

## SUBSECTION FOR NOMENCLATURE

*Chairman:* E. D. MERRILL.

*Recorder:* A. A. PULLE.

*Rapporteur général:* T. A. SPRAGUE.

*Secretaries:* Miss M. L. GREEN, J. MATTFELD and W. ROBIJNS.

*Report by* T. A. SPRAGUE.

### INTRODUCTION

The object of this Report is to give an accurate impression of the circumstances in which the Rules and Recommendations concerned were adopted or modified, and to permit of reference to the original discussions in case of any doubts arising as to the interpretation of particular provisions.

It is based on the following documents:

1. The report of the Secretary for English, Miss M. L. GREEN.
2. The report of the Secretary for French, Prof. W. ROBYNS.
3. The report of the Secretary for German, Prof. J. MATTFELD.
4. A few documents handed in by various botanists, including the text of certain motions and one or two short abstracts of speeches.

5. Notes made during the course of the proceedings by the writer in the capacity of Rapporteur général.

The data included in the Report are drawn mainly from documents 1, 2 and 3, which are mutually complementary, and the writer is greatly indebted to the Secretaries for the three languages, Miss M. L. GREEN, Prof. W. ROBYNS and Prof. J. MATTFELD, for the admirable manner in which they carried out their difficult tasks.

As the proceedings were conducted in English, except for occasional speeches in French or German, the greater part of the actual work of reporting fell on the shoulders of the Secretary for English. The German report, however, gave a concise summary of the proceedings with details of the voting in each case, as well as abstracts of the speeches delivered in German. The Secretaries for French and German, in addition to supplying reports of the speeches in those languages, performed an invaluable service in translating them for the benefit of the English-speaking members of the Congress, and also in giving summaries, in French and German, of various speeches and new proposals made in English.

The arrangements as to voting were in the hands of the Recorder, Prof. A. A. PULLE, and were modelled on those adopted at Cambridge in 1930, Dr. J. LANJOUW and Dr. H. UITTIEN acting as scrutineers. A list of the Botanical Institutions, Societies and Academies represented by nomenclature delegates, with the number of votes allotted to each, is given in Suppl. III (p. 372). Votes were allotted also to members of the several Nomenclature Committees appointed at Cambridge in 1930 (Suppl. I, p. 370) and to authors of motions (Suppl. II, p. 371).

The discussions on nomenclature were based on two printed works distributed to delegates and others attending the nomenclature meetings, namely, the *Synopsis of Proposals* and the *Preliminary Opinions*, both prepared by the Rapporteur général. The *Synopsis of Proposals* includes all motions duly transmitted to the Rapporteur, preceded in each case by the original text of the part of the International Rules concerned. The *Preliminary Opinions* includes the results of the preliminary voting on the proposals by the seven members of the Executive Committee of Nomenclature, and seven other botanists, including the Presidents and Recorder of Section Sys at Amsterdam, and the members of the Editorial Committee of the International Rules, ed. 3. This preliminary voting made it clear that a large number of proposals received little or no support from botanists, over 30 of them being rejected by majorities of at least four-fifths. These were subsequently (see p. 337) rejected automatically by

the Section, and the great saving of time thus effected made it possible to complete the nomenclature programme during the three sessions assigned to it. The comments and suggestions printed in the *Preliminary Opinions* were also very helpful.

The Nomenclature Reports of the Congresses at Vienna, Brussels and Cambridge were written in French, the French text of the first and second editions of the International Rules being the official one. In the case of the third edition (1935), however, it is the English text which is decisive (see p. 335) in case of any discrepancy between the three versions, since it was prepared first, and served as the basis of the French and German translations. The present Report accordingly appears in English.

The writer is indebted to Miss M. L. GREEN for her collaboration throughout its preparation.

**1st Session.** Sunday, September 1st at 2 p.m.

*Chairman:* Dr. E. D. MERRILL.

The *Chairman* opened the proceedings with a few remarks, emphasizing the importance of making the discussions as brief as possible. He referred to the lamented death of the late *Rapporteur général*, Dr. John BRIQUET, all present standing in their places as a mark of respect.

The *Recorder*, Prof. A. A. PULLE, read out the list of members of the Bureau of Nomenclature, which was approved by the meeting.

*President:* Dr. E. D. MERRILL.

*Vice-President and Recorder:* Prof. A. A. PULLE.

*Vice-President and Rapporteur-général:* Dr. T. A. SPRAGUE.

*Vice-President and Vice-Rapporteur:* Prof. H. HARMS.

*Vice-Presidents:* Prof. R. É. FRIES, Prof. B. P. G. HOCHREUTINER, Prof. R. PAMPANINI, Mr. J. RAMSBOTTOM, Dr. A. B. RENDLE.

*Secretary for English:* Miss M. L. GREEN.

*Secretary for French:* Prof. W. ROBYNS.

*Secretary for German:* Prof. J. MATTFELD.

*Scrutineers:* Dr. J. LANJOUW, Dr. H. UITTEN.

Prof. HARMS gave a short account of the preparation of the third edition of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature, of which he acted as General Editor, no manuscript of the new Rules having been left by Dr. BRIQUET. As most of the proposals on which they were based had been drafted in English, Prof. HARMS asked Dr. RENDLE to prepare the English version. This version, revised by HARMS, is accepted as the

official text in the event of any discrepancy between the three versions. Prof. HARMS was responsible for the German translation, and Prof. HOCHREUTINER for the French. Owing to the unavoidable delay in the publication of the Rules, an abbreviated text of the English version was published in advance as a Supplement to *The Journal of Botany* for June, 1934.

A vote of thanks to the Editorial Committee, proposed by Sir A. W. HILL and seconded by Dr. E. D. MERRILL, was carried unanimously.

The RECORDER read out lists of members suggested by the Bureau for the several Nomenclature Committees, and various alterations were made in them by the meeting (for the lists see Suppl. IV, pp. 381).

Dr. SPRAGUE explained the arrangement adopted in his *Synopsis of Proposals* and *Preliminary Opinions* concerning nomenclature proposals. Two copies of the *Synopsis* were sent, for preliminary voting, to each of the seven members of the Executive Committee of Nomenclature and to seven other botanists including the Presidents and Recorder of the Section and members of the Editorial Committee of the International Rules, ed. 3. The results of the preliminary voting on each proposal would be announced by the Recorder for the information of the Section. Dr. SPRAGUE expressed his thanks to Sir A. W. HILL for affording all facilities for the preparation of the *Synopsis* and *Preliminary Opinions*; to Miss M. L. GREEN for her help and collaboration; to the Executive Committee of the Cambridge Congress for defraying the cost of publication; and to the Cambridge University Press for their speed in publishing these works.

Prof. HARMS expressed the thanks of the meeting to Dr. SPRAGUE and Miss GREEN for their work.

Prof. PULLE stated that after he had been appointed by the Organizing Committee as Recorder of the Section for Taxonomy and Nomenclature, he visited in the beginning of November 1933 Prof. HARMS at Berlin, as Secretary of the Executive Committee. Prof. HARMS gave him much useful information, and with his approval Prof. PULLE invited Dr. SPRAGUE of Kew to act as Rapporteur général in the place of Dr. BRIQUET in preparing a synopsis of nomenclature proposals submitted to the Congress.

In April 1934 Prof. PULLE consulted Dr. RENDLE in London in order to expedite the publication of the International Rules, ed. 3. An English version was printed in June 1934, and the official Rules in three languages appeared in February 1935. Prof. PULLE also visited Mr. RAMSBOTTOM in London and Dr.

SPRAGUE and Miss GREEN at Kew in order to obtain information about the technical preparation required. Miss GREEN gave him a list of voting institutions and samples of voting forms used at Cambridge in 1930. Similar arrangements were adopted at Amsterdam. A notice that one hundred copies of all proposals concerning nomenclature should be sent to Dr. SPRAGUE before January 1st, 1935, was prepared and sent to all members of nomenclature committees, and also to the editors of the principal botanical journals. Some proposals were received later, and were included either in the *Synopsis* or in the *Preliminary Opinions*. It was suggested by the Bureau that these later proposals should also be considered.

The PRESIDENT observed that the Recorder had had a very heavy task, and that the Section appreciated the work he had done to make the Congress a success. At a joint meeting of the Bureau and the Executive Committee it was decided that in order to save time, the best course would be to refer all the proposals marked „PB” to the Palaeobotanical Committee, and those marked „MYC.” to the Mycological Committee, and to request that they report on them to the Section on or before September 6th. The President proposed this as a motion.

Mr. DIXON suggested that rules and recommendations dealing with any special group of plants be printed in a separate part of the Rules.

The PRESIDENT remarked that this was an excellent suggestion and one that could be handled by the Editorial Committee. The President's motion was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDENT next proposed, on behalf of the Bureau, that all motions against which a  $\frac{4}{5}$  majority had been recorded in the preliminary voting should be excluded, on the understanding that if time permitted they could be discussed later on. A similar arrangement was adopted at Cambridge in order to expedite matters.

Mr. EXELL considered that Art. A 31 ought to be excepted; it had a voting of 8 : 1—8 acceptances and one against.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the motion concerned only proposals *against* which there was a  $\frac{4}{5}$  majority. The motion was carried unanimously.

The PRESIDENT called on Dr. SPRAGUE to make a statement on behalf of the Bureau.

Dr. SPRAGUE said the Bureau thought it would simplify matters if the meeting would give its approval to the general text of the International Rules, ed. 3, as prepared by Dr. RENDLE and Prof. HARMS. They had had a difficult task in

preparing the Rules, and in order to avoid any complications, it seemed desirable to accept the Rules as a faithful record of the Cambridge decisions. Owing to Dr. BRIQUET's death there had been a great delay in the publication of the new Rules — the advance English version appeared in 1934, and the official text in 1935. On this account Prof. HARMS and Dr. RENDLE felt that they would be acting in the spirit of the Cambridge decisions if they advanced the date for compulsory Latin diagnoses from 1932 to 1935 (see Art. 38). The date first fixed at Cambridge was 1931, and on the following day Dr. BRIQUET stated that as the Rules would probably not be ready until 1931, it would be advisable to put forward the date for compulsory Latin diagnoses to 1932. Acting on similar lines, Prof. HARMS and Dr. RENDLE had put forward the date to 1935, since the advance version of the Rules did not appear till 1934. The Bureau was unanimous in its opinion that the date 1932 fixed by the Cambridge Congress should be advanced to 1935.

The PRESIDENT said he thought that the case was now clear to everybody, and asked whether any discussion was desired. The motion was carried unanimously.

Before proceeding to the consideration of the various proposals (excluding those marked "PB" and "MYC.") the PRESIDENT announced that if motions in one language were not understood, members might have them interpreted on request. This and subsequent speeches, whenever required, were translated into French and German by the Secretaries for these languages.

The PRESIDENT announced that the Recorder would in all cases present the motion, and give the figures of the preliminary voting.

Art. A 2 (accepted, 8 : 3). The PRESIDENT pointed out that this was merely a textual amendment involving no principle. The motion was carried.

Art. A 3 (rejected, 2 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 7 (rejected, 0 : 12). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 14 (accepted, 9 : 2). Carried unanimously.

Art. A 15 (rejected, 0 : 12). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 19 (accepted, 7 : 4). Dr. SPRAGUE drew the President's attention to the fact that special sanction of the meeting was required before this motion could be discussed, as it had been rejected at Cambridge. It had also been rejected at Vienna. Mr. WILMOTT's proposal was intended to do what we all wished, namely, to avoid further changes in nomenclature, especially of genera, entailed by the adoption of certain names from certain books at present regarded as valid publications.

Dr. SPRAGUE considered that the motion should be discussed, although he was of opinion that the decision made at Cambridge should be retained. The question had been discussed at considerable length in *Preliminary Opinions*, pp. 5—8. If any names were found in these works which invalidated well-known generic names, the latter could be conserved. Mr. WILMOTT thought that accepted names published in ADANSON, *Familles des Plantes* would rarely be lost if that work were rejected. It seemed desirable, however, to know how many names it would be necessary to conserve if ADANSON were rejected, *Abutilon* being a case in point. From the works listed by Mr. WILMOTT there were 201 names already on the list of *Nomina rejicienda*, and a rejection of these works would necessitate a revision of the entire list of *Nomina generica conservanda*. It would be well to hear what Prof. HARMS had to say on the subject, since he had the greatest experience of anyone on *Nomina conservanda*.

Prof. HARMS observed, that, as stated by him in *Preliminary Opinions*, the rejection of the works concerned would involve far-reaching alterations in generic nomenclature, since the list of *Nomina generica conservanda* had been prepared on the basis that certain of these works were valid. Furthermore, if Patrick Browne's *Hist. Jamaica* (1756), which had been regarded as doubtful, is accepted as valid, several *Nomina generica conservanda*, e.g. *Sechium* P. Br., become superfluous.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM read the following statement on behalf of Mr. A. J. WILMOTT:-

*Observations on the possible objections raised in the 'Gray Book' (Preliminary Opinions, pp. 5—8).*

(1) It might lead to name changes.

I regard this as a completely mistaken view, because these works actually were not used during the century in which our normal nomenclature was established. The changes in the last forty years are considerably due to the reversal of this historic usage of rejection of these works, and their formal rejection now will merely cause return to the established nomenclature.

Dr. SPRAGUE objects that no evidence is given. I can here only add that when I revised the nomenclature of the British Flora, I found that the only name which would be lost was *Mibora* Adans., which would return to *Chamagrostis* Borkh., the name long in use for the plant. I am satisfied that as regards British — and presumably, also, European — Phanerogams, the proposition would not have the harmful effects feared by some.

