



Nomenclature Committee Reports

Author(s): Edward G. Voss

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (May, 1982), pp. 310-318

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1219998>

Accessed: 16/08/2012 05:52

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Taxon*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

NOMENCLATURE

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE REPORTS

The committee reports below were formally presented to the Nomenclature Section at the Sydney Congress and were there accepted. They are published here in the interest of prompt and wide dissemination, and will not be repeated in the full Report of the Section. Attention should be called to the following points:

- (1) The slate proposed by the Nominating Committee was elected. Botanists whose names are listed thus comprise the regular Nomenclature Committees until the next Congress (Berlin, 1987). Special ad hoc committees authorized by the Section will be established by the General Committee shortly.
- (2) The Guidelines for Committee Operations proposed by the General Committee were endorsed by the Section.
- (3) Any names recommended for conservation in the Committee reports are yet to be acted upon by the General Committee. If approved, they will appear in the appropriate Appendix to the new Code with an asterisk, as in past editions, indicating that formal acceptance by the next Congress is still required.
- (4) The Section accepted for conservation the names approved by the General Committee in previous reports and in the report below (items 2, 3 & 4). These names will be added to the appropriate appendices in the Code as fully official.

Edward G. Voss
Secretary, General Committee

*Report of Nominating Committee for Committees on Nomenclature,
XIII International Botanical Congress*

The Nominating Committee has met twice as a Committee and the Chairman has met at least once with the Secretary of each of the Standing Committees. The following slate of candidates is presented for consideration by the Section on Nomenclature.

1. Rapporteur-général—W. Greuter, W. Germany.
2. *Committee for Spermatophyta.*
 - H. J. Eichler, Australia (Chairman)
 - R. K. Brummit, U.K. (Secretary)
 - I. A. Linczevski, U.S.S.R.
 - B. Jonsell, Sweden.
 - H. W. Lack, W. Germany.
 - J. McNeill, Canada.
 - D. H. Nicolson, U.S.A.
 - H. Hara, Japan.
 - F. R. Fosberg, U.S.A.
 - I. Friis, Denmark.
 - G. Buchheim, U.S.A.
 - R. Wilbur, U.S.A.
- 2a. *Subcommittee on Family Names, Spermatophyta.*
 - G. Buchheim, U.S.A., (Secretary), F. Butzin, W. Greuter, H. K. Airy Shaw, P. G. Wilson and C. E. Wood.

3. *Committee for Pteridophyta.*
 - R. E. Holttum, U.K. (Chairman)
 - R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli, Italy (Secretary)
 - R. C. Ching, China.
 - E. Hennipman, Netherlands.
 - D. B. Lellinger, U.S.A.
 - E. A. C. L. E. Schelpe, South Africa.
 - A. R. Smith, U.S.A.
 - M. Tindale, Australia.
 - R. M. Tryon, U.S.A.
- 3a. *Subcommittee for Family Names, Pteridophyta.*
 - R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli, Italy (Secretary)
 - M. D. Tindale, Australia.
 - R. E. Holttum, U.K.
4. *Committee for Bryophyta.*
 - R. Grolle, E. Germany (Chairman)
 - M. Crosby, U.S.A. (Secretary)
 - A. Abramova, U.S.S.R.
 - R. Gradstein, Netherlands.
 - H. Inoue, Japan.
 - P. Isoviita, Finland.
 - Z. Iwatsuki, Japan.
 - S. Jovet-Ast, France.
 - W. Margadant, Netherlands.
 - G. Menendez, Argentina.
 - E. Petit, Belgium.
 - G. Sayre, U.S.A.
 - G. A. M. Scott, Australia.
 - R. Stotler, U.S.A.
 - J. Váňa, Czechoslovakia.
5. *Committee for Fungi and Lichens.*
 - L. Holm, Sweden (Chairman)
 - R. H. Petersen, U.S.A. (Secretary)
 - T. Ahti, Finland.
 - H. H. Burdsall, U.S.A.
 - G. Hennebert, Belgium.
 - R. P. Korf, U.S.A.
 - G. F. Laundon, New Zealand.
 - M. McGinnis, U.S.A.
 - Z. Pouzar, Czechoslovakia.
 - B. Sutton, U.K.
 - J. P. Van der Walt, South Africa.
 - Wang Yun-Chang, China.
 - V. Demoulin, Belgium.
 - D. L. Hawksworth, U.K.
 - D. N. Pegler, U.K.
6. *Committee for Algae.*
 - T. Christensen, Denmark (Chairman)
 - P. C. Silva, U.S.A. (Secretary)
 - M. Chihara, Japan.
 - P. Compère, Belgium.
 - T. V. Desikachary, India.
 - E. Hegewald, W. Germany.
 - J. Komárek, Czechoslovakia.

