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Et cent Simples connus dans le Champ de l'Histoire.

From an introductory poem in Abraham Munting, Waare Oeffeninge der Planten, 1672, written by Michel Nöé in honour of the author.
INTRODUCTION.

In February 1947 Dr C. Skottsberg, chairman of the Committee for the Organizing of the 7th International Botanical Congress to be held in 1950 at Stockholm, asked me on behalf of his Committee whether I would be prepared to take Dr T. A. Sprague's place as Rapporteur Général to the Section for Nomenclature. Dr Sprague had expressed his wish to withdraw from that function as he had no longer the facilities of the library of the Kew Herbarium at his disposition, and also because he thought that his task should be taken over by a younger man. Although appreciative of the honour I have long hesitated before I accepted this commission. I was well aware of the high standard to which I would have to conform: to succeed to a line of eminent men like De Candolle, Briquet and Sprague would certainly entail a serious responsibility. Apart from my less comprehensive experience in the field of nomenclature there was moreover a special and by no means negligible difficulty with which I would have to contend, viz. the necessity to express myself continually in a foreign tongue, not only in writing but also by word of mouth and on the spur of the moment. The amiably promised support of Dr and Mrs Sprague and the encouragement I received from several colleagues in my own country and abroad, have helped me to overcome my reluctance.

Once this decision was taken, I asked myself what my first task as Rapporteur Général would have to be. In regard to this it was a happy coincidence that I had already been appointed Secretary to the International Committee for Taxonomy of the I.U.B.S. and that at the time I received Dr Skottsberg’s request I was making plans to convocate an international conference in order to make preparations for the agenda of the meeting of the Section for Nomenclature at the Stockholm Congress. You will be aware that this Conference, for which a limited number of botanists were invited, was held in June 1948 at Utrecht. Further on I will deal with the results of this Conference.

Before starting my work on the problems of nomenclature I considered it my first duty to seek contact with Dr Sprague. A financial subsidy of the I.U.B.S. enabled me in May 1947 to go to Cheltenham. During the days I stayed there, I received from Dr and Mrs Sprague a wealth of valuable dates and indications. An additional result of my visit was the completion of the final redaction of the changes in the Rules of Nomenclature that had been accepted in 1935 at the Amsterdam Congress. As contact with the Swedish Organizing Committee and especially with Dr Hylander, the Recorder of the Section for Nomenclature, was also urgently needed, I paid in April 1948 a visit to Uppsala and Stockholm, for which I received once more the financial support of the I.U.B.S. These conferences too lead to valuable results.

I also remember with pleasure the meetings held with my Dutch colleagues in 1947 and 1948, which proved very illuminating. Of paramount importance was in my opinion the Conference held in 1948 at Utrecht, of which mention has already been made. At that meeting
the proposals for changes in the Rules of Nomenclature that should have
been dealt with by the International Botanical Congress planned for the
year 1940, as well as those that had been sent in since then, were fully
discussed. The results of this Conference were laid down in a stencilled
report, which was issued at the beginning of 1949. As its circulation was
but limited, it was fortunate that Dr F. V er doorn was found willing
to print it in the „Chronica Botanica”, in which it will appear in the
near future 1). The decisions taken by the Conference are, of course, not
binding, and the proposals themselves are therefore without exception
included in the „Synopsis of Proposals” and will be submitted to the
Congress. The significance of the Conference is to be seen in the arguments
that have been brought forward in favour of or against the acceptance
of the proposals, and for this reason the report of the Conference will,
I hope, prove a useful guide to the Congressists. The „Synopsis” gives
a complete survey of the results of the voting on the various proposals
and also of the amendments to the latter that were proposed at the
Conference.
In the period after the Utrecht Conference a stream of new proposals
came in. Originally the final term for the receiving of proposals was put
at the 1st January 1949, subsequently it was extended to the 1st July 1949,
but in the end proposals sent in after that date (up to February 1950)
have also been accepted and printed. The sum total of the proposals is
more than a hundred, and some of them are of tremendous size and
suggest amendments to almost every article! It will easily be understood
that the swelling of this heap filled me with misgivings. Originally I
intended to issue the „Synopsis of Proposals” before the 1st January 1950,
but on account of the enormous mass of material and also because of
private circumstances this proved impossible. Shortly after the Utrecht
Conference, viz. in August 1948 I joined an expedition to Surinam, and
it was not before the middle of May 1949 that I was back in the Nether-
lands. During that time I was, of course, unable to occupy myself with
questions of nomenclature, although this was apparently not generally
understood, for at one time when I stayed far away in the jungle, I
received a proposal for a change in one or another of the articles! Back
in my own country another task was waiting for me, for I had in the
meantime been appointed to the chair of Systematic Botany at the
Utrecht University as successor to professor P ull e, and especially
during the first months this new function did not allow me to give as
much attention to the preparation of the „Synopsis” as I should have
liked to do. It was, however, a fortunate circumstance that my nearest
associate at Utrecht, Dr F. P. J o n k e r, had undertaken to carry on,
apart from the task that already rested on his shoulders, also this part
of my work, and that he continued to assist me in it after my return.
Without his help the delay would doubtless have been much greater and
might have proved disastrous.
The proposals show not only a wide diversity in the nature of the

1) See Chronica Botanica Vol. 12, Number 1/2, 1950.
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questions with which they are dealing, but also in their redaction and in the form in which they were presented. Several had been printed, others were stencilled, some typed. Quite a number proved to be equally excellent in form and content. Especially the joint proposals of the American Botanists are exemplary. Other proposers, however, have sometimes driven me to the verge of despair, for only with the utmost solicitude I have been able to extract from their often lengthy expositions what the proposal really was, and what article or recommendation it wished to change. It would perhaps be well if in future some directions could be given with regard to the way in which the proposals have to be drawn up in order to be included in the „Synopsis”.

The proposals have been numbered in a more or less arbitrary way, viz. for the greater part according to the date at which they were received. Those that had been sent in before 1940, have been kept apart from those that were received at a later date. Both series begin with the number 1. Apart from the name of the proposer the list mentions in the case of proposals that have been published in a journal, the name of the latter, and in other instances the form in which they were received (privately printed, stencilled, typed, etc.). In the „Synopsis of Proposals” itself I have only given the number the proposal bears in this list, and the name of the proposer. It was, of course, impossible to print the, often very elaborate, argumentation of the proposer. With regard to those proposals that have been published in a journal, the arguments can, of course, be found at the place indicated in the list. Of the other proposals I am in principle prepared to send a copy of the arguments to those who are interested, but I have to admit that I will not be able to meet all demands. Of some proposals I have received 100 or 50 copies, but this applies mainly to those that have been printed, either in journals or privately, and to the stencilled ones; of many other ones I have received but 1 to 10 copies, and as the members of the various subcommittees will have to receive a complete set, it is to be expected that there will often be a shortage. It is, of course, regrettable that the argumentation will not always be at hand, but this draw-back is perhaps not so serious as it might seem, for every proposal will in the end have to be judged at its face value, and not on perhaps more or less far-fetched arguments; the latter, moreover, will not be available either to those that in future will have to use the rule. Some indication as to the nature of the arguments may, moreover, be found in my comments.

As proposals have been received for the great majority of the articles and recommendations, it seemed practical to print in the „Synopsis” all the articles and recommendations without exception. This will make it easier to see the relations between the various articles and recommendations in their true light. In those cases where a new article or a new recommendation are proposed, the latter are inserted, as a rule, at the place indicated by the proposer (in a few instances I have inserted them at a place that seemed to me more suitable), and bear the same number as the preceding article or recommendation with the addition bis, ter, etc. In every instance the „Synopsis of Proposals” begins with the article
or recommendation in the form in which it is found in the third edition of the "International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature", eventually as amended by the Sixth International Botanical Congress held in 1935 at Amsterdam (Sprague's Supplement). Then follow the proposals relating to the article or the recommendation, indicated, when there are more than one of them, with the numbers 1, 2, etc. At the end of each set of proposals I have given my comments. The latter have, on the whole, be kept as short as possible. This shortness should not be interpreted as a lack of consideration. In view of the large number of proposals it was simply impossible to state my objections in every case where the acceptance of a proposal seemed undesirable to me. Moreover, if I had done this, I also ought to have printed the proposer's arguments. It should be realized that my comment is no more than an advice, and my main intention in giving this advice is to serve you by keeping the rules as simple and concise as possible. It should be clearly understood that we will never succeed in making the rules so comprehensive that they will take every possible case into account. We should not try to be too explicit, for that would often close a most welcome escape out of difficulties which otherwise would lead to the loss of a useful name. In respect to this the remarks made a few years ago by Gleason in "Phytologia" deserve our most attentive consideration! We should, moreover, not overlook that the present wording of the articles is the result of the joint work of more than one generation of botanists, and when an article or a recommendation in its present form does not at once appeal to us, we should bear in mind that an eminent scientist like Briquet, who knew the subject in all its details, will certainly have had good reasons for choosing the form in which it now appears. When a change is effected, the results may not always come up to our expectations, because we failed to recognize in time the rocks which this trusted pilot tried to avoid. I hope you will forgive me this plea for what may seem to you a too conservative attitude. It was inspired by the fear that the multiplicity of proposals to be considered at the approaching Congress might easily confuse our mind, and might lead to steps which afterwards would be regretted.

Of all proposals laid before the Utrecht Conference the conclusion to which the discussions have led, has been reported. When the Congressists would beforehand consider these conclusions, a good deal of time could be saved. The proposals of the American Botanists have already been submitted to the judgment of a large group of American colleagues, and their voting too has been included in my commentary. In view of the large number of professional botanists that took part in this vote, it seems to me that the results, although representing the opinion of a single country only, deserve a careful consideration. A study of the very detailed report published by the American Taxonomists is strongly recommended.

With the "Synopsis of Proposals" you will receive a voting-paper. This

1) See Chronica Botanica Vol. 12, Number 1/2, 1950.
is a novelty. At the previous Congresses too a preliminary vote was taken, but this remained confined to the members of the Executive Committee of Nomenclature, who did not number more than circ. 25. Proposals for which no votes or but a small number of votes could be obtained, were not submitted to the Congress. However, it appeared to me that this was a more or less arbitrary procedure, and that it would be better to give all persons, Institutes, Societies, etc. who have a right to vote at the Congress, the opportunity to take part in this preliminary test, each of them with the number of votes to which he is entitled. At the Utrecht Conference I have already defended this procedure, and although at that occasion no decision was arrived at, I have taken liberty to introduce the procedure on my own responsibility. It has in my opinion two advantages, viz. 1° it allows those who are unable to attend the Congress to express their opinion, and 2° it makes the preliminary vote far more representative.

The large number of proposals will make it impossible to discuss most of them at the meeting of the Section for Nomenclature at greater length. This will only be admissible in the case of proposals that tend to introduce changes or additions of fundamental importance. A large part of the proposals, however, will have to be put to the vote without any previous discussion, and especially in these cases the result of a really representative preliminary vote will be of great value. The result of this vote will be recorded in the „Preliminary Opinions”, in which I will also give the result of the vote in the Executive Committee and in the Special Subcommittees for the Nomenclature and of the Proposers, Institutes and Societies. It is possible that the meeting will be of opinion that the decision reached by the Committees for the Nomenclature and by the Executive Committee is to be accepted as final: in that case the vote of the larger circle will have to be discarded.

It is perhaps not superfluous to draw the attention to the fact that the position of the Subsection for Nomenclature and the appointment of its Voting Members as well as the relation of the Subsection to its various organs, has not yet been placed on a legal base, and to express the hope that the Congress will see the desirability of such a base, and will take the necessary steps to its establishment. A solution that would be satisfactory from an international point of view, would be the founding of an International Society of Plant Taxonomists with a Permanent International Bureau as its centre. As there are circ. 500 herbaria in the various countries, an International Bureau with a staff of 5 to 10 persons could certainly not be regarded as something beyond our means. The only really important condition for the creation of such a body would be a sincere desire for collaboration.

On the voting-paper that is issued with the „Synopsis” the Voters are requested to fill in the following items: 1° Name and address. The name must be the same as that on the envelop in which the „Synopsis” is received, i.e. in case of an Institute the name of the latter, not that of the Director. When the Director has a vote in his own right, he will receive a „Synopsis” and a voting-paper in his own name. The number
of votes to which the Voter is entitled, will be filled in by me. 2° Yes or no (or if you do not want to express an opinion, nothing) in the space left open for this purpose opposite each proposal. Those who wish to make special comments or who wish to propose changes in the redaction of a proposal, can do this on a separate sheet. In the last case the article or recommendation to which the proposal refers as well as the proposal itself in which a change is suggested, should clearly be indicated.

In view of the time it will take to tabulate the results of this preliminary vote, I would appreciate a speedy return of the voting-papers; voters outside Europe are urgently requested to send them by air mail. Voting-papers received after the 1st June cannot be taken into consideration, but I sincerely hope you will not increase the difficulties of my task by waiting to the last moment.

Finally I wish to express my sincere thanks to Dr C. E. B. Bremekamp for his kind assistance in translating my comments and for all the valuable suggestions he gave in the course of that work.

Utrecht, March 1950.

J. LANJOUW
Botanical Museum and Herbarium
University of Utrecht.
106 Lange Nieuwstraat.
LIST OF PROPOSALS.

1940 — 2 De Toni, G., privately printed, Brescia, 1939.
1940 — 3 Swedish Botanists, privately printed, 1939.
1940 — 7 Patrick, Ruth, privately printed, 1939.
1940 — 8 Hochreutiner, B. P. G., stencilled, 1939.
1940 — 11 Gleason, H. A., privately printed, without date.
1940 — 15 De Toni, G., privately printed, Brescia, 1939.
1940 — 19 Werdermann, E. in Kakteenkunde Heft 3, 1937.
1940 — 25 Hara, H., stencilled, without date.
1940 — 26 Houtzagers, G., stencilled, without date.
1940 — 27 Houtzagers, G., stencilled, without date.

1950—11 Japanese Botanists, privately printed, without date.
1950—17 Mattfeld, J., type-script, without date.
1950—19 Shaw, C. G., type-script, without date.
1950—20 American Phytopathological Society & Mycological Society of America, stencilled, without date.
1950—24 Royal Horticultural Society (C. V. L. Lycett), stencilled, without date.
1950—26 Buchanan, R. E., type-script, without date.
1950—30 Blake, S. T., type-script, without date.
1950—31 Willis, J. H., type-script, without date.
1950—32 Davis, G. L., type-script, without date.
1950—34 Pichon, M., type-script, without date.

XIV
1950 - 41 Benham, Rhoda W., stencilled, without date.
1950 - 46 Botanistes Belges, stencilled, without date.
1950 - 48 Hylander, N., stencilled, without date.
1950 - 50 Dodge, C. W., stencilled, without date. Also incorporated in 1950 — 20.
1950 - 54 Shaw, C. G., stencilled, without date. Also incorporated in 1950 — 20.
1950 - 58 Reed, J. R. & R. S. Cowan, stencilled, without date.
1950 - 59 Johnson, L. & J. Garden, type-script, without date.
1950 - 70 Fosberg, F. R., stencilled, without date.
1950 - 73 Patrick, Ruth, stencilled, without date.
1950 - 74 Wehmeyer, L. E., stencilled, without date.
1950 - 80 Polunin, N., type-script, without date.
1950 - 81 Domin, K., type-script, without date.
CHAPTER I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS
AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

ART. 1

Botany cannot make satisfactory progress without a precise system of nomenclature, which is used by the great majority of botanists in all countries.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Add: The precise system of nomenclature on which an international agreement has been secured shall be known as the Linnean System of Botanical Nomenclature, hereinafter referred to merely as the Linnean, Binary or Binomial system. This system is generally biverbal for species.

Add: Note 1: (a) A binary name denotes two concepts, the first generic and the second specific; under the Rules these two concepts must be associated with two separate descriptions, though under certain conditions these two descriptions may be combined into one (descriptio generico-specifica).

(b) A binomial is a combination of two epithets, each of which stands in place of a description. The terms binomial and binominal are interchangeable.

(c) A biverbal name consists of two words; sometimes each word may be formed of two words united with a hyphen.

