicated [or cited if *Prop. 261* is accepted] a different type or placed the earlier name in an atypical taxon subordinate to the illegitimate name”.

*Prop. C (218 – Silva in Taxon 53: 852)* In Art. 7.11, add Art. 9.18 to the parenthetic references.

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* is apparently intended to make the Article clearer by using “cited” rather than “indicated”, but there is also a change in meaning: “cited a different type” is more restrictive than requiring that a type be at least “definitely indicated”. Without evidence that the change would not affect the application of the rule, it would seem unwise to alter the long established wording.

*Prop. B* addresses the rather uncommon situation in which the author of an illegitimate superfluous name, although not indicating any type, nevertheless recognizes a ‘typical’ infraspecific taxon, but assigns the type of the name causing the illegitimacy to a different infraspecific taxon. There is some logic behind the proposal in that the author of the superfluous name clearly did not regard the two names as homotypic (but how many authors of illegitimate superfluous names do?), but the proposal is nevertheless flawed. Whereas the present wording of Art. 7.5 clearly establishes the type of all illegitimate superfluous names,

the proposal would leave typification of an illegitimate superfluous name unresolved in these circumstances.

*Prop. C* appears to be a logical and desirable addition. The justification of *Prop. C* would equally justify referring to Art. 9.18 in Art. 7.10 also.

### Article 8

*Prop. A (208 – Traverse & al. Taxon 53: 849)* Amend Art. 8.5 to read:

“The type, epitypes (Art. 9.7) excepted, of the name of a taxon of fossil plants, plant microfossils<sup>1</sup> excepted, of the rank of species or below is always a specimen (see Art. 9.13). One whole specimen is to be considered as the nomenclatural type (see Rec. 8A.3). However, for names of plant microfossils an effectively published illustration may serve as type (see also Art. 37.4).”

*Prop. B (209 – Traverse & al. Taxon 53: 849)* Add as a footnote to the words “plant microfossils” in the above amendment to Art. 8.5 the following:

“<sup>1</sup>“Plant microfossils” here refers to fossil microscopic plants or microscopic plant parts, found dispersed in sedimentary rocks. Such microscopic fossils, for investigation, are located on microscope slides, SEM stubs, or are parts of other sorts of preparations that must be studied by light, electronic, or other kinds of microscopy at a magnification of at least 100×.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* and *B*, along with Art. 9 *Prop. A*, Art. 37 *Prop. D* and Art. 38 *Prop. A*, are part of a set of proposals to permit illustrations as types of names of plant microfossils and should be considered as a whole. The current set of proposals attempts to address the question of the definition of plant microfossils, the omission of which was a major factor in the withdrawal of a similar proposal at the Saint Louis Congress. The proposals do not raise any other general issues and the Committee for Fossil Plants has been asked to give its recommendation on them.

### Recommendation 8B

*Prop. A (276 – Nicoletti de Fraga & Rezende Silva in Taxon 53: 1095)* Add a new Recommendation immediately following Rec. 8B.2:

“8B.3. In cases where the nomenclatural type was prepared from cultivated material in a registered collection of a botanic garden, such cultivated material (but not its sexually propagated progeny) should be referred to as “pre-type” (*pre typum*), “pre-holotype” (*pre holotypum*), “preparatype” (*pre paratypum*), etc., in order to make it clear that that material was the origin of the type but not itself the nomenclatural type.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A*, together with Art. 9 *Prop. P* and Rec. 9C *Prop. A*, would introduce two new terms into the *Code*. The comparative rarity of cases in which ‘clonotypes’ would exist and the absence of any nomenclatural function not already provided by designation of an epitype or neotype does not seem to justify complicating Art. 9 with additional rulings.

### Article 9

*Prop. A (210 – Traverse & al. Taxon 53: 849)* Insert

after “fossil plants” in line 2 of Art. 9.13: “microfossils excepted” and add a parenthetical sentence at the end:

“(Note that for plant microfossils, an effectively published illustration may serve as type – see Art. 8.5.)”

*Prop. B (263 – Brummitt, Taxon 53: 1090)* In Art. 9.10, insert after the first sentence:

“An extant syntype takes precedence over an isosyntype (not cited by the author of the name)”.

*Prop. C (068 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 215)* Amend Art. 9 Note 2:

“*Note 2.* For the purposes of this *Code*, the original material comprises those specimens and illustrations, cited or uncited, both unpublished and published either prior to or together with the protologue, upon which it can be shown that the description or diagnosis validating the name was based, including the indicated type, holotype, isotype(s), paratype(s), or syntype(s) (see also Rec. 9A); however, any duplicates of such elements, contrary to the evidence of their use for valid publication, are to be excluded from being considered as original material.”

*Prop. D (069 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 215)* Amend Art. 9.2:

“9.2. A lectotype is a specimen or illustration designated from the original material as the nomenclatural type, in conformity with Art. 9.9 and 9.10, if no holotype was indicated at the time of publication, or if it is lost, or as long as it is missing, or if it is found to belong to more than one taxon (see also Art. 9.13), or if it is demonstrably ambiguous and cannot be critically identified for the purposes of the precise application of the name”.

*Prop. E (070 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 215)* Amend Art. 9.3:

“9.3. An isotype is any duplicate of the holotype that is part of the original material; it is always a specimen.”

*Prop. F (071 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 215)* Amend Art. 9.4:

“9.4. A syntype is any element of the original material when no holotype was designated, or any one of two or more elements simultaneously designated as types.”

*Prop. G (072 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 215)* Amend Art. 9.5:

“9.5. A paratype is an element of the original material other than the holotype, isotype(s), or the subsequently designated lectotype and taxonomically similar to them.”

*Prop. H (073 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 215)* Amend Art. 9 Note 3:

“*Note 3.* In most cases in which no holotype or lectotype was designated there will also be no paratypes, since all the cited specimens, even when two or more specimens were simultaneously designated as types, are syntypes.”

*Prop. I (075 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 216)* Amend Art. 9.7:

“9.7. An epitype is a specimen or illustration selected to serve as an interpretative type when all original material (Art. 9 Note 2) associated with a validly published name and conforming with the validating description or diagnosis, including the holotype, lectotype, or previously designated neotype, is demonstrably ambiguous and cannot be critically identified for the purposes of the precise applica-

tion of the name. When an epitype is designated, all the original material or the neotype that the epitype supports must be explicitly cited (see Art. 9.18).”

*Prop. J (076 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 216)* Amend Art. 9.10 merging it with Art. 9.12:

“9.10. When the holotype is missing or is demonstrably ambiguous for precise application of the name (see also Art. 9.7), a lectotype should be selected from among the isotypes if such exist; otherwise it should be selected from among the paratypes if such exist. When the author of a name of a species or infraspecific taxon indicated no holotype, a lectotype must be chosen from among the syntypes if such exist. When the material designated as type is found to belong to more than one taxon, a lectotype must be chosen from that part which corresponds with the validating description or diagnosis. When choosing a lectotype from among paratypes or syntypes, an unambiguous specimen may be given preference (cited over uncited) over an illustration if such exists.”

As an editorial note, if the above proposal passes, Art. 9.12 will become redundant and should be deleted; also, at the end of Art. 9.17, “Art. 9.12” should be replaced by “Art. 9.10”.

*Prop. K (077 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 216)* In Art. 9.15 replace “all the other original material differs” with “the isotype(s) and paratype(s), if such exist, differ”.

*Prop. L (078 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 216)* Amend Art. 9.16:

“9.16. The author who first designates a neotype must be followed, but the choice is superseded if: (a) it was selected under Art. 9.6 and any of the original material agreeing to the validating description or diagnosis of the name is subsequently rediscovered; or (b) it was selected under Art. 9.15 and it can be shown to differ taxonomically from the holotype, lectotype and all other taxonomically similar original material that it substituted.”

*Prop. M (079 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 216)* Amend Art. 9.17:

“9.17. The author who first designates a lectotype must be followed, but the choice is superseded if: (a) the holotype or any of the original material agreeing to the validating description or diagnosis of the name is rediscovered; or (b) it is in serious conflict with the validating description or diagnosis, and another element is available that is not in such conflict; or (c) it is contrary to Art. 9.10.”

*Prop. N (074 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 215)* Amend Art. 9.6 and delete the first sentence of Art. 9.11 (“If no .... be selected”):

“9.6. A neotype is a specimen or illustration to serve as the nomenclatural type if no original material is extant or so long as it is missing (see also Art. 9.15).”

*Prop. O (080 – Mukherjee in Taxon 53: 216)* In Art. 9 Note 4 replace “supported type” in the second sentence with “lectotype or neotype”.

*Prop. P (277 – Nicoletti de Fraga & Rezende Silva in Taxon 53: 1095)* Add a new Article and Note between Art. 9.7 and 9.8:

“9.7 *bis*. A clonotype is a specimen prepared from a pre-type (see Rec. 8B.3) to serve as an interpretative type.

When an epitype is designated, the holotype, lectotype, or neotype that the epitype supports must be explicitly cited.”

“*Note 3 bis.* A clonotype will never substitute a holotype, isotype, paratype or syntype and will never have priority over any specimen from among the original material. A clonotype will have priority when the necessity arises for the designation of an epitype or neotype. When a clonotype is prepared after the designation of an epitype or neotype, this recent material should be designated as epitype or neotype substituting the previous designation, also substituting any original illustration designated as lectotype since Art. 9.10 places illustrations, even those based upon a holotype, as possessing inferior priority compared with any herbarium material. A clonotype can never substitute a specimen designated as a lectotype, as in accordance with Art. 9.10 such a lectotype would be a specimen from among the original material.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* is part of a set of proposals to permit illustrations as types of names of plant microfossils commented on under Art. 8 *Prop. A* and *B*.

As the proposer of *Prop. B* notes, the recommended sequence for choice of lectotype in the pre-1983 “Guide for the Determination of Types”, and in the Recommendation that succeeded it, indicated that a syntype should be given preference over an isosyntype (i.e. a specimen seen by the author over one that might not have been seen). Whereas that seems sensible as a recommendation, some will question the desirability of making it mandatory, thereby making the rules on lectotypification more complex, and with the likelihood of making ineffective a number of lectotypifications previously carried out in accordance with the rules.

*Prop. C–M* would significantly change the definitions of the terms original material, isotype, syntype, paratype, lectotype, and epitype. The only definitions to remain unchanged would be those of holotype and neotype. Acceptance of any of these proposals would enforce substantial change to current practice in typification. The only ‘neutral’ proposals are *Prop. N*, which is essentially an editorial rearrangement of Art. 9.6 and 9.11, and *Prop. O*, which makes a valid, if minor point, although inserting “lost or destroyed” after “superseded” would perhaps be a more complete refinement of the current Note 4.

*Prop. P* is discussed under Rec. 8B *Prop. A* where the desirability of legislating for additional terms in a relatively rare situation, to which the existing epitype or neotype provisions can be applied, is questioned.

### Recommendation 9C (new)

*Prop. A (278 – Nicoletti de Fraga & Rezende Silva in Taxon 53: 1095)* Add a new Recommendation following Rec. 9B:

“9C.1. The herbarium label of a clonotype should include primarily the collection data of the botanic garden where it is cultivated, the collector and date being those of the *ex situ* gathering. The data of the original *in situ* gathering should be mentioned in the observations field. This order should be followed also in publications.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* is discussed under Rec. 8B *Prop. A* and Art. 9. *Prop. P*.

### Article 11

*Prop. A (059 – Moore & Clemants in Taxon 52: 637)* Amend Art. 11.7 to add the phrase indicated in italics below:

“For purposes of priority, *except in cases of homonymy (see Art. 53.1)*, names of fossil taxa (diatoms excepted) compete only with names based on a fossil type representing the same part, life-history stage, or preservational state (see Art. 1.2).”

*Prop. B (060 – Moore & Clemants in Taxon 52: 637)* Amend Art. 11 Note 4 to add the phrase indicated in italics:

“*Except in cases of homonymy (see Art 53.1)*, names of plants (diatoms excepted) based on a non-fossil type are treated as having priority over names of the same rank based on a fossil (or subfossil) type.”

*Prop. C (061 – Moore & Clemants in Taxon 52: 637)* Add two new examples under Note 4:

“*Ex. n. Endolepis* Torrey (1861), based on a non-fossil type, is an illegitimate later homonym of, and does not have priority over, *Endolepis* Schleiden (1846), based on a fossil type.”

“*Ex. n. Ficus crassipes* F. M. Bailey (1889), based on a non-fossil type, is an illegitimate later homonym and does not have priority over *F. crassipes* (Heer) Heer (1882), based on a fossil type.”

*Prop. D (213 – Chaloner in Taxon 53: 850)* Add the following example after Art. 11.7:

“*Ex 26 bis.* Cleal and Thomas (Plant fossils of the British Coal Measures, 1994) illustrate what is generally believed to be pteridosperm foliage under the name *Lyginopteris hoeninghausii*. The basionym of that name is *Sphenopteris hoeninghausii* Brongn. 1822, of which the type is a compression specimen of sterile foliage. The type of the generic name *Lyginopteris* Potonié is a structurally preserved pteridosperm stem, *Lyginopteris oldhamia* (Binney) Potonié. Although it is widely believed that that species bore leaves of the *Sphenopteris hoeninghausii* type, the leaf morphospecies *S. hoeninghausii* cannot be placed in the stem morphogenus *Lyginopteris* of which the type is a different plant part, in a different state of preservation. The Cleal and Thomas specimen should therefore be cited as *Sphenopteris hoeninghausii* Brongn.”

*Prop. E (214 – Chaloner in Taxon 53: 851)*: Add the following example after Art. 11.7:

“*Ex 26 ter.* A common Jurassic leaf compression fossil is referred to by different authors either as *Ginkgo huttonii* (Sternb.) Heer or *Ginkgoites huttonii* (Sternb.) M. Black. Both names are in accordance with the *Code*, and either name can correctly be used, depending on whether this Jurassic morphospecies is regarded as rightly assigned to the living (non-fossil) genus *Ginkgo* L. or whether it is more appropriate to assign it to the morphogenus *Ginkgoites* Seward (type, *G. obovata* (Nath.) Seward, a Triassic leaf compression).”

*Prop. F (254 – Moore & al. in Taxon 53: 1088)* Amend Art. 11.9 and Art. 16 Note 2 as follows, but leave the cross-references in parentheses unchanged:

“The principle of priority does not apply above the rank of family (...)”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – Prop. A and B are intended to make clear that Art. 11.7 and its corollary Note 4 do not mean that a later homonym, with a non-fossil type, can displace an earlier homonym based on fossil material, a concept that would be extraordinarily destabilizing to palaeobotanical nomenclature, and which is clearly contrary to Art. 53. The wording suggested as an insertion does not, however, belong in Art. 11 which deals entirely with priority of names applicable to the same taxon. If clarification is needed in Art. 11, as many may feel to be the case, a Note to this effect would be more appropriate. It might be worded along lines such as: “The provisions of Art. 11 determine priority between different names applicable to the same taxon; they do not concern homonymy which is governed by Art. 53, and which establishes that later homonyms are illegitimate regardless of whether the type is fossil or non-fossil.” An “ed.c.” vote will be interpreted as favouring this solution.

*Prop. C* would provide a valuable example, regardless of whether any action were taken on Prop. A and B. The example of *Ficus crassipes* could be substituted by another, especially if conservation as proposed by Ungricht & al. (in *Taxon* 53: 566. 2004) is recommended.

*Prop. D* and *E* provide examples intended to clarify the application of the rules introduced in the *Saint Louis Code* on morphotaxa. The Committee for Fossil Plants has been asked to give its recommendation on them.

*Prop. F* arose from the deliberations of the Committee on Suprageneric names but, although favoured, did not secure the necessary 60% majority to be proposed in the name of the Committee. The proposed amendment to Art. 11.9, which also applies to Art. 16 Note 2, provides more accurate wording regarding priority above the rank of family and does not affect the application of Rec. 16B recommending the use of priority at these ranks, and is to be commended.

### Article 13

*Prop. A* (242 – Committee on Suprageneric Names in *Taxon* 53: 1083) Amend Art. 13, adding to clauses (a) and (c), as follows:

“[(a) ... ], except suprageneric names, 4 August 1789 (Jussieu, *Genera plantarum*).

[(c) ... ], except suprageneric names, 4 August 1789 (Jussieu, *Genera plantarum*).”

*Prop. B* (243 – Committee on Suprageneric Names in *Taxon* 53: 1083) If proposal 242 is defeated, amend Art. 13, replacing clause (a) with two clauses and adding to clause (c), as follows:

“(a) SPERMATOPHYTA, 1 May 1753 (Linnaeus, *Species plantarum*, ed. 1), except suprageneric names, 4 August 1789 (Jussieu, *Genera plantarum*).

(a bis) PTERIDOPHYTA, 1 May 1753 (Linnaeus, *Species plantarum*, ed. 1).

[(c) ... ], except suprageneric names, 4 August 1789 (Jussieu, *Genera plantarum*).”

*Prop. C* (222 – *Silva* in *Taxon* 53: 852) In Art. 13.1(e), delete “NOSTOCACEAE HOMOCYSTEAE” and “NOSTOCACEAE HETEROCYSTEAE”.

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – Prop. A and B are alternative

proposals from the Special Committee on Suprageneric Names to resolve the problem (see *Englera* 14: 95–96, 241–243. 1994; 20: 109–114. 2000) that arose from the Montreal Congress accepting a list of conserved family names of *Spermatophyta* that was constructed on the principle of Jussieu’s *Genera plantarum* (1789) being the starting date for such names, without this principle ever being incorporated into an Article of the *Code*. *Prop. A* would establish 4 August 1789, the publication date of Jussieu’s work, as the starting date for suprageneric names of *Spermatophyta*, *Pteridophyta*, *Sphagnaceae*, and *Hepaticae* (non-*Sphagnaceae* mosses have a general 1801 starting date). The alternative *Prop. B* would exclude *Pteridophyta*, for which all names would then retain the 1753 starting date. The Committee for Bryophyta has indicated its support for either proposal (9 : 0 : 2) and the Committee for Pteridophyta has been asked to indicate its preference as between Prop. A and B.

*Prop. C* proposes abandoning the later starting dates of 1886 and 1892 for two groups of blue-green algae or cyanobacteria, the “*Nostocaceae homocysteeae*” and “*Nostocaceae heterocysteeae*”. As the proposer outlines, later starting dates create their own special nomenclatural problems, which were a factor in the abandonment of later dates for fungi, albeit with sanctioning as a replacement. The issue is, perhaps, complicated by the acceptance, as the governing rules for these organisms by some workers, of the *International Code of Bacteriological Nomenclature* with an effective starting date in its 1978 “Approved List” (yet to be developed for cyanobacteria). The Committee for Algae has been asked for its comments on the proposal.

### Article 14

*Prop. A* (279 – *Hawksworth* in *Taxon* 53: 1096) Proposal to enable the conservation of names of infraspecific taxa.

Replace “species” in Art. 14.1 by “species, and infraspecific taxa”.

Replace “species” by “species or infraspecific taxon” in Art. 14.4.

Replace “A species name” by “[The name of a species or an infraspecific taxon” in Art. 14 Note 2.

Insert “et nomina infraspecifica” after “specifica” in the heading of App. IIIB.

*Prop. B* (280 – *Hawksworth* in *Taxon* 53: 1096) Proposal to enable the conservation of names of subdivisions of genera.

Replace “genera,” in Art. 14.1 by “genera, subdivisions of genera,”.

Replace “or genus” by “genus, or subdivision of a genus” in Art. 14.4.

Insert “et nomina subdivisionum genericorum” after “generica” in the heading of App. IIIA.

*Prop. C* (175 – *Rijckevorsel* in *Taxon* 53: 590) Move “(see Rec. 50E)” from Art. 14.2 to 14.1.

*Prop. D* (176 – *Rijckevorsel* in *Taxon* 53: 591) Add a reference in Art. 14.2:

“(see Art. 57 and the resolution of the XV International Botanical Congress, Yokohama (in *Regnum Veg.* 131: xiv.

1994)).”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* and *B* both address the issue of whether conservation procedures should be limited to names at the ranks of family, genus and species, the former seeking to extend this to infraspecific ranks, and the latter to names of subdivisions of genera. The issue of extending conservation provisions (matching, for example, those for rejection of names under Art. 56) was the subject of several proposals to the Saint Louis Congress and a proposal to cover both the categories in the present proposals was closely debated, but eventually defeated on a card vote (*Englera* 20: 106–109. 2000). The issue rests not on the importance of names currently used at these ranks, which would rarely seem to justify conservation, but rather on the fact that occasionally the most effective way of maintaining current usage of names of species and genera, is by conservation of a name of an infraspecific taxon or of a subdivision of a genus. Given this circumstance, it is not envisaged that acceptance of these proposals would significantly increase the workload of nomenclatural committees.

*Prop. C* makes good sense. Perhaps the reference would be better added at the end of the first sentence of Art. 14.1.

*Prop. D* would place in the *Code* a reference to the resolution of the Tokyo Congress with respect to conservation of names. While it is useful to refer to that resolution when justifying the need to conserve (or not to conserve) a name, it is debatable whether that reference should actually be in the text of the *Code*. The reference to Art. 57 seems quite out of place here; see Rec. 14A *Prop. B* below.

### Recommendation 14A

*Prop. A* (266 – *Brummitt in Taxon* 53: 1091) Amend the wording of the last phrase of Rec. 14A.1 to read: “... authors should avoid making changes to the names established in the literature for the taxa concerned ...”.

*Prop. B* (177 – *Rijkevorsel in Taxon* 53: 591) Add “(see also Art. 57)” to Rec. 14A.

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* derives from a concern that the current wording of Rec. 14A that “authors should follow existing usage” while conservation of rejection proposals are pending, might be misconstrued as meaning accepting an existing type when a new type is being proposed for conservation. The *Rapporteurs* do not see this as a reasonable interpretation of the current wording, but are sympathetic to the proposer’s concern, and wonder if adding “of names” after “usage” would not meet the concern in a simpler manner. An “ed.c.” vote would endorse this suggestion.

*Prop. B* would add to Rec. 14A an unnecessary and inappropriate reference to Art. 57. The former is a general recommendation to follow existing usage of names pending a proposal to conserve or reject, whereas the latter deals with the particular case of “nomina confusa” in which current usage of the name is in fact mandated.

### Article 16

*Prop. A* (220 – *Silva in Taxon* 53: 852) In the last sentence of Art. 16.1, delete “which apply to taxa with a rec-

ognized circumscription and”.

*Prop. B* (247 – *Committee on Suprageneric Names in Taxon* 53: 1088) Add “above the rank of order” to the second clause Art. 16.1 and delete “Automatically typified” from Art. 17.1:

“... (b) descriptive names, not so formed, which apply to taxa above the rank of order with a recognized circumscription and which may be used unchanged at different ranks.”

