

*Regnum Vegetabile Vol. 14*

# **SYNOPSIS OF PROPOSALS**

CONCERNING THE  
INTERNATIONAL CODE OF BOTANICAL  
NOMENCLATURE

SUBMITTED TO THE  
NINTH INTERNATIONAL BOTANICAL CONGRESS  
MONTREAL - 1959

presented by  
**J. LANJOUW**



# SYNOPSIS OF PROPOSALS

CONCERNING THE

## INTERNATIONAL CODE OF BOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE

SUBMITTED TO THE

NINTH INTERNATIONAL BOTANICAL CONGRESS  
MONTREAL - 1959

presented by

J. LANJOUW

Rapporteur général



January 1959

UTRECHT — NETHERLANDS

Edited by the Organizing Committee of the Ninth Int. Bot. Congress and  
by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature of  
the International Association for Plant Taxonomy.

Published with the financial assistance of I.U.B.S.—U.N.E.S.C.O.

*Obtainable from*

**THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR PLANT TAXONOMY AND NOMENCLATURE**  
**106 LANCE NIEUWSTRAAT - UTRECHT - NETHERLANDS**



**Printed in the Netherlands by Kemink en Zoon N.V.**  
**Domplein 2 - Utrecht**

## PREFACE

For the third time in less than 10 years it is my duty to present a Synopsis of Proposals on Botanical Nomenclature. A few days before writing this preface I heard about the death of my predecessor as Rapporteur-général, Dr. Th. A. Sprague. An expression of gratitude towards Sprague for the important work he did on botanical nomenclature should find its place here. At three international botanical congresses, Cambridge 1930, Amsterdam 1935, Stockholm 1950, Sprague was among the most important participants in the nomenclature section, each time in a different office. The results of his work will always remain discernible in many places in our Code of Nomenclature.

Although there is again a relatively high number of proposals, I think that I am right in stating that they aim at less far-reaching effects than those made at Stockholm and Paris. The proposals are often concerned with mere details or are logical consequences of decisions of principle taken at previous Congresses: e.g. the proposals that try to bring the rules into a closer agreement with the type-method. Of prime importance remains the question of *nomina specifica conservanda c.q. rejicienda* and the proposals connected with this principle. It is highly desirable that the Congress at Montreal should reach a satisfactory decision on this for we cannot go on having this controversy. In order to make it clear without the slightest doubt that I want to give no grounds for the charge that I have influenced those who are perhaps not in a favourable position to form a considered opinion on this question, I have refrained from commenting on this matter of principle. I want it to be understood that this does not mean that I myself have no opinion on the subject. On the contrary, at the meeting at Montreal I shall clearly indicate what I think is the best solution.

I am particularly grateful towards the Canadian Congress Committee for the extremely liberal way in which it has left me complete liberty in the preparation of this Synopsis and the organisation so far of the work for the Nomenclature Section. The circumstance that our colleagues Rousseau and Boivin will cooperate with us at Montreal certainly warrants our expectations of successful deliberations.

The linguistic problems involved in compiling this Synopsis have been solved by Dr. W. Robyns and Mr. R. Ross, who have critically examined the French and English text. It is a pleasure to thank them for this collaboration, especially also because they very often do the same for Taxon, a help which cannot always be publicly acknowledged at the time.

A traditional but certainly not less important acknowledgment is due to Miss Keuken and Dr. F. A. Stafleu for their help in compiling this Synopsis. Thanks to the co-operation of the Canadian Congress Committee and the help of I.U.B.S. we shall be able to count on their presence at Montreal.

I should like to conclude with the wish that everyone carefully considers his decisions before voting and that the discussion at Montreal will be both pleasant and successful.

J. Lanjouw

Utrecht, 11 November 1958.

