

to be used when united with *Caesalpiniaceae* nom. cons. and *Mimosaceae* nom. cons.

(112) Add a further Note to Art. 18 as follows:

“Note 3. If *Fabaceae* Lindl. (1836), nom. cons. is united with *Caesalpiniaceae* R. Br. (1814), nom. cons. and/or *Mimosaceae* R. Br. (1814), nom. cons., *Fabaceae* is to be used (see App. IIB).”

If Proposal 110 to delete Arts. 18.5 and 18.6 is approved, a concomitant and long extant issue needs a simultaneous solution. This is again to do away with the liberty of using the alternative family and subfamily names *Papilionaceae/Fabaceae* and *Papilionoideae/Faboideae*, respectively, based on personal preferences, and to bring universal uniformity in their use. According to Art. 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.

Article 19.7 states that when the *Papilionaceae* are included in the family *Leguminosae* (nom. alt., *Fabaceae*) as a subfamily, the name *Papilionoideae* may be used as an alternative to *Faboideae*. In the context of the present proposal to delete Art. 18.5, we propose to delete Art. 19.7 to disallow further use of *Papilionoideae*, as neither it, nor *Papilionaceae* already disallowed if Proposal 110 is accepted, is based on the generic name of the type of the subfamily. A replacement Note is proposed.

(113) Delete Art. 19.7 and insert the following Note at the end of Art. 19:

“Note 3. Use of the designation “*Papilionoideae*”, earlier approved for application to a subfamily of *Fabaceae* that included the genus *Faba*, is not permitted, the correct name being *Faboideae*.”

With the deletion of the Arts. 18.5, 18.6 and 19.7, and the introduction of explanatory Notes in those Articles, the long-existent

incongruity and inconsistency in the use of the family names *Leguminosae*, *Fabaceae* and *Papilionaceae*, and the subfamily names *Faboideae* and *Papilionoideae* would be settled and stability of nomenclature attained.

If Proposals 110 and 113 are accepted, a number of changes will be required to other Articles of the *Code*; these are detailed below.

(114) If Proposals 110 and 113 are accepted, amend the following Articles as indicated:

Art. 10.6. Delete the final sentence.

Art. 11.1. Delete the final clause of the first sentence so that the sentence reads: “Each family or taxon of lower rank with a particular circumscription, position, and rank can bear only one correct name.”

Art. 18.1. Delete the parentheses “(but see Art. 18.5)” in the first sentence.

Art. 19.4. Delete the words “but see Art. 19.7” at the end of the paragraph.

App. IIB. Remove the entries that with the deletion of Art. 18.5 are no longer validly published names.

In addition adjustment to Art. 19 Ex. 3 and adoption of regularly formed family names in Art. 53. Ex. 1, Ex. 10 and Ex. 18 would be required.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express their gratitude towards the Vice-Rector, King Saud University, Riyadh for providing a research grant under the Centre of Excellence in Biodiversity Research for the study of biodiversity of wetlands of Saudi Arabia, during the course of the work of which the present proposal was prepared. Sincere thanks are expressed towards Drs. Dan H. Nicolson, John McNeill, and Werner Greuter for their expert opinion and critical comments at various stages of formulation of the proposals.

(115–116) Proposals to eliminate the Latin requirement for the valid publication of plant names

Estrela Figueiredo,¹ Gerry Moore² & Gideon F. Smith³

1 *Schweickerdt Herbarium, Department of Plant Science, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, 0002 South Africa*

2 *Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 1000 Washington Avenue, Brooklyn, New York 11225 U.S.A.*

3 *Office of the Chief Director: Research and Scientific Services, South African National Biodiversity Institute, Private Bag X101, Pretoria, 0001 South Africa / Acocks Chair, Schweickerdt Herbarium, Department of Plant Science, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, 0002 South Africa*

Author for correspondence: *Estrela Figueiredo, estrelafigueiredo@hotmail.com*

Article 36.1 in the *International code of botanical nomenclature* requires that, as from 1 January 1935, all names of new plant taxa (algae and fossils excepted) must be accompanied by a Latin description or diagnosis in order to be validly published. In this issue (Figueiredo & al. in *Taxon* 59: 617–620) it is argued that the Latin requirement must be removed now as it represents a relic that does not serve the purposes for which it was originally intended. We propose that, as from the effective date of the Melbourne *Code*, a diagnosis or description in any language would suffice to effect valid publication of a plant name, once the other Articles have been complied with.

In order to effect these changes the following two proposals are made:

(115) In Art. 36.1 add the words in bold italics so it reads as follows:

“36.1. On or after 1 January 1935 **and until and including 31 December 2012**, a name of a new taxon (algae 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.”

(116) Delete Recommendation 36A.1.

If accepted, these proposals would have no effect on the language requirements the *Code* places on diagnoses for non-fossil algae (Latin on or after 1 January 1958 – Art. 36.2) and fossil taxa (English or Latin on or after 1 January 1996 – Art. 36.3). However, if there is consensus

among the users of names of algae and/or fossils, similar proposals could be made to Arts. 36.2 and 36.3 that would allow the newly adopted *Code* to be completely free of any language requirement for diagnoses for newly described taxa. The primary objective of the authors is to eliminate the Latin requirement at Art. 36.1, and we feel that the best way to effect this change is to not require any specific language.