*Prop. C* (248 – *Committee on Suprageneric Names in Taxon* 53: 1088) Add an example to Art. 16:

“*Ex. 5 bis.* “*Codiales*” (Chadefaud, 8ème Congr. Int. Bot. Paris Rapp. Commun. Avant Congr. 17: 92. 1954) and *Codiales* Feldmann (l.c.: 97) were proposed in the same publication. Chadefaud’s article is presumed to be completely in French, as evidenced by his writing “*Sphaeropléales*” and “*Derbésiales*”, and therefore “*Codiales*” was not validly published by him. Although Feldmann also wrote “*Sphaeropléales*” and “*Derbésiales*”, he provided a formal key and subsequent discussion in which he wrote *Derbesiales*, thus making a distinction between French scientific names in the text and Latin scientific names in the key. By analogy, *Codiales* Feldmann is accepted as validly published. In the absence of typographic cues, *-ales* must be accepted as Latin regardless of the language of the text.”

*Prop. D* (249 – *Committee on Suprageneric Names in Taxon* 53: 1088) Expand Art. 16.4 and Ex. 6:

“16.4. Where one of the word elements *-clad-*, *-cocc-*, *-cyst-*, *-monad-*, *-myces-*, *-nemat-*, or *-phyton-*, being the genitive singular stem of the second part of a name of an included genus, has been omitted before the termination *-phyceae*, *-phycota* (algae), *-mycetes*, *-mycota* (fungi), *-opsida* or *-phyta* (other groups of plants), the shortened class name or division or phylum name is regarded as based on the generic name in question if such derivation is obvious or is indicated at establishment of the group name. These word elements may also be omitted before the termination for subdivision or subphylum as appropriate in each case.”

“*Ex. 6.* The name *Raphidophyceae* Chadef. ex P. C. Silva (1980) was indicated by its author to be based on *Raphidomonas* F. Stein (1878). The name *Saccharomycetes* G. Winter (1881) is regarded as being based on *Saccharomyces* Meyen (1838). The name *Trimerophytina* H. Banks (1975) was indicated by its author to be based on *Trimerophyton* Hopping (1956).”

*Prop. E* (188 – *Moore in Taxon* 53: 599) Replace the last sentence of Art. 16 Note 1 with the following:

“When “*divisio*” and “*phylum*” are used simultaneously to denote different ranks, this is to be treated as informal usage of rank-denoting terms (see [Article of proposal 195]).”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* seeks to remove words that are meaningless in the context and would improve the clarity of the Article.

*Prop. B* proposes to restrict descriptive names to ranks above that of order, thus making unavailable a name such as *Centrospermae*. The argument is ostensibly based on the lack of use of such names in any recent system of classifi-

cation, but is evidently also influenced by a distaste for their “irregular” form. The Section will probably make its judgement in light of these considerations, and any counterbalancing advantage in having names that may be used unaltered at different ranks.

*Prop. C* proposes the inclusion of an example, ostensibly to clarify the distinction in Art. 16 between “an improper Latin termination” and a “non-Latin termination”. If the distinction established in the proposal, i.e. whether comparable words in the work were or were not in Latin, is acceptable to the Section, this would have to be specifically accepted as a voted example, as the criteria being advanced are not characteristics of the termination, but of the stem of the words involved.

*Prop. D* proposes to expand the number of word elements, the omission of which should not affect the basis of a suprageneric name, and provides an example. The additions seem appropriate, although the second sentence might be better integrated with the first editorially, with addition of the corresponding terminations (*-phycotina*, *-mycotina* & *-phytina*) for subdivision or subphylum.

*Prop. E* is part of a group of proposals dealing with misplaced rank-denoting terms, upon which comment is made under Art. 33 Prop. K–O, and is a natural corollary of Art. 33 Prop. N.

### Recommendation 16A

*Prop. A (244 – Committee on Suprageneric Names in Taxon 53: 1086)* Convert Rec. 16A to a rule, to be placed after Art. 16.4:

“16.4 *bis*. Automatically typified names are to end as follows: *-phycota* (division or phylum), *-phycotina* (subdivision or subphylum), *-phyceae* (class) and *-phycidae* (subclass) for the algae; *-mycota* (division or phylum), *-mycotina* (subdivision or subphylum), *-mycetes* (class) and *-mycetidae* (subclass) for the fungi; and *-phyta* (division or phylum), *-phytina* (subdivision or subphylum), *-opsida* (class) and *-idae*, but not *-viridae* (subclass) for all other groups of plants.”

*Prop. B (245 – Committee on Suprageneric Names in Taxon 53: 1086)* Insert a new paragraph at the end of recommendation 16A:

“16A.4. The following endings are recommended for ranks not covered in Rec. 16A.1–3 [ / paragraph of proposal 244].

- (a) *-ota* (superkingdom)
- (b) *-obiota* (kingdom)
- (c) *-obiotina* (subkingdom)
- (d) *-ophytanae* (superdivision or superphylum), but *-mycotera* in fungi
- (e) *-idanae* (superclass), but *-mycia* in fungi
- (f) *-anae* (superorder)
- (g) *-indae* (superfamily)
- (h) *-idinae* (supertribe)”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* seeks to convert to an Article the existing Rec. 16A describing terminations for names at certain suprageneric ranks that are already made mandatory through the provisions of Art. 16.1. Although the current formulation (of Art. 16.1 and Rec. 16A) is unam-

biguous, some may prefer to have these mandatory endings incorporated in an Article. If so it should be placed following Art. 16.1 (not 16.4).

*Prop. B* proposes terminations for eight further ranks, either as the first (and only) or fourth paragraph of Rec. 16A (depending on whether Prop. A is accepted or rejected), which would not be mandatory through the provisions of Art. 16.1. Some may question whether such detailed provisions for the form of names in ranks not covered by the rules of priority (except supertribe) are either necessary or desirable, but as it is not proposed to make these terminations mandatory (by amending Art. 16.1 to include the recommendation of Prop. B) those who consider such advice helpful should support the proposal. It may be noted that none of these ranks is considered by the International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria, and only superfamily (with the ending *-oidea*) by the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature.

### Article 18

*Prop. A (215 – Committee for Algae in Taxon 53: 851)* To avoid homonymy, permit formation of family names from the nominative singular of a generic name:

Insert the following sentence before the last sentence of Art. 18.1: “Likewise, when formation from the genitive singular of a generic name results in a homonym, *-aceae* is added to the nominative singular.”

Add new example: “Ex. 3. Family names formed on the nominative singular of a generic name to avoid homonymy: *Dictyosphaeriumaceae* G. S. West 1916 (from *Dictyosphaerium* Näg.) vs. *Dictyosphaeriaceae* Kütz. 1849 (from *Dictyosphaeria* Decne. ex Endl.), *Trigoniumaceae* Glezer 1986 (from *Trigonium* Cleve) vs. *Trigoniaceae* Endl. 1841 (from *Trigonia* Aubl.)”

*Prop. B (216 – Committee for Algae in Taxon 53: 851)* Editorially improve Art. 18.1:

Change the last two words of the second sentence of Art. 18.1 from “full word” to “nominative singular”.

*Prop. C (051 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 383)* Reword the first two sentences of Art. 18.1:

“18.1. The name of a family is treated as a noun in the plural and is written with an initial capital letter (see Art. 60.2). It is a plural adjective formed from ...”

*Prop. D (250 – Committee on Suprageneric Names in Taxon 53: 1088)* Add the following sentence to Art. 18.1:

“A name of a family is automatically typified on the included genus used to form the name.”

*Prop. E (057 – David in Taxon 52: 636)* Standardize *-opsidis* as the genitive of *-opsis* by adding at the end of Art. 18.1 the words: “except that the genitive of names ending in *-opsis* is, in accord with botanical tradition, always *-opsidis*.”

and, in Art. 60.12, add to the statement in parentheses so that it reads:

“see Art. 18.1, last clause, and Art. 61”

*Prop. F (255 – David & al. in Taxon 53: 1088)* Add a Note and an Example after Art. 18.4:

“Note 1. Names published at the rank of family (see also Art. 18.2) but with a non-traditional or inappropriate

Latin or latinized termination are to be considered validly published providing all other conditions for valid publication are fulfilled.”

“*Ex. 7 bis. “Lauri”* (Jussieu, Gen. Pl.: 80. 1789) was validly published as *Lauraceae* even though a non-traditional Latin termination was used. “*Beslerides*” (Rafinesque, Sylva Tellur.: 70. 1838) was validly published as *Besleriaceae* even though an inappropriate latinized termination was used. However, “*Carpantheus*” (Rafinesque, Med. Repos., ser. 2, 5: 357. 1808) was not validly published as the termination “-ous” is in English, not Latin.”

*Prop. G (189 – Moore in Taxon 53: 599)* Add the following Note after Art. 18.2:

“*Note 1.* Names published with their rank denoted as “order” (“ordo”) or “natural order” (“ordo naturalis”) should not be treated as having been published at the rank of family if this would result in a taxonomic sequence with a misplaced rank-denoting term or if the term family is simultaneously used to denote a different rank in the taxonomic sequence.”

*Prop. H (190 – Moore in Taxon 53: 599)* Add the following Voted Example to Art. 18 after the Note of Prop. 189:

“\**Ex. n.* Names published at the rank of order (“rad”) by Berchtold & Presl (*O p̄irozenosti Rostlin [...].* 1820) are not to be treated as having been published at the rank of family, since the term family (“čeled”) was sometimes used to denote a rank below the rank of order.”

*Prop. I (205 – Govaerts in Taxon 53: 603)* Replace Art. 18.5 by the following text and delete Art. 18.6:

“The names *Leguminosae* and *Papilionaceae* (type of both *Faba* Mill.) are treated as validly published. When the *Papilionaceae* are regarded as a family distinct from the remainder of the *Leguminosae*, the name *Papilionaceae* is conserved against *Leguminosae*”.

*Prop. J (206 – Govaerts in Taxon 53: 603)* On acceptance of Prop. 205, above, add to the remaining Art. 18.5 the following:

“The name *Palmaceae* Juss., Gen. Pl.: 38 (1789) (type *Areca* L.) is also treated as validly published”.

*Prop. K (198 – Rijkvevorse in Taxon 53: 601)* In Art. 18.1 delete “legitimate” and in Art. 18.3 and 19.5 delete the sentence “Contrary to ... publication”.

*Prop. L (199 – Rijkvevorse in Taxon 53: 601)* Delete Art. 19.5, and rephrase Art. 18.3:

“18.3. For the purposes of Art. 18.1, an illegitimate name (see Art. 52–54) of a genus is treated as legitimate when it serves as a basis in forming a name of a family that is conserved (see Art. 14 and App. II).”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* is an elegant solution to the rare situation in which, because of identical stems of names of genera both of which are the basis of family names, homonymy at the family level cannot be avoided. *Prop. B*, stemming from but independent of this proposal, suggests a more precise wording of Art. 18.1.

*Prop. C* is part of Rijkvevorse’s first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60, Prop. D–P.

*Prop. D*, although with faulty wording, proposes to add to Art. 18.1 a statement that the type of a family name is that

of the generic name from which it is formed. Such an addition seems quite unnecessary as this is already explicitly stated in Art. 10.6.

*Prop. E* would ensure that family names formed from a generic name ending in *-opsis* would end in *-opsidaceae* (which is more usual) and not *-opsaceae*. It would have a corresponding effect on other suprageneric names ultimately formed from the name of such a genus. The proposal would also specify for Art. 60.12 (fungal epithets derived from a generic name) which genitive to use when alternatives exist.

*Prop. F* proposes a Note and Example to elaborate on Art. 18.4. It is not clear, however, that “a non-traditional or inappropriate Latin or latinized termination” is any more informative than “an improper Latin termination” already in the Article. The examples may be referred to the Editorial Committee.

*Prop. G* and *H* are part of a set of proposals on misplaced rank-denoting terms that are more fully discussed under Art. 33, Prop. K–O. Although both could be passed independently of the others, Prop. G has a parallel proposal in Art. 19 Prop. D, and at least these two (and perhaps the whole set) should be voted on consistently.

*Prop. I* and *J* seek to remove the special exception that permits nine families and one subfamily to have more than one correct name (Art. 11.1). The proposer, rather than settle for either the names “of long usage” or the names regularly formed from generic names, has instead opted for making mandatory the names found to be most frequently used in a recent survey. This results (Prop. I) in *Leguminosae* and *Papilionaceae*, alone amongst the names of long usage, being accepted, while *Fabaceae*, as a later synonym of both, would not be accepted. Many may find the less familiar and curiously formed *Palmaceae* as an obligatory replacement of either *Areceaceae* or *Palmae* (Prop. J) even more difficult to accept.

*Prop. K* and *L* are alternatives. Prop. K seems entirely logical. Currently, Art. 18.1 requires the name of a family to be formed from the legitimate name of an included genus. Under Art. 18.3, if the generic name is illegitimate, the family name is also illegitimate unless conserved. The second sentence of Art. 18.3 is needed because the family name would in fact not be validly published under Art. 32.1(b), which requires compliance with Art. 18.1. Identical wording occurs in Art. 19.5 for names of subdivisions of families. As the proposer rightly observed, “It seems pointless to have Art. 18.1 require a legitimate name and at the same time have Art. 18.3 and 19.5 negating this requirement.” The Rapporteurs foresee no problems if Prop. K is accepted. The first sentences of Art. 18.3 and 19.5 would still apply.

*Prop. L* involves some convoluted logic and therefore seems a less elegant option than Prop. K. Of more concern is that it would render some names not validly published. A name of a family (or subdivision thereof) based on an illegitimate generic name would not be validly published. However, for family names (presumably already) conserved, the illegitimate generic name would be treated as legitimate allowing the family (or subdivisional) name to be validly published.

**Article 19**

*Prop. A (052 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 383)* Reword Art. 19.1 and integrate Art. 19.3 into it:

“19.1. The name of any subdivision of a family (Art. 4 Note 1) is treated as a noun in the plural and is written with an initial capital letter (see Art. 60.2). It is formed in the same manner as the name of a family (Art. 18.1) but the termination is *-oideae* for a subfamily, *-eae* for a tribe and *-inae* (but not *-virinae*) for a subtribe.”

*Prop. B (251 – Committee on Suprageneric Names in Taxon 53: 1088)* Add the following sentence to Art. 19.1:

“A name of a subfamily is automatically typified on the included genus used to form the name.”

*Prop. C (252 – Committee on Suprageneric Names in Taxon 53: 1088)* Add the following sentence to Art. 19.3:

“A name of a tribe or subtribe is automatically typified on the included genus used to form the name.”

*Prop. D (191 – Moore in Taxon 53: 599)* Add the following Note after Art. 19.2:

“*Note n.* Names published with their rank denoted as suborder (subordo) should not be treated as having been published at the rank of subfamily if this would result in a taxonomic sequence with a misplaced rank-denoting term or if the term subfamily is simultaneously used to denote a different rank in the taxonomic sequence.”

*Prop. E (207 – Govaerts in Taxon 53: 603)* Reword Art. 19.7 to read:

“When the *Papilionaceae* are included in the *Leguminosae* as a subfamily, the name *Papilionoideae* must be used”.

*Prop. F (281 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1096)* Add a paragraph to Art. 19 following 19.4 or preceding or following 19.7 (and refer to it in Art 11.3, 14.4 or 14.5 and Art. 19 Note 1):

“The name of any subdivision of a family that includes the type of a name listed in App. IIB (i.e. a name of a family conserved against all unlisted names, see Art 14.5) is to be based on the generic name equivalent to that type, unless this is contrary to Art. 19.4 (see also 19.7).”

*Prop. G (282 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1097)* Add an example following the paragraph of proposal 281:

“*Ex. n.* Unless it also includes *Erica* (the type of the name of the family), a subfamily of *Ericaceae* is to be called *Epacridoideae* Link (1829, ‘*Epacrideae*’) when it includes *Epacris* Cav. (1797), the type of *Epacridaceae* R. Br. (1810) a name listed in App. IIB.”

*Prop. H (283 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1097)* Add an example following the paragraph of proposal 281:

“Unless it also includes *Rosa* (the type of the name of the family), a subfamily in *Rosaceae* is to be called *Maloideae* C. Weber (1964) when it includes *Malus* Mill. (1754), the type of *Malaceae* Small (1903) a name listed in App. IIB. This is irrespective of the placement (or not) in this same subfamily of *Pyrus* L. (1753), the type of *Pyrroideae* Burnett (1835); *Pyraceae* Vent. (1818) is not a name listed in App. IIB.”

*Prop. I (284 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1097)* Include in the paragraph of proposal 281, following “Appendix IIB”:

“(excepting [families to be excepted])”

*Prop. J (285 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1097)* To include a new paragraph in Art. 19, following the paragraph of proposal 281 (and refer to it in Art 11.3):

“In applying [paragraph of proposal 281] any question of priority is to be resolved at the rank of family.”

*Prop. K (289 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1098)* Delete Art. 19 Ex. 4.

*Prop. L (292 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1098)* In Art. 19.4 following “equivalent to that type” add “(see Art. 10.6)” so that it reads:

“19.4. The name of any subdivision of a family that includes the type of the adopted, legitimate name of the family to which it is assigned is to be based on the generic name equivalent to that type (see Art. 10.6), except as provided for in Art. 19.7.”

*Prop. M (293 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1098)* In Art. 19.4 replace “equivalent to that type” and add a note:

“19.4. The name of a subdivision of a family that includes the type of the adopted, legitimate name of the family to which it is assigned is to be based on the same generic name from which the name of the family was formed (Art. 18.1), except as provided in Art. 19.7.”

“*Note n.* In the case of a family name of long standing, for which the use of an alternative name is authorised (Art 18.6), the name of a subdivision as indicated in Art. 19.4 is to be based on the generic name from which the corresponding alternative name (indicated in parentheses in Art. 18.5) was formed.”

*Prop. N (294 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1098)* Rephrase Art. 19 Ex. 2 (and move it to follow the note of proposal 013):

“*Ex. 2.* The type of the family name *Gramineae* Adans. (nom. alt. *Poaceae* Barnhart – see Art. 18.5) is *Poa* L. and the subfamily, tribe and subtribe which include *Poa* are to be called *Poöideae* Benth. (1861), *Poëae* R.Br. (1814) and *Poinae* Dumort. (1829).”

*Prop. O (295 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1098)* Add a note to Art. 19.4:

“*Note n.* For the purposes of Art. 19 (and its recommendations) the phrase “same generic name” is to be taken as “same genitive of the same generic name”, whenever a generic name has more than one possible genitive.”

*Prop. P (200 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 601)* Delete Art. 19 Ex. 5, or move it to follow Ex. 2 and rephrase it:

“*Ex. 5.* The name *Caryophylloideae* Arn. (1832) is based on *Caryophyllus* Mill. non L. (1754). Although this is a later homonym and illegitimate (see Art. 53.1), it serves as the basis of *Caryophyllaceae* Juss. (1789), a conserved family name (see App. IIB): this generic name is considered legitimate for the purposes of Art. 18.1 (see Art. 18.3).”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* is part of Rijckevorsel’s first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 Prop. D–P.

*Prop. B* and *C*, like Art. 18 Prop. D, are unnecessary, the intent being already explicitly covered by Art. 10.6.

*Prop. D* is part of a set of proposals on misplaced rank-denoting terms that are discussed under Art. 33 Prop. K–O; see also the parallel proposal in Art. 18 Prop. G.

*Prop. E* is a corollary to Art. 18 *Prop. I* and any who support that proposal will probably favour this.

*Prop. F–H* and *J–K* are a set of proposals (with *Prop. I* as an alternative) designed to address what may be thought an undesirable outcome when a family with a well-known name is treated taxonomically as a subdivision of another family. Under the rules, priority lies with the earliest available name at the new rank, which may well be based on a different generic name from that of the well-known family name. The proposer gives as an example the fact that if the family *Epacridaceae*, as usually circumscribed, is treated as a subfamily of *Ericaceae*, the correct name is not *Epacridoideae*, but apparently *Styphelioideae* published a year earlier (1828). For those who agree that this is undesirable, *Prop. F* (with examples in *Prop. G* and *H*) provides a good solution for names of subdivisions of genera of *Spermatophyta*, protecting those based on the same generic names as the family names conserved in App. IIB. Although family names of *Bryophyta* are included in App. IIB, these do not represent a relatively complete list of widely accepted families as do the *Spermatophyta* entries, nor are there any comparable lists of conserved family names for other groups. *Prop. I*, to allow for some names listed in App. IIB to be excluded, is a hypothetical proposal that does not even have the support of the proposer! *Prop. J*, although requiring editorial attention, establishes that when more than one name of a subdivision of a family compete, it is the priority of the corresponding family name that determines the priority of the name of a subdivision of a family. *Prop. K* is a corollary to acceptance of the other proposals.

*Prop. L–O* are editorial.

*Prop. P* is also editorial and would arise from acceptance of Art. 18 *Prop. L*.

### Recommendation 19A

*Prop. A* (291 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1098*) Rephrase Rec. 19A.1:

“When a family is reduced to the rank of a subdivision of a family, or the inverse change occurs, and no legitimate name is available in the new rank, the new name should be based on the same generic name as the name in the former rank.”

*Prop. B* (286 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1097*) Rephrase Rec. 19A Ex. 2 and move it to a position following the paragraph of proposal 285:

“*Ex. 2*. Three tribes of the family *Ericaceae*, none of which includes *Erica* L. (the type of the name of the family), but which each include the type of a name listed in App. IIB, are *Monotropeae* Dumort (1829), *Pyroleae* Dumort (1829), and *Vaccinieae* Rchb. (1831). Three subfamilies whose names are typified likewise are *Monotropeoideae* Arn. (1832), *Pyroloideae* Kostel. (1834) and *Vaccinioideae* Arn (1832). A subfamily that includes both *Monotropa* L. and *Pyrola* L. (but not *Erica* L.) is *Pyroloideae*, as the name *Monotropaceae* is rejected in favour of *Pyrolaceae* when these two are united.”

*Prop. C* (287 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1097*) Delete Rec. 19A Ex. 2 and add a new example following the paragraph of proposal 285:

“*Ex. n*. Unless it also includes *Erica* (the type of the name of the family), a subfamily of *Ericaceae* which includes both *Monotropa* L. (1753) and *Pyrola* L. (1753) is to be called *Pyroloideae* Kostel. (1834), as the name *Monotropaceae* is rejected in favour of *Pyrolaceae* when these two are united.”

*Prop. D* (288 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1098*) Add a new example to Rec. 19A.2:

“*Ex n*. When A. P. de Candolle published a tribe including *Dalbergia* L.f. (1782) he did so as “*Dalbergieae* Bronn” (to be cited as *Dalbergieae* Bronn ex DC., 1825). This same spelling (and author attribution) was used at the publication of a subtribe (to be cited as *Dalbergiinae* Bronn ex Wight & Arn., 1834). When regarded as a subfamily the correct name is *Dalbergioideae* Burnett (1835, ‘*Dalbergidae*’).”