# LIST OF PROPOSALS \*

1—3.	E. L. Little, Jr.	Taxon 6: 191. 1957	120—145.	G. M. Schulze et G. Buchheim	Taxon 7: 253. 1958
4.	M. Buchinger	Taxon 6: 197. 1957			
5—9.	H. St. John	Taxon 6: 197. 1957	145a—150.	L. Holm	Taxon 7: 256. 1958
10.	H. W. Rickett et W. H. Camp	Taxon 4: 37. 1955	151—152.	A. A. Bullock	Taxon 7: 257. 1958
11.	A. A. Bullock	Taxon 6: 215. 1957	153—164.	A. A. Bullock et R. Ross	Taxon 7: 257. 1958
12—13.	G. Buchheim	Taxon 6: 226. 1957	165—178.	R. Ross	Taxon 7: 259. 1958
14.	F. A. McClure	Taxon 6: 239. 1957	179.	J. E. Dandy et R. Ross	Taxon 7: 261. 1958
15.	H. P. Traub	Taxon 6: 239. 1957			
16—17.	H. C. D. de Wit	Taxon 5: 6. 1956	180—182.	R. Ross	Taxon 7: 262. 1958
18—19.	M. A. Donk	Taxon 6: 255. 1957	183—186.	R. Ross	Taxon 7: 262. 1958
20.	H. W. Rickett	Taxon 7: 39. 1958	187—188.	F. C. Deighton	Taxon 7: 263. 1958
21.	H. W. Rickett	Taxon 4: 188. 1955	189.	A. A. Bullock	Taxon 7: 264. 1958
22.	G. P. DeWolf	Taxon 5: 52. 1956	190—191.	F. C. Deighton	Taxon 7: 264. 1958
23—37.	F. R. Fosberg	Taxon 7: 149. 1958	192—193.	R. Ross	Taxon 7: 267. 1958
38—39.	H. W. Rickett et A. C. Smith	Taxon 7: 151. 1958	194.	A. A. Bullock	Taxon 7: 267. 1958
40—41.	F. T. Wherry	Taxon 7: 152. 1958	195—200.	F. C. Deighton	Taxon 7: 268. 1958
42—43.	H. W. Rickett et F. A. Stafleu	Taxon 7: 153. 1958	201.	A. A. Bullock	Taxon 7: 270. 1958
44—48.	G. Rowley	Taxon 7: 153. 1958	202.	T. Christensen	Taxon 7: 270. 1958
49—50.	H. St. John	Taxon 7: 155. 1958	203—211.	Y. Prokhanov	Taxon 7: 270. 1958
51.	R. Mansfeld	Taxon 7: 155. 1958	212.	T. van der Hammen	Taxon 7: 274. 1958
52—57.	C. A. Arnold	Taxon 7: 156. 1958	213—242.	Czechoslovak Botanists	Taxon 7: 274. 1958
58.	P. C. Silva	Taxon 7: 184. 1958	243—258.	J. Dostál	Taxon 7: 283. 1958
59—65.	J. Proskauer	Taxon 7: 215. 1958	259—262.	J. Dostál	Taxon 7: 285. 1958
66—88.	H. P. Fuchs	Taxon 7: 218. 1958	263—280.	P. C. Silva	Taxon 8: 3. 1959
89—92.	A. A. Bullock	Taxon 7: 223. 1958	281—301.	C. V. Morton	Taxon 8: 11. 1959
94—96.	S. H. Mamay	Taxon 7: 224. 1958	302—304.	J. E. Dandy et R. Ross	Taxon 8: 16. 1959
97—100.	A. T. Cross et al.	Taxon 7: 225. 1958	305—306.	Committee for Bryophytes	Taxon 8: 17. 1959
101.	F. L. Staplin	Taxon 7: 226. 1958	307.	R. Potonié	Taxon 8: 18. 1959
102—108.	H. Tate Ames et al.	Taxon 7: 226. 1958	308.	F. R. Fosberg	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
109—115.	A. Traverse	Taxon 7: 229. 1958	309.	N. Y. Sandwith	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
116.	E. Boureau	Taxon 7: 230. 1958	310.	H. W. Rickett	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
117—119.	J. W. Funkhouser	Taxon 7: 231. 1958	311.	J. Proskauer	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
			312.	F. R. Fosberg	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
			313.	R. Potonié	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
			314—317.	Committee for Stabilization	Taxon 8: 21. 1959

\* All proposals have been published in *Taxon* together with the comments of the authors — Toutes les propositions ont été publiées dans *Taxon* avec l'argumentation des auteurs.

For technical reasons, however, the following proposals have not been published in *Taxon*: a) the proposal by Rickett and Stafleu on the list of *nomina conservanda*. b) the proposals by the rapporteur.

Cependant, pour des raisons techniques, les propositions suivantes n'ont pas été imprimées dans *Taxon*: a) la proposition de Rickett et Stafleu concernant la liste des *nomina conservanda*, b) les propositions du rapporteur.

For the proposals concerning *Nomina conservanda proposita* see p. 80 — Les propositions concernant les *nomina conservanda proposita* sont énumérées à la p. 80.

