



Suite des Discussions

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 4, No. 7, Huitieme Congres International de Botanique: Section Nomenclature (Sep., 1955), pp. 153-167

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1215944>

Accessed: 08/03/2014 06:36

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

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



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

<http://www.jstor.org>



TAXON

Official News Bulletin of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy, Edited and Published for I.A.P.T. by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht, Netherlands

HUITIEME CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DE BOTANIQUE SECTION NOMENCLATURE

Président: J. ROUSSEAU

Vice-présidents: CH. BAEHNI, H. W. RICKETT, W. ROBYNS

Rapporteur-général: J. LANJOUW

Vice-rapporteur: F. A. STAFLEU

Correspondant-organisateur: M. PICHON

Suite des Discussions

Article 32

Mr BULLOCK presented the full text of his motion with regard to this article (The discussion on this article had been postponed). The motion read: "The name of the subgenus and section containing the type species of the genus must repeat the name of the immediate higher taxon unaltered and these names are to be regarded as validly published at the same time as the name of the genus itself, even if they are not at that time mentioned."

Dr ROUSSEAU remarked that we had already rejected a proposal to mention author's names in such cases. Now we had to consider a new proposal regarding the dates of the new combinations.

Mr ROSS said that the important part of Bullock's proposal was the part from "and these names . . . time mentioned". This introduced a new principle which must be discussed.

Dr AMARAL FRANCO fait remarquer qu'il semblerait plus raisonnable que tous les taxa, compris entre le genre et l'espèce, devraient répéter le nom du genre, et non seulement le sous-genre et la section.

Dr LANJOUW did not think that Mr BULLOCK's proposal was necessary.

M. BAEHNI fait observer que la forme de

l'article telle qu'elle est proposée par M. Bullock est contraire à ce qui se fait sous l'Art. 34 et les subdivisions d'espèces.

Mr DANDY supported Mr Bullock's proposal because he believed it would solve certain problems in the nomenclature of infra-generic taxa. He also believed that a corresponding emendation of Art. 34 would solve similar problems in infra-specific nomenclature.

Dr ROLLINS said that as the rules are now written, the same practical effect is produced as that sought in the proposal. He did not see any reason to change the present rule.

M. LÉONARD explique qu'il faut indiquer *Croton* subgen. *Croton* sans nom d'auteur. Il faut donc ajouter comme pour l'Art. 35: "... tel quel mais (en contradiction avec l'Art. 55) sans citer d'auteur."

The motion by Mr Bullock was then put to the vote by ballot and rejected by 146 votes against 114. La proposition est rejetée.

Recommendation 42A

Prop. A (298:18:4:—) *Accepted. Acceptée.*

Recommendation 58A

Prop. B (98:155:46:—) Rejected by show of cards (2 in favour). Rejetée.

Prop. C (32:257:18:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (132:128:40:—)

Dr LANJOUW said that the same proposal had been presented to the Stockholm Congress at which it was flatly defeated.

Dr SCHULZE war der Meinung, dass der alte Text (1935) in Hinblick auf die Form und Art des Zitierens (in, apud) besser ist als der gegenwärtige Art. 58A.

Dr ROUSSEAU pointed out that it was only a recommendation. In some countries some recommendations might be disregarded.

A short discussion followed on the merits of this proposal in which Mr Ross, Dr Schulze, Dr Donk and Mr Dandy took part.

The proposal was put to the vote by show of cards, 27 cards being shown in favour, 25 against, the proposal was rejected under the 2/3 majority rule. La proposition est rejetée.

Intervention by Dr Ponce de León

Dr PONCE DE LEÓN asked the president to read a protest, written in Spanish, in which he complained about the way in which some of the Cuban proposals had been dealt with. A certain number of these proposals had been automatically rejected whereas some proposals by the Rapporteur had been accepted that were mere modifications of these Cuban proposals. Common democratic procedure would have been first to accept the original proposal and then to consider the amendments. He asked the president to point out the precise nature of the procedure adopted in dealing with the Cuban proposals.

Dr LANJOUW stated that he had already acknowledged in his preface to the *Recueil Synoptique* that many of his proposals were indeed mere modifications of the Cuban ones. He once again referred to the influence and importance of the proposals made by Dr Ponce de León and his collaborators.

Dr ROTHMALER gave a Spanish translation of Dr Lanjouw's answer.

Dr BAEHNI fait remarquer l'importance du travail de M. Ponce de León et ses collaborateurs et propose une motion exprimant la reconnaissance de la section.

Dr ROUSSEAU put this motion of thanks to Dr Ponce de León to the vote and it was *carried* unanimously (applause). Le Président met la motion aux voix et l'on vote des remerciements unanimes au Dr Ponce de León pour le travail important qu'il a accompli.

Dr PONCE DE LEÓN thanked the president, the rapporteur-général and the meeting for its kind consideration and appreciation of

the work done by the Cuban botanists (applause).

The text submitted by Dr Ponce de León was the following:

Ilustre señor Presidente: Muy respetuosamente tengo el honor de dirigirme a Vd para suplicarle se aclare por esta asamblea, y así se consigne en acta, que numerosas de nuestras proposiciones, que merecieron la aceptación del Sr Rapporteur Dr Lanjouw, quien gentilmente así lo consigna, haciéndoles solo ligeras enmiendas, dada la forma de la votación, aparecen rechazadas y aprobadas únicamente las enmiendas, lo que es contrario a las normas parlamentarias. Lo correcto es aprobar la proposición original con la enmienda y así consignarlo, pues si la primera es rechazada la enmienda no puede hacerse. Es una súplica para que se haga la aclaración por la Asamblea respecto a todos los casos, como supo vuestra señoría hacerlo gentilmente cuando le llame la atención en un caso particular, lo que espero merecer de su excelencia y de los ilustres miembros de esta asamblea.

Nota. En este caso se encuentran también la formación del capítulo preliminar y la distribución general enmendada por la reunión de Ginebra.

New Article 70bis

Prop. A (20:265:15:3) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (246:58:23:—)

Dr LANJOUW explained that the proposal tried to prevent the bad practice of sinking varietal names by simply automatically changing the rank and so using the liberty of giving entirely new names to the same taxon. In such cases the type remains the same but the later author is at liberty to choose a new name.

Dr ROUSSEAU did not want to have separate rules for subspecies.

Dr PROSKAUER quoted the difficulty concerning old "forma" names supplanting sound "varietal" epithets, the latter based (by reduction in rank) on older types.

Dr ROLLINS said that the aim of this proposition was to make it impossible under the rules to coin new names for what are essentially the same taxa by describing them anew in a slightly different category. For example, if a taxon has been recognized and described as a variety, this would prevent the description and naming anew of this same taxon as a subspecies.