*Rapporteurs’ comments*. – *Prop. A* is editorial.

*Prop. B–D* are revised examples, required if Art. 19 *Prop. F* and associated proposals are accepted.

### Recommendation 19B (new)

*Prop. A* (290 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1098*) Add a recommendation following Art. 19:

“When a proposal for conservation of a name of a family, if adopted, would have an effect on the name of a subdivision of a family (see [paragraph of proposal 281], Rec. 14A.1 should be applied equally to this latter name.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments*. – *Prop. A*, proposed to encourage stability of names of subdivisions of families if Art. 19 *Prop. F* is accepted, seems already covered by Rec. 14A.1, but could be referred to the Editorial Committee.

### Article 20

*Prop. A* (053 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 383*) Reword Art. 20.2 (and adjust Ex. 2–3):

“20.2. The name of a genus may not coincide with a technical term currently used in morphology unless (a) it was published before 1 January 1912 and (b) in that publication it was used in the name of a species, in a combination conforming to Art. 33.1.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments*. – *Prop. A* is part of *Rijckevorsel’s* first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 *Prop. D–P*.

### Recommendation 20A

*Prop. A* (041 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 382*) Split Rec. 20A into two new recommendations.

*Prop. B* (042 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 382*) Give the following form to the first new recommendation from proposal 041 (to be referred to in Rec. 21 and 23 and reworded in singular mode):

“20A.1. Authors forming a name or epithet in any rank should comply with the following suggestions:

(a) To use a Latin termination insofar as possible.

(b) Not to make a name or epithet that is very long or difficult to pronounce in Latin.

(c) The etymology of a new name or epithet should be given, especially when its meaning is not obvious.

(d) Not to make a name or epithet by combining words from different languages.

(e) [Rec. 60A]

(f) [Rec. 60E]”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – Prop. A and B are part of Rijkevorsel's first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 Prop. D–P.

## Article 21

*Prop. A (202 – Rijkevorsel in Taxon 53: 602)* Rephrase Art. 21.4:

“21.4. When in the original publication the generic name (or its abbreviation) appears before a subdivisional epithet, as if constituting a binary combination with this epithet, this does not prevent valid publication. The generic name in this second appearance is not part of the name and is to be disregarded for nomenclatural purposes.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* seeks to avoid the use of “Contrary to Art. 32.1(b) ...” in Art. 21.4. While the current wording of Art. 21.4 may seem awkward to some, it is not immediately apparent that the proposed new wording is any less awkward. The proposal could be referred to the Editorial Committee. See Art. 24 Prop. A for a parallel proposal for names of infraspecific taxa.

## Recommendation 21B

*Prop. A (043 – Rijkevorsel in Taxon 52: 382)* Add a new paragraph to Rec. 21B:

“21B.3 *bis*. Recommendations made for forming the name of a genus (Rec. 20A) apply equally to a subgeneric or sectional epithet, except where Rec. 21B recommends otherwise.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* is part of Rijkevorsel's first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 Prop. D–P.

## Article 22

*Prop. A (081 – Niederle in Taxon 53: 217)* Proposal to extend the concept of autonyms by amending Art. 26.3, 22.3 and 11.2 and removing Art. 11.6, Rec. 26A and 22A.

The new formulation should be as follows.

“26.3. The first instance of valid publication of a legitimate name of a species or an infraspecific taxon automatically establishes the corresponding autonyms at all levels below it (see also Art. 32.6). The epithet of an autonym literally repeats the epithet of the name whose publication established it.”

“22.3. The first instance of valid publication of a legitimate name of a genus or an infrageneric taxon automatically establishes the corresponding autonyms at all infrageneric levels below it (see also Art. 32.6). An autonym literally repeats the name whose publication established it.”

Delete last sentence in Art. 22.1.

Remove Rec. 22A.

Associated changes are as follows.

“11.2. In no case does a name have priority outside the rank in which it is published (but see Art 22.3, 26.3 and 53.4).”

Remove Art. 11.6 and associated Note 3.

*Prop. B (082 – Niederle in Taxon 53: 218)* Alternative proposal to change the concept of autonyms by amending

Art. 26.3, 22.3 and 11.2 and removing Art. 11.6

The new formulations should be as follows.

“26.3. The first instance of valid publication of a legitimate name of a species automatically establishes the corresponding autonyms at all levels below it (see also Art. 32.6). The epithet of an autonym literally repeats the epithet of the name whose publication established it”

“22.3. The first instance of valid publication of a legitimate name of a genus automatically establishes the corresponding autonyms at all infrageneric levels below it (see also Art. 32.6). An autonym literally repeats the name whose publication established it.”

Associated changes are as follows.

“11.2. In no case does a name have priority outside the rank in which it is published (but see Art 22.3, 26.3 and 53.4).”

Remove Art. 11.6 and associated Note 3.

Delete last sentence in Art. 26.1.

Delete last sentence in Art. 22.1.

*Prop. C (066 – Moore & al. in Taxon 53: 214)* Add the following Note after Article 22.3:

“Note 1. Automatic establishment of an autonym does not establish the limits of any taxon to which the autonym may apply.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* and *B* are alternative proposals to revise the rules on autonyms; the first, preferred by the proposer, would make two conceptual changes in the present rules, whereas the second involves only one of these changes. The change common to both proposals is that priority of an autonym would date to the publication of the generic or specific name to which the autonym applies, i.e. the autonym would be created by the generic or specific name itself, not by the first publication of a name at the rank of the autonym within the genus or species. This reflects the “Co-ordinate status” rule in zoological nomenclature but operating only in the “downward direction”. This option was considered, and indeed had substantial support, when the present autonym rules were adopted at the Sydney Congress in 1981, but, even though a logical option at that time, it was not the one ultimately adopted. Although establishing an earlier date of publication of autonyms may not have extensive nomenclatural consequences, there are bound to be some, and it seems unwise to change the basic principle of a rule that has been operating successfully for over 20 years. In addition to this change, *Prop. A* also proposes that publication of a name of a subdivision of a genus or of an infraspecific taxon should create names at all lower ranks bearing the same epithet as the name creating them. These names would not strictly be autonyms as that term is currently defined in the *Code*, and, moreover, their creation would seem to impose a degree of taxonomic structure on the nomenclature of subdivisions of genera and infraspecific taxa, which is foreign to the *Code* (cf. Art. 21.1 and 24.1).

*Prop. C* proposes a new Note that represents a truism, applicable to the valid publication of any name, not just to an autonym. If it is thought important to make explicit in the text of the *Code* what is implicit in Prin. II, namely that nomenclature is substantially independent of any particular taxonomic circumscription, a Note might be included fol-

lowing Art. 6.2 along the lines of “Valid publication creates a name but does not of itself imply any taxonomic circumscription beyond inclusion of the type of the name (Art. 7.1)”.

### Recommendation 23A

*Prop. A (044 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 382)* Give a new form to Rec. 23A:

Begin the recommendation with “Authors forming a specific epithet should comply with the following suggestions.”; reduce the status of Rec. 23A.1–2 to clauses; include Rec. 60D as a clause; and adjust the wording and position of clauses so as to have them make best sense.

If proposal 042 [Rec. 20A Prop. B] passes, then clauses (a), (b) and (c) should be deleted here and there should be a reference to the new Rec. 20A. Judging by content, Rec. 23A.1–2 would not look out of place among the clauses of Rec. 23A.3.

*Prop. B (045 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 382)* Delete from Rec. 23A.1 the part on geographical names, perhaps to be moved to a note:

A note could be added to clarify the status of geographical genitives. Alternatively geographical genitives could be maintained and integrated with Rec. 60D (this could be put to a 50% vote).

*Prop. C (046 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 382)* Reword Rec. 23A.1, perhaps integrating the first sentence of Rec. 60C.2. If proposal 044 and 045 pass it will be a clause and might be worded:

“To give an epithet based on the name of a person the form of a noun in the genitive or of an adjective. An epithet based on a modern personal name should be formed according to Rec. 60C. If a personal name is already in Greek or Latin, or possesses a well-established latinized form, it can be used in the appropriate Latin genitive [examples not included here].”

If Rec. 60C.2 is not integrated into Rec. 23A.1 there should be a reference to it.

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A–C* are part of Rijckevorsel’s first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 D–P.

### Article 24

*Prop. A (201 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 602)* Rephrase Art. 24.4:

“24.4. When in the original publication the generic name (or its abbreviation) appears before an infraspecific epithet, as if constituting a binary combination with this epithet, this does not prevent valid publication. The generic name in this second appearance is not part of the name and is to be disregarded for nomenclatural purposes.”

*Prop. B (203 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 602)* Adjust Art. 24 Ex. 4 and 5 and Art. 21 Ex. 2 to include the original lettering and typeface, for example in Art. 24:

“Ex. 5. The name that appeared in print, when validly published, as “312. PHYLLERPA. Kg. ... 2) **Ph. prolifera**. Kg. ... Variat: ...  $\delta$  **Ph. firma**; ...” (Kützing, Sp. Alg.: 494–495. 1849) is to be cited as *Phyllerpa prolifera* var. *firma* Kütz.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* parallels Art. 21 Prop. A, and the same comments apply.

*Prop. B* is purely editorial, but, if accepted, would create an anomaly among the Examples of the Code. The standard practice is to quote the necessary information from publications, not to copy the exact typography including fonts, case, etc. It is hard to justify a change when the essential information in the current Ex. 5 is no different from that in the proposed new version.

### Article 26

*Prop. A (067 – Moore & al. in Taxon 53: 214)* Add the following Note after Article 26.3:

“Note 1. Automatic establishment of an autonym does not establish the limits of any taxon to which the autonym may apply.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* parallels Art. 22 Prop. C, and the same comments apply.

### Article 29

*Prop. A (180 – Committee on Electronic Publication in Taxon 53: 593)* New proposal permitting effective publication in electronic journals on the WWW with PDF.

Add to Art. 29, a new paragraph, Art. 29.2:

“29.2. Effective publication on or after 1 January 2006 may be in electronic format in an all-electronic journal (i.e., a journal not formally issuing a paper version) if the following criteria are met: (1) the journal must have its own ISSN number, (2) it must publish on the World Wide Web, (3) identical copies (electronic or both electronic and paper) must be deposited by the author or the journal in three libraries accessible to botanists generally and the identity of such libraries must be cited in the publication, (4) the date of publication must be cited in the publication, and (5) the publication must be in Portable Document Format (PDF), preferably following the ISO PDF/X specification. Effective publication in such all-electronic journals is by the online electronic version, not by any paper issues no matter when issued, which are considered later publications or reprints, nor by electronic forms other than the World Wide Web such as CD-ROM’s.”

“Note 1. Subscription to the all-electronic journal by a library will be equivalent to deposit of a copy.”

In consequence Art. 29.1 must also be changed to read (changes in italic):

“29.1. Publication is effected, under this Code, only by distribution of printed matter (through sale, exchange, or gift) to the general public or at least to botanical institutions with libraries accessible to botanists generally, *or electronically as provided by Art. 29.2*. It is not effected by communication of new names at a public meeting, by the placing of names in collections or gardens open to the public, by the issue of microfilm made from manuscripts, typescripts or other unpublished material, [*‘by publication online,’* deleted] or by dissemination of distributable electronic media.”

and Art. 31.1 changed to:

“31.1. The date of effective publication is the date on which the printed *or electronic* matter became available as defined in Art. 29 and 30. In the absence of proof establish-

ing some other date, the one appearing in the printed or electronic matter must be accepted as correct.”

*Prop. B (181 – Committee on Electronic Publication in Taxon 53: 594)* New proposal permitting effective electronic publication by Compact Discs (CD-ROM, CD-R, CD-RW) and DVD discs.

Modify Art. 29.1 (changes in italic):

“29.1. Publication is effected on or after 1 January 2006, under this Code, only by distribution of printed matter or by dissemination of distributable electronic media, namely compact discs (CD-ROM, CD-R, and CD-RW) and DVD discs (through sale, exchange, or gift) to the general public or at least to botanical institutions with libraries accessible to botanists generally. For a name to be effectively published through electronic media, the medium must have been produced in an edition containing simultaneously identical copies, and it must contain a statement by the author that any new name or nomenclatural act within it is intended for publication under provisions of Art. 29.1 Of the Code, and is intended for permanent, public, scientific record. It is not effected by communication of new names at a public meeting, by the placing of names in collections or gardens open to the public, by the issue of microfilm made from manuscripts, typescripts or other unpublished material, or by publication online.”

“*Note 1. Publications of names in an electronic journal are effectively published only through dissemination of printed copies, or electronic media as laid out in the provisions of Art. 29.*”

In consequence, Art. 31.1 must be changed to:

“31.1. The date of effective publication is the date on which the printed or distributable electronic matter became available as defined in Art. 29 and 30. In the absence of proof establishing some other date, the one appearing in the printed or electronic matter must be accepted as correct.”

*Prop. C (083 – Prado & Bicuda in Taxon 53: 219)* Amend Article 29.1 to amplify the meaning of not effectively published by including the text indicated in italic below:

“29.1. Publication is effected, under this Code, only by distribution of printed matter (through sale, exchange, or gift) to the general public or at least to botanical institutions with libraries accessible to botanists generally. It is not effected by communication of new names at a public meeting, by the placing of names in collections or gardens open to the public, by the issue of microfilm or any kind of photocopy made from manuscripts, typescripts or other unpublished material, by publication online, or by dissemination of distributable electronic media”.

Add the following example to the Article 29.1:

“*Ex. 1.* In Prado’s thesis “Revisão taxonômica de *Pteris* L. (Pteridaceae) no Brasil” (Feb 1993) *Pteris denticulata* Sw. var. *tristicula* (Raddi) Prado, based on *Pteris tristicula* Raddi (Opusc. Sci. Bol. 3: 293. 1819), was presented with all the requirements for valid publication, except that the text of the thesis was reproduced by photocopy. The work was not, therefore, effectively published; this new combination was later validly published by Prado in Amer. Fern J.

83: 131, Dec 1993).”

*Prop. D (085 – Prado & Bicuda in Taxon 53: 219)* Define printed matter by inserting the following footnote to Article 29.1:

“Publication is effected, under this Code, only by distribution of printed matter<sup>1</sup> ....”

“<sup>1</sup>Here and elsewhere in the Code, the expression printed matter means text reproduced by mechanical or graphic process (i.e. processes that require a matrix from which copies are made), excluding any kind of photocopy (i.e. instant copy made straight from the document).”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* would allow effective publication in an all-electronic journal on the World Wide Web, and by that online publication only. There is an assumption implicit in *Prop. A* that the publication will exist online indefinitely. The proposers do not address what should happen if the all-electronic journal became bankrupt. A short browse through B-P-H demonstrates that paper journals are by no means permanent, so one can hardly assume otherwise for electronic journals. There may also be concerns about making effective publication dependent on possibly impermanent standards such as ISSN, World Wide Web and PDF/X. Although ISSN may be around for many years to come, “World Wide Web” and especially “PDF”, bearing in mind the rapid development of computer technology over the last twenty years, may prove to be much more ephemeral.

*Prop. B* is an alternative to *Prop. A* and would allow electronic publication by Compact Discs (CDs) and DVDs. The issue of permanence is less troublesome here. Indeed, the proposers point out that such media “now have rather long shelf lives” (referring to their physical, archival qualities). However, again there may be problems with enshrining particular technological standards within the Code. What happens if (or when) CDs and DVDs become obsolete? (Imagine if “floppy disk” had been put into the *Berlin Code* or the *Tokyo Code*.) Moreover, the wording “by a method that assures numerous identical copies” can really only mean that numerous identical copies must be produced. What is the minimum number for “numerous”? Obviously more than one, but what if, say, ten copies were produced. Some people might consider ten numerous, others not so. Effective publication should not be dependent on a subjective definition.

*Prop. C* and *D* seek to address an important issue that has arisen since theses submitted for a degree in many countries have no longer been typewritten but have been routinely prepared electronically and then printed using a laser or other printer. Such theses are commonly considered by all concerned not to be media for effective publication of scientific names. Nevertheless, provided that two institutions with “libraries accessible to botanists generally” receive a copy, it is hard to see how such theses are not effectively published under the present rules. Unfortunately, *Prop. C*, seeking to exclude photocopies as media for effective publication, would be ineffectual in this regard (in many countries theses are printed in multiple copies rather than photocopied) and moreover is inoperable in practice, as most photocopies are indistinguishable from printed doc-

uments, which are often produced on the same machine. Prop. D, in its definition of “printed matter” is also unsatisfactory; if taken literally it would seem to exclude all publications from camera-ready copy, and would also seem to be inoperable because of the difficulty of distinguishing the products of one printing process from another.

### Recommendation 29A (new)

*Prop. A (084 – Prado & Bicuda in Taxon 53: 219)* Insert the following new Recommendation following Article 29:

“29A.1. Authors preparing theses (except for those which are part of a regular publications series) are encouraged to state what kind of reproduction mechanism was used.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A*, being dependent on Art. 29 Prop. C and D, should be treated similarly.

### Article 30

*Prop. A (267 – Brummitt in Taxon 53: 1091)* Add a new paragraph to Art. 30 reading:

“Publication on or after 1 January 2006 of an independent non-serial work stated to be a thesis submitted to a university or other institute of education for the purpose of obtaining a degree is not to be treated as effectively published unless it bears an International Standard Book Number (ISBN)”.

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* addresses the same problem as Art. 29 Prop. C and D, but with a more promising approach. This proposal was also made at the Saint Louis Congress, where a modified version was narrowly defeated. The current proposal maintains reference to an ISBN as a criterion for effective publication, and whereas this is an indication of such intent, many have felt that enshrining “ISBN” in the rules themselves may be unwise. Wording that might be more widely acceptable derived from the proposal narrowly defeated at Saint Louis might end: “... obtaining a degree is not effectively published unless it includes an explicit statement or other internal evidence that it is regarded as a publication by its author or publisher”, with added examples, voted if necessary, using an ISBN and a serial title as “other internal evidence”. The latter could exemplify theses published in series such as *Symbolae Botanicae Upsaliensis*, which are clearly to be considered effectively published. Some restriction of date might also be desirable to avoid any questions arising over traditionally printed theses (such as the Linnaean *Amoenitates!*). On or after 1 January 1973 would deal with the advent of laser-printed theses, while an earlier date such as 1 January 1958 would make the photoreproduced theses produced from about 1960 by University Microfilms International (Ann Arbor) not effectively published. On the other hand, if such a proposal were to be adopted, there would inevitably be some names that would cease to be validly published (and typifications that would no longer be effective). There are theses from a number of countries that have been distributed quite widely to other institutions without any internal evidence that they were printed for other

than the degree-granting purpose; the Rapporteurs are aware of three such (from France and Greece) from which names have been included in the international indices and there are likely others. The proposal should be supported only if it is clear that the number of hitherto accepted names being lost is very small compared with the number of names that, although in theses that must be considered effectively published under the current rules, have never been taken up. A “yes” vote would endorse the original wording of Prop. A; an “ed.c.” vote would indicate preference for a modified version, to be finalized by the Nomenclature Section, but along the lines suggested above.

### Article 32

*Prop. A (268 – Brummitt in Taxon 53: 1091)* In Art. 32.1 add a new item (b) reading “be composed only of letters of the Latin alphabet, except as provided in Art. 23.3 and Art. 60.4, 60.6, 60.9 and 60.10;” before the present wording, re-lettering the subsequent items accordingly.

*Prop. B (302 – Perry in Taxon 52: 1103)* Add a new paragraph and an example after Art. 32.1:

“32.1 bis. Except as provided in Art. 32.1 quater and Art. 32.1 quinquies, prior to 1 January 2007 any statement describing a feature or features of a taxon satisfies the requirement of Art. 32.1 (c) for a “description or diagnosis”. On or after 1 January 2007 such a statement must include a diagnosis.”

*Ex. n1. Agaricus cossus* Sowerby (Coloured figures of English Fungi or Mushrooms (London) 2: tab. 121. 1798) first appeared with the statement “The pileus is covered with a gluten, which constantly gives a strong goat-like, odour exactly resembling the wounded larva of Phœl. Cossus. In colour and shape this Agaric varies but little from the figure here given”. This statement refers to four features of the fructification, but the only ones actually described are the surface of the pileus and the odour of the gluten. Nevertheless *Agaricus cossus* is validly published.”

*Prop. C (303 – Perry in Taxon 52: 1103)* Add a new paragraph and two examples after Art. 32.1 (303 is offered as an alternative to 302):

“32.1 bis. Except as provided in Art. 32.1 quater and Art. 32.1 quinquies, prior to 1 January 2007, any statement describing a feature or features of a taxon satisfies the requirement of Art. 32.1 (c) for a “description or diagnosis”, except for any taxa for which the descriptive statement reports the features as identical to those given by the same author for another taxon appearing simultaneously in the same work, and for which there are no other distinguishing features indicated. On or after 1 January 2007 such a statement must include a diagnosis.”

*Ex. n2.* On p. 63 of Forsskål (*Flora aegyptiaco-arabica 1775*) the designation “*Catha*” appears with the descriptive statement “*Monogynia, 5-petala infera*,” followed by two species descriptions and then on p. 64 *Melhania* appears accompanied by “*Monogynia, pentapetala infera*,” but with a description of a single species, *M. velutina*. Since the descriptive information given for “*Catha*” is identical to the diagnosis given for *Melhania*, “*Catha*” is not validly published. *Melhania* is, however, validly published under

Art. 42.1.”

“*Ex. n3.* Steudel (*Nomencl. bot.*, ed. 2, 1: 213 1840) in a list of *Boerhavia* species gives the symbol for perennial for many of the species, including two new species designated “*B. rubicunda*” and “*B. sessiliflora*”. Since the symbol is the only descriptive information given for each of them, this does not satisfy the requirement of Art 32.1 (c) for either of them and so neither “*B. rubicunda*” nor “*B. sessiliflora*” is validly published.”

*Prop. D (304 – Perry in Taxon 52: 1103)* Add the following example after Art. 32.1 (or after Art. 32.1 bis if either Proposal 302 or 303 is accepted):

“*Ex. n4.* “*Crepis praemorsa* subsp. *tatrensis*” (Dvorák & Dadáková in *Biológia (Bratislava)* 32: 755. 1977) appeared with “a subsp. praemorsa karyotypo achaeniorumque longitudine praecipue differt”. This statement specifies the features by which the two taxa differ but not how these features differ and so it does not satisfy the requirement of Art. 32.1(c) for a “description or diagnosis”.”

*Prop. E (305 – Perry in Taxon 52: 1103)* Add a new paragraph and an example after Art 32.1 bis if Proposal 302 or 303 is accepted:

“32.1 *ter.* For the purpose of Art. 32.1 bis, properties such as economic, medicinal or culinary usage, cultural properties, cultivation techniques, and geographical origin are not to be considered features of a taxon.”