# International Code of Botanical Nomenclature

## PREAMBLE

*Prop. A (120 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 253)*

Proposed rewording of paragraph 6: "The provisions regulating the method of modification of this Code form its last division."

### *Comments Rapporteur*

The proposal should be referred to the Editorial Committee for special consideration by the English-speaking members.

## Division I. Principles

### Principle I

*Prop. A (264 — Silva, Taxon 8: 5)*

To read: "The Code applies equally to taxonomic groups of plants whether or not they were originally assigned to the plant kingdom."

### *Comments Rapporteur*

The wording as proposed in *proposal A* could certainly supplement the present wording; it should not replace it. It seems furthermore necessary to incorporate in the code a definite provision for this purpose, illustrated by one or more examples (e.g. in Art. 45 with additional examples). If this view is accepted it would be best to refer this proposal to the Committee for Algae with the instruction to retain also the present wording of Principle I. In the preliminary vote, a vote "yes" will be considered as in favour of proposal A replacing the present text and a vote "Comm. Alg." will be counted as in agreement with the view expressed by the Rapporteur.

### Principle III

*Prop. A (151 — Bullock, Taxon 7: 257)*

To read: "The correct name of a taxonomic group is determined by priority of publication."

### *Comments Rapporteur*

The proposed rewording does not seem to be an improvement. In questions of, e.g., homonymy priority is also a determining factor although there may be no question of correct names.

## Principle IV

### Principle IV

#### *Prop. A (268 – Silva, Taxon 8: 7)*

To be divided into three new Principles of which the first to read as follows:

“Each taxonomic group with a given circumscription, position, and rank can bear only one correct name.”

#### *Prop. B (269 – Silva, Taxon 8: 7)*

The second:

“The correct name of a taxonomic group is the earliest name or combination of the earliest epithet that is in accordance with the Code.”

#### *Prop. C (270 – Silva, Taxon 8: 7)*

The third:

“In the selection of correct names, the principle of priority of valid publication may be superseded by special legislation (conservation).”

#### *Comments Rapporteur*

The present text of Principle IV seems to be quite clear, whereas the three proposals reproduce the same contents in a more complicated way besides adding definitions which are better placed elsewhere.

### Principle V

#### *Prop. A (5 – St. John, Taxon 6: 197)*

To read: “Scientific names of plants are commonly Latin or Greek, or if from other languages, they are often latinized.”

#### *Prop. B (265 – Silva, Taxon 8: 6)*

To read: “Names of taxonomic groups are treated as Latin irrespective of their derivation.”

#### *Prop. C (152 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 257)*

To read: “Scientific names of plants are treated as Latin even if they are taken wholly or partly from other languages or are without meaning.”

#### *Comments Rapporteur*

The wording as proposed in proposal B seems to be a real improvement which is preferable to the more involved rewordings of proposals A and C.



### New Principle VII

*Prop. A (263 – Silva, Taxon 8: 4)*

“Every plant is treated as belonging to a number of taxonomic groups of consecutively subordinate rank, among which the rank of species is basic.”

#### *Comments Rapporteur*

The original Art. 2 in which this statement was embodied is in fact not a ‘rule’, and the rapporteur therefore favours adoption of this proposal.

### New Principle VIII

*Prop. A (266 – Silva, Taxon 8: 6)*

“Names of taxonomic groups of the rank of genus and above are monomial; names of taxonomic groups of the rank of subgenus down to and including species are binomial; names of taxonomic groups of the rank of subspecies and below are trinominal.”

#### *Prop. B (Rapporteur)*

Amendment to prop. A: Insert this text as a new Article in Chapter III, in a new section preceding the present section 1.

#### *Comments Rapporteur*

The statement as presented by *proposal A* is correct, but it is not a principle. It is a basic rule determining the formation of names of taxa and as such it would be better placed in Chapter III. Adoption of *proposal A* with the amendment sub *proposal B* is suggested.

### New Principle IX

*Prop. A (267 – Silva, Taxon 8: 6)*

“Names of taxonomic groups have no status under the Code unless they are validly published.”

#### *Comments Rapporteur*

This is indeed a principle, since it implies the association of names with descriptions. If this principle is accepted the Editorial Committee could perhaps be instructed to consider whether the addition of the word “valid” before “publication” in Principle III would not have the same result. The adoption of *proposal A* is recommended.

## Article 1

# Division II. Rules and Recommendations

## (1-5) Chapter I. RANKS OF TAXA, AND THE TERMS DENOTING THEM

### Article 1

*Prop. A (66 — Fuchs, Taxon 7: 218)*

To read: "Any group of individuals joined together by their morphological, anatomical, or other similarity will, in this Code, be referred to as *taxon* (plural *taxa*)."