- A. R. Loeblich III U.S.A.
P. G. Parkinson, New Zealand.
W. Prud'Homme van Reine, Netherlands.
R. Simonsen, W. Germany.
W. J. Woelkerling, Australia.
A. D. Zínova, U.S.S.R.
L. Irvine, U.K.
P. Bourrelly, France.
7. *Committee for Hybrids.*
W. T. Stearn, U.K. (Chairman)
P. F. Yeo, U.K. (Secretary)
C. D. Brickell, U.K.
P. Hanelt, E. Germany.
R. D. Meikle, U.K.
O. Poletiko, U.S.S.R.
W. H. Wagner, U.S.A.
S. Spongberg, U.S.A.
B. R. Baum, Canada.
D. M. Bates, U.S.A.
F. Vrugtman, Canada.
B. D. Morley, Australia.
8. *Committee for Fossil Plants.*
W. G. Chaloner, U.K. (Chairman)
A. Traverse, U.S.A. (Secretary)
S. Archangelsky, Argentina.
H. P. Banks, U.S.A.
W. R. Evitt, U.S.A.
K. Faegri, Norway.
J. Galtier, France.
J. Jansonius, Canada.
V. Krassilov, U.S.S.R.
H. H. Li, China.
H. K. Maheshwari, India.
S. V. Meyen, U.S.S.R.
J. Muller, Netherlands.
F. Schaarschmidt, W. Germany.
9. *General Committee.*
F. A. Stafleu, Netherlands (Chairman)
E. G. Voss, U.S.A. (Secretary)
R. H. Petersen, U.S.A. (Secy. Fungi/Lichens Comm.)
P. F. Yeo, U.K. (Secy., Hybrids Comm.)
A. Traverse, U.S.A. (Secy. Fossil Pl. Comm.)
R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli, Italy (Secy. Pteridophyta Comm.)
R. K. Brummitt, U.K. (Secy. Spermatoph. Comm.)
P. C. Silva, U.S.A. (Secy. Algae Comm.)
M. Crosby, U.S.A. (Secy. Bryoph. Comm.)
W. Greuter, W. Germany (Secy. Edit. Comm.)
R. S. Cowan, U.S.A. (Pres. IAPT)
H. Hara, Japan.
R. P. Korf, U.S.A.
M. E. Mathias, U.S.A.
I. A. Linczevski, U.S.S.R.
R. C. Rollins, U.S.A.
D. H. Nicolson, U.S.A.
A. E. Orchard, Australia.

10. *Editorial Committee.*

E. G. Voss, U.S.A. (Chairman)
W. Greuter, W. Germany (Secretary)
R. D. Meikle, U.K.
P. Hiepko, W. Germany.
V. Demoulin, Belgium.
R. C. Rollins, U.S.A.
J. McNeill, Canada.
D. H. Nicolson, U.S.A.
H. Burdet, Switzerland.
W. Chaloner, U.K.
P. C. Silva, U.S.A.
F. A. Stafleu, Netherlands (Special Consultant)

*Richard S. Cowan, Chairman, Nominating
Committee, A. Lourteig, O. Almborn, P. Hiepko*

*Report of the General Committee on Botanical Nomenclature to the
Nomenclature Section, XIII International Botanical Congress*

Since the previous Congress, several circulars have been prepared by the secretary and mailed to all members of the General Committee by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature. Summary reports of Committee actions appeared in *Taxon* 25: 511–512 and 29: 689.

