

Overview of changes affecting fungal nomenclature in the International Code of Nomenclature & Progress of nomenclatural working groups

Keith A. Seifert & Andrew N. Miller

keith.seifert@agr.gc.ca & amiller7@illinois.edu

International Commission on the Taxonomy of Fungi (www.fungaltaxonomy.org)

Quotes from **International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants** = Melbourne Code (2012)

www.iapt-taxon.org/nomen/main.php

Electronic Publication

29.1. Publication is effected, under this *Code*, by distribution of printed matter (through sale, exchange, or gift) to the general public or at least to scientific institutions with generally accessible libraries. Publication is also effected by distribution on or after 1 January 2012 of electronic material in Portable Document Format (PDF; see also Art. 29.3 and Rec. 29A.1) in an online publication with an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) or an International Standard Book Number (ISBN).

30.2. An electronic publication is not effectively published if there is evidence within or associated with the publication that it is merely a preliminary version that was, or is to be, replaced by a version that the publisher considers final, in which case only that final version is effectively published.

30.3. The content of a particular electronic publication must not be altered after it is effectively published. Any such alterations are not themselves effectively published. Corrections or revisions must be issued separately to be effectively published.”

Arts 29, 30 paraphrased. From January 1, 2012, names can be published in electronic format in the absence of printed hard copy, but only in publications having a **PDF format** and only in **books or journals** having **ISBN or ISSN numbers**. Publication is not official until the final version is on-line.

Language of Diagnosis

39.1. In order to be validly published, a name of a new taxon (algae and fossils excepted) published between 1 January 1935 and 31 December 2011, inclusive, must be accompanied by a Latin description or diagnosis or by a reference (see Art. 38.13) to a previously and effectively published Latin description or diagnosis (but see Art. H.9; for fossils see Art. 43.1; for algae see Art. 44.1).

39.2. In order to be validly published, a name of a new taxon published on or after 1 January 2012 must be accompanied by a Latin or English description or diagnosis or by a reference (see Art. 38.13) to a previously and effectively published Latin or English description or diagnosis (for fossils see also Art. 43.1).”

Art. 39.2 paraphrased. Starting on **January 1 2012** names are valid with **either English or Latin** description or diagnosis. **Art. 39.1** paraphrased. Between 1935 – 2011 (inclusive) a Latin diagnosis or description was required and this remains in force for names published in that time period. Prior to 1935 any language could have been used.

Registration of Fungal Names

42.3. The Nomenclature Committee for Fungi (see Div. III) has the power to (1) appoint one or more localized or decentralized, open and accessible electronic repositories to accession the information required by Art. 42.2 and issue the identifiers required by Art. 42.1; (2) cancel such appointment at its discretion; and (3) set aside the requirements of Art. 42.1 and 42.2, should the repository mechanism, or essential parts thereof, cease to function. Decisions made by this Committee under these powers are subject to ratification by a subsequent International Mycological Congress.”

Art. 42.3 paraphrased. As of January 1, 2013, to be validly published, **all new fungal names must be registered electronically**. The official registries are: **MycoBank** (Int. Mycol. Assoc.) www.mycobank.org **Index Fungorum** (U.K./N.Z.) www.indexfungorum.org **Fungal Names** (China) www.fungalinfo.net/fungalname/fungalname.html

The end of dual nomenclature *aka* 1F : 1N. The New Art. 59

“59.1. A name published prior to 1 January 2013 for a taxon of non-lichen-forming *Ascomycota* and *Basidiomycota*, with the intent or implied intent of applying to or being typified by one particular morph (e.g. anamorph or teleomorph), may be legitimate even if it otherwise would be illegitimate under Art. 52 on account of the protologue including a type (as defined in Art. 52.2) referable to a different morph. If the name is otherwise legitimate, it competes for priority (Art. 11.3 and 11.4; see also Art. 57.2).