*Comments Rapporteur*

It is not clear that the proposed rewording constitutes a real improvement; the adoption of this proposal is not recommended.

### Article 2

*Prop. A (67 — Fuchs, Taxon 7: 218)*

Replace the word 'taxa' by 'taxonomic groups'.

*Comments Rapporteur*

The adoption of *proposal A* is not recommended. The difference between "taxa" and "taxonomic groups" as suggested by the author is not clear and would perhaps be confusing.

### Article 3

*Prop. A (68 — Fuchs, Taxon 7: 218)*

Replace the word 'taxa' by 'taxonomic groups'.

*Comments Rapporteur*

The adoption of *proposal A* is not recommended for the reasons given above

### Article 4

*Prop. A (23 — Fosberg, Taxon 7: 149)*

Add "Subregnum" after *Regnum Vegetabile*.

*Prop. B (69 — Fuchs, Taxon 7: 218)*

To read: "If a greater number of ranks of taxonomic groups is required, the terms for these are made either by adding the prefix sub (*sub*) to the terms denoting the ranks or by the introduction of supplementary terms. A taxon may be assigned to taxonomic groups of the following subordinate rank: . . . . ."

*Prop. C (202 – Christensen, Taxon 7: 270)*

Remove “*Regnum Vegetabile*” from the enumeration of systematic ranks.

*Prop. D (215 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 275)*

Insert the word “*Phylum*” between “*Regnum Vegetabile*” and “*Divisio*”

*Prop. E (226 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 277)*

Add: “Taxa whose rank has not been precisely designated by means of a term according to this Article and published on and after . . . . are invalid. If they were published before this date, it is necessary to designate them subsequently by means of one of the terms admissible under this Article, which will be considered a change of rank of the taxon (Art. 60). If, however, the original author himself has explained in his publication, which admissible term he had in mind when using an inadmissible symbol or term for the category of the taxon, the use of this admissible term is not considered a change of rank of the taxon.”

#### *Comments Rapporteur*

The Rapporteur is not in favour of any of the present proposals. *Proposal D* was rejected by a large majority at the previous Congress. *Proposal E* would involve a great many changes in author-designation (it is really an amendment to Art. 44).

#### Recommendation 4A

*Prop. A (24 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 149)*

In line 3 change “should” to “may”.

#### *Comments Rapporteur*

The suggested change would be a real improvement.

#### Article 5

*Prop. A (25 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 149)*

Give the modern status of the Friesian “tribes”.

*Prop. B (51 – Mansfeld, Taxon 7: 155)*

The last paragraph to read: “An exception is made for names of the infra-generic taxa termed tribes (*tribus*) in Fries’ *Systema Mycologicum* and the generic taxa termed natural species (*species naturales*) in Necker’s *Elementa Botanica*, which are treated as validly published.”

## Article 5

### *Prop. C (70 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 218)*

Insert after the second paragraph: "This does not apply to cases in which an author referred to a taxonomic group by a term used for a different rank today."

### *Comments Rapporteur*

*Proposal A* should be referred to the Committee for Fungi.

The rapporteur is in favour of *proposal B* (see also prop. C to Art. 20 and prop. A to Art. 68). It is advisable to clarify the status of the names in Necker's *Elementa Botanica* and *proposal B* would serve this purpose.

The implications of *proposal C* are far too wide to warrant acceptance.

## (6-15) Chapter II. NAMES OF TAXA (GENERAL PROVISIONS)

## (8) Section 1. DEFINITIONS

## Article 6

*Prop. A (281 — Morton, Taxon 8: 11)*

It is suggested that the example of *Leptostachya* and *Dianthera* be deleted and the following substituted:

**Example:** The generic name *Cashalis* Standley (Journ. Washington Acad. Sci. 13: 440. 1923), based on the single species *C. cuscatlanica*, is legitimate because it is in accordance with the rules. The same is true of the generic name *Dussia* Krug & Urban (ex Taubert in Engl. & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. III, Abt. 3: 193. 1894), based on the single species *D. martinicensis*. Both generic names are correct when the genera are thought to be separate. Steyermark (Fieldiana: Botany 24, pt. 5: 248. 1946) however, reduced *Cashalia* Standley to *Dussia* Krug & Urban; when this concept is accepted the latter name is the only correct one for the genus with this particular circumscription. The legitimate name *Cashalia* may therefore be correct or incorrect according to different concepts of taxa.