Examples: The consistent employment of binary binomials for species began in Linnaeus, Species Plantarum (1753); only occasionally these binomials are not biverbals (the Rules have provided for making them biverbal names). Many varietal names in Gandoger's Flora Europae are biverbal binomials, but are not binary, because, though the first epithet stands for a generic description, the second stands for the description of a variety. Many specific names in Hill's Herbal are binary biverbals, but not binomials; many others are binary but neither biverbal nor binomial.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Acceptance of Furtado's proposal is dissuaded. The addition points to Linné as the originator of the graded system of classification, but this is from a nomenclatural point of view of no importance. The last sentence of the addition and the note refer to biverbal and binary names, but Chapter I does not seem to be the right place for this matter, which is dealt with in Chapter III, sect. 4, § 4.

ART. 2

The precepts on which the precise system of botanical nomenclature
is based are derived into principles, rules and recommendations. The principles (Art. 1—9, 10—14, 15—19) form the basis of the rules and recommendations. The object of the rules (Art. 19—74) is to put the nomenclature of the past into order and to provide for that of the future. They are always retroactive: names or forms of nomenclature contrary to a rule (illegitimate names or forms) cannot be maintained. The recommendations deal with subsidiary points, their object being to bring about greater uniformity and clearness especially in future nomenclature; names or forms contrary to a recommendation cannot on that account be rejected, but they are not examples to be followed.

1) Art. 19 is both a principle and a rule.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 1; WHEELER)

Change sentence 4 to read: „They are always retroactive except when expressly limited: . . . .“

PROP. 2 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Delete: „Names or forms of nomenclature contrary to a rule (illegitimate names or forms) cannot be maintained.”
Add the following to this Article: „Where necessary notes are added in order to make the meaning of the rules, or of the words used in them, unequivocal and precise.”

PROP. 3 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Art. 2B: The rules are divisible into three main categories according as they pertain to (a) validity, (b) legitimacy, and (c) propriety of names.

(a) The validity rules determine when a name shall have a claim to recognition by botanists, and so they treat of: (i) the admissible order of the different categories of taxonomic groups; (ii) the formation of names to denote these categories; (iii) the nature of the description or citation with which a name or its epithet is to be associated; and (iv) the nature of the publication wherein the descriptions and names are published. Names instated in violation of any one of these rules are invalid, having no status under the Rules (Art. 19A).

(b) The legitimacy rules decide the correct name for a given taxonomic group in given circumstances (Art. 16A), and so deal (i) with the priorability and impriorability of names and epithets (Art. 52B—F), (ii) with the use of a name or epithet on transference of a taxonomic group from one nomenclatural position to another (Art. 53A bis), and (iii) with the claims of two or more priorable names or epithets for the same taxonomic group (Art. 56A bis). Names in use contrary to any one of these rules are illegitimate.

(c) The propriety rules decide (i) the correct spelling of names and
epithets, (ii) the correct gender of these names and epithets, and (iii) the correct manner of citing the names both of the author who first validated the names and epithets noting the taxonomic groups, and of the author who first placed the epithet in the correct position. Nomenclatorial expressions offending any of these rules will be improper; these offences affect neither the validity nor the legitimacy of the names or epithets.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Wheeler) was accepted by the Utrecht Conference and it is recommended for acceptance to the Congress. Proposal 2 (Furtado) was rejected by the Utrecht Conference, as it is no real improvement. Proposal 3 (Furtado) is an attempt to give a more precise definition of the contents of the original article but as all these points are dealt with in subsequent chapters, the addition seems superfluous and it is therefore proposed to reject.

ART. 3

The rules of nomenclature should be simple and founded on considerations sufficiently clear and forcible for everyone to comprehend and be disposed to accept.

NO PROPOSALS

ART. 4

The essential points in nomenclature are: (1) to aim at fixity of names; (2) to avoid or to reject the use of forms and names which may cause error or ambiguity or throw science into confusion. Next in importance is the avoidance of all useless creation of names. Other considerations, such as absolute grammatical correctness, regularity or euphony of names, more or less prevailing custom, regard for persons, etc., notwithstanding their undeniable importance are relatively accessory.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)

Add after „fixity of names” the following phrase: „in a definite taxonomical conception.”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 24; MANSFELD and ROTHMALER)

Der letzte Abschnitt soll lauten:
Entsprechend dem Grundsatz „ein Name ist ein Name” sind sonstige Gesichtspunkte, wie vollige grammatische Richtigkeit, wortmassige Bedeutung, Regelmassigkeit oder Wohlklang der Namen, Ruckicht auf Personen usw. fur die Nomenklatur gleichgultig.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Japanese Botanists). Art. 13 admits that the de-
Definition of the taxonomic categories may vary according to individual opinion, and it seems therefore correct to specify the expression "fixity of names" by the proposed addition, which might perhaps be read: "in each taxonomic group".

Proposal 2 (Mansfeld & Rothmaler): This appears to be an improvement, but the first words are perhaps better omitted. The rapporteur proposes to read: "Other considerations, such as absolute grammatical correctness, adequacy, regularity or euphony of names, regard for persons, etc. are of no value in questions of nomenclature".

ART. 5

In absence of a relevant rule, or where the consequences of rules are doubtful, established custom must be followed.

PROPOSAL 2 (1940 - 14; Airy-Shaw and Burtt)

"In the absence of a relevant rule, or where the consequences of rules are doubtful, established custom must be followed." Replace by:

"In the absence of a relevant rule, established custom must be followed. Where the consequences of rules are doubtful, the matter should be immediately submitted to the Executive Committee, pending whose report no nomenclatural changes should be made."

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

At the Utrecht Conference it was unanimously decided to leave Art. 5 as it stands.

ART. 6

Botanical nomenclature is independent of zoological nomenclature in the sense that the name of a plant is not to be rejected simply because it is identical with the name of an animal. If, however, an organism is transferred from the animal to the plant kingdom, its validly published names are to be accepted as botanical nomenclature in the form prescribed by the rules of botanical nomenclature, and if an organism is transferred from the plant to the animal kingdom, its names retain their status in botanical nomenclature.

NO PROPOSALS

ART. 7

Scientific names of all groups are usually taken from Latin or Greek. When taken from any language other than Latin, or formed in an arbitrary manner, they are treated as if they were Latin. Latin terminations should be used so far as possible for new names.
PROP. 1 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)
In art. 7, 18, 38, 41 and in the similar examples, the words groups or group are desirable in altering for taxonomic groups and taxonomic group respectively.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)
Add the following: „Names of taxonomic groups are normally in the nominative singular or plural, sometimes in the genitive, but they are susceptible to vary in case and number whenever so required by usage or grammar.
„Examples: Monographia Potentillarum; Species Batorum; Differt a Carice laxiore...; Corni oppositijoliae; Folia var. typici...”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR
Proposal 1 (Japanese Botanists): Seems superfluous. When art. 8 is amended in accordance with Lam’s proposal, the Editorial Committee will substitute the term „group” by „taxon” in every place where this seems desirable.

Proposal 2 (Boivin): This addition is undesirable. The examples show that the proposer aims at the use of good Latin, but this is no special concern of nomenclature.

ART. 8
Nomenclature deals with: (1) the terms which denote the rank of taxonomic groups (Art. 10—14); (2) the names which are applied to the individual groups (Art. 15—72).

PROP. 1 (1950 — 5; LAM)
Modify as follows:
Nomenclature deals with: (1) the terms which denote the rank of taxonomic groups, units, categories (Art. 10—14); taxonomic groups of any rank will, in the Rules, generally be referred to as taxa (singular: taxon); (2) the names which are applied to the individual taxa (Art. 15—72).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR
Proposal 1 (Lam): The original wording of Lam’s proposal was slightly different. It was modified as above by the Utrecht Conference and carried unanimously. In case the proposal is accepted, the Editorial Committee will bring the wording of the Rules in accordance with this proposal.

NEW ARTICLE 8bis

PROP. COMMITTEE UTERCHT CONFERENCE
A legitimate name or epithet is one that is in strict accordance with the Rules. Illegitimacy is defined in Art. 60.
Effective publication is publication in strict accordance with Art. 36. Valid publication is publication in strict accordance with Art. 37—45. Note: A correct name is the legitimate name of a taxon with a particular circumscription, position and rank.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The original draft of this proposal was submitted by Lanjouw to the Utrecht Conference. A committee consisting of Fosberg, Hylander, Lanjouw, Ramsbottom and Sprague gave it its present form, in which it was accepted by the Conference.

ART. 9

The rules and recommendations of botanical nomenclature apply to all classes of the plant kingdom, recent and fossil, with certain distinctly specified exceptions.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 33; Newman)

Substitute for „to all classes of”: „throughout”.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposal seems reasonable and is recommended for acceptance.

CHAPTER II. CATEGORIES OF TAXONOMIC GROUPS, AND THE TERMS DENOTING THEM

ART. 10

Every individual plant, interspecific hybrids and chimaeras excepted, belongs to a species (species), every species to a genus (genus), every genus to a family (familia), every family to an order (ordo), every order to a class (classis), every class to a division (divisio).

PROP. 1 (1950 — 5; Lam)

Modify as follows: „Every individual plant is treated as belonging to a number of taxa of consecutive rank and consecutively subordinate, of which the species is the basic one, or it may represent a hybrid or chimaera. The consecutive upward taxa are: Species (species), genus (genus), family (familia), order (ordo), class (classis), division (divisio), which means that every species belongs (is to be assigned) to a genus, every genus to a family, etc.”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 10; Schopf)

Add after the words „every genus to a family (familia)” the following phrase: „certain artificial groups of fossil plants excepted”.
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PROP. 3 (1950 — 29; MANSFELD and ROTHMALER)

Add at the end of the Article: „Jede Abteilung zu einem Stamm (phylum)“.

PROP. 4 (1950 — 33; NEWMAN)

Add at the end of the Article: „of the plant kingdom (regnum vegetabile)“.

PROP. 5 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Read in stead of „individual plant“: „plant individual“.

PROP. 6 (1950 — 72; CAMP)

Modify to read as follows: „Every individual plant, those of certain categories such as interspecific hybrids, graft chimaeras, and others excepted, belongs to a species ... etc.” (Vide proposals re Arts. 31—34, 34bis et ter, and Appendix VII.)

PROP. 7 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Revise as follows: The classification under the Linnean system so far recognizes the following ranks or categories of taxonomic groups enumerated in their descending order: Regnum vegetabile, Divisio, Subdivisio, Classis, Subclassis, Ordo, Subordo, Familia, Subfamilia, Tribus, Subtribus, Genus, Subgenus, Sectio, Subsectio, Species, Subspecies, Varietas, Subvarietas, Forma and Subforma.

Note 1: If this list of categories is insufficient, it may be augmented by the intercalation of supplementary categories provided that this does not introduce confusion or error.

Examples: Series and Subseries are categories which may be intercalated between Subsection and Species.

Note 2: (a) These categories of groups shall be classified philosophically as follows: Necessary (essential to the binary binomial system) and Accessory (non-essential to the system). The Necessary groups may again be divided into Fundamental and Non-Fundamental; and the Accessory into Subdivisionary and Disjunctive.

(b) The Fundamental Necessary groups are the Genus and the Species; only on these two the entire binomial system has been built. The Non-Fundamental Necessary groups are family, order, class and divisio; at one time these groups did not exist in the Linnean system, though now they are necessary to phylogenetic taxonomy of the Fundamental groups.

(c) The Accessory groups, though not essential to the system are useful. The Subdivisionary groups divide a superior group into two or more parts in order to show the affinities of the inferior group and the superior group; a Subdivisionary group itself is permitted
to be again divided and subdivided into subordinate groups according to convenience (Note 1). Subdivisionary groups can never be less than two under their immediate superior group. Prior to 1930 Subspecies were both Subdivisionary and Necessary, but now they are only Subdivisionary groups (Art. 37A bis Note 5).

(d) Disjunctive groups, which include varieties and subvarieties, represent minor deviations from the standard established by the type specimen, varieties being minor deviations from the species sensu stricto, and subvarieties from varieties sensu stricto. Forms and Subforms (which are distinguished on characters either permanent and hereditary, or transient, or required under special conditions), may be distinguished as forma and subforma biologica, specialis, juvenilis, adulta, cultigena, hybrida, apomicta, choronomica, etc. These are not taxonomic groups in the proper sense of the word, and their names being admitted as special subjects to the Nomenclatural Rules, shall not interfere with the priority or homonymy of the names of the superior groups.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Lam): Lam's original proposal was amended by the Utrecht Conference and unanimously accepted. On a suggestion of Dr Bremerkamp I propose the following rewording of the first sentence: „For nomenclatural purposes the species is regarded as the central taxon”.

Proposal 2 (Schöpf): The proposed addition will be necessary if the proposals on organ genera etc. of the palaeobotanists are accepted, but instead of „fossil plants” I should prefer the term „botanical fossils”.

Proposal 3 (Mansfield and Rothmaler): This proposal seems superfluous as in our opinion divisio and phylum are taxa of the same rank. The addition of the term „phylum”, although perhaps not necessary, would do no harm.

Proposal 4 (Newman): This article is dealing with taxa (taxonomic groups); as we confine ourselves to the Plant Kingdom we can hardly consider the latter as a taxon.

Proposal 5 (Hylander): It is proposed to leave this to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal 6 (Camp): In our opinion this has already been expressed in proposal 1.

Proposal 7 (Furtado): We believe that the main part of this proposal does not materially differ from Prop. 1. Note 1 is superfluous, as this matter is dealt with in Art. 11. Note 2 deals with the philosophy of taxonomy and is therefore entirely out of place in the rules.

ART. 11

In many species, varieties (varietas), forms (forma), and races or biological forms (forma biologica) are distinguished; in parasitic species special forms (forma specialis), and in certain cultivated species modi-
fications still more numerous; in many genera sections (sectio) are distinguished, in many families tribes (tribus)

**PROP. 1 (1950 — 5; LAM)**

It is proposed that Article 11 will take the place of Art. 12 (while Art. 12 becomes Art. 11) and to modify the Art. as follows:

„Similarly a species may be subdivided on the same principles, the main consecutive downward taxa being: variety (varietas) and form (forma). If it is desired to intercalate intermediate taxa, the series might be: Subspecies, Varietas, Subvarietas, Forma, Forma biologica (race or biological form), Forma specialis (in parasitic species), Modificatio (modification).”

**PROP. 2 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

To take the place of Art. 12 and modify as follows: In the same way the taxonomic categories below the species are arranged after descending rank in a series as follows: subspecies (subspecies), variety (varietas), subvariety (subvarietas), form (forma).

In parasites, esp. parasitic Fungi, forma which are characterized by their adaptation to different hosts but are scarcely or not at all morphologically different, may be distinguished as „special forms” (formae speciales, ff. spec.). These are for nomenclatural purposes treated as varieties.

**PROP. 3 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)**

Delete the Art. (as it is incorporated in Furtado’s proposed Art. 10).

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Lam): Lam’s proposal amended as above by the Utrecht Conference, is recommended for acceptance. The place of this Art. after the former Art. 12 is more logic.

Proposal 2 (Hylander): Acceptance of this proposal is not advisable: it partly deals with scientific taxonomy.

Proposal 3 (Furtado): See the comment under Art. 10.

**NEW ARTICLE 11 bis**

**PROP. SCHOPF (1950 — 22)**

Fossil plants not identified with extant genera may be classified in organ genera (organogenus) or in form genera (formigenus) depending on the particular nature of the fossils.

Definition: An organ genus (organogenus) is one whose identifying characteristics are derived from a restricted grouping of organs that are commonly connected organically in fossils.

Names of organ genera are subject to the same nomenclatural con-
siderations as elsewhere provided by the Rules for generic names. 
Note: Names based on essentially diverse organ groupings are re-
garded as differing in circumscription unless proved to be taxonomi-
cally correlated, i.e., representative of the same species and genus, 
through a definite interval of geologic time. Whenever such proof can 
be established, the respective generic groups and their included 
species may be merged as provided under Art. 57 bis.

Examples: (a) *Lepidostrobus* is an organ genus of the family Lepido-
dendraceae. *Lepidostrobus* differs in circumscription from *Lepidodendron* be-
cause correlation of species of the two genera has not been consistently established. 
It is reasonable to believe this degree of correlation may eventually be achieved; 
whenever correlation is accomplished the separate generic entities may be merged 
(Art. 57 bis) with precise expression of taxonomic groups and their relationships.