Dr ROUSSEAU agreed that this bad practice existed. He was, however, of the opinion

that it should be a recommendation only.

Dr ROBYNS propose d'ajouter deux ou trois exemples afin de clarifier le texte en question.

Dr McVAUGH suggested saying merely "with or without the addition of another word".

Dr WHEELER asked whether this was intended to apply only when the available name is cited in synonymy? If it is to apply to taxonomic synonyms ascertained later it will have unexpected consequences.

Dr FOSBERG was of opinion that Art. 70 as it stands has always been well understood and has caused no trouble. This proposal seems intended to prevent people acting in ill-will. Legislation with the specific purpose of thwarting action resulting from ill-will is bound to fail.

Mr Ross formally moved that proposal B be adopted but given the status and form of a recommendation and an example added to it.

Mr DANDY said that in view of the difficulties involved he seconded Mr Ross's amendment that the proposal should be accepted as a recommendation.

Dr ST JOHN suggested reading "infraspecific taxa" instead of subdivision of a species.

The proposal by Mr Ross was *adopted*, 31 cards being shown in favour of it, 15 against. La proposition est *acceptée* à titre de recommandation.

Article 79

Prop. A (166:109:18:1)

Dr ROUSSEAU thought that it would be better not to speak of "symbol".

Dr STAFLEU read the arguments put forward by Mrs Sprague in Taxon (2 : 114).

Mr DANDY considered that the argument for this proposal concerning the *Trifolium* species of Linnaeus was unsound and that the addition of the proposed words was unnecessary.

Dr ROBYNS proposed the following version: "When they exactly repeat the generic name with or without any addition".

The proposal was put to the vote and rejected, 12 cards being shown in favour, 35 against. La proposition est *rejetée*.

Prop. B (25:242:22:—) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. C (42:252:3:3) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. D (15:291:5:—) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. E (8:298:5:—) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. F (15:266:11:3) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. G (22:261:12:3) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. H (151:144:11:3) Withdrawn. *Retirée*.

Prop. I (no mail vote, Taxon 3 : 124) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Article 43

Prop. A (39:257:17:—) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. B (217:99:1:—) Rejected by show of cards (30 in favour, 29 against). *Rejetée*.

Article 44

Prop. A (8:325:1:—) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. B (7:310:1:10) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. C (72:221:13:—) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. D (28:100:161:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. *Référée au comité de rédaction*.

Prop. E (199:100:13:—) *Adopted* by show of cards (40 in favour, 10 against). *Adoptée*.

Prop. F (220:83:11:—) *Adopted* by show of cards (45 in favour, 7 against). *Adoptée*.

(A motion with regard to this article was put forward in the seventh session by the special committee for algae. This motion was *adopted*; it proposed that a new date in the future be fixed after which a Latin diagnosis would be required for algae).

New Article 44bis

Dealt with in the fifth session. See above.

Article 45

Prop. A (36:49:19:203) Referred to the special committee for algae (The committee reported on this proposal in the seventh session: it recommended its *adoption* and the section sanctioned this adoption).

Prop. B (36:52:19:200) This proposal had been referred to the special committees for cryptogams (The committees for fungi and algae took no action, the committee for Bryophytes recommended the rejection of this proposal in a report presented in the seventh session. The section accordingly rejected the proposal).

Article 48

Prop. A (19:240:27:—) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. B (13:249:28:—) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. C (61:207:16:—) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. D (29:242:25:—) Rejected. *Rejetée*.

Prop. E (205:76:26:—) Withdrawn. *Retirée*.

Mr Ross pointed out that if this proposal was adopted it would make it possible to validate a new monotypic genus based on an old species simply by referring to the specific description. This it not now possible.

Dr LANJOUW was of opinion that this could be remedied by adding "in the same rank"

to the first sentence of Art. 42. He was, however, prepared to withdraw the proposal, since the sentence might be useful.

Article 50

Prop. A (100:22:203:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Prop. B (97:15:207:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Prop. C (69:43:215:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Article 51

Prop. A (295:20:9:—)

Dr BAEHNI suggested the wording "names of taxa below . . .".

The proposal was *adopted* as amended, three cards being shown against it. La proposition est *adoptée*.

Article 52

Prop. A (4:299:6:6) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (8:257:23:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (17:165:59:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (15:154:67:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. E (70:63:163:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Prop. F (86:180:38:—) Rejected by show of cards. Rejetée.

Prop. G (79:33:164:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Prop. H (38:75:178:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référé au comité de rédaction.

Prop. I (193:89:34:—) *Adopted* by show of cards, 46 cards being shown in favour, 7 against. *Adoptée*.

Article 53

Prop. A (47:95:178:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Article 54

Prop. A (35:227:66:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

New Article 54bis

Prop. A (26:285:8:11) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 54A

Prop. A (26:236:27:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (205:96:21:—) *Adopted*. *Adoptée*.

Recommendation 54D

Prop. A (5:309:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (297:28:5:—) *Adopted* unanimously. Unanimement *adoptée*.

Recommendation 54E

Prop. A (31:286:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (7:308:3:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 54F

Prop. A (2:310:3:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 54I

Prop. A (14:24:281:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référé au comité de rédaction.

Article 55

Prop. A (49:14:254:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Article 57

Prop. A (33:253:12:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (45:63:195:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Article 58

Prop. A (6:287:6:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (246:56:18:—) *Adopted* by a considerable majority, 7 cards being shown against the proposal. *Adoptée*.

Recommendation 58A

Dealt with earlier in the same session (see above).

Article 59

Prop. A (no mail vote; Taxon 3:123).

Dr ST JOHN explained that this motion was made to provide a distinct means of indicating the first authority when it is based only on inference. It often has happened that the second author, say in the genus *Lespedeza* adopts a species previously known and described in the genus *Meibomia*. The second author gives no basionym, but he is dealing with the same species, of identical circumscription and identical epithet. It is inferred that the second author's publication is really a transfer. As he did not state the basionym it was proposed that such an inferred first authority be enclosed in braces.

Dr LANJOUW remarked that the typographical sign proposed by Dr St John would be difficult to use in some countries because it was not found in the normal typographic outfits.

Mr DANDY saw no need for a special notation in the cases mentioned by Dr St John. In the earlier works of Linnaeus's time it was quite common for a new combination to be published without direct reference to the basionym but with exact repetition of the definition of the basionym. In these cases there is no reason why the usual parentheses should not be used.

The proposal was rejected, one card only being shown in favour. La proposition est rejetée.

Article 60

Prop. A (241:40:29:—) *Adopted* by show of cards (35/10). *Adoptée*.