“*Ex. n5.* “*Musa basjoo*” (Siebold in *Verh. Bat. Genootsch. Kunsten* 12: 18. 1830) appeared with “*Ex insulis Luikiu introducta, vix asperitati hiemis resistens. Ex foliis linteum, praesertim in insulis Luikiu ac quibusdam insulis provinciae Satzuma conficitur. Est haud dubie linteum, quod Philippinis incolis audit Nippis*”. This statement gives information about the economic use (linen is made from the leaves), horticulture attribute (scarcely survives the winter) and on its origin (introduced from the Ryukyu Islands), but since there is no descriptive information given for the “leaves”, the only feature mentioned, the statement does not satisfy the requirement of Art. 32.1(c) for a “description or diagnosis”.”

*Prop. F (306 – Perry in Taxon 52: 1104)* Add a new paragraph after Art. 32.1 and four examples:

“32.1 *quater.* A descriptive statement appearing in a published letter, diary, or record of travels does not satisfy the requirement of Art. 32.1 (c) for a “description or diagnosis” unless it is clear that it was the intent of the author to describe or diagnose a new taxon.”

“*Ex. n6.* *Podocarpus cunninghamii* Colenso (In *Memoriam: An account of visits to, and crossing over, the Ruahine Mountain Range, Hawke’s Bay, New Zealand; and of the natural history of that region performed in 1845–1847: 58. 1884*) published with: “I discovered a plant which I believed to be a new species of *Podocarpus*, and therefore named it *P. Cunninghamii*, ... – its leaves and male amentae with the squamulae at their bases were very much larger than those of *P. Totara*, and the amentae were also on long peduncles; its bark, too, was semi-papery, more like that of some large species of *Fuchsia excorticata*, and not at all resembling the bark of *P. Totara*. ... I have little doubt of its being a distinct species.”. Colenso indicates how the

leaves, male amentae and bark of his new species differ from those of *P. totara* and so the statement was clearly intended to be a diagnosis and so the requirement of Art. 32.1 quater is satisfied and *Podocarpus cunninghamii* was validly published by Colenso.”

“*Ex. n7.* “*Capparis gibbosa*” (A.Cunn. in *J. Bot. (Hooker)* 4:261. 1841), appeared in a biographical sketch of Alan Cunningham by R. Heward. He states quoting verbatim from Cunningham’s diary, “Two species of *Capparis* abound in the brushes, of the same kind as those seen at Vansittart Bay last year; the arborescent gouty species of this genus (*Capparis gibbosa*, A.Cunn.) which was first observed on the shores of Cambridge Gulf, is frequent here, growing to an enormous size, and laden with large fruit. I measured the stem of one very remarkable tree of the species, and found it near twenty-eight feet in circumference, and scarcely twenty-five feet high. Some of the trees were in the earlier stage of veneration, the extremities of the naked branches appearing green and one that I opened exhibited the character of *folia quinata*”. Clearly Cunningham’s initial reference to “the arborescent gouty species ...” was simply a reminder that this was the species that he first saw in the Cambridge Gulf. The rest are notes on the particular trees growing in the area through which he travelled. There is no evidence that the author intended the statement to be the description of a new taxon and so the statement does not satisfy the requirement of Art. 32.1 quater and “*Capparis gibbosa*” is not validly published.”

“*Ex. n8.* “*Eucalyptus Dumosa*” (A. Cunn. ex Oxley, *Journals of Two Expeditions into the Interior of New South Wales: 63. 1820*) appeared with “Mr Cunningham named those thick brushes of eucalyptus that spread in every direction around us *eucalyptus dumosa* or the dwarf gum, as they never exceed twenty feet in height, and are generally from twelve to fifteen, spreading out into a bushy circle from their roots in such a manner that it is impossible to see further than from one bush to the other; and these are very often united by a species of vine (cassyta), and the intermediate space covered with prickly wire-grass, rendering a passage through them equally painful and tedious.” Clearly Oxley was simply describing the vegetation around him, and there is no evidence that the features described for the taxon Cunningham designated “*Eucalyptus Dumosa*” were intended as characters to describe a new taxon and so the statement does not satisfy the requirement of Art. 32.1 quater and “*Eucalyptus dumosa*” is not validly published.”

“*Ex. n9.* “*Lawrencella lanceolata* J. Drumm.” (in *Hooker’s J. Bot. & Kew Gard. Misc.* 5: 312 (1853) and *Templetonia regina* J. Drumm. (in *Hookers J. Bot. & Kew Gard. Misc.* 5: 312 (1853) both appeared in a published letter of Drummond’s to Hooker. Drummond wrote “... rich grassy country which ... was gay with flowers of my *Lawrencella lanceolata*, one of the loveliest of plants. Its large seeds afford food to the *Euphonia splendens* Gould, which I found breeding in the district ... we discovered a charming Leguminous shrub, 3 or 4 feet high, and bearing scarlet flowers, nearly two inches long, varying to yellow, and which resembles those of *Templetonia* more than any Australian genus I know. At present I have called it *T. regi-*

na, ... Its seed-vessels are like those of *Jacksonia*.” As Drummond clearly gave “Its seed-vessels are like those of *Jacksonia*” as a feature to distinguish *T. regina* from other species of *Templetonia*, the statement was clearly intended as a diagnosis and so the requirement of Art 32.1 quater is satisfied and the name is validly published. On the other hand it is obvious that the reference to “large seeds” being eaten by a species of *Euphonia* was not intended to be a description or diagnosis of a the taxon given the designation *Lawrencella lanceolata* and so the above statement does not satisfy the requirement of Art. 32.1 quater and *Lawrencella lanceolata* is not validly published.”

*Prop. G (307 – Perry in Taxon 52: 1104)* Add a new paragraph after Art. 32.1 (and after Art. 32.1 bis if either Proposal 302 or 303 is accepted):

“32.1 *quinquies*. When, in a list of taxa, one or more features of each taxon are given in tabular form and their expression is reported to be identical for two or more taxa within the next higher group (e.g. species of a genus), the requirement of Art. 32.1 (c) for a “description or diagnosis” is not satisfied by this descriptive information for any of the listed taxa.”

*Prop. H (308 – Perry in Taxon 52: 1105)* Move the present voted example Art. 32. \*Ex. 3 to after Art. 32.1 *quinquies* if Proposal 307 is accepted.

*Prop. I (310 – Perry in Taxon 52: 1105)* Add a Note after Art. 32.2 to read:

“A diagnosis may appear as a separate statement or be incorporated within a description, with or without distinguishing typography.”

*Prop. J (311 – Perry in Taxon 52: 1105)* Add a new paragraph after the last of the additions to Art. 32 proposed above:

“32.1 *sexies*. When it is doubtful whether or not a descriptive statement satisfies the requirement of Art. 32.1 (c) for a “description or diagnosis”, a request for a decision may be submitted to the General Committee, which will refer it for examination to the committee or committees for the appropriate taxonomic group or groups. A recommendation may then be put forward to an International Botanical Congress, and if ratified will become a binding decision.”

*Prop. K (062 – Zhu in Taxon 53: 638)* Add a new clause at the end of Art. 32.1:

“; and (e) after 1 January 2007, if a book needs to include a new taxon, new combination, or nomen novum, that name must be validly published beforehand in a journal.”

*Prop. L (054 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 384)* Add a new paragraph to Art. 32 directly before or after Art. 32.5, and refer to it in Art. 60.2 (or 16.1, 20.1 and 21.2), 60.4 and 60.6:

“32.4 *bis*. Valid publication requires a name (and diagnosis) written in an alphabet accepted in botanical usage at the time of publication, but otherwise is not affected by matters of orthography or typography, such as (a) lower case or capital letters (at variance with Art. 16.1, 20.1, 21.2 and Rec. 60F); (b) presence or absence of a diaeresis; (c) a letter or sign that is to be transcribed or deleted following standardization imposed by this *Code* (Art. 60.4–6 and

60.8–12); or (d) an orthographical or typographical error to be corrected (Art. 60.1). For names by Linnaeus see Art. 23.3.”

If proposals 051 [Art. 18 Prop. C] and 052 [Art. 19 Prop. A] pass, this paragraph should also refer to Art. 18.1 and 19.1.

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* has the same general thrust as Prop. L (discussed below) without its undesirable (and presumably unforeseen) consequences. Both seek to enshrine in an Article the principle (Prin. V) that botanical names are in Latin. Prop. A requires that names must be composed only of letters of the Latin alphabet but other characters that are or have been used in names (e.g. symbols used by Linnaeus, w, y, diacritical signs, ligatures, hyphens and apostrophes) are all allowed although most must be “corrected” under the articles cited. The proposal seems an effective implementation of Prin. V.

*Prop. B* and *C* are alternative core proposals of a set of 11 that address the issue of “nomina subnuda”, names published with such limited or unusual descriptive material as to raise doubts as to their valid publication under Art. 32.1 (c). There are two components in both proposals: a formulation of how Art. 32.1 (c) should be interpreted for existing names, and a new requirement for a diagnostic statement from 1 Jan 2007. With respect to the first component, Prop. B sets out explicitly what the proposer (and the Rapporteurs) consider to be an inescapable interpretation of the current wording of the *Code*, even if such a liberal approach is not followed by all botanists. Prop. C narrows this somewhat by identifying a category of names that should not be considered validly published: those that have descriptive material identical to others in the same work. The first component of Prop. B is not proposing any change in the current rules, but in making them more explicit may inadvertently induce instability by drawing attention to names hitherto “swept under the carpet”. Some, including the Rapporteurs, may prefer the first component of Prop. C to that of Prop. B as better reflecting what has been past practice. Those who favour either entire proposal will, of course, vote for it; those preferring the more ambiguous status quo, will, likewise, vote against both. Some may, however, wish to have one of these clarifications of what Art. 32.1 (c) implies without requiring explicit diagnoses for valid publication in the future; a vote of “ed.c.” for one of Prop. B or Prop. C will be interpreted in that way.

*Prop. D* is independent of any of the changes being proposed and would provide a useful example in the *Code*.

*Prop. E*, although worded on the basis of acceptance of either Prop. C or Prop. D, could, with some editorial modification, be accepted independently of those proposals. It proposes, very reasonably, that certain properties of plants should not be considered components of a description under Art. 32.1 (c).

*Prop. F* addresses the special situation of names that appear in a published letter or diary or the like. This category, which some may have considered covered by the “incidental mention” rule removed from the *Code* in Berlin in 1987, provides many names that have been a source of contention with respect to valid publication or otherwise.

Unfortunately these problematic cases will not be resolved by the present proposal, if only because what is “clear” to one person often is not to another. Although the lengthy examples are illustrative of the problems, they do not immediately clarify the proposed new Article. Although the Rapporteurs recognize that Special Committees are not always a solution to difficult problems, this is a situation in which a “sp.c.” vote might be the best solution. Some may even feel that the whole issue of “nomina subnuda” should be so assigned.

*Prop. G* is an attempt to enshrine in an Article of the *Code* the thrust of the current voted example \*Ex. 3 of Art. 32. That example seems fairly clear in its application, and certainly the proposed wording is no clearer, so the Rapporteurs are not convinced that any change is either necessary or desirable. *Prop. H* would be an editorial consequence of acceptance of *Prop. G*.

*Prop. I* would be a desirable clarification if the future requirement for a diagnosis, incorporated in *Prop. C* and *D*, were accepted. Indeed, it might be helpful anyway and could be referred to the Editorial Committee.

*Prop. J* takes a different approach to the question of “nomina subnuda” by proposing that the *Code* establish a procedure to make decisions on individual cases, analogous to that which operates under Art. 53.5 for names that are so similar that they might be confused. Although the Permanent Committees for particular groups do have to assess a number of such cases in order to make recommendations on proposals to conserve or reject, there has never been any general provision in botanical nomenclature for ‘rulings’ on particular nomenclatural issues beyond the rather limited situation of Art. 53.5. To judge by the published report referred to by the proposer, recommendations are likely to be quite inconsistent in their interpretation of the current wording of the *Code* and may lead to very similar situations being treated very differently. This may be a small price to pay for a definite decision, but it must be borne in mind. Moreover, the Rapporteurs must caution as to the dangers of excessive work-load arising for the Permanent Committees were this to be approved, particularly if no other clarification of the *Code* were to be accepted. It may be that eventually such a solution is the only effective one for a ‘hard core’ of difficult cases, but we would hope that in the interim, the requirements of the *Code* might be made clearer.

*Prop. K* would severely restrict where botanists could validly publish new names from 2007 onwards. The rationale for forbidding valid publication in books is merely to render simpler the process by which a correct author citation can be ascertained. However, this rationale is flawed; see the related proposal in Art. 46 *Prop. E*.

*Prop. L*, which is part of Rijkvovorsel’s first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 *Prop. D–P*, would cause severe problems if accepted in its present form. Firstly, the definition “alphabet accepted in botanical usage at the time of publication” is far too vague to enable consistent application of the proposed rule. Secondly, valid publication would depend on a diagnosis (or description, presumably) being written in such an alphabet. Among pre-

1935 names, which do not require Latin, those with a description or diagnosis in an alphabet not accepted in contemporary botanical usage (whatever that may mean), or not in an alphabet (e.g. Chinese or Japanese characters) would not be validly published.

### Recommendation 32B

*Prop. A (309 – Perry in Taxon 52: 1105)* Delete Rec. 32B.1 if Proposal 302 or 303 is accepted.

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* follows necessarily if the future requirement for a diagnosis included in Art. 32 *Prop. B* or *C* is accepted.

### Recommendation 32F

*Prop. A (312 – Perry in Taxon 52: 1105)* Add a new paragraph to Rec. 32F (ahead of the present Rec. 32F.1):

“32F.1 bis. Botanists should propose works for listing as *Opera utique oppressa* in App. V that contain only names accompanied by very short and/or non-technical descriptive statements, when acceptance of these names as validly published would be disadvantageous to nomenclatural stability.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* emphasizes the option of suppressing a particular work as a means of dealing with extensive cases of “nomina subnuda”. Even though the two works referred to by the proposer may be good candidates for inclusion in App. V, this may be a more extreme solution than should generally be canvassed for “nomina subnuda”, and the Rapporteurs are not convinced that it should be enshrined as a Recommendation.

### Article 33

*Prop. A (231 – Jørgensen in Taxon 53: 856)* Add a further example to Art. 33.1:

“Tuckerman (in Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 12: 168, 1877) described “*Erioderma velligerum* sub-sp. nov.”, but did not associate the subspecific epithet with that of any species, only indicating in the discussion features that distinguished it from *E. chilense* to which it was said to be “very near”. His intended subspecies name is not, therefore, validly published.”

*Prop. B (223 – Zijlstra & Brummitt in Taxon 53: 854)* Insert a new Art. 33.1 bis and example as follows:

“Before 1 January 1953 an indirect reference to a basionym or replaced synonym is sufficient to validate a new combination (or new generic name with a basionym) or a nomen novum. Thus, errors in the citation of the basionym or replaced synonym, or in author citation (Art. 46), do not invalidate such publication.

Editorially revise Art. 33.4 to apply only on or after 1 January 1953.

Move Art. 32, Ex. 7 and Ex. 8 to Art. 33, to follow Art. 33.1 bis.

Add an additional example under Art. 33.1 bis:

“*Ex. n1.* The name “*Persicaria runcinata* (HAMILT.)” was included in a list of names by Masamune (Bot. Mag. Tokyo 51: 234. 1937) with no further information. The name *Polygonum runcinatum* was validated by D. Don (Prodr. Fl. Nep. 73. 1825) and ascribed there to “Hamilton

mss". The mention by Masamune of "Hamilt." is regarded as an indirect reference through Buchanan-Hamilton to the name validated by Don, and the combination *Persicaria runcinata* (Buch.-Ham. ex D. Don) Masam. must be accepted as validly published."

*Prop. C (224 – Zijlstra & Brummitt in Taxon 53: 854)* Reword Art. 33.2 as follows:

"Before 1 January 1953, if for a presumed new combination, an epithet of a previously validly published name that applies to the same taxon is adopted but that name is neither cited nor indicated in any way, the new combination is validly published if, and only if, it would be otherwise validly published. In these circumstances, the same applies to a new generic name presumed to be based on an earlier validly published infrageneric epithet, or a new infrageneric epithet presumed to be based on an earlier validly published generic name."

In Art. 33.3, last line, delete "33.2."

*Prop. D (224a – Zijlstra & Brummitt in Taxon 53: 854)* As Prop C but omit "Before 1 January 1953," at the beginning of the revised Art. 33.2, and omit the deletion of "33.2" from Art. 33.3.

*Prop. E (225 – Zijlstra & Brummitt in Taxon 53: 854)* Add two new examples under Art. 33.2:

"*Ex. n2. Brachiolejeunea* was published by Stephani & Spruce (*Hedwigia* 28: 167. 1889) for a taxon that had previously been described as *Lejeunea* subg. *Brachiolejeunea* Spruce (*Trans. & Proc. Bot. Soc. Edinburgh* 15: 75, 129. 1884) but without any reference to Spruce's earlier publication. Because Stephani & Spruce provided a description of *Brachiolejeunea plagiophiloides* that under Art. 42 is a descriptio generico-specifica of a monotypic genus the name would be validly published as a new genus. It is, however, to be treated as a new generic name based on Spruce's subgeneric name, despite the lack of reference to Spruce in the protologue of Stephani & Spruce."

"*Ex. n3.* When Sampaio published '*Schismatomma graphidioides* nob.' (*Brotéria, Sér. Bot.* 15(3): 140. 1 Dec 1917), he cited a synonym (*Platygrapha rimata* Nyl.) and from his taxonomic treatment was evidently intending to publish a new combination based on *Chiodecton graphidioides* Leight., but he made no mention of that name or of Leighton. Because otherwise *Schismatomma graphidioides* would be a valid but illegitimate nomen novum for *Platygrapha rimata* Nyl., it is to be treated as a new combination, *Schismatomma graphidioides* (Leight.) Samp., based on *Chiodecton graphidioides* Leight."

*Prop. F (226 – Zijlstra & Brummitt in Taxon 53: 855)* In Art. 33.6, replace the first line by:

"On or after 1 January 1953, in any of the following cases, a full and direct reference to a work other than that in,"

and delete the final phrase: ", even if published on or after 1 January 1953"

*Prop. G (227 – Zijlstra & Brummitt in Taxon 53: 855)* In Art. 33 (not in 33.2) insert a sentence:

"If on or after 1 January 1953 an author avowedly intends to publish a new combination or nomen novum but fails to provide the full information required under Art.

33.3, the name is not validly published even though the author may have at the same time provided other information which would validate the name."

*Prop. H (228 – Challis & Eggl in Taxon 53: 855)* Add to Art. 33.3:

"33.3. A new combination or nomen novum published on or after 1 January 2007 is not validly published unless its basionym or replaced synonym is cited."

*Prop. I (229 – Challis & Eggl in Taxon 53: 856)* Reword Art. 33.4 as follows:

"33.4. Errors in the details of author citation (Art. 46) or bibliographic reference required under Art. 33.3, but not the omission of these requirements (but see Art. 33.2), do not invalidate publication of a new combination or nomen novum. Provided the other conditions of Art. 33.3 are met, errors in the citation of the basionym or replaced synonym itself, or even indication without any such a citation, do not invalidate publication of a new combination or nomen novum (but see Art. 33.2)."

*Prop. J (230 – Challis & Eggl in Taxon 53: 856)* Add the following example after the current Ex. 6:

"*Ex. 6 bis. Conophytum marginatum* subsp. *littlewoodii* (L. Bolus) S. A. Hammer (Dumpling & His Wife: New Views Gen. *Conophytum*: 181. 2002) is validly published. Although Hammer omitted the basionym (*Conophytum littlewoodii*) he indicated it by citing the full basionym reference."

*Prop. K (192 – Moore in Taxon 53: 600)* Add the following Note after Art. 33.7:

"*Note 3.* Only those names published with the rank-denoting terms that must be removed so as to achieve a proper sequence are to be regarded as not validly published. In cases where terms are switched, e.g. family-order, and a proper sequence can be achieved by removing either or both of the rank-denoting terms, names at neither rank are validly published, unless one is a secondary rank (Art. 4.1) and one is a principal rank (Art. 3.1), e.g. family-genus-tribe, in which case only names published at the secondary rank are not validly published."

*Prop. L (193 – Moore in Taxon 53: 600)* Add the following Note after Art. 33 Ex. 14:

"*Note 4.* Sequential use of the same rank-denoting term in a taxonomic sequence does not represent misplaced-rank denoting terms."

*Prop. M (194 – Moore in Taxon 53: 600)* Add the following Example to Art. 33 after the Note of proposal 193:

"*Ex. n.* Danser (in *Recueil Trav. Bot. Néerl.* 18: 125–210. 1921) published ten new names of subspecies in a treatment of *Polygonum* in which he recognized subspecies (indicated by Roman numerals) within subspecies (indicated by Arabic numerals). These do not represent misplaced rank-denoting terms, so Art 33.7 does not apply and the new names are validly published."

*Prop. N (195 – Moore in Taxon 53: 600)* Add the following Article to Art. 33 after the Example of proposal 194:

"33.7 *bis.* Situations where the same rank-denoting term is used at more than one non-successive position in the taxonomic sequence represent informal usage of rank-denoting terms. Names published with such rank-denoting

terms are treated as unranked (see Art. 35.1).”

*Prop. O (196 – Moore in Taxon 53: 600)* Add the following Example to Art. 33 after the Article of proposal 195:

“*Ex. n.* Names published with the term “series” by Bentham & Hooker (Gen. Pl. 1–3. 1862–1883) are treated as unranked because this term was used at seven different hierarchical positions in the taxonomic sequence. Therefore, the sequence in *Rhynchospora* (l.c. 3: 1058–1060. 1883) of genus-“series”-section does not contain a misplaced rank-denoting term.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* offers a useful example.

*Prop. B* seeks to clarify what is generally required for valid publication of a new combination or a nomen novum prior to the more stringent requirements from 1 January 1953, described in Art. 33.3. The proposed wording reflects current practice and is in accord with the provisions of other relevant articles of the *Code*.

*Prop. C* addresses two quite different things. In general, it represents a slight, but desirable, extension and clarification of Art. 33.2 introduced into the *Code* in Saint Louis, but it also restricts the application of Art. 33.2 to names published prior to 1 January 1953, which was decided against in Saint Louis. Although the thrust of Art. 33.2 is clearly toward names in early literature, at least some application of Art. 33.2 to post-1953 names has taken place. Those who favour the entire proposal, including the limitation to older names, will vote “yes” to *Prop. C*. *Prop. D* has been segregated (as 224a above) for those who favour the general changes to Art. 33.2, but do not wish any restriction of date; this position would be the reverse of that in *Prop. G* (see below). *Prop. E* provides some useful examples to the modified Art. 33.2.

*Prop. F* restricts the application of Art. 33.6 to names published on or after 1 January 1953 and is presumably made on the assumption that the new Art. 33.1 bis, proposed in *Prop. B*, will ensure no nomenclatural changes as a result of this restriction of Art. 33.6; this appears to be the case and acceptance would be appropriate if *Prop. B* were accepted.