(2) I have already replied to the objection of the late Dr. BRIQUET, that when the author does not describe species, one

cannot tell whether he was using the binary system of nomenclature or not. The differences between the two nomenclatures are so considerable that there is not in fact this difficulty in determining the matter when one actually investigates the works themselves.

ADANSON is in a somewhat different category from the other works. Now that his herbarium has been received at the Musée d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, and types of his names may be found, it seems desirable that the probable effect of accepting or rejecting his works — he was admittedly a "crank" — should be investigated before too definite a decision is made.

No worker in other branches of science is obliged to make continual reference to unsound work of previous workers. A similar means of setting aside work which for any special reason causes a nuisance in established nomenclature seems desirable, if used with proper caution."

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM thought that Mr. WILMOTT's proposal was logical, although perhaps logical and expedient were not synonymous terms. He stated that there was a misunderstanding at Cambridge when the voting took place on this Article, and considered that, for that reason, it must be re-voted on.

Mr. EXELL stated that Mr. WILMOTT had the principle at heart more than the actual list of works.

Dr. HITCHCOCK said he saw no reason against accepting names from these works if they had been taken up by subsequent authors, and deciding others by means of *Nomina generica conservanda*. On these grounds he would reject the motion. The President suggested referring the motion to a Special Committee, in order to obtain statistics.

Mr. WEATHERBY suggested that the Committee appointed to consider Mr. WILMOTT's proposal be asked to prepare lists of *Nomina conservanda* made necessary by the exclusion of the works mentioned in that proposal (particularly ADANSON's *Familles des Plantes*), in case such exclusion is recommended by the Committee. *Dryopteris*, for instance, was not taken up after ADANSON until 1834, and in the meantime *Nephrodium* (1801), based on the same type was published. *Dryopteris* now in general use would be eliminated.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the name *Dryopteris* was proposed for conservation (*Syn. Prop.* p. 68).

Mr. WEATHERBY said that although this particular case was covered by a proposal for conservation before the Congress, there were likely to be other similar cases.

The following were then appointed as a Special Committee to report on the effects of the adoption of the proposed Art.

A 19: A. J. WILMOTT (Secretary), H. HARMS, H. HUMBERT, J. LANJOUW, T. A. SPRAGUE.

Art. D 20 (accepted, 7 : 3). Dr. SPRAGUE suggested that consideration of Art. D 20 should be deferred until a report on Art. E 20 had been received from the Mycological Committee. The question was one that affected Mycologists more than Phanerogamists.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM said that the principle at issue was whether we started with *dates* or with *works*. Dr. DODGE's Art. B 20 proposed as a starting-point "(f.) Fungi caeteri 1821 (Fries, *Systema mycologicum*)", so that a name proposed by another author in 1822 might have priority over one proposed by FRIES. Dr. HAMSHAW THOMAS on behalf of the palaeobotanists suggested beginning with the work rather than with the date, as it was sometimes difficult to determine the date of publication.

The PRESIDENT proposed that Art. E 20 should be referred to the Mycologists for discussion and report, and that Art. D 20 and E 20 should be considered by the meeting later in the week. This was carried unanimously.

Art. A 21 (rejected, 4 : 7); Art. 21 bis (rejected, 2 : 6).

Dr. SPRAGUE pointed out that the sanction of the meeting was required for a discussion to take place, as these proposals reversed a decision reached at previous Congresses. If the meeting decided that they should be considered, the Bureau recommended the adoption of Mr. RAMSBOTTOM's proposal (*Prelim. Opin.* p. 9) that a list of names of economic plants should be drawn up in accordance with the International Rules. If the principle of *Nomina specifica conservanda* were accepted, it would be necessary to examine each name very carefully, as *Cedrus libani*, one of those put forward for conservation, was already the correct name under International Rules.

Dr. BURTT DAVY said that if the Congress agreed to Mr. RAMSBOTTOM's proposal, he would, on behalf of thirty-eight forestry institutions, withdraw Art. 21 bis.

Prof. MAIRE proposed that a vote should be taken in the first place on the principle of *Nomina specifica conservanda* (to which he personally was opposed), and that if this principle were rejected, there should be a vote on the compromise suggested by Mr. RAMSBOTTOM.

The PRESIDENT approved of Prof. MAIRE's suggestion, and Mr. RAMSBOTTOM formally proposed the rejection of the principle of *Nomina specifica conservanda*.

Dr. H. HANDEL-MAZZETTI considered that a list of *Nomina specifica conservanda* was indispensable, but that it must be small. He observed that it was sometimes very difficult to find

out the *correct* name for a particular plant (e.g. *Silene venosa*\*); a name thought to be correct this year might have to be changed next year, so that this list drawn up by a Committee would have to be corrected from time to time.

A vote by show of hands revealed a majority in favour of the motion for the rejection of the principle of *Nomina specifica conservanda*. A vote by secret ballot was taken at the request of Prof. HOCHREUTINER and others. [The result was 208 votes for the motion and 61 votes against it — see p. 342].

Rec. A IX (rejected, 0 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Rec. B IX (accepted, 7 : 3). Adopted.

Art. A 23 (rejected, 0 : 12). Rejected automatically.

Art. B 23 (rejected, 0 : 12). Rejected automatically.

Art. C 23 (accepted, 7 : 4). Accepted with the following wording:

"Names of families are taken from the name of one of their genera, or from a synonym, and end in *-aceae*."

Adopted by show of hands.

Art. A 24 (rejected, 1 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 25 (rejected, 0 : 11). Rejected automatically.

Art. 25 bis (rejected, 0 : 11). Rejected automatically.

Art. 25 ter (rejected, 0 : 12). Rejected automatically.

Rec. A X (rejected, 0 : 11). Rejected automatically.

Rec. B X (accepted, 9 : 1). In reply to Mr. H. N. DIXON, Dr. SPRAGUE explained that such compound names as *Merrill-obryum* (Bryophyta) were not treated as personal generic names.

Adopted by show of hands.

Art. A 26 (rejected, 2 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Rec. A XI (rejected, 1 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Rec B XI (rejected, 2 : 9). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 27 (rejected, 0 : 11). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 31 (accepted, 10 : 1). Adopted with the following amended wording of the example proposed by Mr. EXELL:

"Example of asexual hybrids: + *Solanum tubingense* (*Solanum Lycopersicum* + *nigrum*)."

Art. A 34 (rejected, 3 : 7). Dr. SPRAGUE stated that the Bureau recommended the rejection of Art. A 34, but that the example be added to Art. 34, the term "subhybrida" being replaced by "forma" in accordance with the suggestion made by Prof. HARMS (*Prelim. Opin.* p. 11).

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM considered that all questions concerning hybrids should be referred to a Special Committee.

\*) The correct name is *Silene Cucubalus* Wib. — see Kew Bull, 1933, 151. — T. A. S.

The suggestion of the Bureau was adopted nem. con.

The scrutineers (Dr. J. LANJOUW and Dr. H. UITTEN) communicated the result of the ballot on the principle of *Nomina specifica conservanda* (Art. A 21 and 21 bis) to the President, who announced it as follows: 208 votes against the principle and 61 in favour of it.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM then formally moved that an International Committee be appointed to draw up a list of names of economic plants according to the International Rules.

At the suggestion of Dr. A. B. RENDLE, supported by Dr. J. BURTT DAVY, a provision that the list should remain in use for a period of ten years was added by Mr. RAMSBOTTOM, who moved as follows:

"That an International Committee be appointed to draw up a list of names of economic plants according to the International Rules, and that this list may remain in use for a period of ten years."

The motion was adopted by show of hands.

Art. A 35 (accepted 10 : 2). The President suggested, on behalf of the Bureau, that in the example the words "var. hort." should be replaced by the letter "c.", so that the example should read: "*Pelargonium zonale* c. Mrs. Pollock". Prof. HOCHREUTNER supported this as being preferable to his original wording. The motion, as amended, was adopted. [The text of Art. A. 35 will accordingly read: The fancy epithet will be preceded by the letter "c."]

Art. A 36 (rejected, 4 : 7). The President pointed out that palaeobotanical institutions are botanical institutions just as much as are mycological and phytopathological ones. The Article was rejected.

Dr. SPRAGUE said that Prof. HOCHREUTNER had pointed out that the text of Art. 36, as adopted at Cambridge, was not entirely satisfactory. Sometimes descriptions of new groups appeared in separates distributed a long time before the appearance of the periodicals from which they were extracted. In such cases the date of publication, under Art. 36, is that of the periodical. Prof. HOCHREUTNER accordingly proposed the addition of the following new paragraph to Art. 36.

"Where separates from periodicals or other works placed on sale are issued in advance, the date on the separate is accepted as the date of effective publication."

Prof. HOCHREUTNER read his proposal in French and explained its effect.

Dr. MATTFELD translated it into German.

Mr. DIXON asked whether it could be a condition that the date be printed on the separate.

The PRESIDENT replied in the affirmative.

Mr. EXELL stated that he was opposed to the proposal, unless it was made a condition that the reprints should be sent to the representative botanical institutions. Distribution of separates among private botanists did not constitute effective publication in his opinion.

Dr. LINDER observed that there were so many botanical institutions in America that the three separates sent to American institutions would not be sufficient to avoid confusion as to the effective date of publication. He urged that the date of publication should be that of the periodical in which the article was published.

On show of hands Prof. HOCHREUTINER'S proposal was adopted by a large majority.

Art. B 43 (accepted, 9 : 1). Adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.

**2nd Session.** Tuesday, September 3rd at 2 p.m.

Section A 7 (rejected, 3 : 8). Discussion on this heading was postponed until a decision on Rec. XXXII quater was reached.

Art. A 47 (accepted, 10 : 2). Accepted, with the following amended wording approved by the Bureau: "An alteration of the diagnostic characters or of the circumscription of a group without exclusion of the type ..."

The proposal, as thus amended, was carried unanimously.

Art. 47 bis (rejected, 1 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 49 (rejected, 1 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Rec. XXXII bis (accepted, 11 : 0). Adopted by show of hands.

Rec. A XXXII ter (accepted, 9 : 2).

The RECORDER proposed the following amended wording in conjunction with Dr. LANJOUW:

"When citing in synonymy a misapplication or shifting of a name to another type, the name should be followed by the name of the author who misapplied or shifted it, preceded by the word 'auct.' and at the end of the citation the original author should be cited preceded by 'non' with the date of the original publication added."

"Example: *Pinus inops* auct. Bongard (1833); non. Ait. (1789)."

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM read the following remarks by Mr. WILMOTT:

"Such a citation as '*Pinus inops* Ait. sensu Bongard; non Ait.' would seem to be sheer nonsense. It cannot be Aiton's and not Aiton's at the same time. It is impossible to maintain nomen-

clatural provisions which are not based on sound fundamentals. The two plants are '*Pinus inops* Bongard non Ait.' and '*Pinus inops* Ait.'. If it is necessary or desirable to indicate that Bongard's use of the name is a misidentification and is not intended as a new name it can be done quite simply by using the form '*Pinus inops* Bongard (non Ait.) in Mem. Acad. ... (etc.)'. The use of the same name as a later homonym can be indicated by the different position of the 'non' and absence of quotation marks, preferably at the beginning, to indicate at once that the name cited is not valid — the form thus: '*Pinus inops* (non Ait). X Y in .....'

Dr. A. S. HITCHCOCK proposed that misapplications of names should not be included in synonymy. They might be included in notes appended to the synonymy or to the description.

Prof. K. DOMIN proposed the form of citation: '*Pinus inops* "Ait." ex Bong., non Ait.

The RECORDER did not like inverted commas because they could so easily be forgotten.

Dr. LINDER considered that it was unwise to flood literature with misidentifications in the form of synonymy.

Prof. HARMS agreed with Dr. HITCHCOCK that misidentifications should not be cited as synonyms, but should be mentioned in a separate statement.

Dr. LANJOUW considered that in floristic and monographic work it would be very difficult to put misapplications into notes.

Prof. REHDER said that by giving full synonymy sometimes an extension of the range of a species would be noted.

Dr. SPRAGUE proposed that misidentifications should be quoted in the form "Wrongly cited by Bongard as *Pinus inops* Ait."

Mr. EXELL proposed that botanists should be left free to cite misidentifications as they pleased and suggested that the substance of Rec. A XXXII ter should be embodied in a note rather than a Recommendation. In the event of the adoption of Rec. B XXXII ter he would like to support Mr. RAMSBOTTOM'S suggestion (*Prelim. Opin.* p. 15) that the word "should" be replaced by "may".

Dr. HITCHCOCK asked whether a vote might be taken at once for the exclusion of misapplications from synonymy.

The PRESIDENT asked Dr. HITCHCOCK to present his motion in concrete form at the next meeting, the vote being postponed meantime.

Rec. B XXXII ter (rejected, 4:7). Speaking on behalf of Mr. W. T. STEARN, Dr. SPRAGUE withdrew this proposal, in view of the preliminary voting and of the discussion on Rec. A. XXXII ter.

Rec. XXXII quater (accepted, 9 : 2). The Bureau recommended the acceptance of the abbreviated text suggested by Prof. HARMS, together with the omission of the first example (*Prelim. Opin.* p. 15):

"In citation of literature 'in' should be inserted after the name of the author if the citation refers to a periodical or other serial publication, or if it is a work by another author."

Prof. HITCHCOCK pointed out that many Americans were accustomed to omit the word "in" when citing from a periodical. He saw no reason for distinguishing between a periodical and an independent work. Dr. LANJOUW, the President and Prof. REHDER considered that the use of the word "in" was advantageous in bibliography as it distinguished between a periodical and an independent work.

Rec. XXXII quater, as amended, was adopted by show of hands.

Rec. XXXII quinquies (accepted, 9 : 1). The following amended wording and omissions from the examples were recommended by the Bureau.

