

parties. The wrangles over what was or was not agreed in Vienna could then be forgotten.

(292) Add to Art. 51 a new paragraph and Note:

“51.2. For compelling practical reasons of nomenclatural stability of specific and infraspecific names in the unique case of the broadly circumscribed genus *Acacia* Mill., the correct name for a genus to which one or more of the types of *Racosperma* Mart. (1835), *Senegalia* Raf. (1838) and *Vachellia* Wight & Arn. (1834) are assigned is *Acacia* Mill. (1754) and the correct names for all taxa assigned to that genus are combinations with *Acacia*. The names *Racosperma*, *Senegalia* and *Vachellia*, and all combinations published under them, are to be treated as incorrect. This is a purely nomenclatural convention and does not preclude the taxonomic acceptance of segregate genera.”

“Note. 1. When reference needs to be made to one of the three segregates to distinguish it from the others, as for example in a non-nomenclatural context such as discussion of numbers of genera in a region or occurrence of certain characters or compounds in different genera, it may be done informally in the format *Acacia* (*Vachellia*), or *Acacia* (*Senegalia*) or *Acacia* (*Racosperma*). When reference is made in a general context to the species described by Linnaeus as *Mimosa nilotica*, which is now referable to *Acacia* (*Vachellia*), it should be given as *Acacia nilotica* (L.) Delile. If in a special context it is necessary to specify to which genus a certain species is referable, the format *Acacia* (*Vachellia*) *nilotica* (L.) Delile may be used.”

Cross references should be added under Art. 11 and 51.1.

Some correspondents prior to submission of this proposal have noted that *Senegalia* has been taken up by a number of authors, and that the proposal would be better without mention of that genus. Against that is the tradition of over 200 years of including *Senegalia* in a broad *Acacia* in Africa, resulting in a massive literature and very many herbarium specimens adopting that concept. It is suggested here that the officers at Melbourne should invite a friendly amendment to delete mention of *Senegalia* in the proposal.

The proposed new rule may appear to be a marked departure from the Principles of the *Code*. However, it is nowhere stated that one name cannot be applied to more than one taxon at the same rank. Principle IV of the *Code* states that one taxon with one circumscription, position and rank can have only one correct name “except in specified cases”. The cases of eight alternative family names specified in Art. 18.5 constitute a departure from the main text of Principle IV, but are justified by the final phrase. The option in Art. 19.7 of using

Papilionoideae rather than *Faboideae* is another example of a special exception being permitted in the *Code* for reasons of practicality in a stated case. Even if there is an unwritten understanding that one name cannot apply to more than one taxon at the same rank, the above proposal can be justified by the analogy of “specified cases”. The same might be thought to apply to Principle 2 and Art. 7.1, but it could equally be argued that the application of the names *will* be determined by nomenclatural types.

The proposal does not preclude minor segregates from *Acacia* sensu lato being recognised, and the names *Acaciella* and *Mariosousa* have already been adopted for two of these in the Americas. It would result in a number of names which are currently correct and in use being ruled incorrect under the next edition of the *Code*. This might be seen as unfortunate, but it would have little impact on names actually in general current use. Very few combinations have been published for any African species (see Mabberley, Mabberley’s Plant-Book ed. 3, 1021. 2008 & Seigler and Ebinger in *Phytologia* 92: 92–95. 2010), but around 60 new combinations in *Vachellia* and around 75 in *Senegalia* were published by Seigler & Ebinger in 2006 for New World species (in *Phytologia* 87: 139–178 & 88: 38–94, respectively) and 10 combinations were published by Kodela in *Vachellia* in 2006 for Australian species (in *Telopea* 11: 233–244. 2006). Some hundreds of combinations have been published by Pedley in 2003 in *Racosperma* for Australian species (in *Austrobaileya* 6: 445–496) but they have not been taken up in practice. These very recently published names under segregate genera have scarcely had time to come into common use, and losing them seems to be a very small price to pay for allowing peace to break out in botany.

This proposal is made by the present author alone, without consultation with any committees, in an attempt to break the present deadlock and hopefully to help restore good international relations in botany. It proposes a purely nomenclatural solution to avoid mass changes of names of important species. It has nothing to do with cladistics and does not query the taxonomic concept of accepting three genera. Without this, a lot of people will be seriously inconvenienced and many will be seriously unhappy.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to Nicholas Turland and John McNeill for helpful comments on the first draft of the wording of the proposal, to a number of others for discussion, and to an anonymous reviewer for extensive suggestions on the submitted MS.

(293) Proposal to add an example to Article 52

Gillian Perry

Western Australian Herbarium, Department of Environment and Conservation, Locked Bag 104, Bentley Delivery Centre 6983, Western Australia. gperry@cygnus.uwa.edu.au

What is now Art. 52.2 entered the *Code* in Edinburgh as a Note to Art. 63 and resulted from proposals by Tryon (in *Taxon* 11: 116–120. 1962), and Weresub & Hennebert (in *Taxon* 12: 218–228. 1963) to explain what was intended by “to include the type” in the sense of that Article. The two proposals were very similar, except that Tryon’s proposal included a provision that “A taxon is considered to include the type of another name if its circumscription

directly and unequivocally includes: ... c) the original description of a name” and an example “The species name *Linum gallicum* L. (Sp. Pl. ed. 2, 401. 1762) is illegitimate, being a superfluous name for *Linum trigynum* L. (Sp. Pl. 279. 1753), the two names having the identical diagnosis.”