(117–119) Proposals to make the pre-publication deposit of key nomenclatural information in a recognized repository a requirement for valid publication of organisms treated as fungi under the *Code*

David L. Hawksworth,¹ Jerry A. Cooper,² Pedro W. Crous,³ Kevin D. Hyde,⁴ Teresa Iturriaga,⁵ Paul M. Kirk,⁶ H. Thorsten Lumbsch,⁷ Tom W. May,⁸ David W. Minter,⁶ Jitendra K. Misra,⁹ Lorelei Norvell,¹⁰ Scott A. Redhead,¹¹ Amy Y. Rossman,¹² Keith A. Seifert,¹¹ Joost A. Stalpers,³ John W. Taylor¹³ & Michael J. Wingfield¹⁴

1 *Departamento de Biología Vegetal II, Facultad de Farmacia, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Plaza Ramón y Cajal, Madrid 28040, Spain; Department of Botany, Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*

2 *Landcare Research, P.O. Box 40, Lincoln 7640, New Zealand*

3 *CBS–KNAW Fungal Diversity Centre, PO Box 85167, 3508 AD Utrecht, The Netherlands*

4 *School of Science, Mae Fah Laung University, Chiang Rai 75100, Thailand*

5 *Departamento Biología de Organismos, Universidad Simón Bolívar, Apartado 89000 Sartenejas, Baruta, Edo. Miranda, Venezuela*

6 *CABI–Europe, CAB International, Bakeham Lane, Egham, Surrey TW20 9TY, U.K.*

7 *Department of Botany, The Field Museum of Natural History, 1400 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60605–2495, U.S.A.*

8 *Royal Botanic Gardens Melbourne, P. Bag 2000, South Yarra, Victoria 3141, Australia*

9 *Department of Botany, Sri Jai Narain Postgraduate College, Lucknow 226001, India*

10 *Pacific Northwest Mycology Service, 6720 NW Skyline Boulevard, Portland, Oregon 97229–1309, U.S.A.*

11 *Biodiversity (Mycology and Botany), Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, 960 Carling Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6, Canada*

12 *USDA–ARS Systematic Botany and Mycology Laboratory, 10300 Baltimore Avenue, Beltsville, Maryland 20705, U.S.A.*

13 *Department of Plant and Microbial Biology, 321 Koshland Hall, University of California Berkeley, California 94720–2465, U.S.A.*

14 *Forestry & Agricultural Biotechnology Institute, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, 0002 South Africa*

Author for correspondence: David L. Hawksworth, d.hawksworth@nhm.ac.uk

Mycologists first proposed the introduction of some form of a mandatory indexing system for newly proposed fungal names in the 1950s (Ainsworth & Ciferri in *Taxon* 4: 3–6. 1955). Following informal discussions amongst mycologists – particularly during the 7th International Mycological Congress in Oslo in 2002 – the CBS–Fungal Diversity Centre in Utrecht initiated MycoBank in 2004 (Crous & al. in *Mycol. Res.* 108: 1236–1238. 2004; Crous & al. in *Stud. Mycol.* 50: 19–20. 2004). This step was taken in order to test the willingness of mycologists to use a depository system where they could place information on new scientific names they were proposing. MycoBank is a fully online system whereby the proposers of new scientific names of organisms treated as fungi under the *Code* (i.e., including chytrids, oomycetes, and slime moulds; Pre. 7 of the *ICBN*; McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146. 2006) can deposit key information that becomes public and freely available on the worldwide web only after effective publication of the work including those names. Each name is assigned a unique number from a range made available by Index Fungorum to MycoBank. (Index Fungorum is a partnership of CAB International, CBS–KNAW Fungal Diversity Centre, and Landcare Research, that offers a freely available nomenclator of fungal names in all ranks online to the public.) As of January 2010, the Index Fungorum database held information on 450,280 names; see <http://www.indexfungorum.org/>.

MycoBank operates similarly to GenBank, which provides unique identifiers for molecular sequence data. MycoBank does not require any hard-copy material to be lodged at CBS or elsewhere, but serves to disseminate information on newly proposed taxa widely and rapidly at no cost to all users, whether they are depositors or interrogators. Since 2007, MycoBank has operated under the auspices of the International Mycological Association (IMA), which has assumed long-term responsibility for its operation. Like IAPT, IMA is a Scientific Member of the International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS).

Scientific names in all ranks are covered in the existing MycoBank system. The basic information required for deposition of a newly described taxon is the name itself, the validating Latin (or for fossil fungi, English) description or diagnosis, details of the nomenclatural type, and (for species and infraspecific taxa) where the type is permanently preserved. New combinations and replacement names require only the full bibliographic reference to the basionym or replaced name, as already specified by Art. 33.4. MycoBank personnel check the uniqueness of the name, alert the depositor to any earlier homonym, and draw attention to orthographic errors (such as incorrect Latin terminations), but do not express any taxonomic opinions; i.e., there is no censorship. Index Fungorum, as the body issuing unique numbers for fungal names, automatically receives a copy of all nomenclatural information deposited in MycoBank.