"If a name cited in synonymy applies only in part to the group under which it is cited, it should be made clear whether the synonym cited includes the type, and in that case the words *pro parte typica*, (*p. p. typ.*) should be appended; in more exact citations the parts excluded or those belonging to the group in question should be cited, or the name of the author who changed the circumscription of the group should be added, preceded by 'emend.'"

In the examples delete "p.p." in lines 1 and 6; substitute the word "under" for "as *synon.*" in line 4/5.

Dr. HANDEL-MAZZETTI suggested that the phrase in brackets in lines 4/5 should read "[cited as *A. taronense* Hand.-Mazz.]"

Dr. HITCHCOCK observed that on a type-basis there was not so much need for "p.p." "excl. ..." etc.

Rec. XXXII quinquies, as amended, was adopted.

Rec. XXXII sexies (accepted, 9 : 2). Adopted.

Rec. XXXII septies (accepted, 8 : 3). Adopted, with the deletion of the words "without grammatical or orthographic corrections or changes in the indication of rank of subdivisions of genera or of species," and the addition of "A." before "Gray" in lines 7 and 9.

Sect. A 7 (rejected, 3 : 8) was next considered.

Dr. SPRAGUE stated that Prof. REHDER had amended the text of his motion as follows: "Citation of authors names and of literature for purposes of precision." The object of Sect. A 7 was to draw attention to Rec. XXXII quater dealing with citation of

literature, and that Recommendation had been adopted. Sect. A 7 was adopted by show of hands.

Art. A 50 (accepted, 9:2). Adopted, with the following wording: "since the type of *Myosotis* L. remains in the genus."

Art. A 54 (5:6) and B 54 (7:5).

The PRESIDENT called on Dr. SPRAGUE, who made the following agreed statement summarizing the points at issue:

"It is agreed that the combination *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) is based on *Pinus Mertensiana* Bong. and must be used for that species when it is placed in the genus *Tsuga*.

The combination *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) was first published by CARRIÈRE, who, however, applied it to another species, namely, *Tsuga heterophylla* (Raf.) Sarg. Later on, SARGENT corrected CARRIÈRE'S taxonomy, excluding *Tsuga heterophylla* from CARRIÈRE'S concept of *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.).

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM (Art. A 54) proposes that SARGENT, who was the first author to give a correct circumscription of *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.), should be cited as the authority for that combination.

Dr. SPRAGUE (Art. B 54) proposes that CARRIÈRE, who was the first author to publish the combination, *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.), should be cited as the authority."

The PRESIDENT stated that a slight textual amendment had been made in Art. B 54, and called on Dr. SPRAGUE to read it. The new wording was:

"When on transference to another genus, the specific epithet has been applied erroneously in its new position to a different plant, the new combination must be retained for the plant on which the epithet was originally based, and must be attributed to the author who first published it."

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM explained that the reason he brought forward Art. A 54 was on account of differences which had arisen in interpreting the Rules. He was under the impression that everything had been clearly settled at Cambridge, and was very surprised to find that Art. 54 could be interpreted in two different ways. The difference in interpretation could be put thus: the one view considers that the species on which the type is based is the important point, and the other view is that the name is the important point. He gave *Alternaria Cheiranthi* (Fries) as an example. *Macrosporium Cheiranthi* Fries was changed by BOLLE to *Alternaria Cheiranthi* (Fries) Bolle. BOLLE had not got the right plant, so this is really *Alternaria Cheiranthi* Bolle.

FRIES' description was inadequate, and mycologists would go to Bolle for a description of the fungus.

WILTSHIRE had pointed out that:

*Alternaria Cheiranthi* Bolle was not *Macrosporium Cheiranthi* Fries, and he wrote *Alternaria Cheiranthi* (Fries) Bolle excl. spec. and gave a revised diagnosis.

This is not good, as BOLLE never saw the type. Everything is wrong except BOLLE's guess. Mr. RAMSBOTTOM said that his way of citing FRIES' species was *Alternaria Cheiranthi* (Fries) Wiltshire.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM referred to the following comment by Dr. BARNHART (*Prelim. Opin.* p. 27): "In the example of Art. A 54 the citation should be *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr., even if Carrière did not have the Bongard plant. The Carrière plant is *Tsuga Mertensiana* Carr. excl. syn.; this is really essential to the type method." Mr. RAMSBOTTOM thought that *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) Sarg. was the plant CARRIÈRE did not have, and *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr. was the plant he did have. He then read the following extract from a memorandum by Mr. A. J. WILMOTT.

Mr. WILMOTT wishes to express strong disagreement with the statement in the Gray Book [*Prelim. Opin.*] that B 54 is 'formally more logical'. In view of the basic function of the author's name it is illogical. If fundamentals are to be ignored so much the worse for 'modern tendencies'. The solution of the difficulty — a real difficulty — is along the line of my proposal A 49, which was made for this purpose.

The function of the author's name is to indicate the type. The citation of the second author to indicate the author of the combination is what is at the root of the trouble, because this is really taxonomy, and is not nomenclature. Actually for correct identification another citation is fundamentally necessary, for identification consists in indicating what one is making (*facio*) a given specimen to be the same as (*idem*). The original author indicates the type, and some citation is really necessary in making records, etc. to show what limits the *recorder* gives to the name, i.e. how *he* is using it. But the author of the combination serves neither of these functions, and although it is not completely useless, its use is taxonomic, and has nothing to do with citation for purposes of precision. In spite of modern tendencies, it has nothing to do with the type method.

It is simply absurd to cite Carrière as the authority for *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) when he himself would have denied that specimens of that species were his own *Tsuga Mertensiana*."

Dr. RENDLE considered that the citation *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr. represented a misidentification. He asked whether instead of perpetuating this misidentification it would not be better to put "Sarg. non. Carr." as the authority.

Dr. MATTFELD said that the important thing was to reach an unambiguous decision, but it was better that this decision should be in harmony with established custom. In the special case of the treatment of Linnean species, the question was already decided by common usage: for the correct application of the Linnean species names was determined by means of the figures, etc. cited by him, and not by means of the specimens in his herbarium, which were sometimes wrongly determined. This procedure is in accordance with Art. B. 54. Furthermore, if Art. A 54 were accepted, it would be necessary to declare as invalid all new combinations associated with wrong identifications, whether they were published with insufficient descriptions not including diagnostic characters, or without descriptions in floras or lists of plants. In both cases the wrong identification could be detected only by consultation of the specimens cited. Finally, when it was necessary to give a new name to a genus, authors sometimes published more or less uncritical lists of new combinations for all the species described under the old generic name, and in doing so have doubtless made new combinations for synonyms. Since Art. A 54 made the validity of a new combination dependent on the species concerned, all these new combinations would become invalid. This would have very unhappy consequences. Art. B 54 supplied the simplest solution and one which made possible a uniform treatment of all cases, and its adoption was therefore recommended.

Dr. SPRAGUE referred to the case of *Oxalis corniculata* and *O. stricta* in support of what Dr. MATTFELD had said as to the interpretation of Linnean species names by means of the citations. Mr. A. J. WILMOTT had shown (*Journ. Bot.* 1915, 172) that the names *O. corniculata* and *O. stricta* should be applied in accordance with the citations given by Linnaeus.

Prof. HOCHREUTINER said that, by a clerical error in his typescript, a remark of his regarding Art. A 54 had been transferred to Art. B 54 in *Prelim. Opin.* p. 16. He considered that Art. A 54 was the more logical, but that Art. B 54 alone conformed with the spirit underlying the rules of nomenclature. The rules of botanical nomenclature were based on the type method, and if one abandoned this method, the whole structure of the rules would crumble.

Prof. DOMIN fully appreciated the value of the reasons given by Mr. RAMSBOTTOM but was satisfied that the proposal of Dr. SPRAGUE was more in accordance with the spirit of the Rules accepted in Cambridge, and besides also preferable from the practical point of view. CARRIÈRE did two things; first he transferred *Pinus Mertensiana* of Bongard to the genus *Tsuga* and made a new combination *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr. In

this he was absolutely right, and his new combination is as a concept (or theoretically) undoubtedly the same as the *Tsuga Mertensiana* of Sargent.

CARRIÈRE made, however, a misidentification, naming so a plant belonging to *Tsuga heterophylla*.

Thus *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr. excl. pl. (or, quoad synonymum Bongard sed non quoad plantam) should be retained as a valid combination.

Dr. HITCHCOCK stated that the example *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr. versus *T. Mertensiana* (Bong.) Sarg. was representative of a large number of cases. *Pinus Mertensiana* was first described by BONGARD. Later, CARRIÈRE decided that the species belonged to the genus *Tsuga* and transferred it as *T. Mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr. He intended to transfer the species as stated and thought he was doing so. However, he described the plant he was studying. Still later SARGENT investigated the case. In his opinion the plant described by CARRIÈRE did not belong to the same species as the one described originally by BONGARD. SARGENT, therefore, transferred the Bongard plant to *Tsuga* as *T. Mertensiana* (Bong.) Sarg.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM's proposal (A 54) supports the combination *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) Sarg.

Dr. SPRAGUE's proposal (B 54) supports the combination *T. Mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr.

By the type method the type of *Pinus Mertensiana* becomes automatically the type of *Tsuga Mertensiana*. This is a nomenclatural change. The discarding of CARRIÈRE's combination because of misidentification of his material is based on taxonomic opinion. A later author might disagree with SARGENT and decide that BONGARD's plant was different from the one described by either CARRIÈRE or SARGENT. A new combination would be necessary for each change of taxonomic opinion. By the type method CARRIÈRE becomes the author of *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) in spite of any error of identification made by him. As the plant identified by CARRIÈRE is different from that of BONGARD, it should receive a new name. This method conduces to stability in nomenclature. Hence he [Dr. HITCHCOCK] was strongly in favour of Sprague's proposal B 54.

Prof. MAIRE considered that the combination might be cited as *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr. emend. Sarg.

Dr. LANJOUW considered that under the type method the new combination *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr. was strictly equivalent to *Pinus Mertensiana* Bong., and he was therefore opposed to giving the option of adding the words "emend. Sarg." as in *Syn. Prop.* p. 39, Art. B 54. Dr. SPRAGUE signified his agreement.

Dr. SPRAGUE then presented his case for the adoption of Art. B 54.

"Under the type-method (Art. 18), which now forms an integral part of the International Rules, each *specific epithet* has a type, which is usually a *specimen* (or preparation). If permanent preservation of a specimen or preparation is impossible, the type of the specific epithet is the *original description*. Under Art. 49, when a species is transferred to another genus, retaining its epithet, the *original author must be cited in parenthesis*, followed by the name of the author who effected the alteration. The name of the original author indicates the *type-specimen* and the *original description* (Art. 54, end of last example). The name of the author who made the combination is added in order to indicate the *date* of the combination. 'For the indication of the name of a group to be accurate and complete and in order that the date may be readily verified, it is necessary to cite the author who first published the name in question' (Art. 46).

Under Art. 54 'When the specific epithet, on transference to another generic name, has been applied erroneously in its new position to a different plant, the combination must be retained for the plant on which the epithet was originally based'. Thus the combination *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) must be retained for *Pinus Mertensiana* (if that species is placed in *Tsuga*).

The first author who made the combination *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) was Carrière, who applied this new combination to another species, namely, *Tsuga heterophylla* (Raf.) Sarg.

I propose in Art. B 54 that the combination *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) be attributed to Carrière because Carrière was the author who first published it (Art. 46). There can be *no ambiguity* about the name *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) Carrière because the citation of BONGARD in parenthesis indicates the type of the combination. It is true that CARRIÈRE included two species under his combination, firstly *Pinus Mertensiana* Bong. and secondly *Tsuga heterophylla* (Raf.) Sargent.

But under Art. 47 of the International Rules 'An alteration of the diagnostic characters or of the circumscription of a group does not warrant the citation of an author other than the one who first published its name.' Hence it is not permissible to *replace* CARRIÈRE'S name by that of SARGENT as the author of the combination *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.).

The view that a combination should be attributed to the first author who applied it *correctly* is open to very grave objections. Priority of publication is one of the most important general principles on which the Rules are based (Art. 16). The impor-

tance of the *date* of publication is shown by the fact that an entire section of the Rules (Section 6, pp. 10-13, Engl. text, Art. 37-45) is devoted to it. Differences of opinion as to the circumscription of a species frequently arise. Where two specialists differ in the limits which they assign to a particular species, who is to decide which of them has *correctly* applied the name? The effect of Mr. RAMSBOTTOM's proposal to attribute a new combination to the first author who applied it 'correctly' would therefore be to make the date of publication uncertain, or a mere matter of taxonomic opinion.

In order to illustrate this difficult question, I am taking the example of *Daphnopsis americana* (Mill.) from a paper by FAWCETT and RENDLE (*Journ. Bot.* 1925, p. 51). We all know the very thorough character of FAWCETT and RENDLE's *Flora of Jamaica*, and I wish to emphasize that the selection of this example implies no criticism of Dr. RENDLE, for whose scholarly work I have the greatest admiration.

The combination *Daphnopsis americana* (Mill.), based on *Laurus americana* Mill. was published by JOHNSTON in 1909. Johnston included also a specimen afterwards identified as *Daphnopsis caribaea* and the synonym *Daphnopsis tinifolia*. Urban in 1921 excluded the specimen cited, but retained the synonym *Daphnopsis tinifolia*. URBAN attributed the combination *D. americana* to JOHNSTON. Fawcett and Rendle excluded the synonym *Daphnopsis tinifolia*. They placed their own names as authors of the combination *Daphnopsis americana* (Mill.). At the time when their paper was written, it was not obligatory to cite the original author of an epithet in parenthesis after a new combination. In 1925 the name *Daphnopsis americana* Johnston was admittedly ambiguous owing to the omission of '(Mill.)'. I do not criticize their action at that date, indeed I myself made a similar proposal in 1921. The situation has now been completely changed by the provision in Art. 49 under which 'the original author of an epithet must be cited in parenthesis' and the recognition (under Art. 54) that 'the citation in parenthesis (under Art. 49) of the name of the original author . . . indicates the type of the epithet.'

