

The following is primarily technical in nature, as very likely it is now best to allow the normal provisions of the *Code* to operate and see if that does not settle matters (i.e, I am not campaigning). Paul van Rijkevorsel, Melbourne, 18 July 2011.

Alternate wording to the Brummitt proposal.

The Brummitt approach is a fascinating one. On the one hand it is exactly what the end-users will want, but on the other hand it is quite untraditional, to put it cautiously. Anyway, the wording appears awkward and inappropriate. The following wording should fit in much better with how the *Code* does things.

"14.9 bis. As an exception, the name *Acacia* Mill. (1754) is to be treated as conserved with more than one type. For the purposes of this *Code*, except Art. 22 where the type of *Acacia penninervis* is to be used, the types of *Racosperma* Mart. (1835), *Senegalia* Raf. (1838) and *Vachellia* Wight & Arn. (1834) are each to be treated as being the type of *Acacia*. Thus, up to three genera may simultaneously be called *Acacia*, and any taxon that is included in a genus thus named is to have a name that is a combination with the generic name *Acacia*."

"*Note n.* When it is desirable to refer to one such genus and to distinguish it from other such genera, this may be done informally in the format *Acacia* (sensu *Vachellia*), *Acacia* (sensu *Senegalia*) or *Acacia* (sensu *Racosperma*). If, in a special context, it is desirable to specify which group a certain species is referable to, the informal format *Acacia* (sensu *Vachellia*) *nilotica* L. may be used (although its formal name is *Acacia nilotica*)."

Alternative to the Turland proposal

The Turland proposal appears ineffective as

- a) there is no stability of names: no species gets to be called *Acacia*
- b) it is also quite untraditional and not in keeping with how the *Code* does things.

If something along these lines is felt to be desirable, the following should be more effective:

- a) the 'Australian' species get to be named *Acacia*, and the 'African' species can get a more pleasing name.
- b) conservation is a mechanism accepted in the *Code* for over a century.

"14.9 bis. As an exception, the name "*Vachellia*" Wight & Arn. (1834) is to be treated as conserved with the spelling *Africacia*."

"*Ex. n.* *Africacia erioloba* (E.Mey.) P.J.H.Hurter (2008) ('*Vachellia erioloba*'), basionym *Acacia erioloba* E.Mey. (1806).

The spelling *Africacia* is only a working option, as any spelling that has support can be put in. It does appear to be desirable to choose something that starts with a "A". For brevity, *An-acacia* ("not-*Acacia*") and *Ab-acacia* ("away from-*Acacia*") probably can not be beaten (these here are hyphenated, which is bad Latin, but which does help considerably in recognizability). A suffix is also possible, provided it is short and carries the feminine gender. In principle, a rule like this could be replaced in the long term by a regular conservation entry, but this requires a conservation proposal to be published, which can be approved no earlier than the next Congress.