Proposals to amend the Code

The Vienna Code (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146, 2006) introduced a requirement in Art. 32.1 that, ‘In order to be validly published, a name of a taxon (autonyms excepted) must … (b) be composed only of letters of the Latin alphabet …’ Since there are several such alphabets, ranging from the usually accepted classical one of 23 letters to the modern one of 26 letters, the Code should be more specific. This may be achieved by a small amendment to Art 32.1.

(169) Proposal to amend Article 32.1
Alex S. George

‘Four Gables’, 18 Barclay Road, Kardinya, Western Australia 6163, Australia. a.george@murdoch.edu.au

The Vienna Code (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146, 2006) introduced a requirement in Art. 32.1 that, ‘In order to be validly published, a name of a taxon (autonyms excepted) must … (b) be composed only of letters of the Latin alphabet …’ Since there are several such alphabets, ranging from the usually accepted classical one of 23 letters to the modern one of 26 letters, the Code should be more specific. This may be achieved by a small amendment to Art 32.1.

(169) Amend Art. 32.1 (b) by the additions shown in bold below:

“32.1. In order to be validly published, a name of a taxon (autonyms excepted) must: (a) …; (b) be composed only of letters of the modern Latin alphabet (a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, p, q, r, s, t, u, v, w, x, y, z), except as provided in Art. 23.3 and Art. 60.4, 60.6, 60.9, and 60.10; (c) …”

(170) Proposal to eliminate the Latin requirement for the valid publication of names of non-fossil algae

David M. Williams & Juliet Brodie

Botany Department, the Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.
Author for correspondence: David M. Williams, dnw@nhm.ac.uk


Their proposals address Article 36.1 of the International code of botanical nomenclature that requires, as from 1 January 1935, that names of new plant taxa be accompanied by a Latin diagnosis or description. Article 36.1 explicitly excludes the names of non-fossil algae and fossil taxa, which are covered in Articles 36.2 and 36.3, respectively. For algae, the requirement for a Latin diagnosis or description has a different start date from other plants and fossils: it is on or after 1 January 1958. There appear to be no reasons to exclude the algae from the proposals offered by Figueiredo & al. and, thus, we suggest an additional proposal:

(170) In Art. 36.2 add the words in bold so it reads as follows:

“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 and including 31 December 2012 must be accompanied by a Latin description or diagnosis or by a reference to a previously and effectively published Latin description or diagnosis.”

The stated primary objective of Figueiredo & al. (in Taxon 59: 617–620. 2010) is to eliminate the Latin requirement for new botanical names. Our objective is to extend that to include the algae. Along with Figueiredo & al., we also feel the best way to effect this change is to have no specific language requirement. We also suggest that this additional proposal to be submitted to the vote only if proposals 115–116 are accepted.

We have left the third proposal concerning names of fossil taxa to the palaeobotanists.

(171) Proposal to amend Article 37.7

Mithilesh K. Pathak, Soumen Gantait & Subir Bandyopadhyay

Botanical Survey of India, P.O.: Botanic Garden, Howrah – 711103, West Bengal, India
Author for correspondence: Mithilesh K. Pathak, mithileshkp@yahoo.com

One of the conditions for valid publication of a name is to abide by Art. 37.7 which states: “For the name of a new species or infraspecific taxon published on or after 1 January 1990 of which the type is a specimen or unpublished illustration, the single herbarium or collection or institution in which the type is conserved must be specified.”

However, we have found that in many cases the authors deposit the types after publication of the new species or infraspecific taxon sometimes even after several years from the date of publication of the names of the new taxa. Thus we feel that a little change in the wordings of the Art. 37.7 is required which we propose as follows:

(171) Proposal to amend Article 37.7
Mithilesh K. Pathak, Soumen Gantait & Subir Bandyopadhyay

Botanical Survey of India, P.O.: Botanic Garden, Howrah – 711103, West Bengal, India
Author for correspondence: Mithilesh K. Pathak, mithileshkp@yahoo.com

One of the conditions for valid publication of a name is to abide by Art. 37.7 which states: “For the name of a new species or infraspecific taxon published on or after 1 January 1990 of which the type is a specimen or unpublished illustration, the single herbarium or collection or institution in which the type is conserved must be specified.”