If Mr. RAMSBOTTOM's Art. A 54 is accepted, the *date of publication* of the accepted combination *Daphnopsis americana* (Mill.) instead of being a matter of ascertainable *fact*, becomes a mere matter of *opinion*. If JOHNSTON was correct in his taxonomic work on *Daphnopsis americana* (Mill.) the date of that combination is 1909; if URBAN was correct the date is 1921; if FAWCETT and RENDLE were correct the date is 1925. This leads to an impossible situation, since different authors will ascribe different dates to the same combination.

If Art. B 54 is accepted, the *actual* date of publication of the combination by JOHNSTON in 1909 is accepted."

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM considered that the attribution of a new combination to an author who misapplied it necessarily led to ambiguity. In the example quoted by Dr. SPRAGUE, MILLER's plant was seen by RENDLE and FAWCETT whereas JOHNSTON and URBAN guessed at its identity. Certainty of nomenclatural date is a big price to pay for confused taxonomy.

Dr. SPRAGUE said that the citation of the original author in brackets removed all ambiguity, as it indicated the type.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM said the reason of the entire discussion was to try and do away with ambiguity, and he suggested as a possible solution of the difficulty, that the zoological method of leaving out altogether the author's name after the brackets might be followed.

MISS GREEN strongly supported Art. B 54, as amended by Dr. SPRAGUE. If Art. A 54 were accepted, its effects would be very far-reaching: not only would the type-method be overthrown, but there would be many practical difficulties in outlying directions. She referred to the *Index Kewensis*, a work with which all present were familiar, and which was consulted by all phanerogamists before starting on any monographic or taxonomic work. She herself had had a hand in the preparation of the *Index Kewensis* for many years. All new names and new transferences are included in the *Index* on their first publication, but subsequent uses of new combinations are not and cannot be indexed.

If Mr. RAMSBOTTOM's proposal (Art. A 54) were accepted, it would be necessary to attribute a new combination to the first author who applied it to the right plant, and so the authorship would become a matter of opinion — what a position for indexing purposes! With such a rule the compilation of the *Index Kewensis* would become extraordinarily difficult, and no doubt many errors would creep in.

MISS GREEN therefore hoped that the practice of crediting a new combination to the author who first published it, placing in brackets the name of the author of the original epithet, would be retained.

With regard to the suggestion that had just been made by Mr. RAMSBOTTOM: that the name of the author outside the brackets should be left out altogether, Miss GREEN pointed out that the work of compilers of indexes would become increasingly difficult if such a proposal were adopted. Authors of taxonomic papers frequently cite no authority after the brackets as a means of indicating that they themselves are the authors of a new com-

bination. A name with no authority attached is treated as one that must be looked up to see whether it is new or not. If it were agreed to leave out the authority always, this clue to new names would be removed, and a very great deal of additional investigation would be necessary before an index could be properly compiled.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM withdrew his suggestion in view of the objection raised by Miss GREEN.

The discussion was then closed, and a vote by secret ballot was taken. [Article B 54 was adopted, see p. 354].

Art. A 55. Consideration deferred pending the result of the ballot on Art. A 54 and B 54.

Rec. A XXXIV (rejected, 1 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Rec. A XXXV (rejected, 1 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 58 (rejected, 3 : 9). Art. 58 bis (rejected, 3 : 9).

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM said that Mr. WILMOTT wished to withdraw Art. 58 bis, as he could not in absence make adequate explanation of his object in making this proposal. On the motion of Mr. RAMSBOTTOM, seconded by Dr. SPRAGUE, Art. 58 bis was referred to the next International Botanical Congress.

Rec. A XXXVI (rejected, 0 : 11). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 59 (rejected, 0 : 11). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 60 (accepted, 9 : 3). Adopted by show of hands.

Art. B 60 (accepted, 9 : 3). Mr. RAMSBOTTOM criticized the wording, as it placed on a dead author an obligation of which he could not have been aware. Dr. SPRAGUE replied that all rules were retroactive. He proposed the following textual amendments in Art. B 60: to replace the words "he (or she)" by "the author", as suggested in *Prelim. Opin.* p. 17, and the phrase "Rafinesque ought to have adopted the name *Pontederia* L." by "the name *Pontederia* L. ought to have been adopted."

Art. B 60, as thus amended, was adopted by show of hands.

Art. C 60 (Section 1, rejected, 1 : 10; Section 2, rejected, 2 : 9). Rejected automatically.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM asked whether it could be discussed later if time allowed.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the question had already been settled by the acceptance of the alternative proposition Art. B 60.

At this stage the result of the ballot on Art. A 54 and Art. B 54 was announced by the PRESIDENT: in favour of Art. B 54, 217 votes; in favour of Art. A 54, 40 votes; 2 votes invalid.

Art. A 61 (accepted, 9 : 2). Dr. SPRAGUE stated that the Bureau supported Prof. REHDER's amended wording: "When an author simultaneously publishes the same new name for more

than one group, the first author who adopts one of them, or substitutes another name for one of them, must be followed." This was adopted by show of hands.

Art. A 62 (rejected, 4 : 7). Withdrawn by Dr. SPRAGUE on behalf of Mr. GILMOUR, in order that the example might be referred for decision to the Special Committee concerned. A motion referring the example was adopted by show of hands.

Art. B 62 (text, 6 : 6; example accepted, 7 : 5).

Dr. SPRAGUE remarked that Miss Green and he had proposed the example of *Lavandula Spica* L. because it was so absolutely ambiguous. The name had been applied almost equally in literature to *L. officinalis* Chaix and *L. latifolia* Vill. (see *Kew Bull.* 1932, p. 295). Mr. RAMSBOTTOM supported the text of the motion and proposed that the example should be referred to the Special Committee concerned.

This course was adopted by show of hands.

Art. C 62 (rejected, 0 : 11). Rejected automatically.

Rec. A XXXVII (accepted, 8 : 3). Adopted with the deletion of the words "(i.e. secundum)" in the example of Rec. XXXVII.

Art. A 67 (rejected, 1 : 11). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 70 (rejected, 0 : 12). Rejected automatically.

Art. B 70 (rejected, 2 : 9). Rejected automatically.

Art. C 70 (accepted, 11 : 1). Adopted by show of hands.

Art. D 70 (accepted, 10 : 0). Dr. SPRAGUE said that, as pointed out by Prof. HOCHREUTNER in the case of *Lespedeza* versus *Cespedeza*, it was important that this note should be re-inserted, the only question being whether it should be a recommendation or a rule. The Bureau was in favour of treating it as a rule. This course was adopted by show of hands.

Art. E 70 (accepted, 7 : 3). Dr. SPRAGUE suggested that it would be better to deal with the small number of personal generic names affected by means of conservation, rather than by a special rule. It was agreed to refer the five generic names *Riccardia*, *Marchesinia*, *Nardia*, *Herberta* and *Pallavicinia* mentioned in Art. E 70 to the Special Committee concerned for investigation as to conservation.

Rec. A XXXIX (rejected, 0 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Rec. A XL (rejected, 1 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Rec. A XLIII (rejected, 0 : 11). Rejected automatically.

Rec. B XLIII (accepted, 8 : 2). Dr. SPRAGUE pointed out that a very great deal of time could be taken up in trying to decide whether a particular vernacular name used as a specific epithet had ever been employed as a generic name. He had once spent 5 hours in determining whether 20 specific epithets

should be spelt with a capital or a small initial letter. The Recommendation was designed to save this waste of time.

Rec. B XLIII was adopted by show of hands.

Rec. C XLIII (rejected, 1 : 8). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 72 (rejected, 0 : 11). Rejected automatically.

Art. B 72 (rejected, 2 : 8). Dr. SPRAGUE mentioned that Dr. DANSER had written a criticism of Art. 72 of the International Rules, and that he himself had written a reply. Copies of these two papers were available in the Nomenclature Room, and he suggested that in order to give members an opportunity for studying them, consideration of Art. B 72 and C 72 should be postponed to the next meeting.

Prof. DOMIN pointed out that no vote had been taken on Art. A 55.

Art. A 55 (accepted, 10 : 1). The following amended text, approved by the Bureau, was read out by Dr. SPRAGUE.

"When, on transference to another genus or species, the epithet of a subdivision of a species has been applied erroneously in its new position to a different subdivision of the same rank, the new combination must be retained for the plant on which the former combination was based, and must be attributed to the author who first published it."

Art. A 55, as thus amended, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.

**3rd session.** Friday, September 6th at 2 p.m.

Art. B 72 (rejected, 2 : 8); Art. C 72 (accepted, 7 : 4).

Mr. WEATHERBY proposed that the following sentence from Art. 72, sect. 2, be appended also to sect. 1: "If the ending is altered, however, the gender will follow it." This suggestion was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prof. HOCHREUTINER spoke in support of his Art. B 72. He considered that since an author, when publishing a new generic name, could spell it as he pleased, he should also be able to choose the gender of the name. He did not regard the question as very important. The object of his proposal was to avoid complications in determining the gender of generic names.

Prof. MAIRE said that in the *Preliminary Opinions* he had reluctantly voted against Art. B 72, solely because the question had been settled in a contrary sense at Cambridge. He was bound to declare, however, that Art. B 72 offered the most practical solution, since most botanists were not philologists. Botanists are not bound to write Ciceronian Latin, and many modifications have been made in it and adopted during the past few centuries. If there were a majority for Prof. Hochreutiner's Art. B 72 he would be happy to support it.

Dr. HITCHCOCK supported Art. C 72. He said that *Andropogon* was masculine by general usage, although Linnaeus made it neuter.

Dr. SPRAGUE said that he had traced 25 generic names ending in *-pogon*. Of these, 17 had been made masculine by their authors, 6 neuter, and 1 feminine, while the gender of the remaining one was doubtful. Thus most authors had chosen the classical gender. In order to determine the gender of these 25 generic names, all that was necessary under Art. 72, sect. (2) was to look up the word *pogon* (πώγων) in a Greek dictionary. Under Art. B 72, on the other hand, it would be necessary to look up the original places of publication of each of the 25 names, some of which appeared in scarce works available only in large botanical libraries.

Prof. B. H. DANSER considered that a botanist who consulted the botanical works concerned was better qualified to decide the gender than one who merely consulted a Greek dictionary.

Prof. HOCHREUTINER thought that the provisions regarding gender in Art. 72 and C 72 were very complicated, and thought that if the words "in general" were added, it would make things easier.

Dr. SPRAGUE then proposed that the provisions regarding gender should be embodied in a recommendation instead of a rule, whether the Congress decided to accept B 72 or C 72. This motion was adopted unanimously.

Prof. HOCHREUTINER then withdrew Art. B 72, and Art. C 72 was adopted as a recommendation.

Art. D 72 (rejected, 1 : 10). Rejected automatically.

Art. A 73. Mr. RAMSBOTTOM explained that this was designed in order to prevent stagnation, and that it was not really an Article in the accepted sense of the word. He withdrew provisions 1 and 2 as now unnecessary, the essential points having already been adopted; the remainder of the Article was then referred unanimously to the Executive and Editorial Committees.

The following motion by Mr. RAMSBOTTOM was read out by the President:

"That the President and Secretary of the Executive Committee of Nomenclature be *ex officio* members of all nomenclature Committees appointed by the Section."

This was adopted by show of hands.

Art. 73 bis (accepted, 7 : 1). Dr. HAMSHAW THOMAS said that the Palaeobotanists had decided to accept the Committee nominated on the previous Sunday (Sept. 1). Some members thought it too large, but they accepted it till the next Congress.

The PRESIDENT observed that there was no need for further comment, since the Committee had been appointed.

Art. 73 ter. The President pointed out that this depended on Art. 21 bis, which had already been rejected.

## II. GENERAL MOTIONS

General Motion I (rejected, 2 : 8).

Dr. SPRAGUE said he was sorry that Mr. WILMOTT was not present to speak in support of this motion. Mr. WILMOTT proposed that certain Recommendations, namely, XXXIX—XLIV, should be given the force of Rules. In view of the decision of the meeting to embody the provisions regarding the gender of generic names in a Recommendation instead of a Rule, it would be contradictory to convert Recommendations dealing with minor points into Rules.

Prof. HARMS also opposed the motion, which was rejected by show of hands.

General Motion II — see Art. 21 bis.

General Motion III — see Art. 38 (p. 337).

## III. APPENDICES

APPENDIX I. *Regulations for determining types.*

No report received. Mr. RAMSBOTTOM enquired whether the preparation of Regulations should be referred to the Executive Committee or to a Special Committee.

Dr. SPRAGUE said that as this was a technical matter he thought that it was desirable to draw on the best experience. He mentioned the name of Dr. HITCHCOCK, whose work in this connection was so well-known.

On the suggestion of the President, the appointment of a Special Committee to prepare the Regulations was referred to the Executive Committee.

APPENDIX II. *Nomina Familiarum Conservanda*, (accepted, 8 : 0).

Dr. SPRAGUE proposed that as the list concerned only Phanerogamae it should be referred to the Special Committee for Phanerogamae and Pteridophyta.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM suggested that the list as it stood should be adopted by the meeting, leaving it to the Special Committee to conserve any additional names that might be required. A motion to conserve the 186 names of families contained in the list was proposed by Prof. HARMS and seconded by Dr. RENDLE. This was adopted by show of hands.

APPENDIX III: 1. *ALGAE.*

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM proposed that the list should be referred

to the Special Committee. Prof. SETCHELL enquired whether it was referred with power of decision. The President stated that all lists of Nomina conservanda were referred with power. The motion was adopted.