The four special committees authorized by the Nomenclature Section at Leningrad, under General Committee auspices, were established early in 1976. Reports by three of these (Romanization of authors' names, autonyms, and generic typification) were published in the Synopsis of Proposals (*Taxon*, Feb. 1981). No report has been received from the fourth (*nomina specifica conservanda & rejicienda*). The General Committee also worked with the Bureau of Nomenclature for the Sydney Congress in making revisions in the list of institutional votes, as charged by Div. III of the Code.

Approval was given to names proposed for conservation by various of the Special Committees for groups of plants, and opinions were expressed on several cases of names that might be confused, under the footnote to Art. 75.1. Accounts of these actions are in the reports in *Taxon*, except for the following, which have occurred since the report appearing in the Nov. 1980 number:

(1) Of the 19 members of the General Committee, 13 voted on whether the names *Arberietta* [Fossil] and *Arberella* [Gramineae] should be treated as variants under Art. 75. Nine members stated that the names are *not* likely to be confused and 4 stated that they *are* confusable.

(2) Names proposed for conservation in Report 22 of the Committee for Spermatophyta (*Taxon* 29: 489–493) have been approved.

(3) Names proposed for conservation by the Committee for Fungi & Lichens (*Taxon* 29: 148) have been approved with two exceptions: *Lophodermium* Chev. and *Scutellinia* (Cooke) Lamb, for which proposals were never initially published in *Taxon* or otherwise referred to the General Committee as required by Art. 14.9.

(4) The name *Doryopteris* J. Smith, proposed for conservation by the Committee for Pteridophyta (*Taxon* 30: 162), has been approved. The name *Trichomanes* L. in the same report was not approved, because it does not require conservation, having long priority over the proposed nom. rej. (and the proposal does not specify a typ. cons. or other variant from the status quo).

(5) In regard to the list of family names of Pteridophyta presented by the subcommittee appointed at Leningrad (first published in *Taxon* 30: 163–168. 1981), the General Committee has taken no action until pteridologists in general have had an opportunity to study the list.

The General Committee has thus far had no explicit guidelines for its actions, nor has it attempted to promote any minimum standards for the Special Committees. There has been some criticism of the varying standards used by committees for acceptance or rejection of proposals for conservation—and of the fact that some General Committee members rarely if

ever express an opinion on matters placed before them. After some exchange of ideas in previous circulars and discussion in Sydney, the General Committee now seeks endorsement by the Nomenclature Section of the accompanying guidelines or standards for taking action henceforth (subject to any necessary refinements consequent upon changes in Art. 75).

Edward G. Voss, Secretary

Guidelines for Committee Operations

Special Committees

- (1) Take final action on proposals to conserve (or reject) only *after* a proposal has been published in Taxon and sufficient time has elapsed for interested botanists to have commented.
- (2) Provide some mechanism for exchange of opinion, and if possible reaching of a consensus, by committee members *before* taking a final vote.
- (3) Require a favorable vote of at least two-thirds of committee *members* to recommend acceptance of a proposal on conservation or rejection.
- (4) When publishing a report on proposals, include not only the committee vote but also a clear statement as to *whether or not* the proposal is *accepted*, a brief summary of the argument or reasoning leading to the committee's decision, and an indication as to how the appropriate entry (or addition or correction) is to read in Appendix II or III (subject to editorial uniformity)—if this is not clear in the original proposal.

General Committee

- (1) On Art. 75 questions (orthographic variants/homonyms), no opinion will be expressed unless a majority of General Committee members have explicitly concurred. [Such a standard would mean, incidentally, that none of the 9 cases since Leningrad received sufficient agreement.]
- (2) When acting upon Special Committee recommendations for conservation or rejection of names (cf. Art. 15), the General Committee will not approve proposals:
 - (a) opposed by two-thirds of General Committee members in a mail ballot;
 - (b) never published, at least briefly, in Taxon (which is construed as referral to the General Committee as required by Art. 14.9);
 - (c) not supported by at least two-thirds of members of the appropriate Special Committee; or
 - (d) until there has been sufficient time for concerned botanists to comment upon each name following publication in Taxon.