These proposals were studied by an ad hoc committee at the Congress and the resulting proposal that was accepted by the

Congress did not include Tryon's provision cited above nor his example. The Note in the *Edinburgh Code* reads: "The inclusion of a type (see Art. 7) is here understood to mean, the citation of a type specimen, the citation of the illustration of a type specimen, the citation of the type of a name, or the citation of the name itself, unless the type is at the same time excluded." This with the addition of "either explicitly or by implication" after "excluded" became the second paragraph of Art. 63 of the *Seattle Code* and remained unchanged up until the *Tokyo Code*.

At the Berlin Congress Rauschert's proposal (in *Taxon* 34: 721–726. 1985) to replace "included the type of a name" in Art. 63.1 with "included the holotype, or all the syntypes, or the previously designated lectotype of a name" was accepted so as to make it clear that a later lectotypification did not retroactively make a name illegitimate. It was asserted at the Tokyo Congress that this change had made Art. 63 difficult to apply. Jeffrey (Greuter & al. in *Englera* 14: 187–189. 1994) claimed that by "[a]ccepting the narrow definition of syntypes given in the *Code*, one could seldom say that a name was superfluous and illegitimate when the replaced name was based on original material, that was neither holotypic nor syntypic nor known to have been the subject of a prior lectotypification. [...] There might also be the case in which all original material was included, none of which however was in the nature of syntypes. Apparently, as long as he did not mention 'the name itself', an author was free to publish a legitimate replacement name for a legitimate name [...]". This it was claimed was in conflict with current practice. It was further stated that "[e]ven citation of the original phrase name associated with the earlier name would not cause illegitimacy, since it was not a name in the sense of the *Code*."

In response, the Rapporteur (Greuter & al. in *Englera* 14: 189–190. 1994) indicated that most botanists had not interpreted the Article as was being suggested, as was evident by the acceptance of Rauschert's proposal in Berlin. He did though acknowledge that there were some difficulties with the wording of the Article resulting from the definitions of the type categories for species and infraspecific names not being applicable to names of higher ranks but that this could be dealt with editorially. Following the Tokyo Congress Art. 63 was renumbered as Art. 52. The wording of Art. 52.1 reverted to the pre-Berlin wording of "included the type of a name", while Art. 63.2 renumbered as Art. 52.2 was completely rewritten, so as to explicitly state how the inclusion of a type was effected for the purpose of Art. 52.1. Nevertheless Art 52.2 is still often misunderstood and some continue to interpret it as was being suggested by Jeffrey, and so it is proposed that the following example be added to the *Code* so as to better illustrate how this Article should be interpreted.

(293) Add the following new example to Art. 52:

Ex. 11bis. In publishing the name *Matricaria suaveolens* (1755), Linnaeus adopted both the phrase name and all the synonyms of *M. recutita* L. (1753) and so Applequist (in *Taxon* 51: 757. 2002) claimed that "all original elements of *M. recutita* are found in the in the protologue of *M. suaveolens*, making it illegitimate under Art. 52". However, as *M. recutita* has neither a holotype, nor any syntypes (cited specimens), nor, when *M. suaveolens* was published, a previously designated lectotype, or a conserved type and as neither *M. recutita* nor a name homotypic with it was cited in the protologue of *M. suaveolens*, the type of *M. recutita* was not included in *M. suaveolens* and so it is a legitimate name."

(294–306) Proposals to define the new term 'teleotype', to rename Chapter VI, and to modify Article 59 to limit dual nomenclature and to remove conflicting examples and recommendations

Scott A. Redhead

National Mycological Herbarium, Eastern Cereal and Oilseed Research Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1A 0C6. scott.redhead@agr.gc.ca

As noted in the report on the Special Committee on the Nomenclature of Fungi with a Pleomorphic Life Cycle (Redhead in *Taxon* 59: 1863–1866. 2010 – this issue), no consensus could be reached on reworking Art. 59. However, several themes arose that did have moderate support. Those supporting the retention of Art. 59.7 that was introduced into the *Vienna Code* and that allowed for epitypification, felt that improvements should be made in the wording. The current definition and rules regarding the term "epitype" prevent the usage of two epitypes for one nomenclatural type, and therefore epitypification with an epitype as allowed by Art. 59.7 would be impossible if an earlier epitype with an anamorph was already designated (Art. 9.18). Consequently, the new term, 'teleotype' was suggested within the Committee. Since being introduced to the Committee this term has already proved to be useful and enjoyed informal adoption (Hawksworth in *Mycol. Res.* 111: 1363–1365. 2007; Gams & al. in *Taxon* 59: 1197–1200. 2010; Norvell & al. in *Mycotaxon* 113: 503–511. 2010).

(294) Define the term 'teleotype' and modify other articles of the Code accordingly:

9.7bis. A teleotype is a specimen or illustration representing the teleomorph of a fungus (see Art. 59.1) and designated to serve as both an interpretive and a nomenclatural supplementary type for a name typified by an anamorphic type. When a teleotype is designated, the holotype, lectotype, or neotype that it supports must be explicitly cited. Designation of a teleotype imparts teleomorphic status to a name for purposes of priority under Art. 59."

Following this paragraph in Art. 9, add the note:

Note 3bis. Teleotypes were not distinguished from epitypes in the *Vienna Code* and therefore teleomorphic "epitypification" made under the provisions of Art. 59 in that *Code* are considered to be effective teleotypifications, and not epitypifications as currently defined."

In Art. 9.7, delete "(but see also Art. 59.7)".

In Art. 9, Note 5, add: "or teleotype" after each use of the word "epitype".