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These proposals are supported by the Report of the Special Committee that is also published in this issue (McNeill & al. in Taxon 65: 1443–1448. 2016).

(391) Add text to Art. 10.5 following clause (b):

“A type selection made under a largely mechanical method is superseded by any later choice of a different type not made under that method, unless, in the interval, the superseded choice has been affirmed in a publication that did not use a mechanical method of selection.”

(392) Add a Note following Art. 10.5:

“Note 2bis. The effective date of a typification (cf. Art. 22.2, 48.2 and 52.2(b)) subject to supersession under Art. 10.5(b) remains that of the original selection, unless the type has been superseded.”

(393) Add a new Article defining “a largely mechanical method of type selection” following Art. 10.5:

“10.5bis. For the purposes of Art. 10.5(b), “a largely mechanical method of selection” is defined as one in which the type is selected following a set of objective criteria such as those set out in “Canon 15” of the so-called “Philadelphia Code” (Arthur & al. in Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 31: 255–257, 1904) or in “Canon 15” of the *American Code of Botanical Nomenclature* (Arthur & al. in Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 34: 172–174, 1907).”

(394) Add a new Article establishing the criteria for a publication adopting “a largely mechanical method of type selection” following Art. 10.5bis:

“10.5ter. The following criteria determine whether a particular publication, appearing prior to 1 January 1935, has adopted a largely mechanical method of type selection:

(a) any statement to that effect, including that the *American Code* or the “Philadelphia Code” was being followed or that types were determined in a particular mechanical way (e.g. the first species in order); or

(b) adoption of any provision of the “Philadelphia Code” or the *American Code* that was contrary to the provisions of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature in force at that time, e.g. the inclusion of one or more tautonyms as species names.

Additionally for publications appearing prior to 1 January 1921:

(c) if an author of the publication was a signatory of the “Philadelphia Code” (and was therefore also a signatory of the *American Code*);

(d) if an author of the publication stated publicly (e.g. in another publication) that in the typification of generic names the “Philadelphia Code” or the *American Code* was followed;

(e) if an author of the publication was an employee or a recognized associate of the New York Botanical Garden; or

(f) if an author of the publication was an employee of the United States federal government.


(395) Add a new Recommendation 10A.2:

“10A.2. In citing a type selection made under a largely mechanical method that has since been affirmed by an author not following such a method, both the place of original selection and that of effective affirmation should be cited, e.g. “Quercus L. … Type: *Q. robur* L. designated by Britton & Brown (Ill. Fl. N. U.S., ed. 2, 1: 616. 1913); affirmed by Green (in Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.: 189. 1929).”

(396) Add Examples following Art 10.5ter:

“Ex. 7bis. (a) Underwood (in Mem. Torrey Bot. Club 6: 247–283. 1899) wrote (p. 251): “For each genus established the first named species will be regarded as type.” Therefore his designation (p. 276) of *Caenopteris furcata* Bergius as type of *Caenopteris* Bergius (in Acta Acad. Sci. Imp. Petrop. 1782(2): 249. 1786) is superseded; this has been effected by Copeland (Gen. Filicum: 166. 1947), who designated *C. rutifolia* Bergius as type.

Ex. 7ter. (a) Murrill (in J. Mycol. 9: 87. 1903), referring to generic types, wrote: “The principles by which I have been chiefly guided are..."
also quite well known having been stated and explained by Underwood [see Ex. 7bis]. Consequently Murrill (l.c.: 95, 98) listed the first-named species treated by Quélet (Enchir. Fung.: 175. 1886), Coriolus lutescens (Pers.) Quélet, as type of Coriolus Quélet (l.c.), and later (in Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 32: 640. 1906) listed Polyporus zonatus Nees as type because it was “the first species accompanied by a correct citation of a figure”. Both lectotypifications are considered to be mechanical and were superseded by the choice of Polyporus versicolor (L.) Fr. by Donk (Revis. Niederl. Homobasidiomyc.: 180. 1933).

Ex. 7quater. (b) Britton & Wilson (Bot. Porto Rico 6: 262. 1925) designated Cucurbita lagenaria L. as type of Cucurbita L. (Sp. Pl.: 1010. 1753). As Britton & Wilson included many tautonyms in their publication (e.g. “Abras Abrus” (L.) W. Wright”, “Acisanthera Acisanthera” (L.) Britton”, and “Ananas Ananas” (L.) Voss”), they were evidently following the American Code, and their type selections followed a mechanical method. Their selection of C. lagenaria (currently treated as Lagenaria siceraria (Molina) Standl.) has been superseded by the selection of C. pepo L. by Green (in Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.: 190. 1929).

Ex. 7quinquies. (d) In considering the typification of Achyranthes L. in a preliminary to his account of Amaranthaceae in the North American Flora, Paul C. Standley (in J. Wash. Acad. Sci. 5: 72. 1915) selected A. repens L. as type stating that “there seems, moreover, no doubt as to the type of the genus Achyranthes under the American Code of nomenclature”, noting that, as a result, “the name Achyranthes must be used in a sense other than that in which it has generally been employed in recent years”. As a result of this publication of acceptance of the American Code, not only is Standley’s selection of A. repens superseded by that of A. aspera L. by Hitchcock (in Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.: 135. 1929), but types cited in his other publications (e.g. in Britton, N. Amer. Fl. 21: 1–254. 1916–1918) are supersedable under Art. 10.5. Thus his statement (p. 134. 1917) that A. repens was the type of Achyranthes does not constitute priorable affirmation of his earlier selection; similarly his publication of type designations previously made by Britton & Brown, such as Chenopodium rubrum L. (p. 9. 1916) and Amaranthus caudatus L. (p. 102, 1917), does not constitute priorable affirmation of their selection; the typification of Chenopodium L. has been superseded by the selection of C. album L. by Hitchcock (l.c.: 137) and that of Amaranthus L. was first affirmed by Green (in Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.: 188. 1929).

In addition, the Editorial Committee should indicate that the current Art. 10 Ex. 6 is an Example of Art. 10ter(a).