*Prop. G* is predicated on acceptance of the restriction in the application of Art. 33.2 to names published prior to 1 January 1953 proposed in *Prop. C*. *Prop. G* proposes that an intended new combination or nomen novum that does not satisfy all the requirements of Art. 33.3 should be treated as not validly published even if the name would otherwise be validly published, the opposite position to that provided by Art. 33.2. *Prop. G* and *Prop. D* provide, therefore, contrasting procedures for dealing with such names, and either could be accepted.

*Prop. H–J* address a small, but for indexers important, point in determining whether or not a new combination is validly published. The current wording of Art. 33.3 requires that after 1 January 1953 a basionym or replaced synonym be indicated (e.g. by citing its place of publication), but not necessarily actually cited. The proposals seek to accept this for the past but to make citation of the basionym or replaced synonym itself mandatory from 1 January 2007.

*Prop. K–O* form part of a set of proposals on misplaced

rank-denoting terms (see also Art. 16 *Prop. E*, Art. 18 *Prop. G* and *H*, Art. 19 *Prop. D*, and Art. 35 *Prop. A*). Problems are often encountered when dealing with misplaced rank-denoting terms under the current rules of the *Code*. These proposals provide a carefully thought-out and elegant solution, and no difficulties are foreseen in the acceptance of all of them.

### Article 34

*Prop. A (178 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 591)* In Art. 34.1(a) replace “in the original publication” by “upon publication”:

“(a) when, upon publication, it is not accepted by the author;”

*Prop. B (179 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 591)* In Art. 34.1(b) replace “group” by “taxon”.

*Prop. C (232 – Jørgensen in Taxon 53: 856)* Add a further example to Art. 34.1:

“The designation “*Sterocaulon subdenudatum*” proposed by Havaas (Bergens Mus. Årbok. 12: 13, 20. 1954) is not validly published in spite of being presented as a new species with a Latin diagnosis, since on both pages it was indicated to be “*ad int.*”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* and *B* both improve the current wording and are supported by the Rapporteurs.

*Prop. C* may be referred to the Editorial Committee.

### Article 35

*Prop. A (197 – Moore in Taxon 53: 600)* Add the following clause to Art. 35.2:

“or (c) would result in a rank sequence in which the same rank-denoting term occurs at more than one hierarchical position.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* is part of a set of proposals on misplaced rank-denoting terms that are more fully discussed under Art. 33 *Prop. K–O*. This proposal could be accepted even if the others were not.

### Article 36

*Prop. A (001 – Rapini in Taxon 51: 209)* Amend Article 36 to remove the Latin requirement by inserting the text indicated in italic below:

“36.1. On or after 1 January 1935 and until 31 December 2006, a name of a new taxon (algal and all fossil taxa excepted) must, in order to be validly published, be accompanied by a Latin description or diagnosis or by a reference to a previously and effectively published Latin description or diagnosis (but see Art. H.9).”

and “36.2. In order to be validly published, a name of a new taxon of non-fossil algae published on or after 1 January 1958 and until 31 December 2006 must be accompanied by a Latin description or diagnosis or by a reference to a previously and effectively published Latin description or diagnosis.”

“36.3. In order to be validly published, a name of a new taxon of fossil plants published on or after 1 January 1996 and until 31 December 2006 must be accompanied by a Latin or English description or diagnosis or by a reference to a previously and effectively published Latin or English

description or diagnosis.”

*Prop. B (086 – Redeuilh in Taxon 53: 220)* Delete Art. 36.3.

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* would remove the requirement for a Latin description or diagnosis for valid publication of the name of a new taxon on or after 1 January 2007. Although conceptually quite independent, and therefore open to independent decision, the proposer does link this proposal to two new requirements for valid publication being proposed in Art. 39 *Prop. A* (an accompanying illustration) and Art. 45 *Prop. A* (a direct statement that the taxon is new) The proposal has one feature that was absent from some earlier proposals to abandon Latin and that may be considered meritorious: it does not propose any additional or alternative language for validating descriptions; authors would be free to chose whatever language they thought most appropriate for descriptions and diagnoses of new taxa – as has always been the case in zoological nomenclature. The existing requirement that a type be formally designated (Art. 37) removes the argument that retaining the Latin requirement avoids “accidental” publication of new taxa, and probably also makes the parallel proposal (Art. 39 *Prop. A*) for a statement such as “sp. nov.” or “gen. nov.” unnecessary for this purpose.

*Prop. B* proposes to delete the requirement for an English or Latin description or diagnosis for valid publication of names of fossil plants; such names could then be published with a description or diagnosis in any language. The initial votes of the Committee for Fossil Plants have been unanimously against the proposal (5 : 0), and members have expressed strong opposition to it, and in particular to any broadening of the language requirement for publication of new taxa of fossil plants.

### Recommendation 36A

*Prop. A (002 – Rapini in Taxon 51: 209)* Delete the existing Recommendation 36A and replace by:

“36A.1. A name of a new taxon should be accompanied by a diagnosis in a language distinct from that used to describe the taxon. It should preferably be in English, in the principal language of the place where the plant occurs, or in Latin.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – The first part of *Prop. A* would be necessary if Art. 36 *Prop. A* were accepted. Some may support the first sentence of the replacement Recommendation but not the second. An “ed.c.” vote will be so interpreted.

### Article 37

*Prop. A (235 – Kiesling & Metzger in Taxon 53: 857)* In Art. 37.2 add the reference “; but see Art. 8.1 and Art. 37.6” after “see also Art. 37.5”.

*Prop. B (236 – Kiesling & Metzger in Taxon 53: 858)* At the end of Art. 37.2 add the following sentence and in Art. 37.6 replace the word “specimen” with “gathering”:

“, in which case these [specimens] are syntypes (Art. 9.4), from among which a lectotype (Art. 9.2) may be designated.”

*Prop. C (296 – Brummitt & al. in Taxon 53: 1099)*

Delete Art. 37.4.

*Prop. D (211 – Traverse & al. in Taxon 53: 849)* Amend Art. 37.4 to read:

“For the purpose of this Article, the type of a name of a new species or infraspecific taxon (fossils excepted: see Art. 8.5) may be an illustration, if, and only if, it is impossible to preserve a specimen. Microfossils, however, may always be typified by illustrations.”

*Prop. E (087 – Voss in Taxon 53: 222)* Change the status of Art. 37.6 to that of a Recommendation.

*Prop. F (237 – Kiesling & Metzger in Taxon 53: 858)* Add a new Article 37.7:

“37.7. In the case of a new monotypic genus (or monotypic infrageneric taxon above the rank of species), the correct mention of, or reference to, the type of the species name is sufficient.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* appears to arise from a misunderstanding. Under Art. 37.2 a type can be indicated by reference to a gathering, but it cannot actually be a gathering comprising more than one specimen. Art. 37 concerns indication of type; it does not define what the type should be. Therefore, the proposed references are unnecessary.

*Prop. B* would again add to Art. 37.2 information that is irrelevant to that Article and already clear from Art. 9. To reiterate, Art. 37 concerns indication of type.

*Prop. C* would be a major change to the *Code* as it has been widely understood, allowing a type to be an illustration for all names, even those published from 1958 onwards. For the record of how the Tokyo Art. 8.3 became the Saint Louis Art. 37.4, by decisions to delete one part of it and to retain the other part, see the report of the Saint Louis Nomenclature Section (Greuter & al. in *Englera* 20: 66–73. 2000 [Prop. D]). The justification of *Prop. C* does not explain why illustrations as types may be desirable. However, the proposers do discuss the matter in detail in a separate paper submitted to *Taxon* and currently in review. Actually, Art. 37.4 may have been better left in Art. 8 as it defines what a type must be, whereas Art. 37 concerns indication of type; the positioning of the rule might be considered by the Editorial Committee.

*Prop. D* is a necessary corollary of the proposals to permit illustrations as types of names of microfossils discussed under Art. 8 *Prop. A* and B.

*Prop. E* seeks to remove the requirement that for valid publication of names of species or infraspecific tax published on or after 1 January 1990 the place of deposition of the type be specified. The proposer’s suggestion that the existing rule is inoperable rests on a misreading of it. While one would hope that, prior to publication of a new name, authors would indeed always deposit the type in the herbarium, collection or institution specified, the requirement for valid publication is not that they do so, but that a place of deposition be specified in the protologue. Acceptance of the proposal would retroactively validate names published since 1990 without any mention of type deposition that have hitherto been considered not validly published.

*Prop. F* raises a valid point. From 1990 onwards valid publication of the name of a new genus (or subdivision

thereof) and its single species requires two separate statements of type, complying with Art. 37.5, for both the (infra)generic and specific names. Before 1990, mention of the single specific name typifies the (infra)generic under Art. 37.3. Prop. F, with some editorial attention, could be a useful addition to the *Code* if there exist names not validly published because the author neglected to provide both type statements, and if the Section feels this potential pitfall needs to be removed.

### Article 38

*Prop. A (212 – Traverse & al. in Taxon 53: 849)* At the end of Art. 38.2 before the parenthesis add the words:

“or, in the case of microfossils, as being the type” and include “Art. 8.5” in the parenthetical references.

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* is another necessary corollary of the proposals to permit illustrations as types of names of microfossils discussed under Art. 8 Prop. A and B.

### Article 39

*Prop. A (003 – Rapini in Taxon 51: 209)* Combine Art. 39 with Art. 38 and add the following new paragraph:

“38.n. In order to be validly published, a name of a new species or infraspecific taxon published on or after 1 January 2007 must be accompanied by an illustration or figure showing the essential characters, in addition to the description or diagnosis, or by a reference to a previously and effectively published illustration or figure.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* which is included with the proposal by the same author to remove the requirement for a Latin description or diagnosis (Art. 36 Prop. A) is conceptually quite independent and its merits should be considered and voted on separately. The proposed requirement would extend to all groups that which currently exists for names of species and infraspecific taxa of algae and all fossil plants. Whereas a full and thorough account of any new taxon at the time of its first publication is eminently desirable and this will often include an illustration, some may feel it extreme for an illustration to be a requirement for valid publication in all cases. The proposal might, therefore, be better incorporated in the *Code* as a Recommendation, and an “ed.c.” vote will be so interpreted.

### Article 41

*Prop. A (256 – Moore & al. in Taxon 53: 1089)* Amend Art. 41.1 as follows and add an Example:

“41.1. In order to be validly published, the name of a taxon above the rank of genus must be accompanied (a) by a description or diagnosis of the taxon, or (b) by a reference (direct or indirect) to a previously and effectively published description or diagnosis of a taxon above the rank of genus.”

“*Ex. 0.* The superorder *Myrtanae* (Bartl.) Takht. (Sist. Filog. Cvetk. Rast.: 295. 1967) was validly published (as a stat. nov.) by reference to a basionym, the class *Myrtopsida* Bartl. (Ord. Nat. Pl.: 225, 326. 1830, “*Myrti*”).”

*Prop. B (257 [‘016’] – Rabeler & al. in Taxon 53: 1089)* Add an Example after Art. 41.1:

“*Ex. 1 bis.* *Peganaceae* (Engl.) Tiegh. ex Takht. (Sist.

Magnoliif.: 178. 1987) was validly published (as a stat. nov.) by reference to the basionym *Peganoideae* Engl. (in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 3(4): 90. 1890).”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* and *B* arose from the deliberations of the Committee on Suprageneric names but, although favoured, did not secure the necessary 60% majority to be proposed in the name of the Committee. Prop. A seeks to extend the requirements for valid publication to names above the rank of family. Hitherto the *Code* has regulated only the ranks and form of such names (e.g. the termination) but has not applied any other rules to them – in large measure a function of their not being subject to the rules of priority. If it is desired to control the publication of names above the rank of family in this way, the present proposal, which permits a description or diagnosis of a taxon at any rank above that of genus to validate a name at any other such rank, seems the simplest and best solution. The issue is, therefore, whether or not names above the rank of family, that are not subject to priority, need be regulated as to publication requirements by the *Code*.

The example in *Prop. B* clarifies that a rank change above the rank of genus can be treated as a “stat. nov.” and is independent of a decision on Prop. A.

### Article 45

*Prop. A (004 – Rapini in Taxon 51: 209)* Add the text in italic to the third sentence of Art. 45.1:

“... However, the name must always be explicitly accepted in the place of its validation, and, on or after 1 January 2007, be followed by a direct citation including the term “*novum*” or an equivalent (e.g., *gen. nov.*, *sp. nov.*, *comb nov.*). ...”

*Prop. B (217 – Committee for Algae in Taxon 53: 851)* To avoid unnecessary nomenclatural complexity, add the following new sentence at the end of Art. 45.4:

“However, names generated in zoological nomenclature in accordance with the Principle of Coordination are not considered validly published under the present botanical code unless such a name appears in print and is applied to an accepted taxon.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* is linked to Art. 36 Prop. A (which proposes to abandon the requirement for a Latin description or diagnosis for valid publication of names) and is designed to add another requirement in addition to that of specifying a type (Art. 37) to avoid any danger of ‘accidental publication’ of a name once the Latin requirement is removed. The proposal can, however, be considered independently. The effect would certainly be to draw attention to publication of a new name, but some may feel it undesirable to make valid publication dependent on what may be viewed as another technicality.

*Prop. B* is a reflection of the fact that under the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature*, publication of any name in the “species group”, “genus group” or “family group” automatically generates the same name at all other recognized ranks within the group, e.g. describing a new subspecies automatically creates a species bearing the same epithet. The proposal seeks to preclude any such automatically created names (when applied to an alga) from

being treated as validly published under the *ICBN*. Although the desire for such a restriction is understandable, it does not address the potential problem that the appearance “in print” and the application “to an accepted taxon” at a different rank from that in which the name was originally published is not a nomenclatural act under the *ICZN*, and may therefore be presented quite incidentally and not be readily recognized nor indexed. The advantages of the limitation may, however, outweigh this problem and the proposal has the support of the Committee for Algae.

### Recommendation 45A

*Prop. A (238 – Kiesling & Metzger in Taxon 53: 858)* Delete Rec. 45A.1.

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* seems entirely appropriate. The proposers are to be commended on their diligent research into the history of this now redundant Recommendation.

### Article 46

*Prop. A (088 – Voss in Taxon 53: 222)* That the editorial committee be advised (more concisely than the full argument [in the proposal]) to use Britton and Brown as an example of the complex operation of Art. 46.

*Prop. B (233 – Zijlstra & al. in Taxon 53: 857)* Rephrase Art. 46 Ex. 5:

“*Ex. 5.* The name *Brachystelma* was published in Sims (Bot. Mag. ad t. 2343. 1822), along with one new species listed as “*Brachystelma tuberosa*. Brown Mscr.”; in addition, at the end of the generic diagnosis Sims added “Brown, Mscr.”, indicating that Brown wrote it. Because the generic and species names were simultaneously validated (Art. 42), the direct association of Brown’s name with the species name and the generic diagnosis establishes that the genus should be cited as *Brachystelma* R. Br.”

*Prop. C (234 – Zijlstra & al. in Taxon 53: 857)* Add the following new examples to Art. 46 following Art. 46.3 and 46.4, respectively:

“*Ex. n.* The name *Claytonia lanceolata* was published by Pursh (1813) without ascription of the name, as is the case for all names in Pursh’s work, although the species description was ascribed to “Pall. Mss.” Since the name itself was not ascribed to Pallas, the name must be cited as *Claytonia lanceolata* Pursh, not *Claytonia lanceolata* Pall. or *Claytonia lanceolata* Pall. ex Pursh.”

“*Ex. n.* The name *Drymaria arenarioides* was published in Roemer & Schultes (Syst. Veg. 5: 406. 1819), with the name ascribed to “Humb. et Bonpl.”, and the description ascribed to “Reliqu. Willd. MS.”. Because of this, and because vol. 5 of this work is authored by Schultes alone, the name is to be cited as *Drymaria arenarioides* Humb. & Bonpl. ex Schult., not as *Drymaria arenarioides* Willd. or *Drymaria arenarioides* Willd. ex Roem. & Schult.”

*Prop. D (269 – Brummitt in Taxon 53: 1092)* Add a new paragraph to Art. 46 before the present 46.3, to read:

“When the epithet of a validly published name is taken up from and attributed to the author of a different binary designation that has never been validly published, only the author of the validly published name is to be cited. If the

original binary designation is later validly published as a new combination, the author of the original binary designation is also not included in the author citation of the new name.”

*Example.* “*Catha edulis*” was published but not validated by Forskål (Fl. Aegypt.-Arab. cvii, 63. 1775). The epithet was taken up by Vahl (Symb. Bot. 1: 21. 1790), who validly published the name *Celastrus edulis* citing “*Catha edulis* Forsk.” in synonymy. The name *Celastrus edulis* must be attributed to Vahl alone, not to Forsk. ex Vahl. The name *Catha edulis* was first validly published by Endlicher (Enchir. Bot. 575. 1841) whose combination is to be cited as *Catha edulis* (Vahl) Endl.’

*Prop. E (063 – Zhu in Taxon 52: 638)* Add a new article after Art. 46.4:

“*46.4 bis.* A name of a new taxon, new combination, or nomen novum published on or after 1 January 2007 must be attributed to the author(s) of the publication in which it appears.”

*Prop. F (064 – Turland in Taxon 52: 639)* Add a new note and three new examples immediately before Art. 46.5:

“*Note 1 bis.* For the purposes of this Article, the authorship of a publication is the authorship of that part of a publication in which a name appears; it may differ from the authorship or editorship of the publication as a whole.”

“*Ex. 20 bis.* *Pittosporum buxifolium* was described as a new species, with its name ascribed to K. M. Feng, in C. Y. Wu & H. W. Li, *Flora yunnanica*, vol. 3 (1983). The account of *Pittosporaceae* in that flora was authored by W. Q. Yin, while the whole volume was edited by Wu and Li. The author of the publication (including the validating diagnosis) was Yin. The name may therefore be cited as either *P. buxifolium* K. M. Feng ex W. Q. Yin or just *P. buxifolium* W. Q. Yin, but not *P. buxifolium* K. M. Feng ex C. Y. Wu & H. W. Li, nor *P. buxifolium* C. Y. Wu & H. W. Li.”

“*Ex 20 ter.* *Vicia amurensis* f. *sanneensis* was described as a new form, with its name ascribed to Y. C. Jiang [as “Y. Q. Jiang”] and S. M. Fu, in Y. C. Ma, H. C. Fu & Shan Chen, *Flora intramongolica*, ed. 2, vol. 3 (1989). The account of *Vicia* in that flora was authored by Jiang, while the whole volume was jointly edited by Ma (Principal Editor) and H. C. Fu and Chen (Vice Principal Editors). The author of the publication is Jiang, who is common to the authorship ascribed to the name, which must therefore be cited as *V. amurensis* f. *sanneensis* Y. C. Jiang & S. M. Fu and not *V. amurensis* f. *sanneensis* Y. C. Jiang & S. M. Fu ex Y. C. Ma & al.”

“*Ex. 20 quater.* *Pittosporum ternstroemioides* was described as a new species, with its name ascribed to C. Y. Wu, in C. Y. Wu & H. W. Li, *Flora yunnanica*, vol. 3 (1983). The author to whom the name was ascribed is also an editor of the flora, but since W. Q. Yin was the author of the publication, the name may be cited as *P. ternstroemioides* C. Y. Wu ex W. Q. Yin or just *P. ternstroemioides* W. Q. Yin, but not *P. ternstroemioides* C. Y. Wu.”

*Prop. G (221 – Silva in Taxon 53: 852)* Delete the second sentence of Art. 46.5 and Art. 46 Ex. 22.

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* is editorial.

*Prop. B* and *C* are to be welcomed. By rewording one example in Art. 46 and providing two new ones, they seek to clarify the application of the Article without changing its meaning. *Prop. B* provides a more accurate explanation of why the name *Brachystelma* should be attributed to Robert Brown. The two new Examples in *Prop. C* deal with cases of author ascription and attribution not currently illustrated in Art. 46, although as both deal with attribution of names, not only ascription, both might be better placed after Art. 46.4.

*Prop. D*, although presented as a new paragraph in Art. 46, deals with a matter already covered by Art. 46.3 and 46.4, though perhaps not obviously so. At least the first portion of the proposed paragraph might usefully be included as a Note and the example might also be useful. This could be referred to the Editorial Committee.

*Prop. E*, intended to simplify author citation, would in fact complicate the situation. There would be two sets of rules: the new, seemingly simple rule of *Prop. E* for all names published from 2007 and, for all other names, the current practice of attributing authorship according to ascription of the name itself and that of the validating description or diagnosis. The proposed new rule also raises the question of what is meant by a “publication”.

*Prop. F* is a useful clarification of what is to be understood as a publication in Art. 46.

*Prop. G* makes the point that authors of illegitimate names are not cited in parentheses in the authorship of a combination, so neither should authors of names that were not validly published be so cited. As the second sentence of Art. 46.5 concerns groups with a later starting date than 1753, the Committees for Algae, Bryophyta, and Fossil Plants have been asked for their opinions and the Committee for Bryophyta has already voted in favour (9 : 0 : 2).

### Recommendation 46E (new)

*Prop. A* (297 – *Hawksworth in Taxon* 53: 1099) Proposal to recommend that dates of valid publication of names are added to author citations.

Insert a new Rec. 46E: “46E.1. In order to enhance the value of author citations as an abbreviated bibliographical reference to the place of valid publication of a name, it is recommended that the year of valid publication be given immediately after the citation of the name(s) or abbreviated names of the author(s). The dates should be presented in a typographical style which distinguishes them from references cited in the text whose full bibliographical details are provided in lists of literature cited, for example by the omission of parentheses.”

*Prop. B* (298 – *Hawksworth in Taxon* 53: 1100) Insert a new example to the new Rec. 46E:

“*Ex. 1.* The citations *Abrothallus* De Not. 1845, and *Acremonium lichenicola* W. Gams 1971 conform to this recommendation.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* and *B* aim to promote what in mycology is a common practice. It is likely that many authors will lack the time, resources, or desire to verify the date of valid publication of all names to which

they refer, and in any case citation of date seems unnecessary unless priority or homonymy is being discussed. There is also the possibility of citing the year incorrectly and that error being perpetuated by subsequent authors.

### Recommendation 50A and 50B

*Prop. A* (159 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon* 53: 589) Replace Rec. 50A.1 and 50B.1 by a single recommendation on names that are not validly published, the first paragraph to be:

“50A.1. In referring to a name that is not validly published (see Art. 32) every care should be taken not to give the impression that it is a name in the sense of this *Code* (see Art. 6.3 and 12.1); the more so when this name meets the requirements of Chapter III of this *Code*.”

*Prop. B* (160 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon* 53: 589) Include a second paragraph in the new recommendation of proposal 159, beginning with:

“50A.2. In the citation of a name that is not validly published, an abbreviation should be added: “nom. nud.” (or “nomen nudum”) if a description has never been published (see Art. 32.1(c)); “pro syn.” (or “as synonym”) if it first appeared in print as a synonym (see Art. 34.1(c)); ...”