Recommendation 60D

Prop. A (4:304:7:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 60F

Prop. A (42:29:237:—)

Prop. B (13:73:220:—)

Prop. C (19:44:248:—)

Dr PAPPENFUSS would like to suggest adoption of the word "sensu". Example: *Sarcophyllis californica* sensu Setchell et Gardner (non J. Agardh).

The proposals A, B and C were referred to the *Editorial Committee* together with the remark by Dr Papenfuss. Les prop. A, B et C et la remarque de M. Papenfuss sont référées au comité de rédaction.

Recommendation 60G

Prop. A (20:275:19:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (272:31:17:—) *Adopted* unanimsly. *Adoptée*.

Recommendation 60I

Prop. A (12:286:8:3) Rejected. Rejetée.

Section 8

Prop. A (213:45:52:—) *Adopted* unanimsly. *Adoptée*.

Article 61

Prop. A (3:301:9:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

New Recommendation 62A

Prop. A (165:109:53:—) Rejected by show of cards (25/25). Rejetée.

Article 63

Prop. A (3:313:7:3) Rejected. Rejetée.

New Article 63bis

Prop. A (4:330:—:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 64

Prop. A (278:23:24:—) *Adopted* by show of cards, there being one dissident. *Adoptée*.

Article 65

Prop. A (35:78:199:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Prop. B (15:277:24:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (22:275:22:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (252:34:36:—) *Adopted*. *Adoptée*.

Article 66

Prop. A (52:23:235:—) *Adopted* and referred to the *Editorial Committee*. *Adoptée* et référée au comité de rédaction.

Prop. B (267:24:30:—) *Adopted*. *Adoptée*.

Article 67

Prop. A (5:310:2:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 68B

Prop. A (284:29:11:—) *Adopted*. *Adoptée*.

Article 69

Prop. A (223:25:37:29) *Adopted*. *Adoptée*.

Prop. B (24:203:38:29) Rejected. Rejetée.

The committee for fungi, in its report presented in the seventh session, proposed to refer the general wording of the article to the *Editorial Committee*. This was *carried*.

Article 70

Prop. A (11:304:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

New Article 70bis

Dealt with in the same session, see above.

Article 71

Prop. A (14:296:5:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 73

Prop. A (13:298:8:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (268:17:38:—) *Adopted*. *Adoptée*.

Prop. D (58:54:214:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Prop. E (31:268:9:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. F (8:299:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. G (= Prop. D to Art. 75; 26:128:162:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Article 74

Prop. A (34:90:191:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au comité de rédaction.

Prop. B (3:312:8:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (177:125:15:—)

Dr FOSBERG was of opinion that this paragraph was all right if "taxa" was changed to "plant groups".

Dr ROUSSEAU thought that the third paragraph was a mere repetition of the first one.

The proposal was *adopted*, 41 cards were shown in favour, 14 against. Proposition *adoptée*.

Prop. D (83:221:19:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

New Article 74bis

Prop. A (54:228:28:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 75

Prop. A (38:267:13:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (37:267:13:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (12:283:19:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (26:128:162:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee* (This proposal was misplaced, it should be termed prop. G. to Art. 73). Cette proposition est référée au *comité de rédaction*.

Prop. E (38:73:205:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au *comité de rédaction*.

M. BAEHNI fait remarquer que le mot "taxon" est ici employé à tort: des éléments discordants ne forment pas un taxon.

Dr ROUSSEAU referred this remark to the *Editorial Committee*. Remarque référée au *comité de rédaction*.

Article 76

Prop. A (39:236:26:5) Rejected. Rejetée.

Dr BAEHNI remarked that in this article too the word taxon should not be used.

Prop. B (15:90:18:193). Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (11:112:19:168). Rejected. Rejetée.

(The committee for fungi, in its report read at the seventh session, moved the rejection of these proposals B and C. The section *carried* this motion).

Prop. D (17:97:190:6) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au *comité de rédaction*.

Prop. E (21:81:48:157) Rejected on the suggestion of the committee for fungi (see prop. B and C).

Prop. F (221:73:15:3) *Adopted* and referred to the *Editorial Committee* to find the final wording (the committee for fungi supported the adoption). *Adoptée* et référée au *comité de rédaction*.

Article 77

Prop. A (182:118:13:—)

Prop. B (182:118:13:—)

Dr FOSBERG did not know what was a monstrosity. If an abnormal plant is described it may usually be referred to a species. If it cannot be identified the name applies only to the type specimen and makes no difference. This article is used in taxonomy classes to point out the lack of infallibility of those who make the rules.

Dr ROUSSEAU suggested replacing the word monstrosity. Species might be monstrosities as was shown by modern genetics.

Mr DANDY was of opinion that Art. 77 presents difficulties because some names are based on monstrous forms of wild plants and should be rejected, whereas others (especially in horticulture) are based on *monstrous* forms because they are monstrosities. He suggested that the article be allowed to stand pro tem, but that it should be referred to the special committee which had been set up to consider the question of rejected names for the next Congress.

M. PICHON estime que si une espèce ou un genre nouveaux ont été décrits sur un échantillon anormal, mais sont malgré tout une espèce ou un genre vraiment nouveaux, le nom donné devrait être rejeté aux termes des règles, ce qui serait regrettable.

C'est le cas du genre *Podochrosia* (Apocynacées), décrit sur un spécimen à pédicelles renflés par l'action d'un parasite, d'où le préfixe *Pod*—.

Dr PAPPENFUSS suggested that the special committee on stabilisation should be asked to consider the implications of this article and to produce a new article.

He also moved the deletion of the present article.

The prop. A and B were put to the vote and rejected, there being 24 cards shown in favour and 32 against. Les prop. A et B sont rejetées.

Prop. C (6:270:24:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (42:247:24:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

It was decided to refer Art. 77 for further study to the *special committee on stabilization*, but in the meantime the article would be retained in accordance with the above vote.

New Article 77bis

Prop. A (no mail vote; Taxon 3:124). Referred to the *special committee on stabilization*. Référée au *comité spécial*.

New Article 78bis

Prop. A (198:110:21:—) Rejected bij 156 votes against 119. Rejetée.

(This proposal was dealt with in the fourth session, see above).

New Article 78bis-A

Prop. A (54:191:58:—)

M. PICHON fait observer que l'adoption combinée de la prop. E de l'Art. 32 et de la prop. B du présent article rend inutile la prop. A. Il regrette cependant qu'une confusion puisse naître dans les cas cités au paragraphe 3, le même nom ayant servi à désigner deux sections différentes.

Dr LANJOUW preferred prop. B to prop. A no. 1.