Note 2. Previous editions of this *Code* provided for separate names for mitotic asexual morphs (anamorphs) of certain pleomorphic fungi and required that the name applicable to the whole fungus be typified by a meiotic sexual morph (teleomorph). Under the current *Code*, however, all legitimate fungal names are treated equally for the purposes of establishing priority, regardless of the life history stage of the type (but see Art. 57.2; see also Art. 14.13).”

Art. 59 paraphrased. All names have equal priority whether they were originally teleomorph or anamorph names, (but see Art. 57.2 below), but names published under old rules are still valid. Dual names published after January 1, 2012 will both be considered invalid.

“57.2. In pleomorphic fungi (including lichenicolous fungi, but excluding lichen-forming fungi and those fungi traditionally associated with them taxonomically, e.g. *Mycocaliciaceae*), in cases where, prior to 1 January 2013, both teleomorph-typified and anamorph-typified names were widely used for a taxon, an anamorph-typified name that has priority is not to displace the teleomorph name(s) unless and until a proposal to reject the former under Art. 56.1 or 56.3 or to deal with the latter under Art. 14.1 or 14.13 has been submitted and rejected.”

Art. 57.2 paraphrased. Important names that were originally those of a teleomorph should not be replaced by older, but less important names that were originally those of the corresponding anamorph.

“14.13. In the interest of nomenclatural stability, for organisms treated as fungi (including lichenicolous fungi, but excluding lichen-forming fungi and those fungi traditionally associated with them taxonomically, e.g. *Mycocaliciaceae*), lists of names may be submitted to the General Committee, which will refer them to the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi (see Div. III) for examination by subcommittees established by that Committee in consultation with the General Committee and appropriate international bodies. Accepted names on these lists, which become Appendices of the *Code* once reviewed and approved by the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi and the General Committee, are to be listed with their types together with those competing synonyms (including sanctioned names) against which they are treated as conserved (see also Art. 56.3).”

Article 14.13 (paraphrased). Lists of Accepted and Rejected Names = lists of genera and/or species, with their types together with those competing synonyms, can be prepared for approval by the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi and the General Committee.



IUMS Commissions & Committees

International Commission on *Penicillium* & *Aspergillus* (chair Rob Samson, r.samson@cbs.knaw.nl)
www.aspergilluspenicillium.org/

Committee on Yeast Systematics and Nomenclature (co-chairs Clete Kurtzman, cletus.kurtzman@ars.usda.gov, & Jack Fell, jfell@rsmas.miami.edu). See MycoBank Forum below.

ICTF Subcommissions.

See www.fungaltaxonomy.org/subcommissions

Colletotrichum (chair Lei Cai, mrcailei@gmail.com)

Fusarium (chair David Geiser, dgeiser@psu.edu)

Rusts (chair, Cathie Aime, maime@purdue.edu)

Trichoderma and *Hypocrea* (chair, Irina Druzhinina, druzhini@mail.zserv.tuwien.ac.at, isth.info)

Working groups

See www.fungaltaxonomy.org/subcommissions

Cordyceps and relatives (chair, Joey Spatafora, joseph.spatafora@oregonstate.edu)

Dothideomycetes (co-chairs, Pedro Crous, p.crous@cbs.knaw.nl, Kevin Hyde, kdhyde2@gmail.com)

Heterobasidiomycetes (chair, Dominik Begerow, dominik.begerow@rub.de)

Homobasidiomycetes (co-chairs, Joost Stalpers, j.stalpers@cbs.knaw.nl, Scott Redhead, scott.redhead@agr.gc.ca)

Hypocreales (co-chairs, Amy Rossman, Amy.Rossman@ars.usda.gov, Priscila Chaverri, pchaverr@umd.edu)

Leotiomycetes (chair, Peter Johnston, johnstonp@landcareresearch.co.nz)

Magnaporthe-Pyricularia (chair, Ning Zhang, zhang@aesop.rutgers.edu)

Oomycetes (chair, André Lévesque, andre.levesque@agr.gc.ca)

Orbiliomycetes (chair, Hans Otto Baral, zotto@arcor.de)