APPENDIX III: 2. MUSCI.

Mr. DIXON pointed out that there was no need to conserve *Myurium* Schimp. since it antedated the nomen rejciendum *Oediacidium* Mitt.

Dr. SPRAGUE suggested that Mr. DIXON should supply standard-species (lectotypes) where these were missing.

Mr. DIXON replied that the Committee must first decide on the Regulations for determining types.

Dr. SPRAGUE explained that it was not a question of the actual types, but of *lectotypes*. It was essential to choose one species in each case in order that the generic name might be conserved in a definite sense.

The PRESIDENT asked what was the rejected name against which *Haplobyemenium* Doz. et Molk. was conserved.

Mr. DIXON said that it was conserved against all other names.

On the motion of Mr. RAMSBOTTOM, the list was referred back to the Special Committee for the necessary corrections, additions and omissions.

APPENDIX III: 3. PTERIDOPHYTA; 4. PHANEROGAMAE.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM observed that the remainder of the Nomina generica conservanda would go automatically to their respective Special Committees for decision.

Dr. HAMSHAW THOMAS referred to the case of *Hausmannia* F. Muell. (Bignoniaceae) put forward by Australian botanists for conservation against *Hausmannia* Dunker, a genus of fossil plants. He said this fossil genus was very well known, and that it was unlikely that any confusion would arise between these two names. The palaeobotanists would object very strongly to the prior name *Hausmannia* Dunker being rejected.

Dr. HITCHCOCK asked whether it was not understood that botanists should communicate to the Committees any information bearing on names proposed for conservation or rejection.

The PRESIDENT observed that this was highly desirable.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM referred to the case of *Tricholoma* QuéL., a genus of Fungi proposed for conservation against *Tricholoma* Benth. (Scrophulariaceae), and said that it was highly desirable that lists of proposed Nomina generica conservanda should be circulated among all the Special Committees.

Mr. EXELL, speaking on behalf of Mr. Dandy, withdrew the name *Eriospora* Hochst. (Cyperaceae), owing to the existence

of the earlier homonym *Eriospora* Berk. et Br. (Sphaeropsidae).

Prof. MAIRE drew attention to the existence of homonyms in different classes of Cryptogamae and even amongst Phanerogamae and Cryptogamae. The name *Sphaerella* had been given to a genus of Algae and also to a genus of Fungi. The name *Matthiola* given in 1812 by Robert Brown to a genus of Cruciferae, had already in 1753 been given by Linnaeus to a genus of Rubiaceae now reduced to *Guettarda*. Under the Rules, *Matthiola* R. Br. should be called *Triceras* Andr. (1828), but it is a name universally accepted.

Prof. MAIRE thought that in such cases there should be consultation between the Special Committee concerned.

The PRESIDENT said that all lists of proposed Nomina generica conservanda should be circulated among all the Special Committees.

Dr. SPRAGUE said he had received a list of Pteridophyta from Mr. A. H. G. ALSTON too late to be included in the *Synopsis* or *Preliminary Opinions*, and suggested that this list be sent to the Committee concerned.

Dr. RENDLE drew attention to the case of *Celmisia* which was proposed for conservation at the Cambridge Congress, but was recommended for adoption by the Special Committee, there being no asterisk against the name in the third edition of the International Rules. He stated that *Celmisia* was a very important genus, both from the botanical and the horticultural standpoint, and suggested that it ought to be conserved.

Dr. SPRAGUE explained that in the third edition of the International Rules an asterisk (\*) had been placed in front of the generic names accepted for conservation by a majority of the Special Committee for Phanerogamae and Pteridophyta. A dagger (†) in front of a generic name indicated that its conservation was unnecessary — see Internat. Rules, ed. 3, p. 131, footnotes 1 and 2. He suggested that the case of *Celmisia* should be referred, for reconsideration, to the new Special Committee for Phanerogamae and Pteridophyta.

Dr. H. HANDEL-MAZZETTI considered that *Calamintha* should be conserved against *Clinopodium*, *Ophiopogon* against *Mondo*, and *Benzoin* against *Lindera*.

Prof. H. St. JOHN suggested that the generic name *Elodea* should be considered.

Prof. MAIRE spoke on the cases of *Elodea* and *Matthiola* and suggested that, when a well-known name was endangered, the attention of the Special Committee concerned should be drawn to it at once.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that *Matthiola* and other generic

homonyms were dealt with in a paper just published in *Kew Bull.* 1935, nos. 6—9.

Dr. SPRAGUE stated that at Cambridge the question of later generic homonyms had been referred to the Special Committees concerned, from whom no reports on the subject were received. Prof. REHDER accordingly took the matter up, and in collaboration with Mr. WEATHERBY, Dr. MANSFELD and Miss GREEN, prepared a paper on the Conservation of later generic homonyms (*Kew Bull.* 1935, pp. 341—544).

A motion by Prof. MAIRE that "As soon as any well-known generic name is found to be endangered, the case should be at once communicated to the Special Committee concerned" was then adopted.

On the motion of the PRESIDENT all lists of proposed *Nomina generica conservanda* were referred to the Special Committee concerned. These included the lists printed in *International Rules*, ed. 3, pp. 118—138, those in *Synopsis of Proposals*, pp. 66—73, and *Preliminary Opinions*, p. 25, and others suggested by Mr. ALSTON, Prof. HANDEL-MAZZETTI, and Prof. St. JOHN.

#### APPENDIX III. SUPPLEMENTUM. *NOMINA GENERICA HOMONYMA CONSERVANDA.*

Referred to the Special Committee for Phanerogamae and Pteridophyta.

APPENDIX III TER. — see p. 342 (Art. 21 bis rejected).

APPENDIX IV. *NOMINA AMBIGUA.* The PRESIDENT stated that there would be separate lists for the various groups concerned.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM considered that the best plan would be to send the lists to the Secretary of each Committee.

APPENDIX V. *NOMINA CONFUSA.* Referred to the appropriate Special Committees.

APPENDIX VI. *REPRESENTATIVE BOTANICAL INSTITUTIONS RECOGNIZED UNDER ART. 36.* [At the Cambridge Congress it was decided that works which were printed but *not placed on sale*, should nevertheless be treated as validly published if they were distributed to specified representative botanical institutions. The number of such works including new names is obviously very small.]

The PRESIDENT said that the list was issued merely as a basis for discussion. The three United States institutions mentioned were all in the Eastern States.

Prof. MAIRE suggested the addition of the Botanical Institutes at Montpellier and Algiers.

Dr. H. LINDBERG suggested the addition of the Botanical Museum, Helsingfors.

Dr. RENDLE suggested the addition of Edinburgh, and asked why the Berlin Herbarium was the only institute mentioned in Germany.

Dr. SPRAGUE said that the preparation of the list was referred at Cambridge to the Executive Committee, from whom no report had been received. He and Miss GREEN had accordingly drawn up a tentative list in order that the question might come up for discussion by the Executive Committee. Any considerable increase in the number of institutions would nullify the whole object of the list. The fewer the institutions the more workable the list would be. If, for example, the Berlin Herbarium were the only institution in Germany included in the list, all the works validly published in this special way would necessarily be represented there, a most convenient arrangement.

Dr. LINDER suggested that the Executive Committee should get into touch with Botanical Institutions in the various countries and ask them to give their ideas concerning representative institutions to be placed on the list. This proposal was approved.

APPENDIX VII [see *International Rules*, ed. 3, 112, 113].

APPENDIX VII bis. *LIST OF WORKS TREATED AS NOT VALIDLY PUBLISHED, OWING TO THE NOMENCLATURE USED IN THEM BEING CONTRARY TO THE INTERNATIONAL RULES.*

The PRESIDENT read the following list of proposed members of the Special Committee appointed to investigate the question and to report to the next Congress: — Mr. A. J. WILMOTT (Secretary), Prof. HARMS, Dr. HUMBERT, Dr. LANJOUW, Dr. SPRAGUE.

This Committee was elected by show of hands.

APPENDIX VII TER. Dr. SPRAGUE said that copies of Dr. SAMPAIO's paper, „La méthode de types et la nomenclature analogique” were available for distribution in the Nomenclature Room. The paper dealt with terminology rather than with nomenclature, and accordingly was not discussed.

The PRESIDENT then read out the list of proposed members of the Special Committee for Economic Plants: Miss GREEN (Secretary), Mr. EXELL, Dr. EYMA, Prof. HARMS, Prof. HOCHREUTINER, Prof. REHDER, Prof. ROBYNS, Dr. BURTT DAVY (to supply lists of forest trees). At the suggestion of Dr. RENDLE the name of Mr. F. J. CHITTENDEN (to supply lists of horticultural plants) was added.

The Committee was then elected.

Dr. RENDLE suggested that only matters left over from the present Congress, or new propositions, should be discussed at the next Congress.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM referred to Art. 74, under which „Modifications accepted at one Congress remain on trial until the next Congress, at which they will receive sanction unless undesirable consequences, reported to the Executive Committee, show need for further amendment or rejection.” He considered that Dr. RENDLE’S proposal was superfluous. All decisions reached during the Amsterdam Congress would automatically have to be ratified or otherwise at the next Congress.

Dr. HITCHCOCK enquired what would happen to proposals rejected both at Cambridge and at Amsterdam. Mr. RAMSBOTTOM said that these could not possibly come up at the next Congress. He wished to know how far Dr. RENDLE’S proposal was a new Article or a modification of Art. 74.

Dr. SPRAGUE said that Dr. RENDLE’S proposal was merely a resolution restricting the scope of the next Congress. A similar resolution was passed at Vienna restricting the nomenclatural work of the Brussels Congress to matters not dealt with at Vienna. The effect of adopting the resolution would be to save the considerable amount of time and expense involved in *printing* proposals definitely rejected by previous Congresses. The *Synopsis of Proposals* submitted to the Amsterdam Congress contained numerous proposals of this kind: these were rejected automatically by the Amsterdam Congress owing to a fourfifths majority being recorded against them in the preliminary voting. The resolution was not binding on the next Congress: each Congress could discuss what it chose.

Dr. RENDLE’S proposal was adopted unanimously by show of hands.

Rec. A XXXII ter [see p. 344] Dr. HITCHCOCK said that he had prepared the following as a substitute for Rec. A XXXII ter:

“Misapplications of names should not be included in synonymy. They may be included in notes appended to the synonymy or to the description.”

“Example: DUROI misapplied the name *Quercus rubra* L. to — [or: to this species] (*Observ. Bot.* 35: 1771).”

He emphasized that the central idea was to keep the misapplication of names out of synonymy, his plan being to put straight synonymy first, and then, if desired, to add misidentifications in notes.

Dr. LINDER suggested the wording “appended to but distinct from synonymy”. Dr. SPRAGUE suggested the following wording:

“Misapplications of names should not be included in synonymy. Misapplied names may be included in notes appended

to the synonymy but distinct from it, or to the description where there is no synonymy”.

Dr. HITCHCOCK regarded this as satisfactory. On the suggestion of the PRESIDENT, the wording of the Recommendation was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Dr. SPRAGUE pointed out that at the Cambridge Congress Art. 37 ter dealing with *Nomina provisoria* (Briquet, *Rec. Syn.* p. 41; *Avis Préalable*, p. 13) had been referred to the Executive Committee for report to the Amsterdam Congress. No action having been taken regarding this class of names, it seemed desirable to bring forward the question for discussion.

Dr. LANJOUW said that the publication of a new group under two names was unfortunate. It was necessary to know whether such names were valid.

The PRESIDENT remarked that the practice of making provisional names had existed for a long time and seemed to be on the increase.

Prof. HOCHREUTINER considered that the question was already settled by the existing Rules: these names were validly published because they were associated with descriptions.

A suggestion having been made that the question be referred to the Executive Committee, Dr. HANDEL-MAZZETTI said it was desirable to settle the question at once and not defer it for another five years. Mr. RAMSBOTTOM thought that a controversial matter ought not to be left to a Committee. Messrs. LANJOUW, EXELL and SPRAGUE also thought that the question should be settled without delay.

The PRESIDENT quoted the *International Rules*, Art. 4, paragraph 2: "Next in importance is the avoidance of all useless creation of names." The proposal of provisional names was thus against the spirit of the Rules. In such cases the author had failed to decide for himself, and had left it to other botanists to decide for him.

Prof. ROBYNS referred to the case of the names *Cymbopogon Bequaerti* and *Andropogon Bequaerti* published simultaneously in *Bull. Jard. Bot. Bruxelles*, vi. p. 8 (1919) as follows:

"*Cymbopogon Bequaerti* De Wild. nov. sp.  
*Andropogon Bequaerti* De Wild. nom. nov."

He himself had always regarded such names as validly published, and as constituting alternative names, *Nomina alternativa*.

Prof. HOCHREUTINER said that if Art. 37 ter (*Rec. Syn.* 41) were adopted neither *Cymbopogon Bequaerti* nor *Andropogon Bequaerti* would be valid since, being alternatives, they were both provisional names.

Dr. HITCHCOCK considered that *Cymbopogon Bequaerti* nov. sp. was validly published, but that the name *Andropogon Bequaerti* nom. nov., added immediately below, was not validly published. If a later author took the latter name up, it should date from that author: "De Wild. ex ....."

Dr. LANJOUW moved that Art. 37 ter (*Rec. Syn.* p. 41) be accepted.

"A name of a taxonomic group is not validly published unless it is definitely accepted by the author who publishes it. A name proposed provisionally (nomen provisorium seu eventuale) in anticipation of the eventual acceptance of the group, or of a particular circumscription, position or rank of a given group, or merely mentioned incidentally is not validly published."

Prof. ROBYNS suggested the addition of alternative name, *nomen alternativum*.