(b) *Myeloxylon* is an organ genus of the Medullosaceae, differing in circumscrip-
tion from the genus *Medullosa* and from the genus *Alethopteris*, although there 
is basis for believing that, in part at least, an intimate correlative relationship 
exists between these groups. These relationships have not yet been proved in 
specific detail; however all three genera may be referred to the same family of 
plants.

Definition: A form genus (formigenus) is one maintained for classi-
fying fossil specimens that lack important diagnostic characteristics 
indicative of natural affinity, although they present a certain basis for 
systematic discriminations of trivial rank. From genera are artificial 
in varying degree, in various instances being assuredly referred only 
to their respective division, class, or order, or some intermediate 
category. A fossil group that is referable to a family is not regarded 
as a form genus.

Names of form genera are subject to the normal nomenclatural con-
siderations as elsewhere provided by the Rules for generic names, 
with the following exceptions: (a) Form genera are included *incertae 
ris* within the lowest major category of established consistent alli-
ance. They are not invalidated by lack of assignment to a particular 
family, order, or class. (b) Form genera are regarded as differing in 
circumscription from generic groups normally assignable to families, 
hence are not in synonymic conflict with other more precisely defined 
groups that are, only in part, similar in alliance.

Note: Consonant with available evidence and information, a fossil 
specimen should be identified with the group that most precisely ex-
presses its natural affinity; identification with a group of precise 
affinity automatically excludes it from nomenclatural consideration 
in the same publication under some different combination of names. 
If a generalized determination is made inadvertently or in preference 
to one of more precise systematic significance, a nomenclatural 
transfer should be made to the group of narrower circumscription. 
Differing taxonomic interpretations, nomenclatural transfers, recom-
binations, etc., are to be expressed and cited normally as provided 
elsewhere in the Rules.

Examples: (a) *Dadoxylon* Endl. is a form genus that includes species not 
assuredly referred in toto to a plant group smaller than a division or a class
(depending on taxonomic interpretation of certain higher categories), and it is
doubtful whether a more precise generic reference will ever be possible for many
specimens of secondary wood that paleobotanists are called on to classify. Specific
differences may be recognized, however, that have geologic significance, and for
this reason a system of classification and nomenclature is necessary. Generic
identification with Dadoxylon is inappropriate if affinity can be established with
a less generalized group of plants. (b) Florinites S. W. and B. is a form genus
that includes species not totally referable to a single family of plants, possibly
not to a single order, but certainly referable to the Gymnospermae. Species of
Florinites are widely identifiable and important for geologic correlation of coal
beds, etc., and provision for orderly classification of these fossils is essential. If
strobilar characteristics are determinable so that identification can be made
with a genus of more precise significance, e.g., Walchianthus or Ernestiodendron,
generic identification with Florinites is inappropriate.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

It is recommended that this and all other proposals on palaeobotany will
be discussed after the advice of the Special Committee for Palaeobotany
has been received.
In our opinion it is not advisable to insert the articles dealing with fossil
plants in the Rules themselves but to assemble them in a Supplement to
the Rules. Where necessary notes might be added to the individual Rules,
in order to refer the reader to the Supplement.

RECOMMENDATION I

In parasites, especially parasitic fungi, authors who do not give special
value to forms characterized from a biological standpoint but scarcely or
not at all from a morphological standpoint, should distinguish within the
species special forms (forma specialis) characterized by their adaption
to different hosts.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Delete the Rec.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Acceptance of this proposal is recommended, as the case is already
provided for in Art. 11.

ART. 12

Finally, if a greater number of intermediate categories are required, the
terms for these subdivisions are made by adding the prefix sub (sub) to
the terms denoting the categories. Thus subfamily (subfamilia) denotes
a category between a family and a tribe, subtribe (subtribus) a category
between a tribe and a genus, etc. The classification of subordinated cate-
gories may thus be carried, for wild plants, to twenty-three degrees in the
following order: Regnum vegetabile. Divisio. Subdivisio. Classis. Sub-
Forma biologica. Forma specialis. Individuum.
If this list of categories is insufficient it may be augmented by the inter-
calation of supplementary categories, provided that this does not introduce confusion or error.

Examples: Series and subseries are categories which may be intercalate between subsection and species.

**PROP. 1 (1950 — 5; LAM)**

It is proposed that Art. 12 will take the place of Art. 11 (while Art. 11 becomes Art. 12) and to modify the Art. as follows:

,,If a greater number of intermediate taxa are required, the terms for these subordinate taxa are made by adding the prefix sub (sub) to the terms denoting the taxa. Thus subfamily (subfamilia) denotes a taxon between a family and a tribe, subtribe (subtribus) a taxon between a tribe and a genus, etc. The classification of subordinated taxa may thus be carried, for plants, to sixteen degrees in the following order: Regnum vegetabile. Divisio. Subdivisio. Classis. Subclassis. Ordo. Subordo. Familia. Subfamilia. Tribus. Subtribus. Genus. Subgenus. Sectio. Subsectio. Species. If this list of taxa is insufficient, it may be augmented by the intercalation of supplementary taxa, provided that this does not introduce confusion or error.”

**PROP. 2 (1950 — 23; TEILING)**

Vorgeschlagen wird die Einführung der Fachwörter facies, verkürzt fac., und Janus.

**PROP. 3 (1950 — 29; MANSFELD and ROTHMALER)**

Zwischen die Worte: Regnum vegetabile und Divisio ist das Wort Phylum einzufügen.

**PROP. 4 (1950 — 33; NEWMAN)**

In the third sentence read: for „plants”: „members of the plant kingdom” and for „Regnum vegetabile” read „Subregnum”.

**PROP. 5 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)**

After „Forma” add „Subforma”.
At the end of the first paragraph delete the following: „Individuum”.

**PROP. 6 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

Between these main categories, other categories may be intercalated, so that the following series is erected: division (divisio), subdivision (subdivisio), class (classis), subclass (subclassis), order (ordo), suborder (subordo), family (familia), subfamily (subfamilia), tribe (tribus), subtribe (subtribus), genus (genus), subgenus (subgenus), species (species).
If this list is insufficient, it may be augmented by the intercalation
of supplementary categories, provided that this does not introduce confusion or error.

Ex. The ex. now given under art. 12 are placed here.

**PROP. 7 (1950 — 72; CAMP)**

Add to examples: As information accumulates, other categories especially applicable to the genetic analyses of taxa (eg. apomict, clone, etc.) may be used, particularly where greater precision in nomenclature is desired.

**PROP. 8 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)**

Delete the Art. (as it is incorporated in Furtado’s proposed Art. 10).

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Lam): Lam’s proposal, amended by the Utrecht Conference, is recommended for acceptance. The words: „provided that this does not introduce confusion or error” could be omitted. It is the former Art. 11, but better placed here.

Proposal 2 (Teiling): This proposal deals with special taxa for Desmidiaceae. If the Special Committee for Algae agrees, the proposed additions might be mentioned in a note.

Proposal 3 (Mansfeld and Rothmaler): See comment under Art. 10.

Proposal 4 (Newman): The word „plants” seems to be quite clear and the alteration cannot be recommended. „Regnum vegetabile” is indeed not a subordinated taxon and it seems reasonable to omit it. If a taxon of a higher rank than „divisio” is needed then perhaps „subregnum” can be used.

Proposal 5 (Boivin): Both proposed alterations belong under the new proposed Art. 11. To add „subforma” is recommended; „individuum” has already been omitted.

Proposal 6 (Hyland): This proposal is the same as Proposal 1 with slightly altered wording.

Proposal 7 (Camp): It is recommended to insert this proposal as a note under Art. 11.

Proposal 8 (Furtado): See comment under Art. 10.

**RECOMMENDATION II**

The arrangement of a species in a genus or in a subdivision of a genus is made by typographic signs, letters or numerals.

The arrangement of subspecies under a species is made by letters or numerals; that of varieties by the series of Greek letters α, β, γ, etc.

Groups below varieties and also half-breeds are indicated by letters, numerals or typographic signs at the author’s will.

**PROP. 1 (1950 — 5; LAM)**

Rec. I becomes Rec. II; Rec. II becomes Rec. I.
PROP. 2 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)
Delete the Rec.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 62; WEATHERBY)
Change to read as follows: „The arrangement of species in a genus or in a subdivision of a genus, and of subdivisions of a species, is made by means of numerals, typographical signs, letters, or, in the case of varieties, may be made by Greek letters”.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR
Proposal 1 (Lam): If Lam’s proposal, with regard to the sequence of Art. 11 and 12 is accepted, the sequence of Rec. I and II has to be altered. Proposal 2 (Hylander): This proposal is recommended for acceptance. Proposal 3 (Weatherby): The wording proposed by Weatherby is better than the present one, but there seems to be no necessity to retain the Rec. Arrangement of equivalent taxa in a publication is no matter of nomenclature.

NEW RECOMMENDATION II bis
(1950 — 5; JONKER and LANJOUW)
The term „grex“ may be used for a category between a species and a subspecies.

ART. 13
The definition of each of these categories varies, up to a certain point, according to individual opinion and the state of the science; but their relative order, sanctioned by custom, must not be altered. No classification is admissible which contains such alterations. Examples of inadmissible alteration: a form divided into varieties, a species containing genera, a genus containing families or tribes: e.g. Huth (in Engl. Bot. Jahrb. XX, 337: 1895) divided the subgenera of Delphinium into „tribes“.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)
Modify the last sentence as follows: Names given to taxa placed in categories denoted by misplaced terms are treated as not validly published. Modify the examples as follows: Examples of misplacement of terms of categories: a form divided into varieties, a species containing genera, a genus containing families or tribes: eg. Huth (in Engl. Bot. Jahrb. XX, 337—365: 1895) subdivided the subgenera and sections of Delphinium into „tribes“ (tribus), and the names Delphinium tribus Involuta Huth, tribus Brevipedunculata Huth, l.c. 365—368, etc. are treated as not validly published.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 48; HYLANDEL)
In the first sentence read for „sanctioned by custom“: „stated above“.
Modify the last sentence as follows: Names given to taxa placed in categories denoted by misplaced terms have no status under the Rules and should not be considered for purposes of priority. Modify the examples as follows: Huth (in Engler, Jahrb. XX, 1895, 337) subdivided the subgenera and sections of Delphinium into „tribes“ (tribus), e.g. tribus Involuta Huth and tribus Brevicalcarata Huth. These names have no status under the Rules.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Delete the Art. (as it is incorporated in Furtado’s proposed Art. 10).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Sprague): Accepted almost unanimously at the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 2 (Hylander): It is recommended to accept the first part of this proposal in the following wording: specified above in Art. 11 and 12. Acceptance of the last part of the proposal cannot be recommended; it is longer and not really better than Proposal 1.
Proposal 3 (Furtado): See Art. 10.

ART. 14

The fertilization of one species by another may give rise to a hybrid (hybrida); that of a subdivision of a species by another subdivision of the same species may give rise to a half-breed (mistus).

PROP. 1 (1950 — 5; LANJOUW)

Delete the Art. and replace it by the following note at the end of Chapter II: The definition and nomenclature of categories such as hybrids, artificial polyploids, chimaeras, etc., are dealt with in Chapter... c.q. Supplement.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 5; VAN DIJK)

Delete the Art. and replace it by the following Recommendation: The interfertilization of individuals belonging to different taxonomic units may give rise to forms to which a number of botanists would not care to assign a definite systematic status: in such cases the forms in question may be indicated by the use of terms taken from genetical terminology, such as hybrid (hybrida) or half-breed (mistus).

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Regulations regarding the nomenclature of interspecific hybrids and chimaeras are given in art. 31—33.
PROP. 4 (1950 — 72; CAMP)

„In taxonomic practice a hybrid individual or group is one in which is found a combination of characters derived through cross fertilization of individuals of two or more taxa. „Note: The intervention of cytogenetic phenomena such as apomixis and polyploidy may result in individuals which, although fundamentally of hybrid origin, would be treated otherwise than as hybrids in precise taxonomic practice.”

PROP. 5 (1950 — 72; CAMP)

„As expediency dictates, various hybrid categories also may be recognized as taxa.”

PROP. 6 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Delete the Art.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (L a n j o u w): After some discussion on the original proposal of L a n j o u w the above version, supplied by him, was accepted by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (V a n D i j k): Acceptance of this proposal is not recommended.

Proposal 3 (Hylander): In the proposed wording this is not a „Rule of Nomenclature”. Practically it agrees with Prop. 1, but then as an addition to chapter II.

Proposal 4 and 5 (C a m p): Proposal 4 is not recommended for acceptance. C a m p himself prefers his proposal 5 which he gives as an alternative. If proposal 1 is rejected, the acceptance of proposal 5 is recommended.

Proposal 6 (F u r t a d o): If the proposals 1—5 are rejected, acceptance of this proposal is recommended.

CHAPTER III. NAMES OF TAXONOMIC GROUPS

SECTION I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES; PRIORITY

PROP. 1 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Modify the title of section 1 as follows: „General principles; priority; conservation of names”.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposal is not recommended for acceptance. It is in my opinion better to leave conservation of names in the present place.
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ART. 15

The purpose of giving a name to a taxonomic group is not to indicate the characters or the history of the group, but to supply a means of referring to it.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Delete the Art.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Acceptance of this proposal is not advisable. It certainly is „a general principle“ to state in the Rules the purpose of giving a name.

ART. 16

Each group with a given circumscription, position and rank can bear only one valid name 1), the earliest that is in accordance with the Rules of Nomenclature.

1) In genera and groups of higher rank, the valid name is the earliest name published with the same rank, provided that this is in conformity with the Rules of Nomenclature and the provisions of Arts. 20 and 21.

In subdivisions of genera the valid name is the earliest name published with the same rank provided that this name and its combination with the generic name are in conformity with the Rules of Nomenclature. In species and groups of lower rank, the valid name is the binary or ternary combination containing the earliest epithet published with the same rank, provided that this combination is in conformity with the Rules of Nomenclature.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Revise as follows: Each taxonomic group with a given circumscription, position, and rank can bear only one legitimate name, the one that is in accordance with the type and priority principles.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 5; LAM)


PROP. 3 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)

Insert before „position“ the word „systematic“.

PROP. 4 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Modify as follows: A legitimate name or epithet is a name or epithet in strict accordance with the Rules; names and epithets which are not in strict accordance with the Rules are called illegitimate. An epithet is not considered illegitimate only because it was originally published under an illegitimate generic name but must be taken into consideration for purposes of priority if the epithet and the resp. combination are in other respects in accordance with the Rules. In
the same way, an epithet of a subspecies or a taxon of a lower rank may be legitimate even if originally published under an illegitimate name of the subsequent higher taxon.

For each taxon with a particular circumscription, position and rank only one name can be legitimate; this is called the correct name. The correct name of a taxon of a rank above species is the earliest legitimate name given within the same rank to the same taxon (or to a taxon including it or making part of it) unless — as to names of orders and higher taxa, families and genera — another name is chosen according to art. 17, or unless — as to names of infrageneric taxa — it will, after transfer under another generic name than the original, be in conflict with the provisions in art. 26.

In species and binarily designated interspecific hybrids and chimaeras the correct name is the binary combination containing the earliest legitimate epithet given in a binary combination to the same taxon (or to a taxon including it or making part of it) and placed under the correct generic name, with the restrictions mentioned in art. 28, 41 and 47bis and provided that it will not be in conflict with art. 61 or 64.

In taxa of lower rank the correct name is the combination containing the earliest legitimate epithet given within the same rank (cfr below art. 29) to the same taxon (or to a taxon including it or making part of it) and placed under the correct name of the subsequent higher taxon, provided that the combination will not be in conflict with art. 65.

In no cases has a name or an epithet any claim to priority outside its own rank.

Concerning names of pleomorphic Fungi and of diplobiontic Algae there are given special regulations in art. 57—58.

For the correct names of organ genera, artificial genera (form genera) and combination genera of fossil plants, see App. ...

**PROP. 5 (1950 — 62; WEATHERBY)**

Art. 16, footnote. Note to Editorial Committee: If Rehders's proposal re Art. 58 and that of Gleason numbered Art. 30 bis are accepted, the third paragraph will have to be altered to read somewhat as follows: "In species, the valid name is the binary combination containing the earliest epithet published in the rank of species, provided," etc.