M. BAEHNI fait observer que 7% des espèces de la flore Suisse changeraient de subdivision. Il préféra le rejet de cette proposition.

M. PICHON retire les deux premières parties de la prop. A.

Parts 1 and 2 being withdrawn by the author a vote was taken on item 3. It was rejected by a considerable majority. La troisième partie de la prop. A est rejetée.

Prop. B (158:107:41:—) *Adopted* by 34 votes against 9. *Adoptée*.

Article 79

All proposals were dealt with earlier in the same session, see above.

Article 80

Prop. A (284:25:3:—) *Adopted* unanimously. *Adoptée* à l'unanimité.

Prop. B (11:301:—:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (9:292:2:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 81

Prop. A (276:26:11:—) *Adopted* unanimously. *Adoptée* à l'unanimité.

Prop. B (51:224:29:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (47:219:34:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (48:257:34:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. E (15:258:15:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. F (143:159:13:—)

The merits of the last sentence were discussed by McVaugh, Baehni and Lanjouw. As a result of this discussion Dr LANJOUW withdraw his proposal to delete the sentence but proposed that the sentence be treated as a note.

This motion by Dr Lanjouw was *carried* unanimously. M. Lanjouw retire sa proposition F mais propose que la phrase impliquée soit traitée comme une note. Cette dernière motion est *acceptée*.

Section 14

Prop. A (224:46:36:—) *Adopted*. *Adoptée*.

La séance se termine à 6h.30 — Session closed at 6.30 p.m.

Septième séance — Seventh session

July 1st, 9 a.m. — 13.30 p.m.

Dr ROUSSEAU suggested appointing a French mycologist on the special committee on stabilization and he asked Mme LE GAL whether she would be willing to accept such an appointment.

Mme LE GAL accepte de faire partie de cette commission spéciale.

The meeting unanimously applauded this appointment.

Dr LANJOUW then read the report of the committee for fungi.

Report of the committee for fungi

The committee for fungi of the Eighth International Botanical Congress met on the evening of June 29 and considered the items referred to it by the nomenclature section and reports as follows. It may be noted that all formal actions of the committee were approved by vote of two-thirds or more of the members present.

Article 6, prop. A. The committee proposes changes in the wording as presented by Boivin, so that the proposal will now read as follows: If, however, an organism is transferred from the animal to the plant kingdom, its name or names shall be automatically accepted as validly published under the botanical Code *as from the date of such transfer*, provided they were validly published under the zoological Code. However, the choice of the correct name shall be made in accordance with the rules of botanical nomenclature *and it must have been or be published in the form provided* by these rules. If an organism is transferred from the plant to the animal kingdom, its names retain their status in botanical nomenclature for purposes of homonymy.

Article 16, prop. C. The committee approves adding the words "*and for certain fungi*" and requests that the proposition be referred for final action to the Editorial Committee.

Article 21, prop. B. The committee does not favour this proposition and recommends its rejection. Fungi in certain groups must continue to be typified by figures and/or description.

Article 23, prop. B. The committee notes with complete agreement that this proposition, which would have been exceedingly dangerous for the nomenclature of the fungi has already been rejected.

Article 23, prop. D. 1st prop. The committee opposes this proposition and recommends its rejection.

2nd prop. The committee opposes this proposition and recommends its rejection.

Article 23, prop. E. This proposition is withdrawn by the proposers.

Article 33, prop. F. The committee recommends that this proposition be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 45, prop. A and B. The committee took no action on these propositions.

Article 69, prop. A and B. The committee recommends that prop. A and B be referred to the *Editorial Committee*, in order that any necessary changes in terminology may be made to bring the article in line with the remainder of the Code.

Article 76, prop. B, C, E. The committee does not feel that the status of lichen nomenclature as set forth in the present Code should be changed at this time, and recommends rejection of prop. B, C and E.

Article 76, prop. F. The committee recommends adoption of this proposition.

New Division III, prop. C. The committee approves this proposed new division in principle with the exception of paragraph 2 of *Provision 1*.

Podocystis. The committee agrees to relinquish the generic name *Podocystis* to the diatomologists.

Hantzschia. The committee agrees to relinquish the generic name *Hantzschia* to the diatomologists.

All other questions of proposed *Nomina generica conservanda* are referred to the new committee for fungi to be appointed at this Congress for further study.

The committee expresses its thanks to Dr Lanjouw and his associates and to Dr Rogers, secretary of the committee.

On Art. 6. Mr Ross was of the opinion that if we inserted "as from the date of such transfer" we should have great difficulties in knowing when the transfer is made. If we leave it out we have the difficulty of knowing how much of the animal kingdom has to be considered for purposes of botanical homonymy. This is probably the greater difficulty and he would personally support its inclusion.

The second insertion of the mycologists must read "effectively published" to meet the views of the special committee for algae.

Dr MARTIN said that the purpose of the amendments to Boivin's proposal for rewording of Art. 6 (Prop. A) was to avoid intro-

ducing homonyms dating from 1755 into groups whose nomenclature under the botanical Code begins at later dates.

In addition, it was intended to obviate the introduction into botanical nomenclature of recent names not published according to the botanical rules.

Dr KORF pointed out that the use of "effective" publication would eliminate the requirement for a Latin diagnosis, which is not what Dr Martin really desires. "Valid" is the word meant by the mycologists.

Dr PAPPENFUSS remarked that the proposal as presented by the committee for fungi was in effect in opposition to Boivin's proposal. Adoption of the proposal of the mycologists would create great confusion as far as algal nomenclature was concerned.

Mr MARGADANT was of the opinion that the old reading was much better, it left no doubt that only publication of the name in accordance with the botanical Code had to be taken into consideration.

Dr KORF said that the proposal would provide a serious loophole in the requirement for a Latin diagnosis, since some mycologists at least consider all fungi to be animals. In publishing a fungus as an animal, no Latin diagnosis would need to be applied, and on transfer to the plant kingdom by the author or someone else the Latin diagnosis would now be circumvented. Also, the provision "as from the date of such transfer" as provided by the mycological group is important from the angle of homonymy, as without it we shall have to consider all possible animals which might have to be transferred to the plant kingdom in homonymy. Some such provision should be included in the present Art. 6.

Dr FOSBERG thought that the only advantage in the proposed wordings over the present article was the provision that the status in botanical nomenclature dates from the date of transfer because any animal name is potentially transferable.

Therefore, if this provision were not adopted we could not know what names would be considered in botanical homonymy.

Dr DONK pointed out that there are scientists who divide living organisms into three kingdoms, of plants, of protista, and of animals and the Code applies to the plant kingdom only. So it is conceivable that both algae and fungi (nomenclatorially to be treated as plants) will first be described outside the plant kingdom.