Prof. PULLE said that the words "eventuale" and "alternativum" were equivalent.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM pointed out that the effect of adding *nomen alternativum* would be to render all the names invalid. Mr. PUGSLEY and Prof. ROBYNS agreed that this was so.

Dr. LANJOUW suggested discriminating between (1) *definitely* published names, and (2) *provisionally* published names.

Prof. PULLE said that *Cymbopogon Bequaerti* nov. sp. was validly published with a description and must be accepted. The name *Andropogon Bequaerti* was a nomen eventuale, and any additional alternative names would also be *nomina eventualia*.

Dr. HANDEL-MAZZETTI said that if the name *Andropogon Bequaerti* were taken up subsequently by another botanist he would cite De Wildeman as the author. The author who first made the combination must be cited.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the names *Cymbopogon Bequaerti* and *Andropogon Bequaerti* were not provisional but alternative names.

Prof. ROBYNS said that any subsequent author who took up the name *Andropogon Bequaerti* would certainly attribute it to DE WILDEMAN, and he therefore suggested that, as a matter of practical convenience, such alternative names should be treated as valid.

Prof. PULLE thought that every botanist should try and fix the genus to which his new species belonged, so as to avoid having two names for the same species.

Prof. ROBYNS proposed that the words "seu eventuale" be omitted from Art. 37 ter.

A motion for the adoption of Art. 37 ter, as thus amended, was put to the meeting. A vote by show of hands being incon-

clusive, a vote by secret ballot was taken with the following result: 182 votes in favour of, and 63 against the motion.

The following motion submitted by the Special Committee for Diatomaceae was read by Dr. SPRAGUE.

"That the Committee for Diatomaceae should prepare a list of nomina generica conservanda of Diatomaceae, and forward it for publication to the Secretary of the Executive Committee of Nomenclature."

This was adopted by show of hands.

The following four resolutions proposed by the Algologists attending the Congress were read in German by Dr. MATTFELD, in French by Prof. ROBYNS, and in English by Dr. SPRAGUE.

(1) In describing new species of Algae, special importance should be attached to the provision of illustrations and to maintenance of cultures of the species concerned.

(2) The desirability of adopting further monographs as the starting points of particular groups of Algae, as in the Oedogoniaceae, should be investigated.

(3) A list of nomina dubia of species, genera and families should be prepared, and also lists of nomina conservanda and rejicienda of genera and families.

(4) The desirability of retaining the Latin language for diagnoses of new Algae should be investigated.

These resolutions were carried by show of hands.

Dr. SPRAGUE referred to the list of "Standard-Species of Linnean Generic Names: Phanerogamae", prepared by Dr. HITCHCOCK and Miss GREEN, and accepted in principle by the Cambridge Congress. He suggested that the Section should pass a resolution "that the standard-species (species lectotypicae) of Linnean generic names printed in *International Rules*, ed. 3, pp. 139—143, be adopted by botanists unless there is clear reason for rejecting any species in favour of another".

In reply to Prof. REHDER, he stated that any changes considered desirable should be communicated to the Secretary of the Special Committee for Phanerogamae and Pteridophyta.

The motion was adopted by show of hands.

Dr. SPRAGUE proposed that the list of "Standard-Species of Nomina Generica Conservanda" prepared by Miss GREEN (*Internat. Rules*, ed. 3, pp. 143—146) should be dealt with in the same way.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM suggested that the list be submitted to the Special Committee for Phanerogamae and Pteridophyta for report at the next Congress.

Miss GREEN having agreed to this course, the list was referred to the Special Committee.

The PRESIDENT then read the following report submitted by Dr. H. HAMSHAW THOMAS on behalf of the paleobotanists.

NOMENCLATURE PROPOSALS CONCERNING FOSSIL PLANTS.

Report by the Secretary of the Special Committee appointed September 1st, 1935.

A meeting of the Section of Palaeobotany was held on September 3rd at 4.30 at which a statement was made with reference to the proposals submitted to this Congress.

It was unanimously decided that additions should be made to the rules and recommendations for the following objects:

1. To recognize as taxonomic groups, organ genera and artificial or form genera.
2. To ensure that the names originally given to detached organs or parts of plants shall only be used in their original significance and shall not be employed in the designation of different organs, or of the plant as a whole.
3. To provide for the naming of an entire plant when it has been possible to reconstruct it by the association of its different organs.
4. To define how the names of the artificial genera are to be used.
5. To set up a permanent committee to consider the interpretation of the rules; to adjudicate in cases of dispute or difficulty; to draw up lists of *Nomina generica conservanda*; and to make such further recommendations as may prove necessary, including rules for the determination of types.

It was decided that the wording and arrangement of the rules and recommendations designed to give effect to the above objects should be left to the Secretary, Dr. HAMSHAW THOMAS, in consultation with the Secretary General for nomenclature [Secretary of the Executive Committee].

It may be mentioned that the proposed additions to the rules which were submitted by the British palaeobotanists, and by Professors Jongmans, Halle and Gothan, were in agreement on the principles mentioned above. There was disagreement on the framing of a rule for the determination of the types of names, but this matter is too difficult to settle at the present Congress.

In view of the very unsatisfactory state of palaeobotanical nomenclature in the past, and of the agreement which has now been reached by workers representing almost all the chief centres of palaeobotanical research, it is hoped that the section of nomenclature will agree to the proposals of the section of palaeobotany. It is not anticipated that the length of the rules themselves will be increased by more than four or five short

paragraphs. The explanation and examples, which take up a considerable space in the red book, can be printed as an appendix.

H. H. T.

This report was put to the meeting and accepted by show of hands.

The PRESIDENT called on Mr. RAMSBOTTOM for his report on the action taken by the mycologists.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM stated that separate subcommittees would be appointed to investigate the effects of the various proposals [Art. A 20, B 20, C 20, E 20, F 20, A 57]. The mycologists had no propositions to put forward at the moment.

This arrangement was approved.

Dr. SPRAGUE then brought forward Art. D 20. Until 1923 volumes 1 and 2 of LINNAEUS, *Species Plantarum*, had been considered as having been published at the same time. The late Dr. B. D. JACKSON then pointed out (*Journ. Bot.* 1923, 174) that vol. 1 appeared in May, and vol. 2 in August, 1753. The two volumes had always been treated as one work for nomenclatural purposes, and the object of Art. D 20 was to retain established custom in this respect.

Prof. REHDER said that he was not in favour of a simultaneous date for the two volumes. Acting under the rule of priority, he had already adopted *Thea* (L. *Sp. Pl.* vol. I, p. 515) in place of *Camellia* (l.c. II. p. 698).

Art. D 20 was adopted by show of hands, there being 3 dissentients.

The PRESIDENT then proposed a motion empowering the Executive Committee of Nomenclature to deal with any important items that might have been overlooked.

This was approved by the meeting.

The PRESIDENT then asked Miss GREEN to prepare the formal resolutions of the Section regarding Nomenclature, for submission to the Plenary Meeting of the Congress.

The following resolutions were accordingly prepared:

(1) That the thanks of the Congress be given to the Editorial Committee of the *International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature*, ed. 3 (1935), namely, Prof. HARMS (General Editor), Dr. RENDLE and Prof. HOCHREUTINER, for the successful manner in which they carried out their difficult task.

(2) That the thanks of the Congress be given to the Executive Committee of the Fifth International Botanical Congress, Cambridge, 1930, for defraying the cost of publication of the *Synopsis of Proposals and Preliminary Opinions*.

(3) That the Sixth International Botanical Congress accepts

the decisions of the Section of Taxonomy and Nomenclature concerning the modification of the *International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature*, ed. 3 (1935), and sanctions the appointment of the Standing Committees by this Section.

In reply to Dr. HITCHCOCK, who asked how delay in the functioning of Committees could be avoided, Dr. SPRAGUE suggested that the Secretary of each Special Committee should report within 12 months to the Secretary of the Executive Committee.

This arrangement was approved.

Mr. RAMSBOTTOM then proposed a vote of thanks to Dr. MERRILL for his services as President.

This was carried by acclamation.

Dr. MERRILL briefly acknowledged the vote of thanks, and expressed his own thanks to Prof. PULLE, Dr. SPRAGUE and the Secretaries for English, French and German.

Prof. HOCHREUTINER also spoke thanking the Officers.

The PRESIDENT then declared the proceedings closed, and the meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

## SUPPLEMENT I

### NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE CAMBRIDGE CONGRESS, 1930 <sup>1)</sup>

1. *Executive Committee.*  
J. H. BARNHART (New York); H. HARMS (Berlin); E. JANCHEN (Wien); R. MAIRE (Alger); J. RAMSBOTTOM (London); A. REHDER (Jamaica Plain, Mass.); T. A. SPRAGUE (Kew).
2. *Editorial Committee of International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature, ed. 3.*  
J. I. BRIQUET <sup>2)</sup> (Genève); H. HARMS (Berlin); B. P. G. HOCHREUTINER <sup>3)</sup> (Genève); L. MANGIN <sup>4)</sup> (Paris); A. B. RENDLE (London).
3. *General Committee of Botanical Nomenclature.*  
[This consisted of 119 numbers — see *Report of Proceedings of the Cambridge Congress*, pp. 652—654].
4. *Special Committee for Phanerogamia and Pteridophyta.*  
C. CHRISTENSEN, M. L. FERNALD, H. HARMS, R. MAIRE, W. R. MAXON, A. REHDER, A. J. WILMOTT.
5. *Special Committee for Bryophyta.*  
*Sub-Committee for Musci:* H. N. DIXON, A. J. GROUT, TH. HERZOG, R. NAVEAU <sup>5)</sup>, I. THÉRIOT.  
*Sub-Committee for Hepaticae:* A. W. EVANS, C. V. B. MARQUAND.
6. *Special Committee for Algae.*  
A. D. COTTON, H. KYLIN, ROBERT LAMI, K. H. O. PRINZ, G. SENN, G. M. SMITH, G. TANDY, W. R. TAYLOR.
7. *Special Committee for Diatomaceae.*  
F. E. FRITSCH, F. C. HUSTEDT, R. W. KOLBE, F. B. TAYLOR <sup>6)</sup>, G. WEST.
8. *Special Committee for Fungi.*  
K. KESSLER, J. LANGE, R. MAIRE, N. A. NAUMOV, J. RAMSBOTTOM, C. L. SHEAR, A. TROTTER.
9. *Special Committee for Lichenes.*  
M. BOULY DE LESDAIN, C. W. DODGE, G. E. DU RIETZ, E. FREY, BERNT LYNGE, A. ZAHLBRUCKNER.
10. *Special Committee for Bacteria.*  
R. S. BREED, R. ST-JOHN BROOKS.
11. *Special Committee for Paleobotany.*  
W. J. JONGMANS, H. HAMSHAW THOMAS.

1) Members of all Committees except No. 3 were entitled to 1 vote.

2) Dr. J. I. BRIQUET died in October 1931.

3) Dr. B. P. G. HOCHREUTINER was co-opted.

4) Prof. L. MANGIN resigned.

5) Mr. R. NAVEAU died in November 1932.

6) Mr. F. B. TAYLOR died in Jan. 1931.

## SUPPLEMENT II

### LIST OF AUTHORS OF MOTIONS CONCERNING NOMENCLATURE PRESENTED TO THE AMSTERDAM CONGRESS<sup>1)</sup>

1, J. ADAMS; 2, J. C. ARTHUR; 3, Australian Botanists (J. M. BLACK, E. CHEEL, A. J. EWART, C. A. GARDNER, C. T. WHITE); 4, A. BECHERER; 5, British Botanists and others (includes separate proposals by J. E. DANDY, A. W. EXELL, M. L. FERNALD, J. S. L. GILMOUR, M. L. GREEN, J. LANJOUW, J. RAMSBOTTOM, T. A. SPRAGUE, W. T. STEARN, G. TANDY, Fr. VERDOORN, A. J. WILMOTT); 6, British Paleobotanists (delegate: H. HAMSHAW THOMAS); 7, B. H. DANSER; 8, H. N. DIXON; 9, C. W. DODGE; 10, B. P. G. HOCHREUTINER; 11, W. JONGMANS, T. G. HALLE and W. GOTHAN; 12, A. REHDER; 14, R. TROUP; 16, A. KOSTERMANS; 17, G. LOOSER. — Communications nos. 13, 15 and 18—20 (received late) were not in the form of motions.

---

1) The running numbers adopted are those used in Sprague, *Synopsis of Proposals*, pp. 1—3, and *Preliminary Opinions*, pp. 2—3. An author of one or more motions was entitled to one vote, but only one vote was allotted in respect of a motion or series of motions proposed jointly by two or more botanists.

### SUPPLEMENT III 1)

LIST OF ACADEMIES, SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS  
REPRESENTED BY DELEGATES FOR NOMENCLATURE AT THE  
AMSTERDAM CONGRESS, 1935, WITH THE NUMBER OF  
VOTES ALLOTTED TO EACH.

#### ALGERIA

- Société d'Histoire naturelle de l'Afrique du Nord, Université,  
*ALGER*. (R. MAIRE), 1.  
Service botanique du Gouvernement général de l'Algérie,  
*ALGER*. (R. MAIRE), 1.  
Laboratoire de Botanique générale de la Faculté des Sciences,  
Université, *ALGER*. (R. MAIRE), 1.

#### ARGENTINE

- Sociedad Argentina de Ciencias naturales, *BUENOS AIRES*,  
Calle Peru 294. (L. R. PARODI), 1.  
Museo Nacional de Historia Natural. *BUENOS AIRES*, Calle  
Bern. de Irigoyen 331. (A. CASTELLANOS), 1.