ISHAM Working Group Nomenclature of Medical Fungi (co-chairs, G.S. de Hoog, s.hoog@cbs.knaw.nl, V. Chaturvedi, vishnu@wadsworth.org)

Special Committee on the Governance of the Code

Contact: David Hawksworth d.hawksworth@nhm.ac.uk

MycoBank Forum

Contact: v.robert@cbs.knaw.nl

Target date for first lists

Bangkok 10th International Mycological Congress, Aug. 2014 (www.IMC10.kasetsart.org)

For delivery to the 19th International Botanical Congress, Shenzhen, China, July 2017 (www.IBC2017.cn)

Next target: IMC11 (2018)+ IMC12 (2022) → **IBC 2023**



Literature

- Seifert, K. A. (ed). 2003. Has dual nomenclature run its course? The Article 59 debate. *Mycotaxon* 88: 493-508.
- Norvell, L.L. *et al.* 2011. IMC9 Edinburgh Nomenclature Sessions. *IMA Fungus* 1: 143–147.
- Hawksworth, D.L. *et al.* 2011. The Amsterdam Declaration on Fungal Nomenclature. *IMA Fungus* 2: 105-112.
- Gams *et al.* 2011. Fungal nomenclature 3: A critical response to the ‘Amsterdam Declaration’. *Mycotaxon* 116: 501-512.
- Taylor, J.W. 2011. One Fungus = One Name: DNA and fungal nomenclature twenty years after PCR. *IMA Fungus* 2: 113–120.
- Hawksworth, D.L. 2011. A new dawn for the naming of fungi: impacts of decisions made in Melbourne in July 2011 on the future publication and regulation of fungal names. *IMA Fungus* 2: 155–162.
- Hawksworth, D.L. 2012. Managing and coping with names of pleomorphic fungi in a period of transition. *IMA Fungus* 3: 15–24.
- Gams, W. 2012. Minimizing the chaos following the loss of Article 59: suggestions for a discussion. *Mycotaxon* 119: 495–507.
- Braun, U. 2012. The impacts of the discontinuation of dual nomenclature of pleomorphic fungi. the trivial facts, problems, and strategies. *IMA Fungus* 3: 81–86.
- Gams, W. *et al.* 2012. Clarifications needed concerning the new Article 59 dealing with pleomorphic fungi. *IMA Fungus* 3: 175–177.
- Geiser, D.M. *et al.* 2013. One Fungus, One Name: defining the genus *Fusarium* in a scientifically robust way that preserves longstanding use. *Phytopathology* 103: 400-408.
- Rossmann, A.Y. *et al.* 2013. Genera in *Bionectriaceae*, *Hypocreaceae*, and *Nectriaceae* (*Hypocreales*) proposed for acceptance or rejection. *IMA Fungus* 4: 41-51.
- Hawksworth, D.L. *et al.* 2013. Names of fungal species with the same epithet applied to different morphs: how to treat them. *IMA Fungus* 4: 53–56.
- Stadler, M. *et al.* 2013. The *Xylariaceae* as model example for a unified nomenclature following the “One Fungus – One Name” (1F1N) Concept. *Mycology (China)* 4: 5-21.
- De Beer, Z. W. *et al.* 2013. A nomenclator for ophiostomatoid genera and species in the *Ophiostomatales* and *Microascales*. In Seifert *et al.* (eds), *Ophiostomatoid fungi: expanding frontiers*. CBS Biodiversity Series 12: 245-322.
- Zhang, N. *et al.* 2012. Impacts of the International Code of Nomenclature for Algae, Fungi, and Plants (Melbourne Code) on the Scientific Names of Plant Pathogenic Fungi.
www.apsnet.org/publications/apsnetfeatures/Pages/Melbourne.aspx

Note: See the ‘editorial’ section of the issues of *IMA Fungus*, starting with vol. 2 number 2, for more discussion of the 1F:1N issue, and the work of the International Commission on the Taxonomy of Fungi and other groups to respond to the nomenclatural changes.

Read IMA Fungus

www.imafungus.org
and
Flipboard Magazines