Edward G. Voss, Secretary

Second Report of the Committee for Pteridophyta

This report was submitted after the Third Report (in this issue) was in press.

Proposal 532. *Dennstaedtia* T. Moore (1857) vs. *Dennstaedtia* Bernh. (1801), *Sitobium* Desv. (1827), *Patania* Presl (1836), *Alectum* Link (1841); see Tryon (Taxon 29: 512. 1980). Votes: 2 in favor, 4 against, 1 not received.

The Secretary asked members of the Committee for comments on the proposal. The comments were circulated among the members and a mail ballot was taken.

According to a recent unpublished study by Tryon and Tryon, the genera *Dennstaedtia* and *Microlepia* show a clear differentiation on the basis of spore morphology. In the former the spores are prominently verrucate-tuberculate, reticulate or ridged; in the latter the spores are delicately echinate. *Trichomanes flaccida*, the type of *Dennstaedtia*, has delicately echinate spores. Consequently, the name *Dennstaedtia* ought to be used for the species now ascribed to *Microlepia* and another name, *Sitobium*, ought to be adopted for the genus currently known as *Dennstaedtia*. In order to avoid these changes, which involve two very well-known generic names, Tryon has proposed to conserve *Dennstaedtia* T. Moore against *Dennstaedtia* Bernh. since, in his opinion, Moore was the first to adopt *Dennstaedtia* essentially in its modern sense.

The members of the Committee question Tryon's proposal, both from the point of view of taxonomy and nomenclature. In his comment, Holttum states that the proposal is premature and should be deferred until a better taxonomic knowledge of the groups of species from Malesia

and the Pacific, to which *D. flaccida* belongs, has been achieved. He considers that, in spite of its spores, *D. flaccida* is not closely related to *Microlepia speluncae*, the accepted type of *Microlepia*. Further, he remarks that the study on the distinction between *Dennstaedtia* and *Microlepia* ought to be extended to other characteristics hitherto not investigated, and that the two genera cannot be distinguished on the sole basis of spore characteristics.

From the point of view of nomenclature, Pichi Sermolli points out that there is no evidence that Moore established a genus distinct from *Dennstaedtia* Bernh. Moore ascribed the generic name to Bernhardt, with full bibliographic citation to the protologue, and, in the same book (Index Filicum), Moore lists *D. flaccida* among the species of *Dennstaedtia*.

Summary: The Committee for Pteridophyta recommends rejection of the proposal to conserve *Dennstaedtia* T. Moore vs. *Dennstaedtia* Bernhardt.

R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli, Secretary

Third Report of the Committee for Pteridophyta

The first Report (Taxon 30: 161–163. 1981) and the second in this issue are followed by the present Report which deals with a further proposal for the conservation of another generic name of ferns.

Stigmatopteris Christensen, Bot. Tidsskr. 29: 292. 1909. [T.: *Polypodium flavopunctatum* Kaulfuss = *Stigmatopteris rotundata* (Willdenow) Christensen (*Aspidium rotundatum* Willdenow)] versus (=) *Cyclodium* K. B. Presl, Tent. Pterid. 85. 1836. [T.: *Cyclodium meniscioides* (Willdenow) K. B. Presl (*Aspidium meniscioides* Willdenow)]; *Peltochlaena* Fée, Mem. Fam. Foug. 5 (Gen. Fil.): 289. 1852 [T.: *Peltochlaena nephrodiiformis* Fée].

Proposal no. 581 by R. & A. Tryon, Taxon 30: 349–350. 1981.

Votes in favour 0, against 4, not received 3.

Stigmatopteris (about 25 American species) and *Cyclodium* (2 or 3 American species) are mostly regarded as two distinct genera. R. & A. Tryon believe that there are sufficient reasons for uniting them into a single genus, and support their opinion mentioning the union of the two genera by Morton and Kramer. In order to avoid making numerous new combinations under *Cyclodium*, R. & A. Tryon proposed the use of the name *Stigmatopteris* for the genus, by conserving the latter against the older name *Cyclodium*. They suggest also the advisability to conserve *Stigmatopteris* versus *Peltochlaena*.