Dr ROUSSEAU thought that a note could

be provided to deal with this situation.

Dr MASON remarked that under the zoological Code, priority of publication is given to specific epithets; under the botanical Code, to the species name.

Dr FOSBERG said that we were also concerned with having as little disturbance as possible to the nomenclature of the rest of the plant kingdom. We did not want the introduction of such a name to knock out the name of a genus of *Rosaceae* with 600 species.

Dr ROUSSEAU thought that it should be possible for the algologists and mycologists to reach a gentlemen's agreement.

Dr ST JOHN proposed to insert "or any other kingdom".

The discussion continued for a little while but as it was clear that in this way no solution would be found Dr ROUSSEAU proposed to request the algologists and the mycologists to meet outside the conference room and discuss the problem together.

The remaining points of the report of the committee for fungi were discussed and carried unanimously. (References to these suggestions are inserted in this report under the appropriate headings).

Report of the committee for algae

The committee for algae has unanimously passed the following resolutions:

Art. 6. The committee recommends that the Section of Nomenclature accept Art. 6, prop. A, in order to continue the present co-operation between algologists and protozoologists in dealing with the nomenclature of organisms treated by both.

Art. 21. The committee recommends that the Section of Nomenclature reject Art. 21, prop. B, since it would be unworkable in view of the adoption of Art. 44bis, prop. C.

Art. 44. The committee wishes to draw the attention of the Section of Nomenclature to the resolution passed by a representative meeting of phycologists during the 7th International Botanical Congress and laid before the Section of Nomenclature at its ninth session (Rep. 7th Internat. Bot. Congr. p. 516). This resolution was to the effect that, in view of the large numbers of algal taxa whose names have been published since 1934 with diagnoses in a modern language, the action of the Section of Nomenclature in rejecting proposals to deal with this problem made it impossible for phycologists to obey the Rules strictly. The committee for algae emphatically endorses this resolution

and calls upon the Section of Nomenclature to fix a date in the future for Art. 44 to begin to apply to the algae.

Art. 45. The committee recommends that the Section of Nomenclature accept Art. 45 prop. A and that the wording to be inserted in the Code be as follows:

"On and from 1 January 1955 the name of a new taxon of algae of specific or lower rank is not considered as validly published unless it is accompanied by one or more illustrations showing the distinctive morphological features, or by a reference to a previously and effectively published illustration".

New Div. III. The committee recommends that steps be taken to ensure that an appropriate proportion of institutional votes are so allocated that they are exercised by cryptogamists.

(Note: The part of the report dealing with *nomina conservanda* is published in *Taxon* 3(7): 234. 1954).

Art. 6. It was decided to await the report of the joint algologists and mycologists.

Art. 21. The suggestion made by the committee was adopted by the section

Art. 44. Dr ROUSSEAU thought that this proposal by the algologists was perfectly acceptable and that it did not interfere with our present customs. We were in a regime of exceptions, so why not make another one.

Mr MARGADANT suggested that the mycologists should consider an exception for *Myxomyceta* too, then old Art. 6 could stand and the question of Latin diagnoses could be settled for the past.

After a short discussion in which Mr ROSS and Dr RAMSBOTTOM took part Dr ROUSSEAU put this motion by the algologists to the vote. It was *accepted* by a show of cards, there being 4 dissentients. La proposition du comité d'algologie au sujet de l'Art. 44 est acceptée.

Dr PAPPENFUSS speaking on behalf of the committee for algae, expressed its appreciation for the assistance given to the algologists by the Section of Nomenclature.

Art. 45, prop. A.

Dr DONK said that by admitting an oblique figure in addition to the description one opened the possibility for confusion; the figure(s) may be drawn up from a different specimen(s) than those on which the description is based.

The suggestion by the algological committee was agreed upon.

New Division III to be discussed later.

Nomina Generica Conservanda. These proposals will be published in *Taxon* and referred to the General Committee for final approval.

Report of the committee for Musci

Art. 21B. no objections.

Art. 45B. The majority of this committee opposes the proposal. There is no need to make a special rule with a new criterion for valid publication especially for the mosses as has been done for fossil plants in Art. 45. We might agree if it were made a rule for *all* plants. We agree also that it should be a recommendation, but this is already stated for all plants in Rec. F.

This report was *approved*. Le rapport est *approuvé*.

Report of the committee for Hepaticae

The committee for hepaticae approves the list of names of *Hepaticae* as printed in the Code except for *Androcryphia* which must be referred back to the committee for further study.

This report was *approved*. Le rapport est *approuvé*.

Report of the committee for Bacillariophyta

Mr Ross stated that the report had been published in *Taxon* vol. 1 p. 80.

This report was *approved*. Le rapport est *approuvé*.

Nomina generica conservanda

Dr STAFLEU moved the adoption of the report by the General Committee and Advisory Board published in *Taxon* 3:155-156 together with the list of conserved names of fungi as printed in *Taxon* 2:30 (*Androcryphia* to be deleted, *Hantschia*, *Frustulia* and *Podocystis* to be added).

These lists were *adopted* unanimously. Les listes sont *adoptées* à l'unanimité.

Dr DONK remarked that in the list of *nomina conservanda* for fungi it would seem that perhaps quite a number of corrections of various kinds were necessary because the list had been drawn up with certain principles in mind that seemed to conflict with Rules and common sense. He had handed over to the Rapporteur General a memorandum containing some general and some special remarks, but he added that he had looked over only the names of *Hymenocetes* and a revision of the rest might become urgent too.

Report of the special committee to deal with Art. 39

Mr DANDY read the above-mentioned report (fifth session).

The committee consisted of Dr Amaral Franco, Mr Dandy and Dr Fosberg.

Dr ST JOHN had no objection to the wording of the present motion, but said that there would still remain a difficulty, or rather an impossibility, in applying the article, which requires that a publication be distributed, but states no minimum number of copies that must be sent out to effect distribution. Since no number is stated, there will be no uniformity in the application of the rule.

In 1944 when the allies attacked Paris, there was very little resistance but one shell hit and destroyed a printer's works. In this printer's were 498 copies of Viguiet's *Leguminosae de Madagascar*. Previously only two copies had been distributed, one to the Paris Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, the other to the friend who had edited the manuscript of the deceased Viguiet. Is the distribution of two copies of a book effective distribution? There is nothing in Art. 39 which allows a botanist to come to a certain conclusion on this issue.

M. PICHON indique à M. St John que toutes les espèces nouvelles du livre de Viguiet dont il ne subsiste que deux exemplaires ont été publiées de nouveau dans les *Notulae Systematicae*. L'ouvrage de Viguiet est donc considéré par les botanistes français comme n'ayant pas été publié.