#### AUSTRALIA

- Linnean Society of New South Wales, *SYDNEY*, Macleay  
House, 16 College Street. (G. P. DARNELL SMITH), 1.  
Royal Society of New South Wales, *SYDNEY*, N.S.W., Glou-  
cester and Essex Streets. (H. E. DADSWELL), 1.  
National Herbarium and Botanic Garden, *SYDNEY*, N.S.W.  
(G. P. DARNELL-SMITH), 2.

#### AUSTRIA

- Zoologisch-Botanische Gesellschaft, *WIEN* III, Mechelgasse 2.  
(H. VON HANDEL-MAZZETTI), 2.  
Botanisches Institut und Garten der Universität, *GRAZ*, Holtei-  
gasse 6. (H. VON HANDEL-MAZZETTI), 1.  
Botanische Abteilung des Naturhist. Museums *WIEN* I, Burg-  
ring 7 (K. H. RECHINGER), 3.  
Botanischer Garten und Institut der Universität, *WIEN* III,  
Rennweg 14. (H. VON HANDEL-MAZZETTI and F. KNOLL), 3.  
Akademie der Wissenschaften, *WIEN*. (F. KNOLL), 1.

#### BELGIUM

- Université Libre de *BRUXELLES*, Laboratoire Technologique de  
produits végétaux coloniaux. (P. LEDOUX), 1.  
Société Royale de Botanique de Belgique, *BRUXELLES*, Rue  
Royale 236. (W. ROBYNS), 2.

---

1) List communicated by the Recorder, Prof. A. A. PULLE.

Jardin botanique de l'État, *BRUXELLES*, 236 Rue Royale.  
(W. ROBYNS), 4.

Institut et Jardin botanique, Université, *LIÈGE*, 3 Rue Fusch.  
(R. BOUILLENNE), 1.

Laboratoire de Botanique de l'Université, *LOUVAIN*, Rue du  
Manège 9. (W. ROBYNS), 1.

## BULGARIA

The Bulgarian Botanical Society, Botanical Institute, University,  
*SOFIA*. (N. STOYANOFF), 1.

Botanical Division of the King's Natural History Museum,  
King's Palace, *SOFIA*. (N. STOYANOFF), 1.

## CANADA

Royal Society of Canada, *OTTAWA*, Ontario (A. H. R.  
BULLER), 1.

Laboratoire de botanique de la Faculté des Sciences, Université,  
*MONTREAL*. (C. A. WEATHERBY), 1.

Central Experimental Farm, *OTTAWA*, Ontario. (H. T.  
GÜSSOW), 1.

Department of Botany, University, *TORONTO*, Ontario. (R. B.  
THOMSON), 1.

National Herbarium of Canada, *OTTAWA*, Ontario. (H. T.  
GÜSSOW), 2.

## CHILE

Academia Chilena de Ciencias Naturales, *SANTIAGO*, Casilla  
114 D. (L. R. PARODI), 1.

## CHINA

Department of Botany, Lingnan University, *CANTON*. (F. A.  
McCLURE), 1.

Botanical Institute, Sun Yat Sen University, *CANTON*. (W. Y.  
CHUN), 1.

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Société botanique tsechoslovaque, *PRAHA II*, Benatska 2.  
(K. DOMIN), 1.

Institut et Jardin botanique, Karlova Universita, *PRAHA II*,  
Benatska 2. (K. DOMIN), 2.

## DENMARK

Dansk Botanisk Forening, *COPENHAGEN*, Gothersgade 130.  
(C. CHRISTENSEN), 2.

Botanisches Institut und Garten der Universität, *COPEN-  
HAGEN*, Gothersgade 130/140. (C. CHRISTENSEN), 3.

## ESTHONIA

Botanisches Institut der Universität, *TARTU*. (T. LIPPMAA), 1.

## FINLAND

Societas pro Flora et Fauna Fennica, *HELSINKI*, Kaseriing. 24.  
(H. LINDBERG), 2.

Botanischer Garten und Laboratorium der Universität,  
*HELSINKI* (H. LINDBERG and K. LINKOLA), 2.

## FRANCE

Société botanique de France, *PARIS* 7e, Rue de Grenelle 84.  
(A. GUILLAUMIN and F. PELLEGRIN), 2.

Société mycologique de France, *PARIS* 7e, Rue de Grenelle 84.  
(R. MAIRE), 1.

Muséum d'Histoire naturelle, Herbar et Labor. de botanique,  
*PARIS* 5e, Rue Cuvier 57. (A. GUILLAUMIN), 5.

Jardin botanique et Laboratoire de la Faculté des Sciences,  
*STRASBOURG*, Bas-Rhin. (H. HUMBERT), 1.

Station de recherches et expériences forestières, *NANCY*,  
Meurthe-et-Moselle. (F. PELLEGRIN), 1.

## GERMANY

Botanischer Verein der Provinz Brandenburg, *BERLIN-Dablem*,  
Königin Luisenstrasse 6—8, (J. MATTFELD), 1.

Deutsche Botanische Gesellschaft. *BERLIN-Dablem*, Unter den  
Eichen 74. (H. HARMS and J. MATTFELD), 2.

Deutsche Dendrologische Gesellschaft, *WENDISCH-WIL-*  
*MERSDORF* bei *THYROW*, Kr. Teltow. (D. HÖFKER), 1.

Freie Vereinigung für Systematik und Pflanzengeographie,  
*BERLIN-Dablem*, Königin Luisenstrasse 6—8. (J. MATTFELD), 1.

Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, *MÜNCHEN*. (F.  
VON WETTSTEIN), 1.

Naturw. Verein *BREMEN*. (H. PFEIFFER), 1.

Leopoldinisch-Carolinische Akademie der Naturforscher, *HAL-*  
*LE* a. Saale, Wilhelmstrasse 36. (L. DIELS), 1.

Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, *BERLIN N.W.*  
Unter den Linden 36. (L. DIELS), 1.

Schlesische Gesellschaft für vaterländische Kultur, *BRESLAU*,  
Neue Sandstrasse 4. (H. WINKLER), 1.

Botanischer Garten und Museum, *BERLIN-Dablem*, Königin  
Luisenstrasse 6/8. (J. MATTFELD), 5.

Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Biologie, *BERLIN-Dablem*, Boltz-  
mannstrasse 2. (F. VON WETTSTEIN), 1.

Botanisches Institut und Garten der Universität. *BONN a.*  
*Rhein*. (J. MATTFELD), 2.

Botanische Anstalten der Universität *BRESLAU IX*. Göppert-  
strasse 6/8. (H. WINKLER), 1.

Botanisches Institut und Garten der Universität. *FREIBURG i.*  
*Br*. (L. DIELS), 1.

Botanische Instituten und Garten der Universität, *GÖTTIN-*  
*GEN*. (L. DIELS), 1.

- Botanisches Institut und Garten der Universität, *KIEL*. Düstern-  
brokerweg 17—19 (H. HARMS), 1.  
Botanisches Institut und Garten der Universität. *KÖLN*. Vorge-  
birgstrasse 51. (H. HARMS), 1.

## GREAT BRITAIN &amp; NORTHERN IRELAND

- Botanical Society and Exchange Club, Yardley Lodge. *OX-  
FORD*. (J. RAMSBOTTOM), 1.  
British Association for the Advancement of Science, Sect. K  
(Botany), Burlington House, *LONDON*, W. 1. Piccadilly.  
(A. B. RENDLE), 1.  
British Bryological Society. *CHELTENHAM*, Gloucestershire,  
Oxford Buildings 3. (H. N. DIXON), 1.  
British Mycological Society. *RICHMOND*, Surrey, Ennerdale  
Road 34. (J. RAMSBOTTOM), 1.  
Linnean Society of London. *LONDON* W. 1. Burlington  
House, Piccadilly. (J. RAMSBOTTOM), 4.  
Royal Society of Edinburgh. *EDINBURGH*. Scotland. George  
Street 22—24. (Sir A. W. HILL), 1.  
Department of Botany, University College of Wales, *ABERYS-  
TWYTH, Wales*. (T. J. JENKIN), 1.  
Botany School, University, *CAMBRIDGE*, Downing Street.  
(H. HAMSHAW THOMAS), 1.  
National Museum of Wales, *CARDIFF*. (H. D. HYDE), 1.  
Department of Botany, University College, *CARDIFF*, Wales.  
(R. C. MCLEAN), 1.  
Royal Botanic Garden, *EDINBURGH*, Scotland, (Sir. A. W.  
HILL), 3.  
Botanical Department, University, *EDINBURGH*, Scotland.  
King's Buildings, West Mains Road. (Sir. A. W. HILL), 1.  
Royal Botanic Gardens, *KEW*, Surrey. (Miss M. L. GREEN and  
T. A. SPRAGUE), 5.  
Hartley Botanical Laboratories, University, *LIVERPOOL*,  
England. (Miss M. KNIGHT), 2.  
British Museum (Natural History), Botany Department.  
*LONDON* S.W. 7, Cromwell Road. (J. RAMSBOTTOM), 5.  
Botany Department, University of London, *LONDON* W.C. 1.  
Gower Street. (Dame H. GWYNNE VAUGHAN), 2.  
Imperial Forestry Institute, University of Oxford, *OXFORD*,  
Parks Road. (J. BURTT DAVY), 1.  
Department of Botany, University of Oxford, *OXFORD*. (W.  
H. WILKINS), 1.  
Royal Horticultural Society, *WISLEY*, Surrey. (F. J. CHITTEN-  
DEN), 1.

## HAWAIIAN ISLANDS

Department of Botany, University of Hawaii, *HONOLULU*. (H. St. JOHN), 1.

Bernice P. Bishop Museum, *HONOLULU*. (H. St. JOHN), 1.

## HUNGARY

Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, *BUDAPEST*. (J. VON TUZSON), 1.

## INDIA

Department of Botany, University, *CALCUTTA*. (S. P. AGHAR-KAR), 1.

Forest Research Institute, *DEHRA DUN*. (J. BURTT DAVY), 1.

Imperial Agricultural Research Institute, *PUSA*, Bihar and Orissa. (Miss E. K. JANAKI-AMMAL), 1.

Botany Department, University of *MADRAS*. (Miss E. K. JANAKI-AMMAL), 1.

## ITALY

Società Botanica Italiana, *FIRENZE*, Via Lamarmora 4. (G. NEGRI and R. PAMPANINI), 2.

Istituto ed Orto Botanico della R. Università, *GENOVA*, Corso Dogali 1 b. (G. CUFODONTIS), 1.

Istituto ed Orto Botanico della R. Università, *PADOVA*, Via Orto Botanico 15. (R. PAMPANINI), 1.

Istituto ed Orto Botanico della R. Università ed Laboratorio Crittogamico, *PAVIA*, Via S. Epifanio 6. (R. CIFERRI), 1.

Istituto ed Orto Botanico della R. Università, *PISA*, Via Solferino 18. (G. NEGRI), 1.

Istituto ed Orto Botanico della R. Università, *ROMA*, Via Milano 75. (R. PAMPANINI), 2.

Istituto ed Orto Botanico della R. Università, *TORINO*, Viale Mattioli 31. (G. NEGRI), 1.

## LATVIA (Letland)

Sistematiskas botanikas un augu morfologias instituts Universitates, *RIGA*, Alberta 10. (N. MALTA), 2.

## LITHUANIA (Litauen)

Botanische Instituten und Garten der Universität, *KAUNAS*. (C. REGEL), 2.

## NETHERLANDS

Koninklijke Academie van Wetenschappen, Trippenhuis, *AMSTERDAM*. (H. J. LAM), 1.

Nederlandsche Botanische Vereeniging, Otto van Gelreweg 2, *WAGENINGEN*. (J. TH. HENRARD), 2.

Nederlandsche Mycologische Vereeniging. (W. J. LÜTJE-HARMS), 1.

Vereeniging voor Microbiologie, *DELFT*, Nieuwe Laan 3. (Miss. J. WESTERDIJK), 1.

- Koninklijk Koloniaal Instituut, Handels-museum, *AMSTERDAM*, Mauritskade 65/66. (L. P. LE COSQUINO DE BUSSY), 1.  
 Phytopathologisch Laboratorium „Willie Commelin Scholten”  
*BAARN*, Javalaan 4. (Miss. H. A. DIDDENS), 1.  
 Laboratorium voor Technische Botanie, *DELFT*, Poortlandlaan  
 67. (Miss A. KLEINHOONTE), 1.  
 Hortus botanicus en Botanisch Laboratorium der Universiteit,  
*GRONINGEN*. (B. H. DANSER), 1.  
 Botanisch Laboratorium, afd. Systematiek, *GRONINGEN*. (B.  
 H. DANSER), 1.  
 Hortus botanicus en Botanisch Laboratorium der Universiteit,  
*LEIDEN*. (J. TH. HENRARD), 1.  
 Rijksherbarium, *LEIDEN*, Nonnensteeg. (J. TH. HENRARD), 4.  
 Botanisch Museum en Herbarium, *UTRECHT*, Lange Nieuw-  
 straat 106. (A. A. PULLE & J. LANJOUW), 4.  
 Hortus botanicus en Botanisch Laboratorium, *UTRECHT*,  
 Lange Nieuwstraat 106. (A. A. PULLE), 1.  
 Arboretum, Landbouwhoogeschool, *WAGENINGEN*. (H. J.  
 VENEMA), 1.

## NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES

- Algemeen Proefstation voor den Landbouw, Botanisch Labora-  
 torium, *BUITENZORG*. (B. H. DANSER), 1.  
 's Lands Plantentuin, *BUITENZORG*. (A. A. PULLE), 4.

## NEW ZEALAND

- Auckland Institute and Museum, *AUCKLAND*. (Miss. L. M.  
 CRANWELL), 1.