Comments have been received from only three Members of the Committee. Holttum and Pichi Sermolli remark that a weak support for uniting the two genera is given by Kramer (1978) and Morton (1939) quoted in R. & A. Tryon's proposal. The former deals with only five species, and unites the two genera without giving any reason for this treatment, and using erroneously the name *Stigmatopteris* instead of *Cyclodium* for the resulting genus. Morton's statement about the affinity of *Cyclodium* and *Stigmatopteris*, with each other and with other genera, is confused, and shows a scarce knowledge of these ferns. Contrary to R. & A. Tryon's affirmation, he reduces *Cyclodium* to *Dryopteris* s.l. and remarks that, "as a matter of convenience, it may be referred" to the subgenus *Stigmatopteris*, since the latter "is already a heterogeneous assemblage." Thus, Morton's paper is not good evidence for uniting the two genera. Holttum thinks it possible that the two genera should be united, but states that he cannot support their union until a monographic treatment of all the species of both is done. Pichi Sermolli is in favour of regarding *Cyclodium* and *Stigmatopteris* as two separate genera. However, both these Members agree that the conservation of the later name *Stigmatopteris* for the resulting genus is not justified by the sole reason of avoiding the creation of about 25 new combinations under the older name *Cyclodium*. Furthermore, as pointed out by Pichi Sermolli, the rejection of *Cyclodium* in favour of the conservation of *Stigmatopteris* is not advisable, since the former is the type of the subfamily *Cyclodiaceae* of Polypodiaceae established by Fée in 1850. Schelpe, in his short comment, does not consider the taxonomy and nomenclature of the two genera in detail, but he regards R. & A. Tryon's proposal as reasonable "in view of the fact that Pteridologists actually working on the American fern flora have preferred to use *Stigmatopteris* and that a not inconsiderable number of new combinations would be necessary under *Cyclodium*."

As regards *Peltochlaena*, Holttum, Pichi Sermolli and Schelpe agree that this generic name was clearly proposed as a provisional name by Fée. Thus, under Art. 34.1(b) of the Code, the name *Peltochlaena* was not validly published by Fée. Consequently, no action in its regards is necessary.

The three comments were circulated among the Members of the Committee who were asked for voting. The mail ballot on the proposal has given the result mentioned above.

Summary. The Committee for Pteridophyta recommends the rejection of the proposal to conserve *Stigmatopteris* Christensen versus *Cyclodium* K. B. Presl.

R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli, Secretary

Report for Committee for Bryophyta

1. Membership

The Committee as reconstituted at Leningrad consisted of 17 members. P. A. Florschütz, Secretary, died on 27 May 1976, and M. R. Crosby was appointed Secretary. C. E. Bonner, Chairman, died on 9 August 1976, and S. Hattori was appointed to the Chair. The first group of proposals was voted on in May 1980, and maximum number voting was 15. R. van der Wijk died on 16 February 1981, reducing the Committee to 14 for the final ballot, distributed in April 1981.

2. Proposals considered

Two votes were taken by the Committee, and the details are listed below. Votes were not taken for at least one year after the proposal was published in order to allow time for responses to the proposal to be received and considered by the Committee. Thus proposals 527, 554, and 654 await a vote. Proposal 468 is still being considered by the Committee, since it has stimulated a good deal of discussion.

With each ballot a copy of the proposal and copies of pertinent literature cited in the proposal were distributed to each Committee member so that complete documentation was at hand. In the future it would be better, perhaps, to distribute the proposal and supporting literature before the ballot so that the Committee would have time to consider them before the ballot was due for return to the Secretary.

The Committee recommends conservation of the names in proposals 410, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 442, and 465. Although proposal 400 bis received support for conservation, several members pointed out that there are problems with conserving the name as proposed, and this information should be circulated to the Committee and a new vote taken.