Mr MARGADANT thought that the case of Dr St John was perhaps covered by the wording of the proposals: institutions in plural. So 1 copy in 1 institution would be insufficient but in 2 institutions it would constitute effective publication.

Dr DE WIT pointed out that 2 copies of Teysmann's and Binnendijk Catalogue 1854 are distributed: 1 is available at Buitenzorg, 1 at Kew. If we accept 2 existing copies of a recent French book, we must accept the Buitenzorg book too, which means the probable change of more than 100 specific names. T. and B. were always rejected. We need a *number* of copies to be distributed.

Mr DANDY said that the special committee of course considered the question of stating in the article a minimum number of copies required for distribution, but decided that this was not desirable as its application would be impracticable.

The report of the committee was then *adopted* unanimously. Le rapport est *approuvé* à l'unanimité.

Report of the committee for palaeobotanical nomenclature

In response to a suggestion by the nomenclature section of the Eighth International Botanical Congress, a special meeting of the palaeobotanists to discuss problems of palaeobotanical nomenclature was held at 8.00 a.m., July 1, at 61, Rue de Buffon, Paris, with Dr Rudolf Florin presiding. Dr Ed. Boureau acted as secretary, and Dr S. H. Mamay assisted in recording the proceedings.

Prior to this meeting, Dr H. H. Thomas, retiring secretary of the committee for palaeobotanical nomenclature, had submitted by mail a list of agenda referred by the Seventh Congress to the Eighth. These were discussed at some length, together with various pertinent proposals contained in the *Recueil Synoptique* (Regnum Vegetabile, vol. 4). D. C. Bhardwaj, Ed. Boureau, I. C. Cookson, R. Florin, W. F. Harris, G. Kremp, T. Just, S. H. Mamay, and R. Potonié participated in the discussions.

The following actions were taken:

1. The original proposal regarding the starting date for palaeobotanical nomenclature as submitted to the Stockholm Congress by Dr J. M. Schopf (Art. 20, prop. 7: Synopsis of Proposals, Stockholm Congress, page 34) was recommended for adoption. The adoption of this proposal has the effect of nullifying prop. A, B and C, Art. 23 (Regnum Vegetabile, vol. 4, page 37.). The text of Schopf's original proposal is as follows:

Replace the sentence beginning with "The nomenclature of Fossil Plants" by (j) *Fossil plants of all groups*, Dec. 31, 1820 (Sternberg, *Flora der Vorwelt*, Versuch, Fasc. I, pp. 1—24, pls. I—XIII).

Note: Schlothheim, *Petrefactenkunde*, 1820, is regarded as published prior to legitimate nomenclature for fossil plants.

2. The *nomina generica conservanda* of fossil plants listed on page 548 of the Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress were recommended for inclusion in the list of such names formally adopted by the Eighth Congress.

3. It was recommended that the following items be referred to the new committee for palaeobotanical nomenclature for careful study and preparation of suitable proposals to be submitted to the Ninth Congress;

a. Typification of fossil plants, including prop. B, Art. 21 (Florschütz, Regnum Vegetabile, vol 4, p. 37).

b. Names of fossil plants derived from the organs of living plants.

c. Names to be used when species belonging to different organ genera are united.

d. Names of fossil dispersed spores and pollen grains, including proposal B, Appendix IV (Potonié: Regnum Vegetabile 4 : 115).

4. The following persons were nominated and elected to membership in the new committee for palaeobotanical nomenclature (Note: only the first ten names listed below were actually selected at this meeting. It was agreed that the palynologists should be invited to elect two representatives to the committee for palaeobotanical nomenclature, and at a subsequent meeting of the palynology section Drs Schopf and Potonié were elected to these two positions on the committee):

C. A. Arnold, U.S.A., Chairman; S. H. Mamay, U.S.A., Secretary; H. N. Andrews, U.S.A.; Ed. Boureau, France; T. M. Harris, England; Th. Just, U.S.A.; N. W. Radforth, Canada; F. W. Stockmans, Belgium; K. R. Surange, India; H. Weyland, Germany; R. Potonié, Germany; J. M. Schopf, U.S.A.

Immediately following adjournment of this meeting, a report of the above proceedings was orally presented to the nomenclature section by Dr Just, and the decisions contained therein were unanimously *accepted* by the members present. Le rapport est *adopté* à l'unanimité.

Report of the committee for lichens

(A report was presented by Dr Sten Ahlner. It was decided that the part dealing with *nomina conservanda* would be published in Taxon after which the names would be studied by the General Committee).

The committee has voted on those proposals to the Paris Congress which were submitted to the committee. The results were:

Art. 21, prop. B. In favour 5; for postponement 1; abstention 1.

Art. 45, prop. A. In favour 6; abstention 1.

Art. 45, prop. B. In favour 6; abstention 1.

Art. 76, prop. B. In favour 0; against 7.

Art. 76, prop. C. In favour 0; against 6; for postponement 1.

Art. 76, prop. E. In favour 3; against 4.

Art. 77 Bis, prop. A (Taxon 3(4) : 124. 1954). In favour 2; against 5.

New Division III, prop. C. In favour 6; abstention 1.

This report was *approved*. Le rapport est *approuvé*.

New Division III

Prop. A (44:219:2:11) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (32:227:3:11) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (213:66:4:11)

There had been a general resolution in Stockholm that a chapter like this should be prepared. Dr ROUSSEAU proposed to start with *Provision 1*.

Provision 1

Dr MASON asked what effect Provision 1 would have upon the reports of committees commissioned to report at the next congress? Would this make it impossible for their reports to become effective or to be acted upon?

Dr KECK said that the 10-year moratorium on modification of the Code can only be a recommendation or gentlemen's agreement rather than a law binding on succeeding Congresses. The plea was made that no changes be proposed that deal with language only (unless these be gathered together periodically and taken up only after 15 years or so), and that only proposals dealing with principles be submitted.

M. BAEHNI estime impossible d'interdire toute modification du Code pendant dix ans.

La solution est que les botanistes restent inertes et s'abstiennent de créer des commissions pendant 5 ans. Mais le prochain Congrès fera ce qu'il voudra: on ne peut l'engager.

Dr LANJOUW was in favour of having a 10 year's rest from nomenclature. However, he realized that it would be difficult to establish a 10 years moratorium. What would be done with the results of the committee on stabilization for instance? We could not afford to wait another 10 years. Appendix III might also be modified by the Horticultural Congress and the moratorium would not allow us to insert their decisions. It would be better to reject the paragraph dealing with this moratorium. It would be a happy circumstance if only a few proposals were received for the Montreal Congress. Perhaps we could pass a resolution that for the Montreal Congress no proposals will be accepted on articles and recommendations dealt with in Paris.