"In subdivisions of species, the valid name is the ternary [or other] combination containing the earliest epithet published in any rank subordinate to species, provided that this combination is in conformity with the Rules of Nomenclature; except as provided in Art. 30 bis for subdivisions containing the type of the species."

**PROP. 6 (1950 — 84; LAM)**

In consequence of the proposed new Art. 22 bis sub (f) the following alteration is proposed. — Read: Each taxon below the rank of a suborder with (etc.) 
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Nomenclature. For taxa above the rank of a family only the endings are compulsory.

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Furtado): The acceptance of this proposal is not recommended.
Proposal 2 (Lam): This proposal was unanimously agreed to at the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 3 (Japanese Botanists): As this proposal is a textual amendment, its consideration can be left to the Editorial Committee.
Proposal 4 (Hylander): Acceptance of this proposal is not recommended. It partly deals with matters already provided for in the new article 8 bis, and partly with provisions made in articles furtheron in the Rules. The attempt to take every contingency into account makes the wording unnecessarily cumbersome.
Proposal 5 (Weatherby): If the proposals mentioned by Weatherby are agreed upon, this proposal too will have to be accepted, although its form may in that case perhaps be amended.
Proposal 6 (Lam): See comments under Rec. VIII.

**ART. 17**

No one may change a name (or combination of names) without serious motives, based either on more profound knowledge of facts or on the necessity of giving up a nomenclature that is contrary to the Rules.

**PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)**

Modify as follows: No one may change, modify, or refuse to accept a name, or epithet, merely because it is badly chosen, or disagreeable, or because another is preferable or better known.

**PROP. 2 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

Delete the Art.

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Furtado): This proposal was unanimously rejected by the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 2 (Hylander): Though the article is more or less superfluous it certainly does no harm. It only stresses the importance of the rules, and for this reason we propose to retain it.

**RECOMMENDATION III**

Changes in nomenclature should be made only after adequate taxonomic study.

**NO PROPOSALS**
SECTION 2. THE TYPE METHOD

ART. 18

The application of names of taxonomic groups is determined by means of nomenclatural types. A nomenclatural type is that constituent element of a group to which the name of the group is permanently attached, whether as an accepted name or as a synonym. The name of a group must be changed if the type of that name is excluded (see Art. 66).

The type of the name of an order or suborder is a family, that of the name of a family, subfamily, tribe or subtribe is a genus, that of a generic name is a species, that of the name of a species or group of lower rank is usually a specimen or preparation. In some species, however, the type is a description or figure given by a previous author. Where permanent preservation of a specimen or preparation is impossible, the application of the name of a species or subdivision of a species is determined by means of the original description or figure.

Note: The nomenclatural type is not necessarily the most typical or representative element of a group; it is merely that element with which the name of the group is permanently associated.

Examples: the type of the name Malvales is the family Malvaceae; the type of the name Malvaceae is the genus Malva; the type of the name Malva is the species Malva sylvestris L.; the type of the name Polyporus amboinensis Fries is the figure and description in Rumph. Herb. Amboin. VI, p. 129, t. 57, fig. 1.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

In the first paragraph instead of „see Art. 66” in brackets read: „see Arts. 50—52, 53b and Appendix I.”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 5; LANJOUW)

Delete the last sentence of paragraph 1. Delete the whole second paragraph.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 11; GLEASON)

Read for group: taxonomic group.

PROP. 4 (1950 — 22; SCHOPF)

Add to the Art.:
Names based on types derived from modern material always take nomenclatural precedence over names permanently attached to fossil or subfossil specimens of congeneric affinity.

Note: Names based on fossil types cannot be used again for modern plants in violation of the rule excluding later homonyms (see Art. 61).

Tentative examples: Adoption of this proposal would serve to validate the name Platycarya Sieb. and Zuc. (Abh. Akad. München. 3(3), 1843), which at present is a synonym of Petrophiloides Sowerbank (Foss. fruits London clay, 43, 1840). Had such a provision been available it would have obviated the need of con-
serving Sequoia Endl. (Synops. Conif.; p. 197, 1847) over Steinhauera Prosl. in Sternberg (Fl. Vorwelt 2, p. 202, 1838), about which a question of compatibility still exists (cf. Dayton, Leafl. Western Bot. 3(10), p. 217). Caryojuglans Kirchheimer (1935) described from a fruit found in German brown coal, and its living representative Rhamphocarya Kuang (1941); and the recent discovery of living Metasequoia are additional examples.

**PROP. 5 (1950 — 33; NEWMAN)**

Line 1: after „groups” add „of the rank of order or lower than order”.

**PROP. 6 (1950 — 46; BOTANISTES BELGES)**

Add: „Au cas où plusieurs spécimens sont désignés comme types par l’auteur d’un groupe type ♀ et type ♂ des espèces dioïques, type florifique et type fruitifique, etc.), cet auteur désignera un unique spécimen comme type du nom du groupe.”

**PROP. 7 (1950 — 46; BOTANISTES BELGES)**

— Pour la typification, les botanistes belges proposent d’adopter les diverses catégories de types définies par G. Trouplin (Bulletin de la Société Royale de Botanique de Belgique, tome 82, 1949) comme suit:

A. **Types primaires:** groupant tous les spécimens faisant partie du matériel type original, c’est-à-dire le ou les spécimens considérés par l’auteur d’un groupe nouveau, lors de la description originale, comme appartenant à ce nouveau groupe.

1. **Holotype:** spécimen unique cité ou choisi par l’auteur et auquel est attaché d’une façon permanente le nom d’un nouveau groupe créé.
2. **Isotype:** tout spécimen double de l’holotype.
3. **Paratype:** tout spécimen autre que l’holotype et l’isotype.
4. **Syntype:** tout spécimen du matériel type original quand l’holotype n’est pas cité ou choisi.
5. **Lectotype:** tout spécimen choisi parmi les syntypes lorsque l’holotype n’est pas indiqué — ou parmi les isotypes et para-types lorsque l’holotype a disparu.

B. **Types secondaires:** groupant tous les spécimens déterminés ultérieurement à la description originale et rattachés au groupe soit par l’auteur lui-même, soit par tout autre auteur.

6. **Topotype:** tout spécimen authentifié récolté dans la même localité que celle de l’holotype.
7. **Neotype:** tout spécimen choisi comme holotype nouveau lorsque tout le matériel des types primaires reste introuvable.

**PROP. 8 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

Modify as follows: The application of the scientific names of orders
and lower but supraspecific taxa is determined by means of nomen-
clatural types to which the names are permanently attached. The
same holds for species and lower taxa if such types were chosen at
the valid publication of the name or if it has later been possible to
choose them. In the absence of types, whether original or of later
date, the application of the name is determined according to the
regulations given in App. . . .

The nomenclatural types of the names of supraspecific taxa are taxa
of specific or higher rank, those of names of species and lower taxa
are plant individuals in the living state or preserved in the form of
herbarium specimens or preparations or represented by figures.

The nomenclatural type of a name may be chosen by its original
author already at the valid publication of the name (eotype), or it
is automatically the type as being the only element on which the
name was based (haplotype); these two categories are together called
prototypes. The contrary to prototype is lectotype, i.e. a type chosen
after the valid publication of the name.

The type of the name of an order or suborder is a family, that of the
name of a family, subfamily, tribe or subtribe is a genus, that of a
genus or a subdivision of a genus is a species. For names of supra-
generic taxa derived from a generic name, the type is the genus
bearing that name resp. the family to which it belongs. Regulations
regarding the application of names of species and lower taxa, esp.
as to the choice of types and type substitutes, are found in App. . . .

PROP. 9 (1950 — 62; AMERICAN BOTANISTS)

After paragraph 2 insert the following sentence:
"If a species is divided into subspecies, the type of one of them is
the same as the type of the species; this holds also for all other sub-
divisions of species."

PROP. 10 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Delete the last sentence of the first paragraph.
Transfer the second parag. with the examples to New Art. 50.
Revise the first sentence of the note as follows: "The nomenclatural
type does not necessarily represent a group which is genetically the
most simple, phylogenetically the most ancient, ecologically the most
common, taxonomically the most polymorphic, or physiologically the
most perfect."

PROP. 11 (BREMEKAMP)

Add after the first two sentences:
"The type of a taxon is that of the oldest valid name under which
the latter has been described, no matter whether this name is
legitimate or illegitimate."
COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Unanimously rejected by the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 2 (Lanjouw): This proposal was accepted by the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 3 (Gleason): This seems to be a useful suggestion for the Editorial Committee.
Proposal 5 (Newman): Not recommended for acceptance. Taxa of higher rank too should be determined by nomenclatural types.
Proposal 6 (Botanistes Belges): This proposal is recommended for acceptance. If proposal 2 is accepted, the proposed addition could be placed as a Note to the new article 18 bis.
Proposal 7 (Botanistes Belges): The proposed list should not be included in this Article but either in an Appendix or in a new article. It seems desirable to add that the Holotype is the nomenclatural type of a taxon i.e. the type meant in Art. 18.
Proposal 8 (Hylland): It is recommended to reject this proposal. In our opinion the object is better served with acceptance of proposal 2 and the proposed new articles. It needlessly complicates the matter by the introduction of terms like haplotype etc.
Proposal 9 (American Botanists). This is a useful addition. However if proposal 2 is accepted it must be referred to the New Art. 18 bis where the matter is already provided for.
Proposal 10 (Furtado): Acceptance of this proposal is not advisable.
Proposal 11 (Bremekamp): It is certainly absolutely necessary that in this article is stated whether the types of illegitimate names have a status under the Rules or not. I would prefer however to add to the article: "The nomenclatural type of an illegitimate name has no status under the Rules".

NEW ARTICLE 18 bis

PROP. 1950 — 5; LANJOUW. UTRECHT CONFERENCE

"The nomenclatural type of a species or that of a taxon below the rank of species is a single specimen which is indicated as the type by the author of the name, except in the following cases (1, 2 and 3), and in that of Art. 18 quater.
1) For small herbaceous plants and for most non-vascular plants the type may consist of more than one individual, which ought to be conserved permanently and assembled on one herbarium sheet or preparation. If it is proved later that such a type herbarium sheet or preparation contains parts belonging to more than one taxon, the
name must remain attached to that part which corresponds most nearly with the original description.

2) For plants for which it is impossible to preserve a type specimen, the type may be a figure and/or a description.

3) In a species without a type specimen, the type may be a description or figure.

4) If a species is divided into a number of taxa of the same rank, the nomenclatural type of the species must be the type for one of them."

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposal modified as above by the Utrecht Conference was accepted at that Conference unanimously.

NEW ARTICLE 18 ter

PROP. 1950 — 5; LANJOUW

„The nomenclatural type of a division or of any taxon between a division and a class is a class, that of a class and of taxa between a class and an order is an order, that of an order and of taxa between an order and a family is a family, that of a family and of taxa between a family and a genus is a genus, that of a genus and of taxa between a genus and a species is a species.“

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This new article was accepted by the Utrecht Conference.

It is suggested to add to the article the following paragraph (see the proposal by Fosberg under New Appendix I, sub 4 e):

„The nomenclatural type of a taxon above the rank of genus whose name is formed in accordance with the Rules, is always the lower taxon whose name was derived from the same root.“

NEW ART 18 quater

PROP. 1950 — 5; LANJOUW

„If no type has been indicated by the author who described the taxon or when the original type is lost or destroyed, a substitute type must be chosen. The author who first made the choice must be followed, unless it can be proved that the choice was not made in accordance with art. 18 quinquies.

A substitute type may be either a Lectotype or a Neotype. A Lectotype has always preference above a Neotype. A Lectotype is a substitute type chosen among those elements studied by the author of a name in those cases where that author failed to designate a type. The original description of the taxon concerned should be the basic guide.

A Neotype is a substitute type chosen in those cases where either the
original type is lost or destroyed. If the author of a name mentions apart of the type other specimens, the Neotype has to be chosen from the latter.

NEW ART. 18 quinquies
PROP. LANJOUW

"The choice of a Lectotype or a Neotype can never be binding unless it is sanctioned by an Intern. Botan. Congress.
Retypification will have to take place when the original type is discovered or when it can be shown that the new type rests upon a misinterpretation of the original description, etc.

NEW RECOMMENDATION III bis
PROP. LANJOUW

For other kinds of types, which have no nomenclatural value, the following terms are recommended:
Isotype or Typi duplum — A duplicate of the type specimen.
Paratype or Cotype — A specimen cited with original description other than the type and its duplicates.
Topotype — A specimen collected in the same locality as the type.

NEW APPENDIX
PROP. (1950 — 70; FOSBERG)

Appendix I. Regulations for the Determination of Types.
1. The choice of the original author, if definitely expressed at the time of the original publication of the name of a taxon, or, failing this, if definitely indicated by him later among his originally cited specimens or species (or subordinate taxa in taxa above the rank of genus), is final. If he only included one element, this must always be accepted as the type. If a species is based on a previously published description, the same considerations apply to material cited by its author.
2. When a new name is published as an avowed substitute for an older one, the type of the old one is automatically that of the new one.
3. Lectotypes may be chosen only when an author failed to designate a type, or when, in species or taxa of lower rank, the type has been lost or destroyed.
4. Designation of lectotypes should only be undertaken in light of an understanding of the group concerned. Mechanical systems, such as the automatic selection of the first species or specimen cited or specimens collected by the person after whom a species is named, should be avoided as unscientific and productive of possible future confusion and further change. The original description of the taxon concerned should be the basic guide.
   a. In choosing a lectotype any indication of intent by the author of
a name should be given preference unless it is contrary to his description. Such indications by the author as a figure, or an epithet such as typicus, genuinus, vulgaris, communis, etc., should be given due consideration. Lectotypes must be chosen from among elements that were definitely studied by the author up to the time the taxon was published, or that were included in it when it was published.

b. Other things being equal, specimens should be given preference over pre-Linnaean descriptions or plates in designating lectotypes of species.

c. In cases where two or more elements were included in the description, the reviewer must use his own judgement in selection of a lectotype, but if another author has already segregated out one or more elements, the residue or part of it should be designated as the typical element if its essential characters are included in the original description. If it can be shown that the element best fitting the description has been removed, it shall be restored and the type shall represent it.

d. The first choice of a lectotype should be followed by subsequent workers unless it can be shown that the choice does not fit the original description as well as another of the originally cited elements (specimens, species, or higher taxa). It should, however, be understood that no typification may be regarded as absolutely binding except that by the author (as cited in his original publication or as he mentioned only one specimen, species, or subordinate taxon) or by actual vote of an international botanical congress (i.e. types of conserved genera). Any subsequent indications, choices of lectotypes may be followed only if they are in agreement with the concept expressed by the original description.

e. Lectotypes of taxa above the rank of genus should be those subordinate taxa from which the names have been formed except where the names have not been so formed.

f. Lectotypes of taxa above the rank of species must be chosen from among the elements originally included in the taxa concerned.

g. Lectotypes of species or taxa of lower rank must be chosen from among cotypes (where no type was originally designated) or isotypes (in case of loss or destruction of the type), or if no isotype exists, from among paratypes. If none of these exist, the description or figure, or both, must be regarded as the type.

5. „Neotypes” carry no weight whatever except to illustrate the chooser’s opinion as to the species (or genus) indicated by the original description. Since they were not seen by the original author they can in no way be regarded as intrinsically indicating to what he attached the name or epithet.

6. For names of fossil species the lectotype specimen, where one is needed, shall be a specimen illustrated at the time of the first valid publication of the epithet. [This will only be practical if Schopf's
substitute third paragraph of Art. 45 or the idea contained therein be adopted.]

7. The procedure in the case of the names of organ genera, form genera, or the genera of fungi imperfecti, or any other such temporary or subsidiary genera, does not differ from that for ordinary genera.

Footnote 1. Definitions:

Type — The individual specimen, species, or other constituent element of a taxon indicated by the author of a name as that to which the name is permanently attached. (If a specimen often called holotype.)

Lectotype — The individual specimen, species, or other constituent element of a taxon chosen subsequently from among those elements studied by the author of a name prior to its publication or cited by him with its original publication in those cases where he failed to designate a type, or where a type specimen has been lost or destroyed.