*Prop. C* (161 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon* 53: 589) One of the cases to be included in the paragraph of proposal 160 to be:

“nom. prov.” if it has been merely proposed in anticipation of future valid publication (see Art. 34.1(b), see also Rec. 23A.3(i));”

*Prop. D* (162 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon* 53: 589) One of the cases to be included in the paragraph of proposal 160 to be:

“nom. oppr.” if published in a work listed in Appendix V, in a rank specified there;”

*Prop. E* (163 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon* 53: 589) The conclusion of the paragraph of proposal 160 to be:

“nom. inval.”, “nom. non rite publ.” or “non rite publ.” if it does not fit in a category indicated above.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A–E* would formalize five abbreviations by adding them to the *Code*. Some of the additional abbreviations are already widely used informally (“nom. nud.”, “nom. prov.”, “nom. inval.”), but “nom. oppr.” in *Prop. D* may well be unfamiliar to many, and anyway would be used only rarely. In *Prop. E*, a choice of one term would need to be made between the options presented. Some editorial attention would be needed if the proposed changes were really felt to be necessary.

### Recommendation 50B bis (new)

*Prop. A* (164 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon* 53: 589) Include a new recommendation, to be placed before Rec. 50C, with one paragraph:

“50N.1. In the citation of a name that was nomenclaturally superfluous when published and that is illegitimate (see Art. 52.1), the abbreviation “nom. illeg.” should be added.”

*Prop. B* (165 – *Rijckevorsel in Taxon* 53: 590) Add an example to the recommendation of proposal 164:

“*Ex. 1. Argania sideroxylon* Roem. & Schult., Syst.

Veg. 4: 502. 1819, nom. illeg.”

*Prop. C (166 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 590)* Add a note to the paragraph of proposal 164:

“*Note 1.* In the citation of a name that was nomenclaturally superfluous when published, but that is not illegitimate (see Art. 52.3), the abbreviation “nom. superfl.” or “comb. superfl.” should be added.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A–C* would formalize three abbreviations by adding them to the *Code*. What is not explained is whether any of them should be cited after such names that have been conserved. Presumably “nom. cons.” would trump “nom. illeg.” but the possibility of someone citing both, following Rec. 50E.1 as well as this new recommendation, cannot be ruled out.

### Recommendation 50C

*Prop. A (167 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 590)* Include “(that is illegitimate by Art. 53–54)” in Rec. 50C:

“The citation of a later homonym (that is illegitimate by Art. 53–54) should ...”.

*Prop. B (168 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 590)* Split Rec. 50C Ex. 1 into three examples, and Rec. 50E Ex. 1 into two examples:

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* implies that only later homonyms that are illegitimate should be followed in a citation by “non” and the earlier homonym. The current Rec. 50C, on the other hand, applies to any later homonym. If a reference to the relevant articles on homonymy would be useful, the alternative wording “(see Art. 53 and 54)” might be better.

*Prop. B* is purely editorial, aimed at improving readability and consistency of style within Chapter IV Section 4.

### Recommendation 50E

*Prop. A (047 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 383)* Adjust Rec. 50E.1 to include conserved spelling:

“*50E.1.* If a name of a family, genus or species is accepted as a *nomen conservandum* (see Art. 14 and App. II–III) the abbreviation “nom. cons.” or, in the case of a conserved spelling (see Art. 14.11), “orth. cons.” should be added in a full citation.”

*Prop. B (169 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 590)* Add an example to Rec. 50E.1, as amended by proposal 047:

“*Ex. 1 ter. Glechoma* L. (1753), orth. cons., “*Glechoma*”.”

*Prop. C (170 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 590)* Add a paragraph before Rec. 50E.2:

“*50E.1 bis.* If a name has been rejected and has been placed on the list of nomina utique rejicienda (see Art. 56 and App. IV) the abbreviation “nom. rej.” should be added in a full citation.”

If this proposal is passed, the paragraph should be referred to in Art. 56.

*Prop. D (171 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 590)* Add an example to the paragraph of proposal 170:

“*Ex. 1 quater. Betula alba* L. (1753), nom. rej.”

*Prop. E (172 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 590)* Add a note to the paragraph of proposal 170:

“*Note 1.* This also applies to any combination based on

a nomen utique rejiciendum (see Art. 56.1).”

*Prop. F (173 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 590)* Add an example to the note of proposal 172:

“*Ex. 1 quinques. Dryobalanops sumatrensis* (J. F. Gmel.) Kosterm. in *Blumea* 33: 346. 1988, nom. rej.”

*Prop. G (174 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 590)* Add a paragraph before Rec. 50E.2, to be placed after the paragraph of proposal 170:

“*50E.1 ter.* While a proposal to conserve or reject under Art. 14 or 56 is pending (see Rec. 14A and Art. 57), the abbreviation “prop.” should be included in the relevant abbreviation in a full citation of the name involved, i.e. “nom. cons. prop.”, “nom. rej. prop.”, etc.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* is part of Rijckevorsel’s first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 Prop. D–P. It goes beyond the purely editorial in recommending the addition of “orth. cons.” to a full citation of a name with conserved spelling.

*Prop. A–G* would formalize three abbreviations by adding them to the *Code*. There is a little inconsistency among these proposals as well as in the current Rec. 50E, assuming that “full citation” means name, authority, full bibliographic reference and date. Prop. A and C (and current Rec. 50E.1 and 50E.2) both mention a “full citation” but the corresponding examples in Prop. B and D (and current Ex. 1–3) lack full citations (except for *Protea* in Ex. 1). This could be resolved editorially.

### Recommendation 50F

*Prop. A (048 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 383)* Adjust Rec. 50F to take account of the possibility of more than one original form:

“*50F.1.* If the form, or one of the forms, of a name or epithet as originally published differs from the validly published form as set in Art. 60.1 and 61.1 it is desirable that in full citations the exact original form(s) should be added, preferably between single or double quotation marks.”

*Prop. B (049 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 383)* Add to Rec. 50F a classic example of a name with more than one form in the original publication:

“*Ex. 3 bis.* More than one form when originally published: *Hieronyma* Allemão, *Hieronima* Alchorneoides, [1] ‘*Hieronima*’, t. [1] ‘*Hieronima*’. 1848, orth. cons.”

*Prop. C (050 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 383)* Add to Rec. 50F a modern example of a name with more than one form in the original publication:

“*Ex. 3 ter.* More than one form when originally published: *Ocotea flavantha* van der Werff in *Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard.* 76: 464. 1989, ‘*flavantha*’.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – Prop. A–C are part of Rijckevorsel’s first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 Prop. D–P.

### Article 52

*Prop. A (270 – Brummitt in Taxon 53: 1092)* In Art. 52.2 (e), after “citation of the name itself” add “or of another name with the same type”.

*Prop. B (299 – Jeffrey in Taxon 53: 1100)* Amend the first sentence of Art. 52.3 to read as follows:

“A name that was nomenclaturally superfluous when published is not illegitimate on account of its superfluity if it is a combination based on a name-bringing or epithet-bringing synonym (basionym), or if it is based on the stem of a legitimate generic name.”

*Prop. C (253 – Committee on Suprageneric Names in Taxon 53: 1088)* Add the following example to Art. 52:

“*Ex. 12 bis. Carpinaceae* Vest (1818) was nomenclaturally superfluous when published because of the inclusion of the type of *Salicaceae* Mirb. (1815). However, it is not illegitimate because it is based on the stem of a legitimate generic name, *Carpinus* L.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* represents a misreading of Art. 52.2 and consequently is unnecessary. However, this misreading occurs more widely than one would wish and editorial attention may be required, although the additional wording proposed would not be appropriate. The confusion stems from assuming that the “name” in line 1 of Art. 52.2 must necessarily be the same “name” as that in line 4 of Art. 52.1. In the example discussed by the proposer the “name” in line 4 of Art. 52.1 is *Persicaria mitis*, whereas the “name” in line 1 of Art. 52.2 is *Polygonum persicaria*. The example discussed by the proposer would, however, be an excellent one for inclusion in the *Code*, and that in itself would clarify the Article. The matter might be referred to the Editorial Committee.

*Prop. B* raises two valid points concerning Art. 52.3. Firstly, “is not illegitimate” would not be the case if the name were a later homonym. Secondly, “if its basionym is legitimate” is nonsensical because a basionym cannot be illegitimate. The proposed new wording of Art. 52.3 may not be ideal, but the exact wording could be dealt with editorially.

*Prop. C* is a useful example that should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

### Article 53

*Prop. A (271 – Brummitt in Taxon 53: 1092)* Add to Art. 53.3 a new sentence:

“If established practice has been to treat two similar names as homonyms, this practice should be continued if it is in the interests of nomenclatural stability” and add an Example: “The name *Gilmania* Coville was published in 1936 as a substitute name for *Phyllogonum* published by the same author in 1893 because he considered the latter to be a later homonym of *Phyllogonium* Bridel 1827. This homonymy has been accepted in *Index Nominum Genericorum*, and the name *Gilmania* has been accepted as legitimate ever since. The names *Phyllogonum* and *Phyllogonium* are, therefore, to continue to be treated as homonyms.”

*Prop. B (204 – Rijkevorsel in Taxon 53: 602)* In Art. 53.4 insert “with a later homonym being illegitimate” immediately after “homonyms”:

“53.4. The names of two subdivisions of the same genus, or of two infraspecific taxa within the same species, even if they are of different rank, are treated as homonyms, with a later homonym being illegitimate, if they have the same or a confusingly similar epithet and are not based on

the same type.”

*Prop. C (239 – Kiesling & Metzger in Taxon 53: 858)* Insert the following phrase in the last sentence of Art. 53.5, between “recommendation” and “may then”:

“, whether or not to treat the concerned names as homonyms,”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* seems a desirable addition to Art. 53 that should reduce unnecessary re-examination of issues of “parahomonymy” already well-resolved in the literature.

*Prop. B* is based on the apparently correct observation that Art. 53 no longer (from the *Tokyo Code* onwards) explicitly states that all later homonyms are illegitimate, although this is still clearly assumed throughout the *Code*. The suggested addition is not, however, well-placed, as Art. 53.4 deals with confusingly similar names being treated as homonyms. Although, it is Art. 21 Note 1 and Art. 24 Note 2 that specifically address homonymy in names of subdivisions of genera and of infraspecific taxa, respectively, a general statement on the illegitimacy of all later homonyms probably belongs in Art. 53.1. The proposal can be referred to the Editorial Committee.

*Prop. C* would improve the clarity of Art. 53.5.

### Article 58

*Prop. A (272 – Brummitt in Taxon 53: 1093)* In the first line of Art. 58.1, replace the word “name” by “later homonym”. Add a further paragraph reading:

“When the epithet of an illegitimate superfluous name (see Art. 52) is transferred at the same rank into a different combination, that combination is also illegitimate unless the author of the combination definitely excludes the type of the name which caused the illegitimacy of the basionym (see Art. 7.5). If, however, the epithet of a superfluous name is transferred to a different combination at a different rank, or used as a generic name, the resulting name (is not made illegitimate by the inclusion of the type of the name at a different rank and) is treated as a legitimate nomen novum. Its priority dates from the publication of the nomen novum, not from the publication of the illegitimate name.”

Add Examples: “1) *Menispermum villosum* Lam., *Encycl. Meth. Bot.* 4: 97 (1797) is illegitimate because *M. hirsutum* L., *Sp. Pl.* 1: 341 (1753) was cited in synonymy. The combination *Cocculus villosus* (Lam.) DC., *Syst. Nat.* 1: 525 (1817) is also illegitimate since the type of *M. hirsutum* L. was not excluded, and the type of the two names is the same. 2) *Hibiscus ricinifolius* E. Mey. ex Harv., *Fl. Cap.* 1: 171 (1860) is illegitimate because *H. ricinoides* Garcke, *Bot. Zeit.* 7: 834 (1849) was cited in synonymy. When the epithet *ricinifolius* was combined at varietal rank under *H. vitifolius* by Hochreutiner in *Annuaire Conserv. Jard. Bot. Genève* 4: 170 (1900) the latter name was legitimate and is treated as a nomen novum, *H. vitifolius* var. *ricinifolius* Hochr., typified by the type of *H. ricinoides*.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – The argument behind *Prop. A*, that Art. 58.1 should deal with later homonyms and superfluous names separately, does not seem well-founded and the additional wording seems unnecessary. The Examples might, however, help illustrate the application of

the Article, as might a Note along the lines of “In the case of re-use at the same rank of epithets of superfluous names, the type of the name causing the original superfluity must be explicitly excluded.”

### Article 59

*Prop. A (183 – Hawksworth in Taxon 53: 597)* Proposal to prohibit the introduction of new formal dual nomenclature in pleomorphic fungi from 1 January 2008.

Add a new Art. 59.7:

“59.7. A separate name, proposed on or after 1 January 2008, for an anamorph associated with a pre-existing named teleomorph, or for a teleomorph associated with a pre-existing named anamorph, is illegitimate (Art. 52.1) and to be rejected. Where the earliest legitimate name is that of an anamorph, an epitype exhibiting the teleomorphic state is to be selected so that the anamorph name can be used as the name of the holomorph (see Art. 59.8).”

The following proposals are necessary corollaries to the above; in each, instead of repeating the date each time, the form “(but see Art. 59.7)” could be used if considered editorially neater.

Add after “(teleomorph)” in Art. 59.1 line 3 “prior to 1 January 2008 (see Art. 59.7)”.

Add after “binary name” in Art. 59.2 “published before 1 January 2008 (see Art. 59.7)”.

Add after “the name” in Art. 59.3 line 1 “if published before 1 January 2008 (see Art. 59.7)”.

Add after “type” in Art. 59.4 line 1 “published before 1 January 2008 (see Art. 59.7)”.

Add after “names” in Art. 59.5 line 1 “introduced before 1 January 2008 (see Art. 59.7)”.

Add after “available” in Art. 59 Note 1 “and prior to 1 January 2008 (see Art. 59.7)”.

Add at the start of Art. 59.6 “prior to 1 January 2008 (see Art. 59.7)”.

Delete Rec. 59A.2 and 59A.3.

This last is consequent on the acceptance of the new Art. 59.7.

*Prop. B (184 – Hawksworth in Taxon 53: 597)* Provision to avoid the introduction of unnecessary teleomorph names, by designation of epitypes.

Add a new Art. 59.8:

“59.8. Where a teleomorph has been discovered for a fungus previously known only as an anamorph and for which there is no available name for the holomorph, an epitype exhibiting the teleomorph stage may be designated for the hitherto anamorphic name even when there is no hint of the teleomorph in the protologue of that name.”

The following proposals are necessary corollaries to the above.

Add “and Art. 59.8” after “see also Art. 10.4” in Art. 14.9.

Add to the end of Art. 59.1: “except where an epitype has been designated under Art. 59.8”.

Add to the end of Art. 59.2: “(but see Art. 59.8)”.

Add after “... not fulfilled” in the first line of Art. 59.3: “and Art. 59.8 does not apply”.

Add after “...teleomorphic type” in Art. 59.4: “or epi-

type (Art. 59.8)”.

*Prop. C (185 – Hawksworth in Taxon 53: 598)* Provision for the use of informal designations for anamorphs.

Add a new Note 2 below Art. 59.8:

“Note 2. Where it is considered useful or desirable to refer to an anamorph alone in cases covered by Art. 59.7, this provision is not to be construed as preventing the use of designations not regulated by this Code (see Rec. 59A.1).”

*Prop. D (186 – Hawksworth in Taxon 53: 598)* Recommendations on the use of informal designations for anamorphs.

Reword Rec. 59A.1 and add two examples:

“59A.1. Where it is considered desirable, anamorphs of known teleomorphs should be referred to by informal designations based on the names of anamorphic genera rather than binary scientific names.”

“Ex. 1. It is desirable that the *Stemphylium* anamorph of *Pleospora herbarum* (Fr.) Rabenh. ex Ces. & De Not. 1863 not be referred to as *Stemphylium botryosum* Wallr. 1833, but in one of the following ways: *Pleospora herbarum* (*Stemphylium* anamorph), *P. herbarum* (*stemphyllium* state), *Stemphyllium* anamorph of *P. herbarum*, or *stemphyllium* anamorph of *P. herbarum*.”

“Ex. 2. Although there is no obstacle under the Code to the use of the binary name *Penicillium dodgei* Pitt 1980 for the anamorph of *Eupenicillium brefeldianum* (B. O. Dodge) Stolk & D. B. Scott 1967, it is desirable that it be referred to as, for example, *E. brefeldianum* (*Penicillium* anamorph).”

*Prop. E (187 – Hawksworth in Taxon 53: 598)* Authorize the Editorial Committee to amend cross-references in the Code to conform to any revisions approved in Art. 59.

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A–E* are designed to encourage use of a single set of names for pleomorphic fungi for which dual nomenclature is currently mandated by Art. 59: normally one name for the anamorph (the asexual state) and another for the holomorph (the whole fungus) that must be based on teleomorphic (sexual state) material. The desirability and feasibility of such a move stem from advances in molecular systematics that permit unequivocal links between particular anamorph and teleomorph structures. The topic has been extensively debated by mycologists over the past few years and the proposals are an attempt to meet the needs of different users of fungal names. *Prop. A* would prohibit the publication from 1 January 2008 (a deliberate 2½ year time lag) of separate new names for a holomorph when its anamorph was already named and vice-versa. As a result of discussions of the proposals by the Committee for Fungi, it became evident that the wording of the last sentence in *Prop. A* was faulty and the proposer now notes that the last line should have read (additions in **bold**) “... the anamorph name **or epithet** can be used as **or in** the name of the holomorph ...”. *Prop. B*, which stands alone from and is not dependent on acceptance of *Prop. A* and *D–E*, provides an ingenious mechanism, using the epitype concept, to permit the first of these prohibitions to be implemented without major change to the other provisions of Art. 59 (e.g. that requiring the type of a holomorph name to be

in the teleomorph state). Prop. C and D encourage the use of informal designations for anamorphs when the holomorph is known and already named. Prop. E is editorial. The Committee for Fungi is actively considering Prop. A–D, and its recommendations will be presented in its Report to the Nomenclature Section of the Congress.

### Article 60

*Prop. A (300 – Wiersema & Nicolson in Taxon 53: 1100)* Modify Art. 60.7 to read (changes indicated in italic font):

“60.7. When changes in spelling by authors who adopt personal, geographic, or vernacular names in nomenclature are intentional latinizations, they are to be preserved, except when they concern only the termination of epithets to which Art. 60.11 applies and stem changes to personal names involving (a) omission of a final vowel or final consonant or (b) conversion of a final vowel to a different vowel, which are to be corrected by restoration of the final letter.”

*Prop. B (301 – Wiersema & Nicolson in Taxon 53: 1100)* Rewrite Art. 60 Ex. 11 as follows (changes indicated in bold font):

“Ex. 11. *Acacia* “**brandegeana**”, *Blandfordia* “*backhousii*”, *Cephalotaxus* “*fortuni*”, *Chenopodium* “*loureiri*”, *Convolvulus* “*loureiri*”, *Glochidion* “*melvilliorum*”, *Hypericum* “**buckleii**”, *Solanum* “**rantonnei**”, and *Zygophyllum* “*billardieri*” were published to commemorate **T. S. Brandegee**, J. Backhouse, R. Fortune, J. de Loureiro, R. Melville and E. F. Melville, **S. F. Buckley**, **V. Rantonnet**, and J. J. H. de Labillardière (de la Billardière). The implicit latinizations are **Brandegeus**, Backhousius, Fortunus, Loureireus or Loureirus, Melvillius, Buckleius, Rantonneus, and Billardierius. The names are correctly cited as *Acacia brandegeana* **I. M. Johnst.**, *B. backhousei* Gunn & Lindl. (1845), *Cephalotaxus fortunei* Hook. (1850), *Chenopodium loureiroi* Steud. (1840), *Convolvulus loureiroi* G. Don (1836), *G. melvilleorum* Airy Shaw (1971), *H. buckleyi* **M. A. Curtis**, *S. rantonnetii* **Carrière**, and *Z. billardierei* DC. (1824).”

*Prop. C (274 – Brummitt in Taxon 53: 1093)* Add a new sentence in Art. 60.8, before the present wording, reading:

“When a compound epithet is derived from a generic name plus an ending, the root of the correct spelling of the generic name, as defined in Rec. 60G (a) (1), is taken without its termination, and the appropriate ending is added with a connecting vowel if appropriate under Rec. 60G (a) (2).”

Add beneath this paragraph the Examples:

“The epithet meaning ‘having leaves like those of *Myrica*’ is *myricifolia* (root *Myric-*, connecting vowel *-i* and ending *-folia*). The epithets *aquilegifolia* and *aquilegiaefolia* derived from the name *Aquilegia* must be corrected to *aquilegiifolia* (root *Aquilegi-*, connecting vowel *-i* and ending *-folia*). The name *Crocasmia crocosmoides* must be corrected to *Crocasmia crocosmioides* (root *Crocosmi-* and ending *-oides*, no connecting vowel needed.”

Placement and numbering of these Examples should be considered in relation to existing Ex. 13–15.

*Prop. D (010 – Rijkkevorsel in Taxon 52: 378)* Reword Art. 60.1:

“60.1. The original spelling of a name or epithet is to be retained as the validly published form (Art. 61.1), excepting (a) conservation of an altered spelling (Art. 14.11, Rec. 14A); (b) standardization imposed by this *Code*; or (c) typographical or orthographical errors to be corrected (but see Art. 60.3 and 60.7).”

If proposals 015, 018 and 020 are passed, the new articles can be referred to (also Art. 32.5) for standardization; otherwise move the text of the last two thirds of Art. 60.1 to a new note and fill in the missing parts as follows:

“*Note n bis*. Standardization is imposed by Art. 60.4 (letters and ligatures foreign to classical Latin), 60.5 (*u/v* or *i/j* used interchangeably), 60.6 (diacritical signs and Latin ligatures), 60.8 (compounding forms), 60.9 (hyphens), 60.10 (apostrophes), 60.11 (terminations), and 60.12 (functional epithets). See also Art. 32.5.”

*Prop. E (011 – Rijkkevorsel in Taxon 52: 378)* Add a note below Art. 60.1:

“*Note n*. In case of more than one original spelling see Art. 61.3.”

*Prop. F (012 – Rijkkevorsel in Taxon 52: 378)* Reword Art. 60 Ex. 5 to conform with Rec. 50E.1 and 50F:

“Ex. 5. Conserved spelling: *Bougainvillea* Comm. ex Juss. (1789, orth. cons, ‘*Buginvillaea*’).”

*Prop. G (013 – Rijkkevorsel in Taxon 52: 378)* Add a note after the examples accompanying Art. 60.1:

“*Note n ter*. For citation of a name or epithet not retaining the original spelling see Rec. 50E.1 and 50F.”