The publication dates for Ditrichaceae and Pottiaceae, proposals 437 and 438 respectively,

Proposal Number	Name	Taxon	Vote
410	<i>Pellia</i> (H)	24: 693–694. 1975.	10-0-4
436	<i>Pleurozium</i> (M)	26: 596–597. 1977.	10-0-5
437	Ditrichaceae (M)	26: 597. 1977.	10-0-5
438	Pottiaceae (M)	26: 597–598. 1977.	10-0-5
439	Sematophyllaceae (M)	26: 598. 1977.	10-0-5
440	Entodontaceae (M)	26: 598. 1977.	10-0-5
440	<i>Jubula</i> (H)	27: 125–126. 1978.	8-2-4
442	<i>Heteroscyphus</i> (H)	27: 127–128. 1978.	10-0-5
465	Lophoziaceae (H)	28: 423. 1979.	9-1-4
468	<i>Calypogeia</i> (H)	28: 607–608. 1979.	—
554	<i>Notothylas</i> (H)	30: 334–335. 1981.	—
527	<i>Grimmia alpicola</i>		
	<i>Schistidium alpicola</i> (M)	29: 337–339. 1980.	—
654	<i>Preissia</i> (H)	30: 495–496. 1981.	—

H indicates Hepaticae; M indicates Musci.

should be corrected from 1909 to 1901, if conserved. *Hypnopsis* is a nomen nudum and should be dropped as a rejected name against *Pleurozium*, proposal 436.

3. Other matters:

R. Grolle has detected several errors in the list of conserved names of Bryophyta, and suggested corrections listed below are mostly his.

Aytonia (H), rejected against *Plagiochasma*—correct citation to Char. Gen. pl. 74. 1775 from Char. Gen. pl. 147. 1776.

Cephaloziella (H)—correct date of publication to Sept. 1893 from Jan. 1895. Add initials J. E. to Smith under *Jungermannia divaricata* in this entry.

Conocephalum (H)—correct citation to type to *C. conicum* (L.) Dum. ex Cogn. from *C. conicum* (L.) Dum. ex Lindb.

Ditrichum (M)—add *Ditrichum* Cassini, Bull. Sci. Soc. Philom. Paris 1817: 33. Feb. 1817. T: *C. macrophyllum* Cassini, Dist. Sci. Nat. 13: 371. July 1819, to list of names rejected against *Ditrichum* Hampe (Art. 147).

Gymnomitrium (H)—correct form of citation to Beitr. Naturgesch. [Naturalientausch] 12:651. 1829. from Beitr. Naturg. 651. 1829 to bring it into conformity with citation of *Chiloscyphus*.

Lejeuneaceae (H)—add nom. cons. to citation of name of type genus.

Lepidozia (H)—correct page number cited to 19 from 10, 109.

Pallavicinia (H)—correct citation of page number in Trevisan reference to 780 from 78.

Marshall R. Crosby, Secretary

Report of the Committee for Fossil Plants

The Committee held several sessions during the period 17–19 August, 1981, preceding the Sydney Congress proper. Those present at all sessions were W. G. Chaloner, Chairman; A. Traverse, Secretary; Members: H. P. Banks, K. Faegri, J. Muller, F. Schaarschmidt. (Norman F. Hughes was an invited observer at most of the sessions.)

The Committee endorsed the positions based on mail votes, as reported earlier (Taxon 30:2: 473–475, 1981). This included the rejection of Kiritchkova and Samylina's proposal to conserve *Czekanowskia* and of a proposal carried over from the 1975 Congress to conserve *Klukia*.

D. Storch's proposal to change the starting-point for fossil plants turns out to be very controversial. Because the proposal was submitted quite late, we have been unable to gather enough information about its ramifications to make a recommendation at this time. We therefore ask that the matter be referred to us, for us to make a recommendation before the next Congress. Storch's proposal carries with it two proposals to conserve names affected by the starting-point change. We therefore ask that these conservation proposals also be referred to us for consideration before the next Congress.