Cotype — A specimen, species, or other constituent element of a taxon, cited in the original publication where no type was designated. (Sometimes termed syntype.)

Isotype — A duplicate of the type specimen.

Paratype — A specimen cited with the original description other than the type and its duplicates.

Neotype — A term applied to any specimen selected to serve as type which was not cited with the original description. Not in any sense a true type.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Of the above proposals, the first paragraph of Art. 18 quater was accepted. The rest of the original proposal Langouw was left for further consideration by a small committee.

As a result of careful reexamination of the matter I am now proposing the new Articles 18 quater and 18 quinquies and the new Recommendation III bis.

To these proposals I have added here a proposal by Fosberg for a new Appendix I as it is dealing with the same. Though in principle I fully agree with Fosberg, I think that it is better to have the various regulations on typification in the Rules and not in an appendix, while the type-method is one of the basic principles of our nomenclature. Moreover it is in my opinion better not to go in too much details. See also under App. I.

NEW RECOMMENDATION III ter

PROP. 1940 — 1 (WHEELER)

„When a name is proposed for conservation the type species should be stated for the name or names to be rejected as well as for the name to be conserved."

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposal was accepted by the Utrecht Conference.
NEW RECOMMENDATION III quater

PROP. 1950 — 48 (HYLANDER)

If a commonly used name, esp. a generic one, is found to be a later homonym or synonym and thus should be rejected by strict application of the Rules, and has not already been discussed as to conservation by an International Botanical Congress or its executive organs, it should, in cases where the earlier homonym or synonym is not in common use, be immediately proposed as a nomen conservandum and in the meantime, until the Executive Committee has made its decision, be retained.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This point is dealt with in Art. 22. In its present wording the latter states that the Executive Committee should provisionally approve. It is indeed true that the organisation is not very practical.

RECOMMENDATION IV

When publishing names of new groups, authors should indicate carefully the subdivision which is the type of the new name: the type-genus in a family, the type-species in a genus, the type-variety or specimen in a species. The type determines the application of the name in the event of the group being subsequently divided. When describing new species varieties or forms of parasitic plants, especially Fungi, the host plant of the type should be indicated.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 62; AMERICAN BOTANISTS)

Change the first sentence to read:
„When publishing a name of a new group, an author should indicate carefully the type of the new name, the type-genus in a family, the type-species in a genus, the specimen, preparation or figure in a species or group of lower rank.”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Transfer the Rec. after Art. 50.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (American Botanists): If the new Art. 18 bis is accepted this recommendation will have to be deleted; if it is not accepted the proposed alteration is to be recommended.
Proposal 2 (Furtado): Not recommended.

RECOMMENDATION V

When revising a genus an author should state which species he accepts as the nomenclatural type.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Transfer the Rec. after Art. 50.
COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Acceptance of this proposal is not recommended.

NEW RECOMMENDATION V bis

PROP. 1950 — 62 (CAMP)

„When the author of a genus of which no type was specifically designated in its original publication later enlarges the genus, the lectotype should be taken from the one or more species in the original publication and not from other parts of any later circumscription.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The acceptance is recommended. The proposal was accepted both by the Utrecht Conference and by the American Botanists.

RECOMMENDATION VI

In selecting a nomenclatural type for a genus of non-vascular Cryptogams, botanists should, where possible, choose a species that will fix the generic name as it is now commonly applied.

Examples: Hypoxylon Fr. (Summa Veg. Scand. 384—4). Fries first used the name for a genus to include 25 species now distributed in Ustulina, Anthostoma, Nummularia, Daldinia, Sordaria, etc. To take the first species, H. ustulatum as the type would displace the name Ustulina, and most of the other species which are now known as Hypoxylon would require another generic name. If, however, H. coccineum, species No. 11 in Fries’s list, a well known and widely distributed species, be taken as the type, the name Hypoxylon would be retained in its present general application and the nomenclature would be stabilized. — The genus Valsa Fr. (Summa Veg. Scand. 410) contained 44 species now placed in several different genera. The first species V. Sorbi is now known as a species of Eutypella. By selecting V. ceratophorc Tul. (V. decorticans Fr.) the name Valsa is retained in its present general application and many nomenclatural changes are avoided 1).

1) Numerous cases of this kind might be cited among the Fungi. Following the above recommendation would largely obviate the need of a lengthy list of nomina conservanda.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 62; WEATHERBY)

„When it is necessary to select a nomenclatural type for any group, it should be so chosen as to preserve established usage, if possible; and typifications by earlier authors should be retained, if possible.”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Transfer the Rec. after Art. 50.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Weatherby): Acceptance of this proposal is not advisable.
I wholly agree with the opinion expressed by Gleason in the report of the American Botanists. (The proposal was accepted by the American Committee). See the proposed new Art. 18 quater.
Proposal 2 (F u r t a d o): Not recommended.

RECOMMENDATION VII

The utmost importance should be given to the preservation of the original ("type") material on which the description of a new group is based. In microscopic Cryptogams the preparations and original drawings, in fleshy Fungi water-colour drawings and specimens suitably prepared or dried, should be preserved. The original account should state where the material is to be found.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 20; DIEHL)

Add as a second paragraph.
„For those cryptogams for which the starting points of nomenclature (cf. Art. 20) are post-Linnaean, but for which the first legitimate specific epithet is accepted from a previously published cited Linnaean or post-Linnaean specific epithet, the valid type is considered to be that of the accepted pre-starting point author."


PROP. 2 (1950 — 46; STEYAERT)

Replace the second sentence by the following:
„Pour la conservation de types de mycètes, on recourra à l'une des méthodes suivantes, par priorité dans l'ordre indiqué:
a) par exsiccata ou conservation dans un liquide approprié.
b) par cultures desséchées.
c) par préparations microscopiques.
d) par cultures vivantes.
e) par un art graphique: 1) dessin en couleur ou au trait.

2) photographie en couleur ou en noir.

Il est recommandé de recourir simultanément à plusieurs de ces méthodes. L'échantillon préparé par la technique la plus élevée dans l'ordre de priorité ci-dessus indiqué restant alors l'élément de base pour autant que l'organisme y soit représenté à l'état fructifié. Une culture vivante ou desséchée, une préparation microscopique ne peuvent donc être désignées comme types si l'exsiccatum dont elles proviennent porte des fructifications."
PROP. 3 (1950 — 46; BOTANISTES BELGES)

Add to last sentence:
"et éventuellement des lieux où les doubles de ces matériaux sont conservés lorsque l'auteur du nom les a vus."

PROP. 4 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Omit the word ("type").

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Diehl): To be referred to the Special Committees concerned. The proposed addition seems to be somewhat out of place in Rec. VII and might better be given the form of a new recommendation. It is suggested to omit the word "valid" as it is superfluous and might cause confusion.

Proposal 2 (Steyaert): To be referred to the Special Committee on Fungi.

Proposal 3 (Botanistes Belges): Recommended for acceptance.

Proposal 4 (Furtado): Recommended for acceptance, but in this case the word "original" should also be deleted.

SECTION 3. LIMITATION OF THE PRIORITY; STARTING POINTS, CONSERVATION OF NAMES

PROP. 1 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Delete this section and place its parts under section 1 and 5.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR.

This proposal is not recommended for acceptance.

ART. 19

A name of a taxonomic group has no status under the Rules, and no claim to recognition by botanists, unless it is validly published (see Section 6, Art. 37).

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9, 1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Revise the rule as follows:
Names, descriptions, publications, interpretations, typifications, or procedures contrary to a rule of validity are invalid, that is, they have no status under the Rules, and no claim to recognition by botanists; while those names, descriptions, etc., that satisfy every one of the validity rules are valid, that is, they have a status under the Rules and a claim to recognition by botanists. Names and descriptions denoting a classification contrary to Arts. 10—14 or published in invalid literature are not valid.
Add: „Note 1. The generic and/or specific names from works wherein genera and species have been treated in an orthodox terminology on philosophic grounds but have nevertheless been given the correct forms of botanical names, shall be admitted as valid under the Rules, provided they were so admitted by contemporary botanists, or in the subsequent editions of Linnaeus Sp. Plantarum. The same principle shall be applied to the names of other taxonomic groups.”

Examples: (1) Necker's philosophical ideas on classification are rejected because he called the Linnean Genera and Species as species and proles respectively; but Necker's names for the Linnean taxonomic groups (genera) were correctly formed and admitted as valid by contemporary botanists. These generic names shall therefore be admitted as valid under these Rules. The same principle applies to Adanson’s genera.

(2) Fries’s sectional and subgeneric names are in the correct form and were admitted as valid by contemporaries, though Fries had called his subgeneric subdivisions „tribus”. Hence they shall be accepted as valid under the Rules provided they satisfy other provisions for validity.

**PROP. 2 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

Modify as follows: In botanical nomenclature only such names are considered which are validly published, i.e. published in strict accordance with art. 36—48.

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Furtado’s interpretation of the terms valid and invalid is not recommendable.

The first part of the proposal was rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Hylander): It is recommended to let Art. 19 stand as it is.

**NEW ARTICLE 19 bis**

**PROP. 1940 — 9; FURTADO**

Rules of legitimacy regulate the use of names which are valid under Art. 19. The use of a valid name is correct or legitimate only if it satisfies everyone of the legitimacy rules: otherwise the use is illegitimate.

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

The proposal is not recommended for acceptance. See under Art. 18 bis.

**ART. 20**

Legitimate botanical nomenclature begins for the different groups of plants at the following dates: —

(a) *Phanerogamae* and *Pteridophyta*, 1753 (Linnaeus, *Species Plantarum*, (ed. 1)).
(b) Muscineae, 1801 (Hedwig, Species Muscorum).
(c) Sphagnaceae and Hepaticae, 1753 (Linnaeus, Species Plantarum, ed. 1).
(d) Lichenes, 1753 (Linnaeus, Species Plantarum, ed. 1).
(e) Fungi: Uredinales, Ustilaginales, and Gasteromycetes, 1801 (Persoon Synopsis methodica Fungorum).
(f) Fungi caeteri, 1821—32 (Fries, Systema mycologicum).
(h) Myxomycetes, 1753 (Linnaeus, Species Plantarum, ed. 1). The nomenclature of Fossil Plants of all groups begins with the year 1820. It is agreed to associate generic names which appear in Linnaeus's Species Plantarum, ed. 1 (1753) and ed. 2 (1762—63) with the first subsequent description given under those names in Linnaeus's Genera Plantarum, ed. 5 (1754) and ed. 6 (1764).

The two volumes of Linnaeus, Species Plantarum, ed. 1 (1753), which appeared in May and August, 1753, respectively, are treated as if they had been published simultaneously on the former date.

Example: The generic name Thea L. Sp. Pl. ed. 1, I (May 1753) and Camellia L. Sp. Pl. ed. 1, II (Aug. 1753) are treated as if they had been published simultaneously in May 1753. Under Art. 56 the combined genus bears the name Camellia, since Sweet (Hort. Suburb. Lond. 1818, 157), who was the first to unite the two genera, chose that name, citing Thea as a synonym.

**PROP. 1 (1940 — 7, 1950 — 62; PATRICK)**

Add to the exceptions: — Diatomeae, 1891 (De-Toni, „Sylloge Algarum, Vol. II, Bacillarieae”. The year 1891 is established as the publication date for the whole of volume two of De-Toni's „Sylloge Algarum”).

**PROP. 2 (1940 — 9, '50 — 83; FURTADO)**

Substitute for the first sentence the following: No literature can be valid unless it is validly published (cf. Art. 36 a). Valid botanical literature begins for the different groups of plants at the dates and with the books specified below: Revise the last sentence after the clause (h) as follows: Note 1: The generic and specific names in works adopted as the starting points of nomenclature for the different groups of plants shall be treated as valid, even when they are unaccompanied by any description, an exception being made only of those names that are
not correctly formed. Reference in those works to generic and specific descriptions published previously under the same name or another are invalid. For the purpose of typification, however, it is allowed to associate the Linnean genera in Species Plantarum (1753) and (1762-63) with their first subsequent description in Linnaeus's Genera Plantarum (1754) and (1764), provided this does not disturb an already accepted typification based on any one of the specific components in 1753 and 1762-63 as the case may be.

**PROP. 3 (1950 — 5; VAN DER WIJK)**

Add to Art. 20:
All works published in the same year as that of the work adopted as the starting-point, are treated as having been published before the latter work.

**PROP. 4 (1950 — 15; HORN AF RANTZIEN and OLSEN)**


**PROP. 5 (1950 — 20; DODGE)**

„It is moved to strike out '-32' in article 20 (f) so that it will read: (f) Fungi caeteri, 1821 (Fries, Systema Mycologicum).”

**PROP. 6 (1950 — 20; DIEHL)**

Emend to read as follows: „Fungi caeteri, Dec. 31, 1832. (Fries, Index to Systema mycologicum which includes also references to species considered in the Elenchus Fungorum (1828) and separate papers by Fries in Linnaea, 1828—1830.)”

**PROP. 7 (1950 — 22; SCHOPF)**

Replace the sentence beginning with „The nomenclature of Fossil Plants” by

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

**PROP. 8 (1950 — 33; NEWMAN)**

For lines 1 and 2 substitute: „Legitimate botanical nomenclature begins for each taxonomic group above the rank of order with the first valid name published after the year 1860; and, for taxonomic groups of order and lower than order, in the different groups of plants at the following dates: —“
PROP. 9 (1950 - 47, 1950 - 68; HERTER)

Modify as follows: Für alle pflanzengruppen gilt als Ausgangspunkt der legitimen Nomenklatur: Linné, Species Plantarum, editio 1.

PROP. 10 (1950 - 48; HYLANDER)

Names of taxa above the rank of order are not considered validly published if they were published before January 1, 1960.
Names of orders and lower taxa known only in the fossil state are not considered validly published if they were published before January 1, 1820.
Names of other orders and lower taxa are not considered validly published if they were published before May 1753 (Linnaeus, Species plantarum).
Names of species and lower taxa belonging to the following groups are not considered validly published if they were published before the following starting points:
Musci, excluding Sphagnaceae, 1801 (Hedwig, Species Muscorum),
Fungi: Uredinales, Ustilaginales, and Gasteromycetes, 1801 (Persoon, Synopsis methodica Fungorum),
Fungi ceteri (non Lichenes), 1821—32 (Fries, Systema mycologicum),
Algae: Hormogonales ceterae, 1886—88 (Bornet & Flahault, Revision des Nostocacées hétérocystées, ib. III—V, VII),
Algae: Desmidiaceae, 1848 (Ralfs, The British Desmidieae),
Algae: Oedogoniacae, 1900 (Hirn, Monogr. u. Iconogr. d. Oedogoniaceen, in Acta Soc. Scient. Fenn. XXVII, no. 1),
Algae: Diatomeae, ...
Bacteria, 1876.

Note 1. (20). The two volumes of Linnaeus's Species Plantarum, ed. 1 (1753), which appeared in May and August 1753, resp., are treated as having been published simultaneously on the former date.

Ex. As added in Amsterdam.

Note 2. (New) If a generic name was originally published before the resp. starting date of nomenclature (1753 or 1820) but was after that date republished in an unchanged re-edition or reprint of the same work (or in a re-edition or reprint changed merely as to title page etc.), this latter circumstance does not validate the publication.

1 (Footnote.) In cases of homonymy, names of orders and lower taxa, validly published for recent plants from May 1753 onwards but before 1820 must be taken into consideration also for taxa of the resp. rank known only in the fossil state.
Ex. The name Chamaedaphne was originally published in 1748 in a dissertation by Mitchell (in App. Acta Acad. Nat. Curios. VIII, 222) but reappeared in 1769 in a reprint with a new dedication but quite unchanged as to the text of the dissertation itself. The name had in the meantime been replaced by Mitchella L. (1753) but antedates the homonym Chamaedaphne Moench (Meth. 1794, 457). It has hence sometimes been proposed to substitute Cassandra D. Don (1834) for Chamaedaphne Moench but according to the above mentioned regulation the latter should be retained.

Note 3. (New) If the name of a species (or a lower taxon) belonging to one of the groups mentioned above under mom. a—i was originally published before the resp. starting point mentioned above and after that date republished in an unchanged re-edition or reprint of the same work (or in a re-edition or reprint changed merely as to title page etc.), this latter circumstance does not validate its publication.