## Comments Rapporteur

The present *Leptostachya* example is certainly not a happy one and Dr. Morton's *Cashalia* example could very well replace it; the proposal is recommended for acceptance.

## (7-10) Section 2. TYPIFICATION

## Article 7

*Prop. A (26 — Fosberg, Taxon 7: 149)*

From Note 3 delete: "unless its name must already be rejected under this Code".

*Prop. B (71 — Fuchs, Taxon 7: 219)*

The Notes to be changed as follows:

*Note 1:* (remains unchanged).

*Note 2:* (new). A *descriptotype* is that constituent element which can be proved to have served an author as a basis for the description of a taxon, or which has been designated as the nomenclatural type.

*Note 3:* (new). An *interpretotype* is that constituent element not clearly proved to have served as a basis for a description, but designated by the author of a taxon by the name in question.

## Article 7

**Note 4:** (formerly note 2). A *holotype* ("type") is that single specimen or other element either used as a basis for the description by the author and/or designated by him as the nomenclatural type (*descriptotype*) or a specimen interpreted by the author as belonging to the taxon described by himself (*interpretotype*). If a holotype is extant, it has precedence over all other kinds of types.

**Note 5:** (new). A *merotype* is a fragment of the original *holotype*, which has been divided into two or more pieces after having been used as a basis for the description.

**Note 6:** (new). If more than one specimen of either the *descriptotype* or *interpretotype* exist, one specimen must be chosen as *lectotype*.

**Note 7:** (new). Once a specimen has been chosen as a *lectotype*, this choice must be taken as binding, unless it can be proved that this choice arises from a misinterpretation.

**Note 8:** (new). A *synonymotype* is that constituent element of a taxon quoted by the author as being identical with his newly described taxon.

A *synonymotype* can be used as a substitute for a *descriptotype* or an *interpretotype* if such are missing. The choice of a *synonymotype*, once made, is permanent and cannot be later changed, even if a *descriptotype* or an *interpretotype* should be found.

**Note 9:** (formerly 4).

**Note 10:** (formerly 5).

*Prop. C (307 – Potonié, Taxon 8: 18)*

In Note 5 emphasize that genera of *sporae diversae* are organ genera and form genera.

*Prop. D (276 – Silva, Taxon 8: 9)*

Note 4 to read: "A new name or epithet published as an avowed substitute (*nomen novum*) for an older name is typified by the type of the older name."

*Prop. E (145 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 256)*

Note 5 and Appendix IV, 7. to read: "The typification of both organ-genera and form-genera based either on plant macrofossils or plant microfossils, of genera of imperfect fungi ....."

*Prop. F (153 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 257)*

Add to Note 1: "It is the element or one of the elements upon which the description (and/or illustration) giving the name valid publication (see Art. 32-45) is based."

*Prop. G (154 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 257)*

Note 3 to read: "If no holotype was indicated by the author who described a taxon, a lectotype as a substitute for it may be designated. When a syntype or paratype exists the lectotype must be chosen from one of these. If the holo-

type is lost or destroyed, an isotype, if such exists, must be chosen, or failing this, a paratype.

"A lectotype (*lectotypus*) is either (a) a specimen or other element selected from the original material available to the describer of a taxon (whether cited in the protologue<sup>1</sup>) or not) up to the time of publication of the name concerned, when no holotype was designated, or (b) a duplicate<sup>2</sup>) of the holotype when the latter is lost or destroyed. When two or more specimens have been designated as "types" by the author of a specific or infra-specific name (e.g. male and female, flowering and fruiting, etc.) one of them must be chosen as lectotype."

*Prop. H (155 — Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)*

Delete in Note 3 the paragraph beginning "A neotype is a . . . . ."

*Prop. I (156 — Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)*

Add further to Note 3, the definitions of isotype, paratype and syntype, at present incorporated in Rec. 8A, with modifications as follows:

"An isotype (*isotypus*) is a duplicate of the holotype; it is always a specimen, and may become a lectotype when the holotype is lost or destroyed."

"A syntype (*syntypus*) is any one of the two or more specimens or other elements cited or indicated in the protologue when the author failed to designate a holotype, or when two or more specimens or other elements were simultaneously designated as types.

"The choice of a lectotype may be superseded only if it can be shown that it was based upon a misinterpretation of the protologue, or if the holotype is rediscovered."