Dr RICKETT said that a further difficulty in declaring a moratorium would be that the

proposals would accumulate for 10 or 15 years, and we should be worse off than at Stockholm. The suggestion made by the Rapporteur carries some danger. A somewhat arbitrary exclusion of certain proposals may cause ill will. A suggestion to the Rapporteur would be to edit the individual proposals, perhaps by correspondence with the editor of Taxon, before printing the Synopsis of Proposals, thus reducing the labyrinth of minor proposals in which we are lost.

Dr LANJOUW said with regard to Dr Rickett's last suggestion that in this way the work prior to the preparation of the Synopsis would be tremendously increased. One of the drawbacks of the present practice is that we always receive proposals after the closing date. Another circumstance is that we shall be busy with the preparation of the next edition of the Code until 1956.

Dr FOSBERG said that acceptance of the 10 year moratorium assumed almost infallibility for the decisions of the session. The wording of the first paragraph makes us have a plenary session of an International Botanical Congress *under the auspices of the nomenclature section* etc. which is impossible.

Dr ROUSSEAU ruled that the second paragraph was out of order. He asked for a confirmation of this ruling and it was *carried* by a large majority. M. Rousseau décide que le 2d paragraphe est hors d'ordre. Cette décision est *acceptée*.

Dr PROSKAUER moved that the Rapporteur be empowered to reject any motion made before the next Congress which corresponds in substance to one rejected either at the Stockholm or Paris Congresses.

Mr ROSS said only the nomenclature section has the power to recommend modifications to the Congress. But the I.A.P.T. could stay in Prov. 2 because it provides the machinery.

A vote was taken on the first three lines of provision 1. They were *carried* unanimously.

A short discussion took place on the status of the I.A.P.T.

Dr LANJOUW agreed that it should not be mentioned in provision 1. It provided the machinery for the committees elected by the Congress.

Provision 2

Dr RICKETT suggested "appointed" instead of "elected" (This was agreed).

Dr BAEHNI suggested including the president and the secretary of I.A.P.T. in the General Committee (this was agreed).

Dr ROUSSEAU pointed out that these ex-officio members were extra and that 5 members were to be elected by the session.

Mr ROSS asked whether the lichens were omitted in error or on purpose.

Dr SANTESSON declared that the lichenological committee agreed to be combined with the committee for fungi.

Dr STAFLEU pointed out that a *committee for Virus* should be established.

Dr AINSWORTH said that Viruses are covered by the new Bacteriological Code edited by the International Congress for Microbiology and it would be best for the Botanical Congress to accept the special virus committee of the International Microbiological Congress.

Dr RAMSBOTTOM suggested that the committee be inserted between those of bacteria and cultivated plants.

Provision 2 was then *carried* unanimously on the understanding that in part 1, second line, the words "committee itself" were to be altered to "Nomenclature Section". La Provision 2 est *acceptée*.

Provision 3

Provision 3 *carried* unanimously. La provision 3 est *acceptée* à l'unanimité.

Provision 4

A. *Preliminary mail vote. a) Private persons.*

M. BAEHNI demande si l'on ne pourrait pas, aux termes de la "Provision 4", voter une fois par an sur les amendements mineurs qui seraient publiés régulièrement dans *Taxon*.

Dr FOSBERG suggested removing categories 2, 3 and 4 from the classes of private persons to be given votes. The authors of proposals can certainly be expected to bear their share of the burden involved in handling their proposals by becoming member of the I.A.P.T.

Dr ROUSSEAU pointed out that it was not possible to know beforehand the names of the members of the Congress. Point 2 should be deleted from provision 4A.

Dr ROTHMALER war der Meinung dass "3. The authors of proposals" stehen bleiben muss, weil vielleicht einige Botaniker nicht Mitglieder der I.A.P.T. sein können.

Dr STAFLEU pointed out that everyone could join the I.A.P.T. Financial difficulties could be overcome in all cases by special arrangements.

Dr ROUSSEAU wanted to keep provisions 3 and 4 of 4A(a).

Provision 4A(a) was then *carried* unanimously on the understanding that point 2 was to be deleted. La provision 4A(a) est *acceptée*, le point no. 2 est préalablement rejeté.

Dr LANJOUW speaking on provision 4A(b) pointed out that it is always difficult to draw up a list. It would simplify the procedure if this could be omitted.

Dr ROUSSEAU said that since it was only a preliminary vote item b might be rejected.

Item 4A(b) was then rejected, only 8 cards being shown in favour of it. La partie A(b) de la provision 4 est rejetée.

Provision 4B (Final vote).

Dr DE WIT put the following motion before the house: "The right to the final vote in the nomenclature section should be restricted to those members or institutions who are admitted to the vote by force of a decision and invitation made by a special committee. The right to vote shall be granted to all those, who have proved themselves actively engaged in taxonomical research and who want that right".

He added that only the doctors could decide on the treatment of a patient, not the whole world.

Mr GILMOUR suggested that a better analogy than Dr de Wit's "doctors", is that of the bakers of the world deciding among themselves what kind of bread the rest of the world should eat! This section was legislating for many thousands of name-users outside this room.

Mr ROSS asked that the provisional list be submitted to the whole General Committee so that the secretaries of the special committees could consider it in the light of the taxonomic work done in their group.

Dr LANJOUW said that this was a difficult question. The criteria used in drawing up the list of institutions entitled to a vote were many: size, collections, staff, present and past activities, etc. The decision was of course always more or less arbitrary. An endeavour was made to provide a more or less even representation of the several countries, etc. It was very difficult to give definite rules and it would be a good idea to have a special committee to deal with this problem.

Dr RAMSBOTTOM supported Mr ROSS and commented on the general lack of proper representation of mycologists and other cryptogamists in institutional votes. He further pointed out the lack of balance in favour of

phanerogamists in general committees and instanced the Genève pre-conference.

Mr GILMOUR asked for a committee to be set up to study the *criteria* on which a list should be drawn up.

Dr LANJOUW said that even committees did not know everything.

Dr ROUSSEAU was of the opinion that in principle we should vote with personal votes only. A difficulty was however, that on certain Congresses there would be a distinct preponderance of local botanists. The number of European representatives in Montreal would be relatively low. In such cases it might be preferable to have institutional votes. He thought that a number of 7 votes for one institution was too high.

Mr ROSS finally moved to submit the list to the General Committee and to include this provision in 4B (2).