Ex. The generic name Hypochaenus occurs in the so called 2nd ed. of Fries, Observationes mycologicae, published in 1824 but as pointed out by Rogers (Mycologia 31, 1939), this „2nd ed.” only consists of some copies of the original edition, published in 1815-18, with a new title inserted. The genus Hypochaenus in this sense was thus published before Fries, Syst. mycol. (1821-32), and specific names formed under it are therefore considered not validly published. Under Hypochaenus no specific names were validly published until 1832 (Fries, Syst. mycol. III), when the genus was published in quite another sense.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Patrick): To be judged by the Spec. Comm.
Proposal 2 (Furtado): Acceptance is not advisable.
Proposal 3 (Van der Wijk): This proposal was accepted in principle at the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 4 (Horn af Rantzien & Olsen): To be judged by the Spec. Committee.
Proposal 5 (Dodge): This proposal deals with the same question as proposal 3. For all works serving as a starting point certainly an exact date must be given.
Proposal 6 (Diehl): To be judged by the Spec. Committee.
Proposal 7 (Schopf): To be judged by the Palaeobotanical Committee.
Proposal 8 (Newman). Newman apparently goes out from the conviction that before 1860 no serviceable delimitation of the higher taxa has been given. If for these taxa no lists of nomina conservanda are supplied, the acceptance of this proposal would probably facilitate the creation of a suitable nomenclature.
Proposal 9 (Hertel): Recommended for rejection.
Proposal 10 (Hylander): Part of the alterations proposed by Hylander are already incorporated in proposals mentioned above. Acceptance of the proposed notes 2 and 3 is not advisable. The conservation of Chamaedaphne Moench does not require the creation of a new rule as it can simply be obtained by proposing it as a „nomen conservandum”. The case of Hypochaenus does not require a new rule either. Fries interpretation of 1815—18 was obviously rejected by himself in the
work that is accepted as the starting-point of the nomenclature of the
group to which this genus belongs.

**ART. 21**

However, to avoid disadvantageous changes in the nomenclature of genera
by the strict application of the Rules of Nomenclature, and especially of
the principle of priority in starting from the dates given in Art. 20, the
Rules provide a list of names which must be retained as exceptions. These
names are by preference those which have come into general use in
the fifty years following their publication, or which have been used in
monographs and important floristic works up to the year 1890.

Note 1. These lists of conserved names will remain permanently open
for additions. Any proposal of an additional name must be accompanied
by a detailed statement of the cases for and against its conservation.
Such proposals must be submitted to the Executive Committee, who
will refer them for examination to the Special Committees for the various
taxonomic groups.

Note 2. The application of conserved names is determined by nomen-
clatural types, or by substitute-types where necessary or desirable.

Note 3. A conserved name is conserved against all other names for the
group, whether these are cited in the corresponding list of rejected
names or not, so long as the group concerned is not united with another
group bearing a legitimate name. In the event of union or reunion with
another group, the earlier of the two competing names is adopted in
accordance with Art. 56.

Note 4. A conserved name is conserved against all earlier homonyms.

Examples. — The generic name *Spergularia* J. et C. Presl (1819) is con-
served against *Alsine* L. (1753), emend. Reichb. (1832) (= *Delia* Dum. +
*Spergularia*), although *Alsine* L. (1753), partim, is not included in the list of
rejected names: *Spergularia* was conserved as including *Delia* (*Alsine* L., partim).
— If the genus *Weihea* Spreng. (1825) is united with *Cassipourea* Aubl. (1775),
the combined genus will bear the prior name *Cassipourea*, although *Weihea*
is conserved, and *Cassipourea* is not. — If *Mahonia* Nutt. (1818) is reunited with
*Berberis* L. (1753), the combined genus will bear the prior name *Berberis*,
although *Mahonia* is conserved. — *Nasturtium* R. Br. (1812) was conserved only
in the restricted sense, for a monotypic genus based on *N. officinale* R. Br., hence,
if it is reunited with *Rorippa* Scop. (1760), it must bear the name *Rorippa*. — The
generic name *Swartzia* Schreb. (1791), conserved in 1905 against *Toumataea* Aubl.,
*Possira* Aubl. and *Hoelzelia* Neck., is thereby conserved automatically against the
earlier homonym *Swartzia* Ehrh. (1787).

**PROP. 1 (140 — 1; WHEELER)**

Note 2. Change to: „The application of *both* conserved and rejected

Footnote 1) See list of *Nomina conservanda proposita.*
names is determined by nomenclatural types, or by substitute-types where necessary or desirable."

Note 3, 2nd sentence, change to: „In the event of union or reunion with another group, the name to be retained is that of the group to which the larger number of species had been assigned prior to the conservation of either or any of the competing names.”

PROP. 2 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)
Delete Notes 3 and 4 and Examples.

PROP. 3 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)
Ein nur durch die Ausnahmsliste als nomen rejiciendum ungültig erklärter Name ist deshalb kein nomen invalidum und kann nicht von neuem gegeben werden.

PROP. 4 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)
The first phrase of the English text to read as follows: „However, in order to avoid disadvantageous changes in the nomenclature of genera entailed by the strict application of the Rules of Nomenclature.”

PROP. 5 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)
Note 4, Examples, line 9, „reunited” must read „united”.

PROP. 6 (1950 — 38; A. C. SMITH)
Modify as follows: However, to avoid disadvantageous changes in the nomenclature of families and genera by the strict application of the Rules of Nomenclature, and especially of the principle of priority in starting from the dates given in Art. 20, the Rules provide lists of names of families and genera which must be retained as exceptions. These names are by preference those which have come into general use in the fifty years following their publication, or which have been used in monographs and important floristic works up to the year 1890.

PROP. 7 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)
Under Note 4, delete the first example (Spergularia versus Alsiné) and substitute:

„Listera R. Br. (1813) is conserved against Diphryllum Raf. (1808); it is also conserved against Bifolium Pétiver, Opera, ed. Millan, t. 70, fig. 10, 11, 12 (1764), as adduced by Nieuwland, in Amer. Midland Nat. iii. 128 (1913) (if Pétiver's name be regarded as validly published), though Bifolium is not mentioned among names to be rejected.”
PROP. 8 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Modify as follows: In order to avoid disadvantageous changes in nomenclature, the International Botanical Congresses have the right to decide that generic names which have for a long time been in common use but which should by the strict application of the Rules be rejected, shall be retained.

These names (nomina generica conservanda), which are listed below in App. ... together with the corresponding names to be rejected (nomina rejicienda), are conserved against all earlier homonyms, whether mentioned in this list or not, and against all synonyms mentioned there as nomina rejicienda and also against all such generic names which are not mentioned in the list but are based on the same type species.

Ex. The generic name Swartzia ... (etc. = ex. 5 under the present art. 21, note 4).

Note. (21, notes 2—4). A name listed as nomen rejiciendum is only to be rejected as long as it is a synonym of the corresponding nomen conservandum, but should, if legitimate, be retained if the genus which it designates is taken as a separate genus. On the other hand, the nomen conservandum must be dropped, if the genus which it designates is united with another genus the correct name of which is of earlier date; the latter name must then be used for the combined genus.

Ex. The generic name Luzuriaga R. & P. (1802) is conserved against the earlier names Enargea Banks ex Gaertn. (1788) and Callizene Juss. (1789). If, however, Enargea Banks is considered to be a separate genus, the name Enargea should be retained for this. — In the same way, the genus Dichromena Michx (1803) should retain its name if treated as a separate unit, not included in Rhynchospora Vahl, Willd., although the name Dichromena is rejected in favour of Rhynchospora as designation for the combined genus. — If the genus Weitha ... (etc. = ex. 2 under art. 21, note 4). — If Mahonia ... (etc. = do., ex. 3). — Nasturtium R. Br. (1812) was conserved only in the restricted sense, for a genus based on Nasturtium officinale R. Br. and coinciding with the section Cardaminum of the genus Rorippa s.l.; hence, if it is reunited with Rorippa Scop. (1760), the latter name must be retained for the combined genus.

The application of both conserved and rejected names is determined by means of nomenclatural types (eutypes, haplotypes or lectotypes); these types are listed together with the resp. names in App. ... If a conserved generic name proves to be legitimately published for the same genus (with the same type species) at an earlier date than that mentioned in the list of nomina conservanda, it should be automatically dated from that earlier date and cited with that author; if the conservation under these circumstances proves to be unnecessary it should be automatically withdrawn.

Ex. The generic name Persea Gaertn. fil., Fruct. III (1805), is conserved against Farnesia Heist. in Fabr., Enum. pl. h. Helmst. ed. 2 (1763). but this conservation is unnecessary and should be cancelled, as the name Persea was already validly published as a legitimate generic name in the same sense (based on
Laurus Persea L.) by Miller, Gard. Dict. ed. 7 (1758). The correct name of the type species is Persea americana Mill., Gard. Dict. ed. 8 (1768), not P. gratissima Gaertn. fil. l.c. — In the same way, the conservation of the name Falcaria Host (1827) should be cancelled, as the same name was validly published as a legitimate generic name by Fabricius, Enum. pl. h. Helmst. /ed. 1/ (1759). The correct name of the type species is Falcaria vulgaris Bernh., Syst. Verz. Erfurt (1800), not F. Rivini Host l.c.

PROP. 9 (1950 — 64; LITTLE)

Change first sentence to read (additions in italics and deletion struck out):

"However, to avoid disadvantageous changes in the nomenclature of families, genera, and species by the strict application of the Rules of Nomenclature, and especially of the principle of priority in starting from the dates given in Art. 20, the Rules provide lists of names of families, genera, and species which must be retained as exceptions (Appendix II for family names and Appendix III for generic and specific names)."

After second sentence insert the following sentence:

"Also, these specific names shall concern only a limited number of species of economic importance and species otherwise widely known."

Note 2, add the following sentence:

"Any proposal of a specific name must cite the type specimen or substitute-type specimen where necessary or desirable and must be accompanied by a photograph of this specimen."

Add the following Note:

"Note 5. — In nomina specifica conservanda the specific epithet is conserved against all other specific epithets for the same species, so long as the species concerned is not united or reunited with another species bearing a legitimate name. The binary combination and generic name are not conserved, but the generic name and specific epithet may be conserved independently."

Add the following examples (to be formally proposed at the following Congress):

"The specific name Picea excelsa (Lam.) Link (1841; otherwise illegitimate under Art. 60 as nomenclaturally superfluous when published) is conserved against Picea abies (L.) Karst. (1881) and against Pinus abies L. (1753). If Picea were reunited with Pinus, the binary name would be Pinus excelsa Lam. (1778; also nomenclaturally superfluous when published). — Eucalyptus rostrata Schlecht. (1847) is conserved against E. camaldulensis Dehnh. (1832) and against the earlier homonym E. rostrata Cav. (1797). — Sequoia gigantea (Lindl.) Decne. (1854) is conserved against the earlier homonym Sequoia gigantea Endl. (1847). If the genus Sequoia Endl., nom. conserv., is divided, the binary name for this species becomes Sequoiadendron giganteum (Lindl.) Buchholz (1939)."

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (W h e e l e r): The proposed alteration in Note 2 was accepted by the Utrecht Conference. At the Utrecht Conference it was decided to leave Note 3 unchanged.
Proposal 2 (Furtado): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 3 (Handel-Mazzetti): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 4 (Sprague): By the Utrecht Conference referred to the Editorial Committee.
Proposal 5 (Japanese Botanists): This is recommended for acceptance as from the point of view of nomenclature it is of no importance that the two genera have been united before.
Proposal 6 (Smith): This proposal is recommended for acceptance. In order to provide also for orders (See New Art. 17 bis) it might be advisable to replace „families and genera” by „genera and taxa of a higher rank.”
Proposal 7 (Boivin): The decision on this point may be left to the Editorial Committee.
Proposal 8 (Hylander): I can not recommend this proposal as it means no real improvement. The examples might be recommended to the Editorial Committee for consideration.
Proposal 9 (Little): This proposal means the introduction of „epitheta specifica conservanda” in the Rules. The Special Committee concerned has to report on this and other proposals. I feel obliged to warn against acceptance of this article, as I am afraid that it will lead to hopeless confusion instead of clearing the way to „fixity of names”.

NEW ART. 21 bis

PROP. 1940 — 9; FURTADO

The conserved and rejected names must be classified in the following groups: (a) Orthographia nominum approbata; (b) Nomina rejecta aut invalidata; and (c) Nomina precedenda.

(a) Orthographia nominum approbata. The decisions given here affect only the orthography of the names placed in the list, but the dates of their publication (under the rejected orthography) are retained. Examples: Thus when Humiria Jaume St. Hil. (1805) is conserved against Houmiri Aubl. (1775) on orthographic grounds, Houmiri Aubl. (1775) must be spelt as Humiria and its full citation is Humiria Aubl. (1775) emend. orth. Jaume St. Hil. (1805) vice Houmiri. Similarly, Heleocharis R.Br. (1814) emend. orth. vice Eleocharis.

(b) Nomina rejecta aut invalidata. Names lose their valid status when placed here: if used again for the same or another taxonomic group with adequate description, these have the status of new names.

(c) Nomina precedenda: A name placed by the Congress in this category acquires a right of precedence in matters of priority or homonymy over certain other names specified in the decision and their later synonyms and homonyms, and over no others,
provided the specified names over which precedence is given are either synonymous or homonymous with the nomen pre-
cedendum.

Examples: (1) In the Rules Spergularia J. & C. Presl. (1819) has been con-
served against Buda Adans. (1763) and Tissa Adans. (1763). This means that either of these names are to yield precedence to Spergularia whenever they are synonymous with the latter, but not otherwise. It also means that all later synonyms of Buda and Tissa cannot claim priority over Spergularia, even though they be earlier than Spergularia itself. But should there be a priorable synonym to Spergularia which is earlier than Buda or Tissa, it would be able to claim right of priority over Spergularia until special decision of the Congress makes it yield that right to Spergularia.

(2) If it is desired to conserve Endlicheria Nees (1833) (Lauraceae) against Endlichera Presl. (1832) on the grounds of homonymy, then the latter must be mentioned vis-a-vis the former. Such a conservation would make Endlicheria Nees (1833) take precedence over Endlichera Presl. (1832) and its later ho-
monyms, but would not give Endlicheria Nees (1833) precedence over the syno-
nyms or homonyms that are earlier than Endlichera Presl. (1832). But this decision would lose its validity as soon as an amendment were introduced in the Rules to make Endlichera Presl. and Endlicheria Nees as non homonymous names.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Acceptance of this new article is not advisable. Group a is of little importance and b is not clearly designed. The present article 21 is suf-
ficient for our needs.

NEW ARTICLE 21 ter

PROP. 1940 — 9; FURTADO

Works listed in Appendix IX are treated as invalid, because their acceptance would constitute a serious impediment to botanical research. Only works of doubtful validity, or published posthumously thirty or more years after the deaths of the authors, or ignored generally by the contemporaries of the authors, may be listed in this Appendix.

(1) Rafinesque, Autikon Botanikon, 1840; (2) Mociño et Sessé, Flora Mexicana, 1888 et 1894; (3) ibid, Plantae Novae Hispaniae, 1886 et 1893; (4) Teyssmann et Binnendijk, (Plant Catalogue of the Buiten-
zorg Gardens), 1855; (5) Sir William Hunter, Plants of Prince of Wales Island, (ed. H. N. Ridley), 1909; (6) Voigt, Hortus Suburbanus Calcuttensis, 1845; (7) Numerous Theses including those of some of the pupils of Linnaeus, Thunberg, etc., Catalogues, Nomenclators and Indexes which have been ignored in larger works up to very recent times: e.g. Roxburgh, Hortus Bengalensis, 1814; Moon, Catalogue of Indigenous and Exotic Plants of Ceylon, 1824; Zinn, Catalogus Plantarum . . . . . . . . . . . . Göttingensis, 1757; Burman, Index to Rumphius's Herbarium Amboinense, 1755 et 1769; Stickmann, dissertation on Rumphius's Herbarium Amboinense, 1754 et 1759; Berzelius, dissertation on Nomenclator Botanicus, 1759; etc.
COMM. RAPPORTEUR

At the Amsterdam Congress a Committee was installed whose task it was to investigate whether the stability of our nomenclature would be enhanced when certain older taxonomic works were eliminated. Unfortunately, no report was received. In view of the manifold difficulties with which this problem is beset, it does not seem likely that a discussion of Furtado's proposal would lead to results. The rapporteur is of opinion that it would be advisable to put it in the hands of a special committee, which, however, ought to have time for an ample discussion. It is hardly to be expected that a report could be issued for discussion at this Congress.