*Prop. K (157 — Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)*

Add to Note 4: "The type of a name or epithet which was nomenclaturally superfluous when published (see Art. 64, 1) is the type of the name or epithet which ought to have been adopted under the Code."

*Prop. L (158 — Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)*

Add: "Note 6. For those groups with nomenclatural starting-points later than 1753 (see Art. 13) the type is to be determined by the protologue given by the author validly publishing (see Art. 32-45) the name, or when valid publication is by reference to a pre-starting-point protologue, the latter must be used as though newly published."

<sup>1</sup>) Protologue (from *πρωτος*, first, *λογος*, discourse) "the printed matter accompanying the first publication of the name [for epithet] (Wilmott MS.); this term was proposed by A. J. Wilmott (1888-1950) to cover everything associated with a name at its first publication, i.e. diagnosis, description, references, synonymy, geographical data, citation of specimens, discussion, comments, illustration. — See Stearn, *Intr. Linn. Sp. Pl. Facs. Ed. Ray Soc.* 126, *adnot.* 1957.

<sup>2</sup>) The word duplicate is here given its usual meaning in herbarium curatorial practice. It is part of a single gathering made by a collector at one time.

*Prop. M (213 – Dostál et al., Taxon 7: 274)*

Paragraph 1 to read as follows:

"The application of names of taxa of the rank of order or below but above that of species is determined by means of standards (typifying taxa), the application of names for taxa of the rank of species or below by means of nomenclatural types (plants and their parts). Thus a standard or nomenclatural type is that constituent element of a taxon to which the name of the taxon is permanently attached, whether as an accepted name or as a synonym."

*Prop. N (Rapporteur)*

Amendment to *proposal K*: add "unless the original author of the superfluous name has indicated a definite holotype".

*Comments Rapporteur*

*Proposal A.* The rapporteur shares Dr. Fosberg's opinion that this sentence is unnecessary and confusing; the adoption of this proposal is recommended.

*Proposal B.* The proposed terms can very well be used in special taxonomic treatments when it is necessary to give more precise indications of certain specimens. It is not advisable, however, to incorporate all this material in the Code.

*Proposal C* should be referred to the Palaeobotanical Committee.

*Proposal D* and *E* should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

The adoption of *proposal F* is not recommended. Where for instance Linnaeus validates a name by reference to a pre-linnean description and supplies no description of his own, but at the same time had a type specimen himself, this type specimen will always prevail over the pre-linnean description and even over the type-specimen of that description if it exists. The wording of the proposal is, therefore, too ample.

*Proposal G* aims at a preciser wording or Note 3 with the exception of the last paragraph. This rewording is recommended. It should be pointed out, however, that it is of importance to retain the provision on neotypes, and that is why the adoption of *proposal H* is not recommended. Our present code aims at a precise typification: for all taxa of specific or lower rank we need a specimen and not a description or a figure except in the cases specified in Art. 10.

*Proposal I* is again a welcome improvement and is recommended for acceptance. The last paragraph should be kept as a separate Article 8, however, in order to give this important provision more prominence. This could be achieved by adopting *proposal I* and rejecting *proposal B* to Art. 8 (q.v.).

*Proposal K* should be restricted to those cases in which there is no definite indication of a holotype. Adoption of this proposal together with the amendment proposed sub *proposal N* is recommended.

*Proposal L* reflects actual practice and is recommended for acceptance.

*Proposal M* is not recommended. The present system is well established and it is not advisable to change over to a new terminology at this late date in the development of our ideas on typification.



## Article 8

*Prop. A (72 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220)*

Delete the Article.

*Prop. B (156 – Bullock and Ross, Taxon 7: 258)*

Proposal I on Art. 7 implies that the text of Art. 8 be inserted in Art. 7.

### *Comments Rapporteur*

The present Art. 8 should be maintained separately. The provision is of great importance and deserves a prominent place. The adoption of neither proposals is recommended.

## Recommendation 8A

*Prop. A (72 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220)*

To become Rec. 7A.

### *Comments Rapporteur*

Adoption not recommended, see above.

## Recommendation 8B

*Prop. A (72 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220; 159 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)*

To become Rec. 7B.

### *Comments Rapporteur*

Adoption not recommended, see above.

## Recommendation 8C

*Prop. A (160 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 259)*

In line 1 for “type material” read “original material”.

*Prop. B (72 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220; 160 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 259)*

To become Rec. 7C.

### *Comments Rapporteur*

Adoption of *proposal A* is recommended because it is a more precise wording. Adoption of *proposal B* is not recommended for the reasons given above.