## NORWAY

- Det Norske Videnskap-Akademi, *OSLO*. (J. HOLMBOE), 1.  
 Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskap Botaniske Samling.  
*TRONDHEIM*. (J. HOLMBOE), 1.

## PALESTINE

- Division of Botany and Bot. Garden, Hebrew University, *JERU-  
 SALEM*. (A. EIG), 1.

## PHILIPPINES

- Bureau of Science, *MANILA*. (E. D. MERRILL), 2.

## POLAND

- Institut de Systématique des Plantes et Jardin botanique,  
*WARSZAWA*, Aleje Ujazdowskie 6/8. (B. HRYNIEWIECKI  
 and R. KOBENDZA), 2.

## PORTUGAL

- Sociedade Broteriana, Instituto Botanico, *COIMBRA*. (F. A.  
 MENDONÇA), 2.  
 Instituto Botanico, Universidade, *COIMBRA*. (F. A. MEN-  
 DONÇA), 2.

## SARDINIA

Instituto ed Orto Botanico della R. Università. *CAGLIARI*, Viale Fra Ignazio da Laconi. (R. PAMPANINI), 1.

## SICILY

Instituto ed Orto Botanico della R. Università *PALERMO*, Via Lincoln. (L. MONTEMARTINI), 1.

## SOUTH AFRICA (UNION OF)

Botanical Society of South Africa, *KIRSTENBOSCH*, Cape Province. (Miss E. L. STEPHENS), 1.

Royal Society of South Africa, *CAPE TOWN*. (Miss E. L. STEPHENS), 1.

South African Society for the Advancement of Science, P. O. Box 6894, *JOHANNESBURG*, Transvaal. (I. B. POLE EVANS), 1.

Herbarium, South African Museum, *CAPE TOWN*. (T. A. SPRAGUE), 1.

Natal Herbarium, *DURBAN* Natal. (I. B. POLE EVANS), 1.

Albany Museum, Herbarium, *GRAHAMSTOWN*, Cape Province. (I. B. POLE EVANS), 1.

Department of Botany, University of the Witwatersrand. *JOHANNESBURG*, Transvaal. (I. B. POLE EVANS), 1.

Bolus Herbarium, *KIRSTENBOSCH*, Cape Province. (T. A. SPRAGUE), 1.

Botanical Survey of South Africa, P. O. Box 994, *PRETORIA*, Transvaal. (I. B. POLE EVANS), 3.

Transvaal Museum and Herbarium, *PRETORIA*, Transvaal. (C. E. B. BREMEKAMP), 1.

## STRAITS SETTLEMENTS

Botanic Garden, *SINGAPORE*. (T. A. SPRAGUE), 1.

## SWEDEN

Kungliga Vetenskapsakademien, *STOCKHOLM*. (R. E. FRIES), 1.

Göteborgs Botaniska Trädgård. *GÖTEBORG*. (C. SKOTTBERG), 3.

Bergianska Trädgården, *STOCKHOLM* 50. (R. E. FRIES), 3.

Botany Department of the University, *UPPSALA*. (N. E. SVEDLIUS), 3.

## SWITZERLAND

Schweizerische Botanische Gesellschaft, *LAUSANNE*. (E. WILCZEK), 2.

Botanische Anstalt und Garten der Universität, *BASEL*, Schönbeinstrasse 6. (G. SENN), 1.

Conservatoire et Jardin Botanique de la ville, La Console, *GENÈVE*, Route de Lausanne 192. (B. P. G. HOCHREUTNER), 5.

Institut Botanique et Herbarium Boissier, Université, *GENÈVE*, Bastions. (B. P. G. HOCHREUTINER), 2.

Laboratoire de Botanique et Jardin botanique de l'Université, *LAUSANNE*. (E. WILCZEK), 1.

Geobotanisches Forschungsinstitut Rübél, *ZÜRICH*, Zürichbergstrasse 38. (W. LÜDI and E. RÜBEL), 2.

Institute für Botanik der Universität, Pelikanstrasse 30, *ZÜRICH*. (B. P. G. HOCHREUTINER), 1.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

American Association for the Advancement of Science, Botany, Section G., c/o Smithsonian Institution, *WASHINGTON*, D.C. (E. D. MERRILL), 1.

American Phytopathological Society, *WASHINGTON*, D. C. (H. T. GÜSSOW), 1.

Botanical Society of America c/o Brooklyn Botanic Garden, *BROOKLYN*, New York. (A. S. HITCHCOCK & A. NELSON), 2.

Botanical Society of Washington. *WASHINGTON*, D.C. (A. S. HITCHCOCK), 2.

New York Academy of Sciences, *NEW YORK*. (E. D. MERRILL), 1.

National Academy of Sciences. *WASHINGTON*, D.C. (E. D. MERRILL), 1.

Torrey Botanical Club, Schermerhorn Hall, Columbia University, *NEW YORK*, Box 42, (T. E. HAZEN), 1.

Washington Academy of Sciences, *WASHINGTON*, D.C. (A. S. HITCHCOCK), 1.

California Academy of Sciences, *SAN FRANCISCO*, Cal. (Miss A. EASTWOOD), 1.

California Botanical Society, *SAN FRANCISCO*, Cal. (W. L. JEPSON), 1.

Department of Botany, University of California, *BERKELEY*, Cal. (W. L. JEPSON), 2.

Department of Botany, Harvard University, *CAMBRIDGE*, Mass. (A. REHDER), 1.

Farlow Library and Herbarium, Harvard University, *CAMBRIDGE*, Mass. (D. H. LINDER), 1.

Gray Herbarium, Harvard University, *CAMBRIDGE*, Mass. (C. A. WEATHERBY), 5.

Department of Botany, Ohio State University, *COLUMBUS*, Ohio. (A. S. HITCHCOCK), 1.

New York State Agricultural Experiment Station, *GENEVA*, New York. (W. O. GLOYER), 1.

Arnold Arboretum, Harvard University, *JAMAICA PLAIN*, Mass. (A. REHDER), 3.

- Department of Botany, University of Wyoming, *LARAMIE*, Wyoming. (A. NELSON), 1.
- Department of Botany, University of California at Los Angeles, *LOS ANGELES*, Cal. (O. A. PLUNKETT), 2.
- Department of Botany, Columbia University, *NEW YORK*, Morningside Heights. (E. D. MERRILL), 1.
- New York Botanical Garden, Bronx Park, *NEW YORK*, N.Y. (E. D. MERRILL), 5.
- California Institute of Technology, Department of Botany, *PASADENA*, Cal. (F. W. WENT), 1.
- Academy of Sciences, *St. LOUIS*, Missouri. (J. M. GREENMAN), 1.
- Missouri Botanical Garden, *St. LOUIS*, Missouri. (J. M. GREENMAN), 2.
- Department of Botany, Stanford University, *STANFORD UNIVERSITY*, Cal. (A. S. HITCHCOCK), 1.
- Dudley Herbarium, Stanford University, *STANFORD UNIVERSITY*, Cal. (A. S. HITCHCOCK), 1.
- Boyce Thomson Southwestern Arboretum, *SUPERIOR*, Arizona. (A. NELSON), 1.
- United States National Herbarium, Smithsonian Institution, *WASHINGTON*, D.C. (E. P. KILLIP), 4.

## SUPPLEMENT IV

### NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE AMSTERDAM CONGRESS, 1935

1. *Editorial Committee of International Rules of Botanical  
Nomenclature: Supplement.*

*General Editor:* H. HARMS (German text).

B. P. G. HOCHREUTINER (French text); T. A. SPRAGUE  
(English text).

2. *Executive Committee of Nomenclature.*

*President:* <sup>1)</sup> H. HARMS (Berlin)

*Secretary:* <sup>1)</sup> T. A. SPRAGUE (Kew)

*Treasurer:* A. B. RENDLE (London)

J. H. BARNHART (New York); W. Y. CHUN (Canton); J.  
CUATRECASAS (Madrid); K. DOMIN (Praha); B. A. FEDT-  
SCHENKO (Leningrad); R. E. FRIES (Stockholm); H. HANDEL-  
MAZZETTI (Wien); B. P. G. HOCHREUTINER (Genève); H.  
HUMBERT (Paris); R. MAIRE (Alger); J. MATTFELD (Berlin);  
E. D. MERRILL (Cambridge, Mass.); T. NAKAI (Tokyo); R.  
PAMPANINI (Cagliari); I. B. POLE-EVANS (Pretoria); A. A.  
PULLE (Utrecht); J. RAMSBOTTOM (London); A. REHDER  
(Jamaica Plain, Mass.); W. ROBYNS (Bruxelles); D. F. VAN  
SLOOTEN (Buitenzorg).

3. *Special Committee for Phanerogamae and Pteridophyta.*

*Secretary:* M. L. GREEN (Kew).

A. H. G. ALSTON (London); A. BECHERER <sup>2)</sup> (Genève);  
R. C. CHING (Nanking); C. CHRISTENSEN (Copenhagen); J. E.  
DANDY (London); J. Th. HENRARD (Leiden); A. S. HITCH-  
COCK <sup>3)</sup> (Washington); B. P. G. HOCHREUTINER (Genève);  
J. LANJOUW (Utrecht); R. MANSFELD (Berlin); F. PELLEGRIN  
(Paris); A. REHDER (Jamaica Plain, Mass.); HANS SCHINZ  
(Zürich); C. SKOTTSBERG (Göteborg); H. UITTEN (Utrecht);  
C. A. WEATHERBY (Cambridge, Mass.); F. J. WIDDER (Graz);  
A. J. WILMOTT (London).

---

1) The President and Secretary of the Executive Committee of Nomenclature are ex officio members of all other Committees of Nomenclature appointed by the Amsterdam Congress.

2) Dr. A. BECHERER resigned his membership in December 1935.

3) Dr. A. S. HITCHCOCK died in December 1935.

4. *Special Committee for Nomenclature of Economic Plants.*

*Secretary:* M. L. GREEN (Kew).

F. J. CHITTENDEN<sup>1</sup>) (London); J. BURTT DAVY<sup>2</sup>) (Oxford); A. W. EXELL (London); P. J. EYMA (Utrecht); H. HARMS (Berlin); B. P. G. HOCHREUTINER (Genève); A. REHDER (Jamaica Plain, Mass.); W. ROBYNS (Bruxelles).

5. *Special Committee for Musci.*

*Secretary:* H. N. DIXON (Northampton).

P. ALLORGE (Paris); E. B. BARTRAM (Bushkill, Pa.); A. J. GROUT (New York); N. MALTA (Riga); H. REIMERS (Berlin); I. THÉRIOT (Fontaine-la-Mallet).

6. *Special Committee for Hepaticae.*

*Secretary:* FR. VERDOORN (Leiden).

H. BUCH (Helsinki); A. W. EVANS (New Haven, Conn.); Th. HERZOG (Jena); C. V. B. MARQUAND (Kew).

7. *Special Committee for Algae.*

*Secretary:* O. C. SCHMIDT (Berlin).

F. C. E. BØRGESSEN (Copenhagen); A. D. COTTON (Kew); J. FELDMANN (Paris); F. E. FRITSCH (London); R. GRÖNBLAD (Karis, Finland); A. PASCHER (Prahá); G. SENN (Basel); W. A. SETCHELL (Berkeley, Cal.); G. TANDY (London); W. R. TAYLOR (Ann Arbor, Mich.); E. L. STEPHENS (Cape Town); W. VISCHER (Basel).

8. *Special Committee for Diatomaceae.*

*Secretary:* N. I. HENDEY (London).

A. FORTI (Verona); G. D. HANNA (San Francisco); F. HUSTEDT (Bremen); R. W. KOLBE (Berlin); K. LOHMAN (Washington); Th. REINHOLD (Heemstede, Netherlands).

9. *Special Committee for Fungi.*

*Secretary:* C. L. SHEAR (Washington).

A. M. BOTTOMLEY (Pretoria); K. B. BOEDIJN (Buitenzorg); E. J. BUTLER (Kew); R. CIFERRI (Pavia); W. J. LÜTJEHARMS (Leiden); R. MAIRE (Alger); J. A. NANNFELDT (Uppsala); F. PETRAK (Mährisch-Weisskirchen, Czechoslovakia); A. PILAT (Prahá); J. RAMSBOTTOM (London); F. J. SEAVER (New York); A. TROTTER (Napoli); E. M. WAKEFIELD (Kew); W. H. WESTON jr. (Cambridge, Mass.).

10. *Special Committee for Lichenes.*

*Secretary:* G. E. DU RIETZ (Uppsala).

C. W. DODGE (Cambridge, Mass.); I. M. LAMB (London); M. BOULY DE LESDAIN (Dunquerque); J. SUZA (Brno); A. ZAHLBRUCKNER (Wien).

1) For horticultural plants.

2) For forest trees.

11. *Special Committee for Bacteria.*

*Joint Secretaries:* R. S. BREED (Geneva, N.Y.) and R. ST. JOHN BROOKS (London).

W. BENECKE (Münster); E. M. DOIDGE (Pretoria); J. RAMSBOTTOM (London)<sup>1</sup>).

12. *Special Committee for Paleobotany.*

*Secretary:* H. H. THOMAS (Cambridge).

R. W. CHANEY (Berkeley, Cal.); W. N. EDWARDS (London); W. GOTHAN (Berlin); T. G. HALLE (Stockholm); W. J. JONGMANS (Heerlen, Netherlands); R. KRÄUSEL (Frankfurt a. Main); A. RENIER (Bruxelles).

13. *Special Committee to report on the effects of the adoption of Art. A 19 (dealing with proposed rejection of certain works).*

*Secretary:* A. J. WILMOTT (London).

H. HARMS (Berlin); H. HUMBERT (Paris); J. LANJOUW (Utrecht); T. A. SPRAGUE (Kew).

---

1) For purposes of liaison with Special Committee for Fungi.