*Prop. H (014 – Rijkkevorsel in Taxon 52: 378)* Move Art. 60.7 to immediately before or after Art. 60.3 and reword it:

“60.7. An original spelling that represents a latinization of a personal, geographic[al], or vernacular name is to be retained and is not to be treated as an orthographical error, except when latinization concerns only the termination of an epithet and Art. 60.11 applies.”

*Prop. I (015 – Rijkkevorsel in Taxon 52: 379)* Move Art. 60.4–6 to a new article on “letters and ligatures” permissible in “names and epithets”. Rearrange, at the discretion of the Editorial Committee, the provisions on diacritical signs, ligatures and the diaeresis in separate paragraphs or any arrangement of the elements of Art. 60.4 and 60.6 that makes best sense.

*Prop. J (016 – Rijkkevorsel in Taxon 52: 379)* Add a new paragraph, either to start the new article of proposal 015 or before Art. 60.4:

“Names and epithets are to be written in the 26 letters of the modern alphabet. A diacritical sign or ligature, present in a name and epithet when published, is to be transcribed as provided for in Art. 60.4 and 60.6 (see also Art. 23.3).”

*Prop. K (017 – Rijkkevorsel in Taxon 52: 379)* Move the German  $\beta$  and supporting text from Art. 60.4 to Art. 60.6, which is to be worded:

“60.6. A diacritical sign is to be replaced by the customarily assigned letter(s), for example:  $\ddot{a}$ ,  $\ddot{o}$ ,  $\ddot{u}$  become, respectively, *ae*, *oe*, *ue*;  $\acute{e}$ ,  $\acute{e}$ ,  $\acute{e}$  become *e*, or sometimes *ae*;  $\tilde{n}$  becomes *n*;  $\emptyset$  becomes *oe*;  $\acute{a}$  becomes *ao*. A ligature, indicating that letters are to be pronounced together, is to be

replaced by the separate letters: *æ* becomes *ae*; *œ* becomes *oe*; *ß* becomes *ss*. The diaeresis, indicating that a vowel is to be pronounced separately from the preceding vowel (as in *Cephaëlis*, *Isoëtes*), is permissible.”

*Prop. L (018 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 379)* Move Art. 60.8–9, 60.12 and Rec. 60G to a new article on compound forms.

*Prop. M (019 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 379)* Add a clarifying note at the beginning of the new article of proposal 018:

“*Note n.* Authors forming a name or epithet which combines elements derived from two or more words can find advice in Rec. 20A.1(d)/23A.3(c)–(d), and Rec. 60G.”

*Prop. N (020 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 379)* Move Art. 60.10–11 and Rec. 60B–C to a new article on forming names and epithets based on personal names.

*Prop. O (021 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 379)* Add a note at the beginning of the new article of proposal 020:

“*Note n.* Authors forming a name or epithet based on a personal name can find advice in Rec. 60B when forming a generic name, or a subgeneric or sectional epithet, or in Rec. 23A.1–2 and Rec. 60C when forming a specific or infraspecific epithet.”

*Prop. P (022 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 379)* Reword “(but not 60C.2)” in Art. 60.11:

“60.11. The use of a termination (for example *-i*, *-ii*, *-ae*, *-iae*, *-anus*, or *-ianus*) contrary to Rec. 60C.1 is treated as an error to be corrected (see also Art. 32.5). Not to be corrected is a well-established Latin form as indicated in Rec. 60C.2.”

*Prop. Q (101 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 579)* In Art. 60.2 replace “in this Article” with “for the purposes of this Code”.

*Prop. R (102 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 579)* In Art. 60.2 insert “, i.e. the spelling found in the protologue” after “validly published”.

*Prop. S (103 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 579)* Add (in parentheses) the year of publication to the scientific names in Rec. 20A Ex. 1, Art. 60 Ex. 16 (*Eugenia costaricensis*) and Rec. 60D Ex. 1.

*Prop. T (130 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 584)* Add a first paragraph to the article of proposal 020 (or to Art. 60, to be placed before Art. 60.11):

“A specific or infraspecific epithet honouring one or more persons and based on a personal name is to have a termination in accordance with Rec. 60C.1 unless it is accepted as having a Latin ending (see [recommendation of proposal 112 / Rec. 60C.2]).”

*Prop. U (131 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 584)* Add a paragraph to the article of proposal 020 (or to Art. 60, to be placed after Art. 60.11):

“The use of a Latin ending contrary to [recommendation of proposal 112 / Rec. 60C.2] is treated as an error to be corrected (see also Art. 32.5).”

*Prop. V (132 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 585)* Add an example to the paragraph of proposal 131:

“*Ex. n.* *Spirotheca “michaeli”* dedicated to Fray Miguel de Ipiales is to be cited correctly as *S. michaelis* Cuatrec. (1954), not as *S. “miguelii”*. Since Cuatrecasas in

1951 published *Senecio miguelii*, honouring Miguel Bang, it is obvious he was well aware of his options and deliberately chose a classic Latin form.”

*Prop. W (133 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 585)* Rephrase Art. 60.11:

“60.11. The use of a termination (for example *-i*, *-ii*, *-ae*, *-iae*, *-anus*, or *-ianus*) contrary to Rec. 60C.1 is treated as an error to be corrected (see also Art. 32.5).”

*Prop. X (134 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 585)* Add a paragraph to Art. 60, to be placed after Art. 60.11, or to become part of the article of proposal 020:

“In coining a specific or infraspecific epithet, latinization or de-latinization of a personal name is only acceptable if the resulting epithet is sufficiently distinct from what it otherwise would be (or if it is indicated in [recommendation of proposal 112 / Rec. 60C.2]).”

*Prop. Y (135 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 585)* Add a note to the paragraph of proposal 134:

“*Note n.* For an epithet formed in accordance with [recommendation of proposal 112 / Rec. 60C.2] (i.e. by treating a personal name as Latin) to be distinct from an epithet formed in accordance with Rec. 60C.1 (i.e. by adding a termination to a personal name), the difference should be more than a single vowel in its final part.”

*Prop. Z (136 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 585)* Insert in the note of proposal 135, immediately after “final part”:

“(i.e. after the last consonant belonging to the personal name)”

*Prop. AA (137 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 585)* Move Art. 60 Ex. 11 to a position after the paragraph of proposal 134 and rephrase the second half of the second sentence:

“... Billardierius, but the resulting epithets differ only in a single vowel from epithets formed by adding a termination to the personal name (see Rec. 60C.1) and are not acceptable.”

*Prop. BB (138 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 585)* Add an example to the paragraph of proposal of 134:

“*Ex. n.* Linnaeus is commemorated by *linnaei* and *linnaeanus*, not by “*linnei*” and “*linneanus*”, which are based on his de-latinized name, Carl von Linné.”

*Prop. CC (139 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 586)* Add a note to the paragraph of proposal 134:

“*Note n.* An original spelling representing an intentional latinization is to be retained unless the latinization concerns only the ending (see Art. 60.7).”

*Prop. DD (140 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 586)* Move Art. 60 Ex. 12 to a position after the note of proposal 139.

*Prop. EE (141 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 586)* Add an example to the note of proposal 139:

“*Ex. n.* *Calyptanthus caroli* Britton & P. Wilson (1920) honours the co-collector of the type, following the custom that a surname (Charles) with the same form as a given name (Charles) can be latinized (Carolus) as if it actually were that given name, a custom that is not generally accepted in botanical tradition. Since the latinization involves more than the ending, the epithet is to be accepted and not altered to “*charlesii*”.”

*Prop. FF (142 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 586)* Add an example to the note of proposal 139:

“*Ex. n. Wollemia nobilis* W. G. Jones & al. (1995) honours the discoverer David Noble (the implicit latinization being *Nobilis*), in the correct and appropriate genitive (singular, masculine, in third declension). Although coining such epithets is not recommended, the epithet is to be accepted and not altered to “*noblei*”.”

*Prop. GG (143 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 586)* Add a note to the paragraph of proposal 134:

“*Note n.* If sufficiently distinct, an epithet formed in accordance with Rec. 60C.1 is acceptable, even if applying [recommendation of proposal 112 / Rec. 60C.2] is recommended, and vice versa.”

*Prop. HH (144 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 586)* Add an example to the note of proposal 143:

“*Ex. n.* Latinized form that is a surname in its own right: Chamisso, Hieronymus and Martius are preferably commemorated by *chamissonis* (adjective *chamissonianus*), *hieronymi* and *martii* (adjective *martianus*), but *Cibotium chamissoi* Kaulf. (1824), *Sphaerococcus chamissoi* C. Agardh (1820), *Lyngbya hieronymusii* Lemmerm. (1905), *Diplostropis martiusii* Benth. (1838) and *Mimosa martiusiana* Steud. (1841) are correct. The name *Hyptis “martiusi”* is to be correctly cited as *H. martiusii* Benth. (1833), not as *H. “martii”*.”

*Prop. II (145 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 586)* Add an example to the note of proposal 143:

“*Ex. n.* Latinized form that is a latinization of a surname: Bigelow and Glaziou are preferably commemorated by *bigelovii* (adjective *bigelovianus*) and *glaziovii* (adjective *glaziovianus*) but *Carex bigelowii* Torr. ex Schwein. (1824), *Erythroxyllum glazioui* O. E. Schulz (1907) and *Vriesea glaziouana* Lem. (1867) are correct.”

*Prop. JJ (146 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 586)* Add an example to the note of proposal 143:

“*Ex. n.* Given name covered by [paragraph of proposal 121 / 60C.2]: a person to be commemorated by the given name Michael, Mike, Mikhail, etc. is preferably honoured by the epithet *michaelis*, but *Nepenthes mikei* B. R. Salmon & Maulder (1995) honouring Mike Hopkins is correct. Similarly a person called Hugh or Hugo is preferably honoured by an epithet *hugonis*, but *Epidendrum hughii* Rchb. f. (1882) honouring Hugh Low is correct.”

*Prop. KK (147 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 586)* Add a note to the paragraph of proposal 134:

“*Note n.* For the purposes of [paragraph of proposal 134], only epithets commemorating the same person are to be compared. An epithet based on a given name, formed in accordance with [paragraph of proposal 121 / Rec. 60C.2], is not to be compared to an epithet based on a surname (formed in accordance with Rec. 60C.1), even though it may differ only in a single vowel. Such epithets will refer to different persons.”

*Prop. LL (148 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 587)* Add an example to the note of proposal 147:

“*Ex. n.* An epithet based on the latinized form Albertus (given name Albert(o), Bert, etc.) is *alberti*, whereas a (hypothetical) epithet based on the surname Albert or Alberti would be *albertii*. An epithet based on Philippus (given name Flip, Philip(pe), etc.) is *philippi*, whereas

*philippii* is the correct epithet when honouring Rudolph Philippi.”

*Prop. MM (149 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 587)* Add an example to the note of proposal 147:

“*Ex. n.* An epithet based on the latinized form Gregorius (given name Greg(or)(y)) is *gregorii*, whereas an epithet based on the surname Gregory is *gregoryi* (adjective *gregoryanus*), except for epithets based on J. W. Gregory and A. C. Gregory, where *gregorii* (adjective *gregorianus*) is correct (see [paragraph of proposal 090 / Rec. 60C.2]).”

*Prop. NN (150 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 587)* Add an example to the note of proposal 147:

“*Ex. n.* An epithet based on the latinized form Alexander (given name Alex(ander), Alexandre, Alexej, Sander, etc.) is *alexandri* (note feminine *alexandrae* based on Alexandra), whereas an epithet based on the surname Alexander is *alexanderi* (feminine form *alexandrae*), except when it concerns R. C. Alexander Prior and *alexandri* is correct (see [paragraph of proposal 114 / Rec. 60C.2]). An epithet based on the latinized form Petrus (given name Pete(r), Pieter, etc.) is *petri* (note feminine *petrae* based on Petra), whereas an epithet based on the surname Peter is *peteri* (feminine form *peterae*).”

*Prop. OO (151 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 587)* Add a note to the paragraph of proposal 134:

“*Note n.* For epithets based on the well-established latinized form of a given name, or based on a surname identical to such a form, an ending of *-is* (a genitive in third declension) versus *-ii* (a termination added to a name) is not sufficiently distinct.”

*Prop. PP (152 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 587)* Add an example to the note of proposal 151:

“*Ex. n.* An epithet based on a given name Michael is *michaelis* (with *michaelii* not sufficiently distinct to be acceptable as a de-latinization) while an epithet based on a surname Michael is *michaelii* (with *michaelis* not sufficiently distinct to be acceptable as a latinization); similarly for Gabriel and Victor.”

*Prop. QQ (153 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 588)* Add an example to the note of proposal 143, to be placed after the example of proposal 146 (or to [Rec.] 60C.2):

“*Ex. n.* Names containing an epithet traditionally accepted as having a Latin ending (treating the surname ending in “-o” or “-on” of a well-known naturalist as a Latin noun in third declension), even though based on a modern surname that preferably is treated in accordance with Rec. 60C.1, epithet in genitive singular: *Aloë ecklonis* Salm-Dyck (1837), *Dimorphotheca ecklonis* DC. (1838) and *Mesembryanthemum ecklonis* Salm-Dyck (1842) based on Ecklon, *Vilfa richardsonis* Trin. (1840) based on Richardson. Adjectives: *Puya berteroniana* Mez (1896) and *Tragus berteronianus* Schult. (1824) based on Bertero. The name *Aristea “eckloni”* is to be correctly cited as *A. ecklonii* Baker (1878) (with a termination in accordance with Rec. 60C.1), not as *A. “ecklonis”* (in third declension).”

*Prop. RR (154 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 588)* Add an example to the paragraph of proposal of 134, to be placed after the example of proposal 137:

“*Ex. n. Lathyrus “bauhini”* was published to com-

memorate one of the bothers Bauhin, the implicit latinization being Bauhinus. Since the epithet differs only in a single vowel from the epithet formed by adding a termination to the personal name, this name is to be correctly cited as *L. bauhini* P. A. Genty (1892). An epithet honouring both brothers Bauhin would be *bauhiniorum*.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – Prop. A and B would remove a conflict between Art. 60.7 and its Ex. 11, as well as removing a grey area concerning whether or not to retain, in epithets, changes in spelling that are intentional latinizations of personal names ending in -ee, -y and -et (with a silent “t”). See also Prop. X–RR for a more comprehensive, but far more complex and arguably less desirable, attempt at a solution to this and similar problems.

Prop. C raises the valid point that, in Rec. 60G.1, the regular compounds under (a) are explained with no examples, whereas the comparatively rare pseudocompounds in (b) are explained with several examples. The process by which an epithet “*opuntiaeflora*” (Art. 60 Ex. 13) is correctable under Art. 60.8 to *opuntiaiflora* may not be obvious. Moreover, errors such as “*aquilegifolia*” (for *aquilegiifolia*) are not mentioned in the Examples, and neither are epithets with the ending -oides. The proposed additions to Art. 60.8, which mandates Rec. 60G for adjectival epithets, would probably be better editorially incorporated into Rec. 60G.1(a), and an “ed.c.” vote will be so interpreted.

Prop. D–P form part of the first set of proposals on orthography by Rijkevorsel (in *Taxon* 52: 377–384. 2003). Provided here are general comments on all these proposals: General Prop. E, Art. 18 Prop. C, Art. 19 Prop. A, Art. 20 Prop. A, Rec. 20A Prop. A–B, Rec. 21B Prop. A, Rec. 23A Prop. A–C, Art. 32 Prop. L, Rec. 50E Prop. A, Rec. 50F Prop. A–C, Art. 60 Prop. D–P, Rec. 60B Prop. A–D, Rec. 60C Prop. C–L, Rec. 60E Prop. A–C, Rec. 60F Prop. B, and Art. 61 Prop. A–E. The proposer has constructed a mock-up of a re-written Section on Orthography, should all the proposals be passed, which can be viewed online at <http://botgard.bio.uu.nl/taxonomy/ortho.htm> (with a backup at <http://www.nehosoc.nl/orthography.htm>). It should first be mentioned that the Rapporteurs do not recommend a ‘sp.c.’ vote in any instance, given the unsatisfactory history of Special Committees on orthography. Although the proposer claimed “This set of proposals is purely editorial in purpose”, there are some that extend beyond the editorial and would change the meaning of the *Code*. Such proposals are discussed individually under their respective Articles and Recommendations. If the Section felt any improvements to the *Code* could be drawn from the remainder, an ‘ed.c.’ vote would be a mandate for the Editorial Committee to evaluate each proposal and act on any or none of the proposed changes, with rewording where necessary.

Prop. J would be new to the *Code* and does not satisfactorily define “the modern alphabet”. There is also considerable overlap with Art. 32 Prop. L (by the same proposer). See Art. 32 Prop. A for a better solution.

Prop. Q–S form part of the “Additional Proposals” by Rijkevorsel (in *Taxon* 53: 579–580. 2004) here comprising General Prop. F, Art. 60 Prop. Q–S, Rec. 60B Prop. E and F, Rec. 60C Prop. M–O, and Rec. 60D Prop. A and B. The

proposer described them as “dealing with strictly editorial matters” and as supplementary to the first set of proposals on orthography discussed above. Proposals that are not in fact editorial are discussed individually under their respective Articles and Recommendations. Again, if potential improvements to the *Code* are perceived, an ‘ed.c.’ vote would be a mandate for the Editorial Committee to evaluate the proposals and implement changes at its discretion.

Prop. T–RR would revise the ‘back-door rule’ by which Rec. 60C.1 is, and Rec. 60C.2 would be, enforced; see the discussion under Rec. 60C Prop. P–KK.

### Recommendation 60B

Prop. A (023 – Rijkevorsel in *Taxon* 52: 379) Reword the first paragraph of Rec. 60B.1 and integrate Rec. 60B Note 1 into it:

“60B.1. Authors forming a generic name, or a sub-generic or sectional epithet, based on a personal name should use a termination as suggested below, but otherwise should follow the customary spelling of this personal name, provided this meets with Art. 60.4 and 60.6.”

Prop. B (024 – Rijkevorsel in *Taxon* 52: 380) Reword Rec. 60B Note 2:

“Note 2. More than one generic name, or subgeneric or sectional epithet, can be based on one and the same personal name, *i.e.* by adding a prefix or suffix to that personal name or by using an anagram or abbreviation of it.”

Prop. C (025 – Rijkevorsel in *Taxon* 52: 380) Delete from Rec. 60B Ex. 1 the genera dedicated to *Martius* and add extra genera dedicated to Engler:

“*Englerina* Tiegh. (1895)” and “*Englerula* Henn. (1904, ‘1905’)”.

Prop. D (026 – Rijkevorsel in *Taxon* 52: 380) Add a new note to Rec. 60B:

“Note n. This recommendation does not apply to an epithet of a subsection or lower subdivision of a genus, which preferably is a plural adjective (Rec. 21B.1).”

Prop. E (104 – Rijkevorsel in *Taxon* 53: 579) Add “*Parenglerula* Höhn. (1910)” to Rec. 60B Ex. 1.

Prop. F (108 – Rijkevorsel in *Taxon* 53: 580) Throughout Rec. 60B and 60C standardize the preposition before the name of a person commemorated.

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – Prop. A–D are part of Rijkevorsel’s first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 Prop. D–P.

Prop. E and F belong to the additional set, discussed under Art. 60 Prop. Q–S.

### Recommendation 60C

Prop. A (273 – Brummitt in *Taxon* 53: 1093) At the end of the first paragraph of Rec. 60C.1, replace “(but see Rec. 60C.2)” by “but not for names covered by Rec. 60C.2” (without brackets).

Prop. B (056 – Stapleton in *Taxon* 52: 635) In Rec. 60C.2, remove “*murielae* for Muriela or Muriel.”.

Prop. C (027 – Rijkevorsel in *Taxon* 52: 380) Reformat Rec. 60C as follows:

60C *semel*. Rec. 60C.3 (see proposal 028);

“60C *bis*. A noun in the genitive (a substantival epithet)

should be formed as follows:” with two clauses: Rec. 60C.1(a) and (b);

“60C *ter*. An adjective should be formed as follows:” with two clauses: Rec. 60C.1(c) and (d);

60C *quater*. Rec. 60C.4.

Also adjust wording and position of Note 1.

*Prop. D (028 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 380)* Reword Rec. 60C.3 to become the first paragraph of Rec. 60C:

“60C *semel*. Authors forming a specific or infraspecific epithet based on a modern personal name should use a termination and form as suggested in this Rec. 60C, but otherwise should follow the customary spelling of that personal name, provided this meets with Art. 60.4 and 60.6 (for a name already possessing a well-established latinized form see Rec. 60C.2).”

*Prop. E (029 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 380)* Upgrade the status of the examples listed between parentheses in Rec. 60C (maybe also those in Rec. 60B) to numbered examples.

*Prop. F (030 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 380)* Remove Rec. 60C.2 from Rec. 60C and either give it the status of an independent recommendation or integrate it in Rec. 23A.

*Prop. G (031 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 380)* Treat the component parts of Rec. 60C.2 separately.

It seems logical to give each part an independent status at least as a clause; the second sentence might also become a note.

*Prop. H (032 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 381)* [In Rec. 60C.2] Substitute “*joannis* or *johannis* from Johannes or Johann, Johan, John, João, Jan or Hans” for “*hectoris* from Hector”.

*Prop. I (033 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 381)* Add an extra name to the examples in the first sentence of Rec. 60C.2:

“... *brunonis* for Bruno (Robert Brown) ...”

*Prop. J (034 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 381)* In Rec. 60C.2 expand “; but not “*cami*” from Edmond Camus or Aimée Camus” to:

“A modern surname, even when originally derived from Latin, should be treated according to Rec. 60C.1: Camus (Edmond Camus or Aimée Camus), not inflected as “*cami*”, and Magnus (Paul Wilhelm Magnus), not inflected as “*magni*”.”

*Prop. K (035 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 381)* Reword the second sentence of Rec. 60C.2:

“A genitive in third declension has sometimes been used for a modern surname ending on *-o* or *-on*, e.g. *munronis* from Munro, *richardsonis* from Richardson: such epithets should not be corrected.”

*Prop. L (036 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 381)* Replace “substantival epithet” in Rec. 60C by “noun in the genitive” so as to conform more closely to Art. 23.1; also reword Art. 60 Note 3:

“Note 3. A genitive inflection inappropriate to the sex and number of the person(s) honoured is contrary to Rec. 60C.1 and is to be corrected.”

*Prop. M (105 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 579)* In Rec. 60C.1(a) reintroduce “*balansae* for Balansa (m)”.

*Prop. N (106 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 579)* In Rec.

60C.1(c–d) reduce the examples to epithets only and, if this is felt to be desirable, add a note somewhere in the Section on Orthography:

“In the Section on Orthography any specific or infra-specific epithet that is adjectival in form is given in masculine inflection for convenience, when it serves as an example. When used in a name it will take the inflection appropriate to the gender of the generic name (Art. 23.5).”