NEW ARTICLE 21 quater

PROP. 1940 — 9; FURTADO

Both generic and specific names published in the works listed in Appendix X are treated as invalid if they have consistently been either ignored, or reduced to synonymy, in monographs and important floristic works published between 1798 (the date of Willdenow's *Species Plantarum*, Vol. I) and 1890 (the year preceding the publication of Kuntze's *Revisio*) both inclusive; both such names from books listed in Appendix X as have been either conserved in the Rules or used in one or more monographs or important floristic works (i.e. floristic works running to more than one volume) issued between 1798 and 1890 are treated as valid. Mere registration of names in nomenclators and indexes does not constitute their subsequent use under this rule. Only works published between 1753 and 1800 both inclusive may be included in this Appendix X.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

To be dealt with in the same way as Art. 21 ter.

NEW ART. 21 quinquies

PROP. 1950 — 48; (HYLANDER)

If an author who proposes a later homonym for conservation, at the same time validly publishes a substitute name for the earlier homonym to be rejected, this substitute name should be considered legitimate, if there was no synonym available that should have been adopted.

A generic name which has been rejected according to art. 17 should be replaced, if possessing one or more validly published synonyms, by this (resp. the earliest of them), even if this was superfluous and thus illegitimate when originally published, provided that it is not in conflict with art. 61 and has not been rejected according to art. 17.
Ex. The name Cuviera Koel. (1802), which has been rejected in favour of Cuviera DC. (1804), must be replaced by Hordelymus (Jessen) Harz (1885) although this was, when originally published, superfluous. (In this case there is no other synonym available.)

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Introduction of this article cannot be recommended before its consequences are quite clear. To this end it should be submitted to a Special Committee. It might appear that a somewhat less strict application of the Rules might lead to the same result.

NEW ARTICLE 21 sexies

PROP. 1950 — 48; (HYLANDER)

In the same way names of orders and families and higher taxa may be conserved; these names (nomina conservanda ordinum, familiarum etc.) are listed in App. ... and ... respectively. Proposed list of nomina conservanda ordinum:

The following names of orders, which are not formed in accordance with art. 22, should be retained: Helobiae, (type fam.: Alismataceae), Glumiflorae (type fam.: Gramineae), Gynandrae (type fam.: Orchidaceae), Liliiflorae (type fam.: Liliaceae), Scitamineae (type fam.: Zingiberaceae), Centrospermae (type fam.: Caryophyllaceae), Polycarpicae (type fam.: Ranunculaceae), Rhoeadales (type fam.: Papaveraceae), Parietales (type fam.: Cistaceae), Umbelliflorae (type fam.: Umbelliferae), Contortae (type fam.: Gentianaceae), Tubiflorae type fam.: Boraginaceae), Campanulatae (type fam.: Campanulaceae), Synandriae (type fam.: Compositae).

In order to avoid useless searching for the earliest legitimate names and to retain commonly used names, the following names of orders are conserved: Pandanales, Cyperales, Fagales, Myricales, Juglandales, Salicales, Urticales, Piperales, Santalales, Proteales, Polygonales, Myrtales, Sapindales, Celastrales, Rhamnales, Plumbaginaceae, Primulales, Rubiales.

In the following cases a decision should be made between two alternatives, the last-mentioned of each pair being formed in accordance with art. 22, the first-mentioned one not but much used: Synanthae, — Cyclanthales, Verticillatae — Casuarinales, Columniferae — Malvales, Grunoales — Geraniales, Ebenales — Diospyrales, Bicornes — Ericales. — A decision should also be made in the following cases, where neither of the alternatives is formed in accordance with the Rules: Spadiciiflorae — Spathiflorae, Principes — Palmales, Farinosae — Enantioblastae.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The introduction of this new article could be avoided by changing in Art. 21 in the first sentence the word „genera” in „genera and taxa of a
higher rank" and to read instead of "a list of names" the words "lists of names". It is recommended that a list of "nomina ordinum conservanda" be made. The list submitted by Hylander might serve as a base for such a list.

**ART 22.**

When a name proposed for conservation¹ has been provisionally approved by the Executive Committee, botanists are authorised to retain it pending decision of the next International Botanical Congress.

¹) There is also to be provided a list of *Nomina conservanda familiarum* (Art. 23; Appendix II).

**PROP. 1 (1950 – 64; LITTLE)**

Delete footnote. (This information has been incorporated into Art. 21, as amended.)

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

If the proposed addition to Art. 21 is accepted, the footnote becomes superfluous and will be deleted.

**NEW ARTICLE 22 bis**

**PROP. 1940 – 9 (FURTADO)**

The long accepted interpretation of a name must not be disregarded without proofs or adequate botanical reasons. When retypification is necessary, under equality of circumstances, the lectotype or neotype selected must conform with the long accepted interpretation of the name.

**Note.** — By *proofs* or *adequate botanical reasons* are meant reasons why the name must be attached to a particular taxonomic group and not to any others, or proofs that the description given under the name agrees with the taxonomic group newly identified with it and conflicts with the older identifications.

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

This new article is undesirable; it deals with taxonomy and not with nomenclature.

**SECTION 4. NOMENCLATURE OF THE TAXONOMIC GROUPS ACCORDING TO THEIR CATEGORIES**

§ 1. Names of groups above the rank of family

**RECOMMENDATION VIII**

Names of divisions and subdivisions, of classes and subclasses, are taken from their chief characters. They are expressed by words of Greek or
Latin origin in the plural number, some similarity of form and termination being given to those which designate groups of the same nature.

Examples: Angiospermae, Gymnospermae, Monocotyledoneae, Dicotyledoneae, Pteridophyta, Coniferae. Among Cryptogams old family names such as Fungi, Lichenes, Algae, may be used for names of groups above the rank of family.

**PROP. 1 (1950 — 29; MANSFELD & ROTHMALER)**


Reich (regnum vegetabile); — bionta; Stamm (phylum): — phyta;
Unterstamm (subphylum): — phytina; Klasse (classis): — ariae;
Unterklasse (subclassis): — ides; Ordnung (ordo): — ales; Unterordnung (subordo): — inaeae.

**PROP. 2 (1950 — 33; NEWMAN)**

Replace the first sentence by the following: „Names of subdivisions and subclasses, when newly coined, should be the names of the relevant divisions or classes with addition of a suitable prefix“. Replace the first two words of the second sentence by:” „Otherwise they should be”.

Delete the list of examples.

**PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

Replace the Rec. by the following new article:
Names of divisions are plural substantives ending in -phyta; they are fixed by decision of an International Botanical Congress or its executive organs.

Note. The following names are approved in this way: Chrysophyta, Phaeophyta, Pyrrhophyta, Euglenophyta, Chlorophyta, Charophyta, Rhodophyta, Glaucophyta, Cyanophyta, Bacteriophyta, Myxophyta, Mycophyta, Bryophyta, Pteridophyta, Spermatophyta. — In the case that the twelve first groups in this list are considered to form one single division in contradistinction to another division, formed by the last three groups above, these divisions should bear the names Thallophyta, resp. Cormophyta; the last-mentioned name may also be used as a collective name, if the Thallophyta are divided in more divisions. If the Cormophyta are arranged in two different divisions the Pteridophyta and Spermatophyta forming one division equal to Bryophyta, that division should bear the name Tracheophyta. If the Cyanophyta and Bacteriophyta are united into one division, this should be called Schizophyta.

Names of subdivisions are plural substantives or adjectives of dif-
ferent types; they are fixed by decision of an International Botanical Congress or its executive organs.


Names of classes and subclasses are plural adjectives used as substantives and derived from a validly published name, legitimate or not, of a genus belonging to the resp. taxon, by the ending -ideae, resp. -enae.

Names of other types may be conserved according to art. 17, ex. Pennatae and Centricae within Diatomeae, provided that their endings are not identical with those prescribed for other categories.

**PROPOSAL 4 (1950 — 84; LAM)**

Delete the recommendation and replace it by the following new Article

(a) Names of divisions are preferably taken from a combination of characters, covering the nature of the division as closely as possible, or from a single character of outstanding importance and their ending should be -phyta. Accordingly, they should preferably be expressed by words of Greek origin, in the plural number.

Names of subdivisions are formed in the same way; they are distinguished from divisional names by some appropriate pre- or infix or by the ending -phytea or both.

(b) The names of classes and subclasses are taken in the same way as those of divisions. Their endings will be:

1. in the Algae (or autotrophic Thallophyta generally): -phyceae (classes) and -phycidae (subclasses) respectively;
2. in the Fungi (or heterotrophic Thallophyta generally): -mycetes (classes) and -mycetidae (subclasses) respectively;
3. in the Cormophyta: -opsida (classes) and -idae (subclasses) respectively.

Accordingly they should preferably be expressed by words of Greek origin, in the plural number.

(c) Names of orders are taken from that of one of their principal families, with the ending -ales. Suborders are designated in a similar manner, with the ending -ineae.

(d) Names of taxa above the rank of family, in contravention of the above rules should be submitted to the Congress for adoption as nomina conservanda.

(e) Names of taxa above the rank of family must be submitted for adoption to the Congress.

(f) In proposing names of taxa above the rank of family the rule of priority (Chapt. III) is not compulsory.

Examples:

(a) divisions: Schizophyta, Rhodophyta, Mycophyta, Cormophyta.
subdivisions: Eocormophyta.
(b) classes: Schizophyceae, Chlorophyceae, Rhodophyceae, Charophyceae, Basidiomycetes, Lichenes (nom. cons.), Bryopsida, Lycopsida, Pteropsida, Coniferopsida, Angiospermae (nom. cons.).
subclasses: Cyclophaeophycidae; Holobasidiomycetidae; Musci (nom. cons.), Hepaticae (nom. cons.), Filicidae, Dicotyledones (nom. cons.).
(c) orders: Fucales, Hymenomycetales, Polygonales, Urticales, Centrospermae (nom. cons.).
suborders: Bromeliineae, Malvineae.

NEW RECOMMENDATION VIII

It is recommended that the Congress supervises the application of Art. 22 a, in this sense that it may coordinate the names in a wider context and make suggestions with the aim of making the skeleton of the nomenclatural system as logical and coherent as possible.

Example: If specialists decide that the Bacteria should be named Schizomyctecae (-tes), the Congress might intimate that the Blue-green Algae be named Schizophyceae, and vice versa.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

All four proposals are dealing with the same question. The proposal 4 by Lam is recommended for acceptance. It was made at the request of the Utrecht Conference. It is suggested to omit the provision made under (e) and to add under (f) after „taxa” the words „for conservation”.

The new Rec. VIII under proposal 4 is not recommended for acceptance in its present form. The matter should be referred to a permanent organisation for nomenclature and not to a Congress. Moreover a Rec. is intended for the guidance of botanists who have to deal with nomenclature and not as an advice for some special organisation.

RECOMMENDATION IX

Names of orders are preferably taken from the name of one of their principal families, with the ending -ales. Suborders are designated in a similar manner, with the ending -ineae, but other terminations may be used for these names, provided that they do not lead to confusion or error.

Examples of names of orders: Polygonales (from Polygonaceae), Urticales (from Urticaceae), Glumiflorae, Centrospermae, Parietales, Tubiflorae, Microspermae, Contortae. Examples of names of suborders: Bromeliineae, (from Bromeliaceae), Malvineae (from Malvaceae), Tricoccæ, Enantioblastæ.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)

In the Recommendation IX, to keep the uniformity of termination, it is desirable to omit the sentence from „But” in line 2 to „error” in line 4, from Glumiflorae to Contortae in line 6, and also Tricoccæ and Enantioblastæ in line 8. The omission, however, should be made only when appropriate names are chosen previously for nomina conservanda familiarum, in which one need not cling to the priority rule.
Example: Arecaceae, Cocoaceae, Coryphaceae for Palmae; Poaceae Lindley (Bambusaceae Link) for Gramineae; Brassicaceae Lindley for Cruciferae; Fabaceae Reichenbach (Cassiaaceae Reichenbach; Mimosaceae Reichenbach) for Leguminosae; Apiaceae Lindley for Umbelliferae; Lamiaeae Lindley for Labiatae; Asteraceae (not Cichoriaceae B. Jussieu or Carduaceae Dumortier) for Compositae.

If this proposal on the abrogation is not accepted by the Executive Committee, we will request to take a decisive step to reform the rule to use either the uniformity of termination or the adoption of exceptions, and to give up the usage of a phrase „may be used”.

**PROP. 2 (1950 — 29; MANSFELD & ROTHMALER)**


Die verschiedenen Rangstufen werden durch folgende Endungen unterschieden:


**PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

Replace the Rec. by the following new Art.:

Names of orders are plural adjectives used as substantives ending in -ales and derived from a validly published name, legitimate or not, of a genus belonging to the order, preferably one which has been used for forming the name of a family within the order.

Note. Names such as Coniferales, Guttiferales, Campanales, Personales or Pennales are not in accordance with the Rules and must be rejected.

An exception is made for the following names, which should be retained: Helobiae, Glumiflorae, Gymnandrae, Liliiflorae, Scitamineae, Centrospermae, Polycarpicae, Rheadales, Parietales, Tricoccae, Umbelliflorae, Contortae, Tubiflorae, Campanulatae. — If the family Compositae is separated as an independent order from Campanulatae this segregate order should be called Synandrae.

Note. As to the name Leguminosae, cfr art. 23.

Names of suborders are derived in the same way as names of orders this by the ending -ineae.

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Japanese Botanists): Acceptance not recommended.
Proposal 2 (Mansfeld & Rothmaler): This proposal has been dealt with already under Rec. VIII.
Proposal 3 (Hylander): The proposal by Lam under Rec. VIII seems preferable.
NEW RECOMMENDATION IXa

PROP. 1950 — 47, 1950 — 79; (HERTER)

Werden die Endungen -aceae, -oideae, -eae, -inae an einen Gattungsnamen angehängt, der auf einen Vokal ausgeht, so bleibt dieser fort. Man schreibe also Melastomaceae, wie die Flora Brasiliensis, und nicht Melastomataceae, wie die Englersche Schule.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Acceptance of this proposal is not advisable. Provision is made already in the list of Nomina Familiarum Conservanda. It belongs under Art. 23.

§ 2 Names of families and subfamilies, tribes and subtribes

ART. 23

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

Examples: Rosaceae (from Rosa), Salicaceae (from Salix), Caryophyllaceae (from Caryophyllus, a pre-Linnean genus).

Exceptions: (1) The following names, sanctioned by long usage, are treated as exceptions to the Rule: Palmae, Cruciferae, Leguminosae, Guttiferae, Umbelliferae, Labiatae, Compositae. Botanists are authorised, however, to use as alternatives the appropriate names ending in -aceae.

(2) Those who regard the Papilionaceae as constituting an independent family may use that name, although it is not formed in the prescribed manner.

To avoid disadvantageous changes in the nomenclature of families by the strict application to the Rules and especially of the principle of priority, a list of names which must be retained as exceptions will be provided (Appendix II).

PROP. 1 (1950 — 1; WHEELER)

Appendix II. Add the two following well-known names to the list of Nomina familiarum conservanda: Dichapetalaceae and Onagraceae.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 38; A. C. SMITH)

Omit the fourth paragraph, which begins „To avoid disadvantageous changes...”

PROP. 3 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

After Art. 23 add the following: „Note: Those who prefer may use regularly formed family names as follows: Arecaceae Reich. (Palmae); Poaceae Br. (Gramineae); Brassicaceae Lindley ( Cruciferae); Fabaceae Reich., from a pre-
Linnean genus *(Leguminosae); those who wish to recognize segregate families may also use Mimosaceae Reich. and Caesalpiniaceae Kl. & Grcke.*); Hypericaceae Lindley* (Guttiferae; those who wish to recognize a segregate family may also use Clusiaceae Lindley); Ammiaceae Presl (Umbelliferae); Lamiaceae Lindley (Labiatae); Asteraceae Lindley* (Compositae; those who wish to recognize segregate families may also use Ambrosiaceae Reich. and Cichoriaceae Reich.).