M. BAEHNI fait observer qu'à plusieurs reprises un vote par cartes a fait suite à un vote à main levée sur la même proposition, et que le résultat obtenu a été le même: la suppression des votes d'institutions n'aurait donc pratiquement aucune conséquence.

Dr LANJOUW supported Dr BAEHNI's proposal. He had always felt that the botanists should be counted, not the institutes. He would prefer to have personal votes only.

Dr DE WIT also pleaded for personal votes only but asked for them to be made transferable to a certain extent.

Dr ROLLINS thought that it would be dangerous to eliminate the votes of institutions. In most instances, the representative of an institute has consulted with his colleagues and really represents some solid botanical views that should not be cut out. Furthermore, it is unwise to put in the hands of the members who just happen to be in attendance at an International Congress the complete power to change the rules.

Provision 4B (1) was *carried* unanimously.

Provision 4B (2) was *carried* by 40 votes against 12 (show of cards).

The amendment proposed by Mr ROSS was *carried* unanimously. It was decided to keep the maximum number of votes that can be attributed to one single institution at 7.

The motion by Dr ROLLINS to appoint a special committee to prepare a list as provided for in Div. III provision 4B (2) was *carried* unanimously.

(No members of the committee were appointed).

Article 6

Dr STEVENSON read the following motion on Art. 6 presented by the algologists and mycologists:

If, however, an organism is transferred from the animal to the plant kingdom, its name or names shall be automatically accepted as validly published under the botanical Code provided they were validly published under the zoological Code. However, the choice of the correct name shall be made in accordance with the rules of botanical nomenclature and, except for organisms treated as algae, it must have been or be validly published in the form provided by these rules. If an organism is transferred from the plant to the animal kingdom, its names retain their status in botanical nomenclature for purposes of homonymy.

Note. In cases of homonymy botanical nomenclature will take precedence.

This motion was unanimously *accepted*.

Orthography

Dr ROUSSEAU proposed that the report of the special committee on orthography (Drs PICHON, RICKETT and SPRAGUE) be accepted as a whole and that the Editorial Committee be changed to take action in accordance with this report. This ruling was *carried* unanimously (This report was submitted to all participants, it is reproduced as Appendix I to this report).

Remaining proposals

Dr ROUSSEAU pointed out that several proposals had not been dealt with because of lack of time. They dealt for the greater part with minor points. He suggested that the Section refer them all to the Editorial Committee. This committee would have to treat them in accordance with the result of the preliminary vote.

This ruling was *carried* unanimously.

Faute de temps plusieurs propositions n'ont pas été étudiées. Le Président suggère qu'on les réfère au comité de rédaction qui alors tiendra compte du vote préliminaire. Cette règle de procédure est adoptée à l'unanimité.

Nomenclature committees

The meeting then appointed the members of the various nomenclature committees listed in Taxon 3: 190-191, 214. 1954.

Languages

Dr FUCHS proposed the addition of a Spanish translation to the Code.

M. TROUPIN fait remarquer que le texte anglais est une traduction de l'ancien texte français, et que l'on a, à plusieurs reprises, beaucoup discuté parce que la traduction anglaise ne correspondait pas au texte français. M. Troupin propose de recourir au texte français en cas de contestation.

M. BAEHNI signale qu'en Suisse les trois langues officielles, français, allemand et italien, sont traitées sur un pied d'égalité et que les textes sont tous trois légaux.

Dr LANJOUW stated that at Stockholm it was decided that English should be the official language of the Code. In the third edition of the rules the English text has also been the primary one.

Dr SCHULZE sagte, dass hier allen Diskussionen und textlichen Abänderungsvorschlägen der englische und nicht der französische Text zu Grunde gelegt worden sei. Daher sei es wohl unumgänglich, auch diesmal den englischen Text bei der neuen Code-Ausgabe als den massgebenden den Übersetzungen zu Grunde zu legen.

Dr ROUSSEAU said that English, French and German would be all official but in cases of difference of opinion we should choose the English one arbitrarily as the correct one. He asked for a vote on this ruling and it was *carried* by show of cards, there being 40 cards shown in favour and 9 against.

M. Rousseau déclare que les textes anglais, français et allemands devraient tous être officiels mais qu'en cas de divergences d'opinion entre les versions, il pourrait être entendu qu'on choisirait arbitrairement le texte

anglais comme le texte correct. Ce point de vue est soumis au vote et *accepté* par 40 voix contre 9.

Dr ROUSSEAU asked whether anyone wanted to present any other motion in the interest of plant nomenclature.

Dr RAMSBOTTOM asked to speak on behalf of the section in order to thank Dr ROUSSEAU for the excellent way in which he had presided over the meetings and for the fine manner in which he had kept everyone reasonable. Dr ROUSSEAU's charm and humour had led to a very agreeable and successful treatment of the problems before us.

Dr ROUSSEAU thanked Dr Ramsbottom for his kind words and he thanked everyone for their cooperation. We had discussed many problems and they had received treatment in accordance with their intrinsic value. As a president he might have slipped, but he had tried to do his best.

He wanted to express his sincere thanks to Miss Keuken for the excellent way in which she had taken her stenographic notes.

Dr ROBYNS wanted to thank the Rapporteur for the excellent work he had done in order to enable the section to accomplish its task.

Mr Ross thanked the other members of the "Bureau" for the assistance given to the work of the section.

Dr ROUSSEAU then declared the proceedings closed. Le Président déclare closes les délibérations de la Section de Nomenclature.

La séance se termine à 1 h. 30. — Session closed at 1.30 p.m.

APPENDICE I

RAPPORT DU COMITÉ SPÉCIAL POUR LES QUESTIONS D'ORTHOGRAPHE REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ORTHOGRAPHY

The following report embodies the views of a special committee formed at the invitation of Dr J. Lanjouw to report to the congress on certain proposals dealing with orthography of names. The committee consisted of M. Pichon, H. W. Rickett and T. A. Sprague. The report is drawn up by H. W. Rickett after correspondence with the other members.

Numbers in parenthesis refer to pages of the *Recueil Synoptique*.

Article 82

A. (98). Brennan's proposal raises Rec. 82B(c) and 82C(c), in effect, to the status of an article by adding their substance as a note to Art. 82. This would enable us to

eliminate accents, umlauts, etc. from older names in which they may be found and would prohibit their use in future. Furthermore these provisions for transcribing signs and letters not found in classical Latin would then concern *all* names, not only those derived from personal names.

The Committee endorses the proposal, with some changes in wording. Several persons have called attention to the fact that to "suppress" a diacritic sign may lead to the transformation of (e.g.) "mülleri" to "mulleri", which would be an incorrect orthography. The following wording is suggested by Rickett and supported by Sprague:

"The consonants *w* and *y*, foreign to clas-