We have discussed at some length the unnumbered proposal of N. F. Hughes and have conferred with its author about the content, purpose and implications of the proposal, which would introduce again a paleobotanical appendix, after more than two decades without such a section in the Code. The proposed new Appendix 4 is intended by Hughes to provide for perceived special requirements of fossil plants. It consists of a mixture of taxonomic recommendations and nomenclatural rules and recommendations. Only the nomenclatural matters were considered by the Committee.

In general, the Committee is not convinced that the difference between fossil and extant taxa is large enough to make a separate appendix desirable. Specifically:

1. The obligatory inclusion of geological time limits and stratigraphic position in the formal description of a taxon would introduce a completely new element in the Code, which would not contribute to nomenclatural clarity or stability. The requirement that the description should be in English only is contrary to the international spirit of the Code and its present requirements.

2. Proposed Art. P-8 has far reaching consequences for the nomenclature of extant plants, especially of higher categories, and does not seem to have any compensating advantage.

The Committee as assembled in Sydney therefore sustains the mail vote as recorded in its previous report and recommends rejection of the entire Hughes unnumbered proposal.

Although we expressed the hope in our earlier report (Taxon 30:2: 475, 1981) that we could

achieve a consensus on new wording for the statement on fossil plants in Art. 3 of the Code, this has not been possible. We have worked diligently since publication of the Leningrad Code to clarify our understanding of nomenclature for taxa of fossil plants, primarily as this understanding is reflected in Art. 3. The Leningrad Code, as published, clearly does *not* present, in either form or substance, the new version of Art. 3.2 proposed by our Committee at Leningrad, and adopted by the Nomenclature Section at that Congress in 1975 (cf. Taxon 24: 690, 1975, with Art. 3 of the Leningrad Code). However, we are agreed that it would not help the situation to amend the wording of Art. 3.2 at this time.

In summary, we recommend the rejection of all proposals submitted to us, except the Storch proposals, which we ask be referred to us for consideration before the next Congress.

Alfred Traverse, Secretary
Jan Muller, Member

Report of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens

Since the XIIth International Botanical Congress, three Committee reports have been published in Taxon (27: 543. 1978; 29: 148–9. 1979; 30: 472. 1981). In those reports ten generic names were approved for conservation and passed on to the General Committee. Four proposals for conservation of generic names were rejected.

Even before the Leningrad Congress, in 1972 to be specific, the First International Mycological Congress (Exeter) had authorized a Nomenclature Secretariat which, in turn, had appointed several subcommittees to grapple with nomenclatural problems more or less unique to mycology and of long standing. These subcommittees invested enormous time and energy in their deliberations and finally reported to the Second International Mycological Congress at Tampa in 1977. Their reports were thoroughly discussed and the resultant proposals for changes in the ICBN were extracted from the Congress proceedings and published in Taxon (28: 424–431. 1979), thus becoming “official” proposals. Since that time, the Special Committee for Lichens and Fungi has considered these proposals and published their votes (Taxon 30: 472. 1981).

The point of this historical outline is to underscore, for the delegates to the Nomenclature Sessions, the seriousness with which these proposals have been treated by two committees, perhaps two score taxonomists, and nine years of hard work. Therefore, the Special Committee asks the delegates to heed the advice of the Committee; it represents the sum total of work over the years.

The Secretary wishes publicly to thank all members of the Special Committee for their cooperative attitude over the past years. Dr. Luella Weresub, our Chairman, died recently and the Committee has functioned without a chairperson during the interim period. Her sharp wit and sage advice will be missed.

Dr. Lennart Holm has been nominated by the Committee as Chairman and Dr. Ronald Petersen has agreed to continue serving as Secretary. [Further nominations were transmitted to the Nominating Committee; cf. Report above.]

It was also agreed that the International Mycological Congress, convening in Tokyo in 1983, should be asked to nominate three or more additional members of this Committee, with a view of increasing the diversity of subject expertise in various groups of fungi, these nominees to be coopted by this Committee to serve hereon.

Ronald H. Petersen, Secretary
by Richard P. Korf, Acting Secretary