However, we have found that in many cases the authors deposit the types after publication of the new species or infraspecific taxon sometimes even after several years from the date of publication of the names of the new taxa. Thus we feel that a little change in the wordings of the Art. 37.7 is required which we propose as follows:
(171) Insert the words in bold in Art. 37.7 as indicated:
For the name of a new species or infraspecific taxon published on or after 1 January 1990 of which the type is a specimen or unpublished illustration, the single herbarium or collection or institution in which the type is conserved or will be conserved must be specified.
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(172–174) Three proposals to amend Article 59 of the Code concerning teleotypification of fungal names
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3 Department of Mycology, Institute of Ecology, Evolution & Diversity, J.W. Goethe-University, Siesmayerstr. 70, Building B, 60325 Frankfurt am Main, Germany
4 Department of Taxonomy, Institute of Botany of the Academy of Sciences, 25243, Pruhonice, Czech Republic
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In view of a possible move towards a unitary nomenclature for pleomorphic fungi at the International Botanical Congress in Vienna in 2005 a new clause was added to Article 59 (Art. 59.7) that opened the possibility of epitypification of the names of anamorphic fungal taxa with teleomorphic material without introducing a new name. Following a suggestion of Scott Redhead, this procedure is here called teleotypification. From 2007 onwards, several cases of teleotypification (Gams & al. in Taxon 59: 1197–1200. 2010—this issue) have shown that this procedure can have positive and negative effects. It does not significantly contribute towards reducing the number of redundant names in the presently permitted dual nomenclature for pleomorphic fungi (Art. 59).

To clarify the effect of teleotypification, we offer three proposals: Proposal 172 is the simplest, to eliminate Art. 59.7 and all allusions to it, returning to the pre-Vienna situation, in the spirit of Korf (in Seifert & al. in Taxon 88: 499. 2003): “Every time we have tinkered with [Art. 59], we have made the situation worse.” The system of teleotypification is not the optimal start to the desirable overall revision of nomenclatural rules concerning pleomorphic fungi. The alternative proposal (Prop. 173) takes into consideration all the complications presented by Gams & al. (l.c.), with the inevitable consequence that its wording gets more complicated. As a continuation of Prop. 173, Prop. 174 would introduce a Recommendation that would restrain the description of new anamorph-typified generic names for fungi.

(172) Delete Art. 59.7 and all allusions to it and add a Note regarding names already published under it:
In Art. 9.7, delete “(but see also Art. 59.7)”.

In Art. 9.1, delete “or epitypified under Art. 59.7, by an element representing the teleomorph”.

In Art. 59.2, delete “or its epitype specimen under Art. 59.7,” “(see also Art. 59.7)”.

Reword Art. 59.4 to read: “Irrespective of priority, teleomorph-typified names take precedence over anamorph-typified names, when both types are judged to belong to the same holomorphic taxon.”

To vindicate the teleomorphogenic application of names so far ‘teleotypified’, a Note after Art. 59.3 such as the following is needed:

“Note 1. Names under anamorph-typified generic names that were epitypified with teleomorphic material on or after 1 January 2007 remain available for the teleomorph but are to be recombined under the appropriate generic name if such a name is available.”

When this proposal is accepted, the rules on the nomenclature of fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle will for now return to the pre-Vienna situation. Without increasing complexity, the way remains open to an integral revision of the anamorph–teleomorph nomenclature in coming decades when the molecular analysis of the whole fungal diversity may have led to a system of monophyletic genera. To us it remains doubtful whether enforcing an entirely unitary nomenclature may be desirable even then.

(173) Add in Art. 59.7 the passages in bold:
“Where a teleomorph has been discovered for a fungus previously known only as an anamorph and for which there is [ne]ither an existing legitimate name for the holomorph nor a teleomorph-typified generic name available, from 1 January 2007 onwards an epitype exhibiting the teleomorph may be designated for the hitherto anamorphic name even when there is no hint of the teleomorph in the protologue of that name.”

This proposal avoids the undesirable inclusion of taxa with teleomorph-typified names in otherwise entirely anamorphic genera. To avoid introducing new anamorph-typified generic names for fungi closely related to so far teleomorphic genera the following Recommendation may offer a solution.

(174) Add a Recommendation 59A.4:
“59A.4. Even when molecular evidence of generic homogeneity is available, newly discovered anamorphic fungi should only be classified under teleomorph-typified generic names, when no suitable anamorph-typified generic name is available. In such cases the subsequent discovery of a teleomorph will require epitypification by a specimen exhibiting the teleomorph.”

Acceptance of this Recommendation presupposes acceptance of Prop. 173, so that the newly found anamorphic species can be teleotypified in due course.