*Prop. O (107 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 580)* Throughout Rec. 60C, and in Art. 60 Ex. 10, 11 and 19, rearrange all names and epithets in alphabetical order, by name of the person commemorated.

*Prop. P (129 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 584)* Reword Rec. 60C.3 to become the first paragraph of Rec. 60C:

“60C.1. Authors coining a specific or infraspecific epithet based on a modern personal name (i.e. a name to which the tradition of being treated as Latin does not apply, see [recommendation of proposal 112 / Rec. 60C.2]), honouring one or more persons, should use a termination and form as indicated in this recommendation, but otherwise should follow the customary spelling of that personal name, provided this meets with Art. 60.4–6.”

*Prop. Q (112 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 581)* Expand the first sentence of Rec. 60C.2 into an independent recommendation, to be placed immediately before or after Rec. 60C. This recommendation to have several paragraphs.

*Prop. R (113 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 581)* The first paragraph in the recommendation of proposal 112 to have this form:

“Authors coining a specific or infraspecific epithet honouring one or more persons may adopt as the epithet the Latin genitive, appropriate to the sex and number of the person(s) honoured, or the Latin adjective of a latinized form<sup>1</sup> of a personal name.”

*Prop. S (114 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 581)* The second (or third) paragraph in the recommendation of proposal 112 to have this form:

“Authors coining an epithet honouring one or more well-known botanists or naturalists who are traditionally commemorated by an epithet that is the Latin genitive or Latin adjective of a well-established latinized form should conform to tradition.”

*Prop. T (115 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 581)* Add an example to the paragraph of proposal 114 (or to Rec. 60C.2):

“*Ex. n.* Epithets commemorating a well-known botanist or naturalist, a Latin genitive singular in second declension: *afzelii* based on Afzelius; *allemanii* based on Allemanius (Freire Allemão); *clusii* based on Clusius; *linnaei* based on Linnaeus; *martii* based on Martius; *rumphii* based on Rumphius; *solandri* based on Solandrus (Solander); *wislizeni* based on Wislizenus. In third declension: *bellonis* based on Bello; *brunonis* based on Bruno (Robert Brown); *chamissonis* based on Chamisso. Latin adjectives: *afzelianus*, *clusianus*, *linnaeanus*, *martianus*, *rumphianus* and *brunonianus*, *chamissonianus*.”

*Prop. U (116 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 582)* Add an example to the paragraph of proposal 114 [“090”] (or to Rec. 60C.2):

“*Ex. n.* Epithets commemorating a well-known botanist or naturalist, who has a surname similar to a given name with a well-established latinized form or who is known *ex officio* by such a given name, a Latin genitive singular in second declension: *alberti* based on Albertus (Prince Albert, patron of the sciences); *alexandri* based on Alexander (R. C. Alexander (Prior)); *gregorii* based on Gregorius (J. W. Gregory or A. C. Gregory); *hieronymi* based on Hieronymus. In third declension: *hugonis* based on Hugo (Father Hugh Scallan); *ottonis* based on Otto (Eduard Otto or his father Friedrich). Latin adjectives: *albertianus*, *gregorianus* and *hugonianus*, *ottonianus*.”

*Prop. V (117 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 582)* Add a note to the paragraph of proposal 114:

“*Note n.* An epithet as indicated here is connected to a person deserving of the honour, not to a particular personal name.”

*Prop. W (118 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 582)* Add an example to the note of proposal 117:

“*Ex. n.* Epithets based on a modern personal name with the same spelling as the latinized form by which a well-known naturalist is commemorated, genitives: *Licania belloi* Prance (1995) after Erick Bello; *Vriesea belloi* Leme (1989) after Renato Bello; *Eugenia brunoii* Mattos (1990) after Bruno Irgang. An adjective: *Digitaria brunoana* Raimondo (1989 [“1988”]) after Francisco Bruno.”

*Prop. X (119 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 582)* Give the text of proposal 034 the status of a note to the paragraph of proposal 114, to be placed after the example of proposal 118:

“*Note n.* A modern surname, even when originally derived from Latin, should be treated in accordance with Rec. 60C.1: an epithet based on Camus (Edmond Camus or Aimée Camus) should be *camusii* (not “*cami*”). A 21st century botanist with a surname Linnaeus should be commemorated by *linnaeusii* and *linnaeusianus*; similarly Magnus, *magnusii* and *magnusianus*, etc.”

*Prop. Y (120 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 582)* Add a footnote to “a latinized form” at its first appearance, likely in the paragraph of proposal 113:

“[For the purposes of Art. 60 and its recommendations, “a latinized form” is defined as any form (of a personal name) that traditionally is treated as being Latin: it includes a Latin personal name, a latinized form of a personal name and a personal name treated as being Latin.”

*Prop. Z (121 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 582)* The third (or second) paragraph in the recommendation of proposal 112 to have this form:

“Authors coining a specific or infraspecific epithet commemorating one or more persons by a given name that either corresponds with, or is taken to be derived from, a well-established latinized form should adopt as the epithet the appropriate Latin genitive of this latinized form.”

*Prop. AA (122 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 583)* Add an example to the paragraph of proposal 121 [“097”] (or to Rec. 60C.2):

“*Ex. n.* Authors desiring to commemorate Frans Stafleu by his given name (Frans) should adopt the Latin genitive of the latinized form (Franciscus) as epithet: *francisci*.”

*Prop. BB (123 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 583)* Add an example to the paragraph of proposal 121 [“097”] (or to Rec. 60C.2):

“*Ex. n.* Epithets commemorating a person by given name, a Latin genitive singular of a well-established latinized form, in first declension: *annae* based on Anna (An(n(a)), Anne(ke), Annika, etc.); *edithae* based on Editha (Edith); *elisabethae* based on Elisabetha (Bess, Betty, Elisabeth, Elizabeth, Lisa, Liz(zie), etc.); *murielae* based on Muriela (Muriel). In second declension: *augusti* based on Augustus (August(e)(in), Augustus, G(u)us(t), etc.); *caroli* based on Carolus (Carl(os), Charles, Karel, etc.); *henrici* based on Henricus (Enrique, Hal, Harry, Heinrich, Hendrik, Henk, Henri, etc.), *hieronymi* based on Hieronymus (Jeroen, Jerome, Jeronimo, etc.); *jacobi* based on Jacobus (Jaap, Jacob, Jake, James, Jim, etc.); *maximilliani* based on Maximilianus (Max(imillian)); *nicolai* based on Nicolaus (Colin, Klaas, Klaus, Nick, Nic(h)o(las), Nico(laas), etc.), *stephani* based on Stephanus (Esteban, István, Stef(an), Stephen, Steve(n), etc.). In third declension: *beatricis* based on Beatrix (Béatrice, Beatrix); *conceptionis* based on Conceptio (Concepción); *gabrielis* based on Gabriël (Gabe, Gabriel, etc.); *hugonis* based on Hugo (Hugh, Hugo, etc.); *joannis* or *johannis* based on Johannes (Hans, Jack, Jan, João, Johan(n(es)), John, etc.); *michaelis* based on Michaël (Mich(a)el, Miguel, Mike, Mikhail, etc.); *victoris* based on Victor (Vic(tor)).”

*Prop. CC (124 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 583)* Add an example to the paragraph of proposal 121 (or to Rec. 60C.2):

“*Ex. n.* Epithets commemorating two or more persons by given name, a Latin genitive plural of a well-established latinized form, in first declension: *Achrynanthes margaretarum* P. J. de Lange (2001) after Margaret “Honey” McCoy and Margaret “Marg” Christian; in second declension: *Weinmannia henricorum* Bernardi (1964) after Henri Baillon, Henri Humbert, Henri Lecomte and Henri Perrier de la Bâthie; in third declension *Macaranga johannium* Whitmore (1980) after John S. Womersley and L. John Brass.”

*Prop. DD (125 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 583)* Add a note to the paragraph of proposal 121 (or to Rec. 60C.2):

“*Note n.* A given name should be treated in accordance with Rec. 60C.1 if it does not correspond with, or is not taken to be derived from, a well-established latinized form. This can be determined by consulting this recommendation or botanical usage.”

*Prop. EE (126 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 583)* Add an example to the note of proposal 125:

“*Ex. n.* Although obviously not of Latin origin, the given name Otto is accepted as a name traditionally treated as being Latin: e.g. *Anthurium ottonis* K. Krause (1932), *Microstylis ottonis* Schltr. (1922), *Psychotrya ottonis* Standl. (1931) and *Stelis ottonis* Schltr. (1929) are all dedicated to Otto Buchtien.”

*Prop. FF (127 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 584)* Add an example to the note of proposal 125:

“*Ex. n.* In botanical usage, Gordon is not accepted as a name traditionally treated as being Latin: e.g. *Dutaillopsi*

*gordonii* T. G. Hartley (1997), *Elaeocarpus gordonii* Tirel (1983), *Engomegoma gordonii* Breteler (1996) and *Tessmanianthus gordonii* Almeda (1989) are all dedicated to Gordon McPherson.”

*Prop. GG (128 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 584)* Add a note to the paragraph of proposal 121 (or to Rec. 60C.2):

“*Note n.* A Latin adjective of a latinized form of a given name has no place in botanical tradition. An adjective based on a given name can be formed in accordance with Rec. 60C.1.”

*Prop. HH (155 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 588)* Add to the example of proposal of 115:

“*bauhini* based on Bauhinus (either of the brothers Bauhin, *bauhinorum* for both)” and (among the adjectives): “*bauhinianus*”.

*Prop. II (156 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 588)* Add an example to the note of proposal 119:

“*Ex. n.* An epithet based on the modern surname Faber, derived from the Latin word *faber* (craftsman, artisan), should be formed in accordance with Rec. 60C.1. The genitive *fabri*, when honouring the Rev. Ernst Faber, is to be corrected to *faberi* or, when honouring C. Fabre-Tonnere, to *fabrei*.”

*Prop. JJ (157 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 588)* Add a note after the note of proposal 117:

“*Note. n.* An epithet formed by treating the surname Faber as a latinized form with genitive *fabri* (although not recommended) is to be accepted as correct.”

*Prop. KK (158 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 589)* Add an example to the paragraph of proposal 157:

“*Ex. n.* The combination *Abies “faberi”*, based on *Keteleeria fabri*, is to be correctly cited as *A. fabri* (Mast.) Craib (1920).

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* aims to address what some perceive as a conflict between Rec. 60C.1 (which is mandated by Art. 60.11) and 60C.2 (which is not). The suggested change to the first paragraph of Rec. 60C.1 may help to resolve the confusion, but a change to Art. 60.11, similar to that in Art. 60 Prop. P (which would need rewording), might be a better option.

*Prop. B* appears well justified by the proposer, who demonstrates that the name Muriel does not have a well-established latinized form and therefore has no place in Rec. 60C.2.

*Prop. C–L* are part of Rijckevorsel’s first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 Prop. D–P.

*Prop. K* seeks to clarify the final sentence of Rec. 60C.2, but depending on the interpretation of the current wording might result in a change in meaning. The existing second sentence of Rec. 60C.2 reads, rather indefinitely, “Treating modern family names as if they were in third declension should be avoided (e.g. *munronis* from Munro, *richardsonis* from Richardson).” Some might conclude from this that names like Munro must instead fall under Rec. 60C.1, so an epithet such as *munronis* would be correctable to *munroi* under Art. 60.11, whereas others might interpret it (correctly we believe) as a neutral recommendation. The proposed new text, reflecting the neutral view, is more direct and simply states that such epithets exist and

that they should not be corrected.

*Prop. M–O* are part of Rijckevorsel’s additional set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 Prop. Q–S.

*Prop. P–KK* deal with Rec. 60C.2 (except Prop. P, which concerns Rec. 60C.3). They aim to address what actually falls under Rec. 60C.1 and 60C.2, and propose a complex restructuring of the latter recommendation and new rules to enforce it in Art. 60 (see Art. 60 Prop. T–RR), with often lengthy examples. It is necessary to weigh the usefulness of the current rules and recommendations (Art. 60.7, 60.11, and Rec. 60C) against that of the proposed, arguably improved, but much expanded and inevitably more complex version. Although the current wording of Rec. 60C.2 is not perfect, the Rapporteurs wonder if the current inadequacies warrant such a large amount of extra text as a ‘fix’.

### Recommendation 60D

*Prop. A (109 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 580)* Add to Rec. 60D:

“A genitive is to be particularly avoided for a geographical feature named after a person (or with a name similar to that of a person), where an adjective with an ending *-ensis* is preferable.”

*Prop. B (110 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 580)* Add an example to the amended Rec. 60D of proposal 109:

“*Ex. n.* Epithets allowing no confusion whether they commemorate a person or a geographical feature: *Arctostaphylos gabrielensis* P. V. Wells (1992) named after the San Gabriel Mountains (California) and *Echinocactus victoriensis* Rose (1909) named after Victoria (Mexico).”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* and *B*, which are not purely editorial, are part of Rijckevorsel’s additional proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 Prop. Q–S.

### Recommendation 60E

*Prop. A (037 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 381)* Reword Rec. 60E:

“*60E.1.* Authors forming an epithet should follow the customary spelling of the word or words on which it is based, provided this meets with Art. 60.4 and 60.6. Authors should observe accepted usage of Latin and latinization (see also Art. 23.5).”

*Prop. B (038 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 381)* Delete the example in Rec. 60E.

*Prop. C (039 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 381)* Include a note in Rec. 60E:

“*Note n.* A respected reference on accepted usage of Latin and latinization is W. T. Stearn, *Botanical Latin* (1966, 1992).”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A–C* are part of Rijckevorsel’s first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 Prop. D–P. Prop. C is not purely editorial.

### Recommendation 60F

*Prop. A (275 – Brummitt in Taxon 53: 1094)* In Rec. 60F.1, delete everything after the first comma.

*Prop. B (040 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 381)* Move Rec. 60F to a position following Art. 23, with notes referring to the former between Art. 23.1 and 23.2 and between Art. 24.1 and 24.2:

“[Art. 23] *Note n.* For the initial letter of a specific epithet see Rec. 60F.”

“[Art. 24] *Note n.* For the initial letter of an infraspecific epithet see Rec. 60F.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* does not seek to change the thrust of Rec. 60F.1 – that specific and infraspecific epithets should always have a lower-case initial letter – but merely seeks to remove what has largely become an explanation as to why, historically, certain specific and infraspecific epithets have been published with an initial capital letter. Some may feel that the explanatory component is useful and is not an invitation to disregard the first sentence of Rec. 60F.1

*Prop. B* is part of Rijckevorsel’s first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 *Prop. D–P*.

## Article 61

*Prop. A (005 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 378)* Move Art. 61 forward to become the first article of Chapter VII.

*Prop. B (006 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 378)* Reword Art. 61.1:

“61.1. Only one orthographical variant of a name or epithet is treated as validly published (see Art. 60.1).”

*Prop. C (007 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 378)* Reword the first sentence of Art. 61.4:

“61.4. Any orthographical variant other than the validly published form is to be corrected.”

*Prop. D (008 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 378)* Reword the second sentence of Art. 61.4:

Replace “corrected form” by “validly published form”.

*Prop. E (009 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 52: 378)* Reword Art. 61 Note 1:

“*Note 1.* For citation of orthographical variants see Rec. 50F.”

*Prop. F (089 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 577)* In Art. 61 and Rec. 50F replace “form” by “spelling”.

*Prop. G (090 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 577)* Add a footnote to “spelling” (wherever it first appears in the Section on Orthography):

“For the purposes of this *Code* “spelling” includes all elements, as discussed in the Section on Orthography, that may be part of a name or epithet without affecting valid publication: it includes not only letters but also hyphens, apostrophes, etc.”

*Prop. H (091 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 578)* In Art. 61.1 replace “treated as validly published” by “correct”.

*Prop. I (092 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 578)* Move “only one nomenclatural type being involved” from Art. 61.2 to 61.1.

*Prop. J (093 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 578)* Rephrase Art. 61.1:

“61.1. Any one name or epithet in a name, only one nomenclatural type being involved, has only one correct spelling (see Art. 60.1 and 61.3). Any other spelling of this name or epithet is an orthographical variant.”

*Prop. K (094 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 578)* Throughout the *Code* replace “orthographical variant” by “different spelling” or “different spelling of the same name”, etc. Maintain “orthographical variant” only where it is used in the sense of “another spelling, to be corrected” (i.e. in Art. 61.4 and 60.12).

*Prop. L (095 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 578)* Rephrase Art. 61.2:

“61.2. An orthographical variant may arise as the result of an orthographical error, e.g. by misapplication of compounding, inflection, etc., or as the result of a typographical error, i.e. by accident.”

*Prop. M (096 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 578)* In Art. 61.3 replace “Art. 60” with “Art. 20, 23 and 60”.

*Prop. N (097 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 578)* Rephrase the beginning of Art. 61.3:

“If there is more than one original spelling (i.e. more than one spelling appears in the protologue [original publication]), the one ...”

Also replace “one of the variants” with “one spelling” in “... adopts one of the variants and rejects the other(s) ...”.

*Prop. O (098 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 578)* Move Art. 61.3 to Art. 60.

*Prop. P (099 – Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 579)* Rephrase Art. 61.4:

“61.4. The use of an orthographical variant is an error to be corrected. For nomenclatural purposes an orthographical variant, whenever it appears in print, is to be treated as if it were the correct spelling of the name or epithet (see Art. 45.2).”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A–E* are part of Rijckevorsel’s first set of proposals on orthography discussed under Art. 60 *Prop. D–P*.

*Prop. F–P* deal with orthographical variants and other matters concerning Art. 61. The proposer perceives problems, real or apparent, in Art. 61, but it is not always evident that the solutions being offered would improve the current wording. As with Rijckevorsel’s first and additional sets of proposals on orthography, an “ed.c.” vote would be advice to the Section to refer all these proposals to the Editorial Committee to evaluate each and act on any or none of the proposed changes, with rewording if necessary.

## Article 62

*Prop. A (058 – David in Taxon 52: 636)* Add *-botrys* to the list of endings deemed to be masculine in Art. 62.2(a) so that it reads:

“(a) Compounds ending in *-botrys*, *-codon*, *-myces*, *-odon*, *-panax*, *-pogon*, *-stemon*, and other masculine words, are masculine.”

*Rapporteurs’ comments.* – *Prop. A* would fix as masculine the gender of generic names ending in *-botrys*, which is currently treated as either masculine or feminine. The proposer has demonstrated that this would be the least disruptive choice of gender.

## Division III

*Prop. A (182 – Kirkbride in Taxon 53: 595)* Remove both clauses of the first sentence of Div. III.4.b.2 and

replace them with the following three sentences:

“One year prior to each International Botanical Congress, the General Committee will notify each institution with one or more herbaria listed in *Index herbariorum* that they may request to vote at the Nomenclature Section. To receive its vote(s), each institution must reply expressing its desire to vote at the Nomenclature Section. Such institutions are entitled to 1–7 votes, as specified on a list drawn up by the Bureau of Nomenclature of the International Botanical Congress and submitted to the General Committee for final approval.”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* is intended to improve representation from institutions outside Europe and North America at the Nomenclature Section of International Botanical Congresses, but there is evidence to suggest that this desirable objective may not be achieved thereby. Searching the online database of Index Herbariorum (<http://sciweb.nybg.org/science2/IndexHerbariorum.asp>), in November 2004, there were 1227 herbaria listed for Europe (555 in the United Kingdom) and 862 listed for North America (Canada, Greenland, Mexico and the United States), making a total of 2089. The total number of herbaria in the database was stated to be “3,240+ herbaria in 165 countries”, i.e. 65% are in Europe and North America. Of the 498 institutions voting at Saint Louis, 58% were from those continents. There would be little change to that percentage if from each country a similar proportion of institutions replied with a request to vote. However, it is possible that more requests might come from Europe and North America than from elsewhere, which would have quite the opposite effect to that desired by the proposer.

### Article H.3

*Prop. A* (241 [“242”]– Govaerts in *Taxon* 53: 858)

Add a sentence at the end of Art. H.3.1:

“A single letter space is left after the multiplication sign.”

and, as a corollary, replace Rec. *H.3A.1* by:

“If the multiplication sign is not available, the lower case letter “x” is used instead.”

*Prop. B* (264 – Brummitt in *Taxon* 53: 1091) Add a new paragraph under Art. H.3 reading:

“For purposes of conserving nothospecific names under Art. 14, the multiplication sign and the prefix ‘notho’ are disregarded.”

If considered necessary, add in Art. 14.1 a reference to nothospecies and cross reference to Art. H.3.

*Prop. C* (265 – Brummitt in *Taxon* 53: 1091) Add to Art. H.3 the following: “Names of nothogenera may not be conserved” and in Art. 14.1 make cross reference to this.

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* aims to standardize positioning of the multiplication sign (or letter “x”) in names of hybrids. It is also a change from what the *Code* currently recommends in Rec. *H.3A.1*. See Rec. *H.3A Prop. A* for an alternative proposal.

*Prop. B* seeks to clarify that nothospecific names may be considered for conservation under Art. 14. The intent is good, but the provisions of Art. 50.1 already make clear that names of nothospecies must be treated in the same way as

other specific names for nomenclatural purposes. All that seems to be required is a note in Art. 14 along the lines of “As species and nothospecies are nomenclaturally equivalent (Art. 50.1), names of nothospecies may also be conserved and rejected.” Those who agree should vote “ed.c.”

*Prop. C* deals with the very different situation of names of nothogenera, which are condensed formulae and which cannot be conserved. Again the existing wording of the *Code* appears to cover the situation, although a Note, probably in Art. H.6, but cross-referenced from Art. 14, would be beneficial. This could also draw attention to the fact that nothogeneric names may, by contrast, be proposed for rejection under Art. 56, which covers “any name” and does not require that the name have a type. The Note might be along the lines of: “Because a name of a nothogenus is a condensed formula (Art. H.6.1) and does not have a type (Art. H.9 Note 1), it cannot be conserved under Art. 14 (Art. 14.3), nor may it be rejected under Art. 14 unless it is a homonym of a conserved name (Art. 14.10). It may, however, be rejected under Art. 56.” Those who agree should again vote “ed.c.”

### Recommendation H.3A

*Prop. A* (111 – Rijckevorsel in *Taxon* 53: 580) Rephrase Rec. *H.3A*:

“*H.3A.1*. The multiplication sign (“×”), indicating the hybrid nature of a taxon, should be placed so as to express that it belongs with the name or epithet but is not actually part of it. The exact amount of space, if any, between the multiplication sign and the initial letter of the name or epithet should depend on what best serves readability.”

“*H.3A.2*. If the multiplication sign is not available it should be approximated by a lower case letter “x” (not italicized).”

*Rapporteurs' comments.* – *Prop. A* may be a more attractive alternative to Art. H.3 *Prop. A*. It would not impose rigid standardization (which, of course, may be desirable to some), and would allow for various levels of computer and printing technology.