„When segregates of any of these 8 families are recognized, then only names regularly formed in *aceae* should be used.

„Example: If the Compositae are segregated in 3 families typified by Aster, Ambrosia, and Cichorium, the family names to be used are respectively: Asteraceae, Ambrosiaceae, and Cichoriaceae.”

PROP. 4 (1950 - 48; HYLANDER)

Names of families are plural adjectives used as substantives, ending in -aceae and derived from a validly published name, legitimate or not, of one of its genera.

Ex. Rosaceae (from Rosa), Salicaceae (from Salix), Caryophyllaceae (from Caryophyllus, an illegitimate synonym of Dianthus), Sapotaceae (from Sapota, an illegitimate synonym of Achrus).

An exception is made for the following names, which should be retained (according to art. 17): Palmae, Gramineae, Cruciferae, Leguminosae, Guttiferae, Umbelliferae, Ebenaceae, Labiatae, Compositae.

Note. If these families are divided into two or more families, the conserved name should be retained for the part containing the type genus; these type genera are listed together with the conserved family names in App. ...

Proposed type genera:
- Palmae: Phoenix
- Gramineae: Poa
- Cruciferae: Brassica
- Leguminosae: Pisum
- Guttiferae: Hypericum
- Umbelliferae: Ammi
- Ebenaceae: Diospyros
- Labiatae: Lamium
- Compositae: Carduus.

The separation of Caesalpiniaceae and/or Mimosaceae as independent families from Leguminosae does not legitimize the name Papilionaceae for the rest of the collective family; only if this latter is separated from Rosales as an independent order, the name Papilionaceae should be used for the collective family or for the part of it including the

*) Nom. fam. conserv. propos.
type genus of *Leguminosae*, and the lastmentioned name be used as name of the order.

**PROP. 5 (1950 — 62; RICKETT)**

Change the first sentence to read as follows:
"The name of a family is a plural substantive (or an adjective used as a substantive) taken from the name of one of its genera, or from a synonym, and ends in -aceae."

**PROP. 6 (1950 — 62; ST. JOHN)**

Paragraph 3, exceptions. Delete the second sentence: "Botanists are authorized, however, to use as alternatives the appropriate names ending in -aceae."

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Wheeler): This proposal was rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Smith): Acceptance is not recommended. A list of conserved family names is easy to consult.

Proposal 3 (Boivin): Several of these provisions have already been made in the list of family names.

Proposal 4 (Hylland): The alteration proposed by Rickett seems preferable.

Proposal 5 (Rickett): This proposal was accepted both by the Utrecht Conference and by the American Botanists.

Proposal 6 (St. John): This proposal was accepted by the Utrecht Conference. It was rejected by the American Botanists.

**ART. 24**

Names of subfamilies (*subfamiliae*) are taken from the name of one of the genera in the group, with the ending -oideae, similarly for tribes (*tribus*) with the ending -eae and for subtribes (*subtribus*) with the ending -inae.

Examples of subfamilies: *Asphodeloideae* (from *Asphodelus*), *Rumicoideae* (from *Rumex*); tribes: *Asclepiadeae* (from *Asclepias*), *Phyllantheae* (from *Phyl lanthus*); subtribes: *Metasteimatinae* (from *Metasteima*), *Madiinae* (from *Madia*).

**PROP. 1 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)**

Add the following paragraph:
"The name of the subfamily that includes the type genus is usually formed after this same type genus. Similarly with tribes and subtribes when they include the type genus of a tribe, or subfamily, or family.

Example: *Asclepiadaceae* and *Asclepiadeae* (from and including *Asclepias*)."
PROP. 2 (1950 — 47, '50 — 79; HERTER)
Delete in the examples Metastelmatinae.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)
Modify as follows: Names of subfamilies are derived from a validly published name, legitimate or not, of one of its genera by the ending -oideae, similarly for tribes by the ending -eae, and for subtribes by the ending -inae.

PROP. 4 (1950 — 62; RICKETT)
Change to read as follows: "The name of a subfamily (subfamilia) is a plural substantive or an adjective used as a substantive. . . ."

PROP. 5 (1950 — 62; RICKETT)
Add the following note:
"When names of the above groups have been published with improper terminations, as -eae for a subfamily, -oideae for a tribe, the ending should be changed to accord with the rule, without change of authority; if, however, the rank of the group is changed by a later author, he is then cited as authority for the name, with the appropriate ending, in the usual way.

"Examples: Subfamily Climacieae Grout, Moss Fl. N. Am. 3: 4 (1928) should be changed to Climacioideae, with rank and authority unchanged. If it is held necessary to change the rank of this group to a tribe, then the name Climacieae should be used, with the name of the author making the change added as authority."

COMM. RAPPORTEUR
Proposal 1 (Boivin): The form of this proposal is not that of a rule but of a recommendation. It therefore seems better to regard it as a recommendation.
Proposal 2 (Herter): Acceptance not recommended.
Proposal 3 (Hylander): In my opinion it is better to avoid the use of illegitimate names as base for the names of these taxa.
Proposal 4 and 5 (Rickett): Accepted by the Utrecht Conference and the American Botanists.

§ 3 Names of genera and subdivisions of genera

ART. 25
Names of genera are substantives (or adjectives used as substantives), in the singular number and written with an initial capital, which may be compared with our family names. These names may be taken from any source whatever, and may even be composed in an absolutely arbitrary manner.
Examples: Rosa, Convolvulus, Hedysarum, Bartramia, Liquidambar, Gloriosa, Impatiens, Manihot, Ifloga (an anagram of Filago).

**PROP. 1 (1940 — 9, ’50 — 83; FURTADO)**

Delete „and written with an initial capital”. (This belongs to the orthography of names).
Add: But no generic name is admissible unless: (1) it is intended definitely as a botanical name, and not merely a non-botanical designation of the genus; (2) when coinciding with a technical term currently used in morphology, it was both published before 1912 and accompanied simultaneously by one or more duly validated specific epithets under it; and (3) it is a univerbal consisting either of a single word or of two or more words united or hyphenated when originally published.

Add: Examples (1), (2) & (4) from Art. 67.

**PROP. 2 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

Modify as follows: Names of genera consist of one substantival word, single or compound (or of an adjective used as a substantive), in the single number and written with an initial capital.

Ex. Add the following: Quisqualis, Sebastiano-Schaueria, Neves-Armondia.

— The following biverbal names, proposed by Miller, are not in accordance with art. 25 and have thus no nomenclatural status: Uva ursi, Centaurium minus.

Note. (67: 1, 3.) Token words, such as Anonymos, which stand in the same place as generic names in binary combinations, are not considered as generic names. Such combinations have no nomenclatural status and must not be taken into consideration for purposes of priority of the epithet concerned.

Ex. = ex. under the present art. 67: 1.

Names which are unitary designations of species must not be considered as generic names.

Ex. = ex. under the present art. 67: 3.

**PROP. 3 (1950 — 62; RICKETT)**

Modify as follows:
„The name of a genus is a substantive … in the singular number (except as syntax requires the plural).”

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 2 (Hylander): Not recommended for acceptance. The Note seems superfluous.
Proposal 3 (Rickett): This proposal was accepted by the Utrecht Conference and the American Botanists. The addition „except as syntax
requires the plural" seems superfluous as this is not a matter of nomenclature but of grammar. The example given by Rickett viz. "Corni oppositifoliae" in the meaning of "the species of Cornus with opposite leaves", proves this point. Omission of these words will not prevent any person to use a term like "Corni oppositifoliae" in a description, but that is no question of nomenclature.

**RECOMMENDATION X**

Botanists who are forming generic names show judgment and taste by attending to the following recommendations:

(a) Not to make names very long or difficult to pronounce.
(b) Not to dedicate genera to persons quite unconnected with botany or at least with natural science nor to persons quite unknown.
(c) Not to take names from barbarous languages, unless those names are frequently cited in books of travel, and have an agreeable form that is readily adaptable to the Latin tongue and to the tongue of civilized countries.
(d) To indicate, if possible, by the formation or ending of the name the affinities or analogies of the genus.
(e) To avoid adjectives used as nouns.
(f) Not to give to a genus a name whose form is rather that of a sub-genus or section (e.g. *Eusideroxylon*, a name given to a genus of *Lauraceae*. This however, being legitimate, cannot be altered).
(g) Not to make names by combining words from different languages (*nomina hybrida*).
(h) To give a feminine form to all personal generic names, whether they commemorate a man or a woman.

**PROP. 1 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)**

Elimination of „and taste“ from Recommendation X is desirable.

**PROP. 2 (1950 — 39; GROVES & BOIVIN)**

In the first sentence delete the following: „show judgement and taste by attending“ and substitute: „should attend“.

**PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

Delete Rec. X (h).

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Japanese Botanists): Acceptance recommended.
Proposal 2 (Groves & Boivin): Acceptance recommended.
Proposal 3 (Hylander): This item was added in 1935 unanimously. There does not seem to be any reason to delete it now.
ART. 26

Names of subgenera and sections are usually substantives resembling the names of genera. Names of subsections and other lower subdivisions of genera are preferably adjectives in the plural number agreeing in gender with the generic name and written with an initial capital, or their place may be taken by an ordinal number or a letter.

Adjectives: *Pleiostyiae*, *Fimbriati*, *Bibracteolata*.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 6, ’50 — 62; REHDER)

Modify as follows: Names of subgenera, sections and subsections are always substantives resembling the names of genera. Names of series and other lower divisions of genera are preferably adjectives in the plural number agreeing in gender with the generic name and written with an initial capital, or their place may be taken by an ordinal number or letter. The names of all coordinated subdivisions of a genus take the same form, either substantives or adjectives in the plural number.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Read: „Epithets denoting subgenera and sections” instead of „Names of subgenera and sections” in the first line; and „Epithets denoting subsections” instead of „Names of subsections” in the second line. Add: It is permissible to reduce more complicated names to biverbal combinations provided an appropriate sign or word precedes the epithet to denote its category. Omit: „Agreeing in gender with the generic name and written with an initial capital”.

PROP. 3 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

(Empfehlung XI b kann dann ganz wegbleiben.)

PROP. 4 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

Delete paragraph (d) of Recommendation XI and change Art. 26 to read as follows:
„Names of subgenera are always substantives resembling the names of genera. Names of sections are either substantives resembling the names of genera or adjectives in the plural number and agreeing in gender with the generic name and written with an initial capital. Names of subsections and other lower divisions above the rank of species or preferably adjectives in the plural number agreeing in
gender with the generic name and written with an initial capital or their place may be taken by an ordinal number or letter. Within a genus, the name of all subdivisions having the same rank generally take the same form."

PROP. 5 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Modify as follows: Names of subgenera consist of one substantival word (or an adjective used as a substantive) of the same type as the generic names.
Names of sections are either substantives (resp. adjectives used as substantives) of the same type as the generic names or adjectives in the plural form, following the genus in gender; they are in both cases written with an initial capital.

Ex. should be given of sectional names in conflict with this art., e.g. substantives in the plural number as used by Fedde in Papaver, or adjectives in the singular number, as used in Primula.

Names of lower supraspecific taxa, such as subsections, are adjectives in the plural number and following the genus name in gender. The same subdivisional name may be used in different genera but in one and the same genus two subdivisions even of different rank cannot bear the same name unless they are based on the same type.

Ex. Under Verbascum the sectional names Aulacosperma and Bothrosperma are allowed although there are also in the genus Celsia two sections named Aulacospermae and Bothrospermae.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Rehder): This proposal was accepted by the American Botanists. It was after an extended discussion rejected by the Utrecht Conference. The proposal is certainly a logic one but it may involve a large number of name-changes.
Proposal 2 (Furtado): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 3 (Handel-Mazzetti): Recommended for acceptance.
Proposal 4 (Boivin): In order to avoid name-changes this is not recommended for acceptance.
Proposal 5 (Hylander): It is recommended to retain the article itself unaltered, but to add the last paragraph of the proposal (The same subdivisional name etc. . . .) as this seems to be a valuable addition.

NEW ARTICLE 26 bis

PROP. (UTRECHT CONFERENCE)

Combine Rec. XI with Rec. XXXIV to form a new Article: The subdivision containing the type species of a generic name must bear that name unaltered if no earlier legitimate name is available.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposal was the result of a discussion on the proposal for a new
Art. 28 bis. If the latter is accepted, this might be regarded as the logical consequence for the nomenclature of the subdivisions of a genus.

**RECOMMENDATION XI**

Botanists constructing names for subgenera or sections will do well to attend to the preceding recommendations and also to the following:

(a) To give, where possible, to the principle subdivision of a genus a name which recalls that of the genus with some modification or addition.

Thus *Eu* may be placed at the beginning of the generic name when it is of Greek origin, *-astrum*, *-ella* at the end of the name when Latin, or any other modification consistent with the grammar and usages of the Latin language.

Examples: *Eucardamine* (from *Cardamine*), *Trifoliastrum* (from *Trifolium*), *Drabella* (from *Draba*).

(b) To avoid giving to a subgenus or a section the name of the genus to which it belongs, with the ending *-oides* or *-opsis* but on the contrary to reserve this ending for a section which resembles another genus and by then adding *-oides* or *-opsis* to the name of that other genus, if it is of Greek origin, to form the name of the section.

(c) To avoid taking as the name of a subgenus or section a name which is already in use as such in another genus, or which is the name of a genus.

(d) To avoid in co-ordinated subdivisions of a genus the use of names in the form of a noun together with those in the form of a plural adjective; the former should be used chiefly for subgenera and sections, the latter for subsections, series and subseries.

**PROP. 1 (1940 — 6, '50 — 62; REHDER)**

Modify as follows:

(a) To give to the subdivision containing the *type species* of a genus preferably the name of the genus modified by the prefix "Eu" or to use the generic name without prefix; for other important subdivisions the generic name with the suffix *-ella* or *-astrum* or any other modification may be used.

**PROP. 2 (1940 — 6, '50 — 62; REHDER)**

(d) To be omitted, since this paragraph has been incorporated in Art. 26.

**PROP. 3 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)**

In Art. 26 sollte der negative Teil der Empfehlung XIb zur Regel gemacht werden.
Rec. XI (d) should be changed in the following way: To avoid the use of nouns and adjectives in the same genus.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Rehder): The proposal was accepted by the American Botanists. At the Utrecht Conference it was decided to reject it in the present form but to delete Rec. XI and replace it by a new article (See Art. 26 bis).

Proposal 2 (Rehder): If proposal 1 is accepted, it is necessary to accept also proposal 2.

Proposal 3 (Handel-Mazzetti): If proposal 3 under Art. 26 is accepted, this proposal should also be accepted.

Proposal 4 (Hylander): Acceptance is not recommended.

RECOMMENDATION XII

When it is desired to indicate the name of a subgenus or section (or other subdivision to which a particular species belongs) in connection with the generic name and specific epithet, the name of the subdivision is placed in parentheses between the two (when necessary, the rank of the subdivision is also indicated).

Examples: Astragalus (Cycloglottis) contortupericactus; Loranthus (Sect. Ischnanthus) gabonensis.

Rec. XII is placed as a note under Art. 27.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The matter is of minor importance, but it seems better to let it stand as a recommendation. A note belongs to the article and the article is a Rule. This is not a rule but a recommendation.

§ 4 Names of species (binary names)

Names of species are binary combinations consisting of the name of the genus followed by a single specific epithet. If an epithet consists of two or more words, these must either be united or joined by hyphens. Symbols forming part of specific epithets proposed by Linnaeus must be transcribed.

The specific epithet, when adjectival in form and not used as a substantive, agrees in gender with the generic name.

Examples: Cornus sanguinea, Dianthus monspessulanus, Papaver Rhoeas, Uromyces Fabae, Fumaria Gussonei, Geranium Robertianum, Embelia Sarasinorum,
Atropa Belladona, Impatiens noli-tangere, Adiantum Capillus-Veneris. — Scandix Pecten ♂ L. must be transcribed as Scandix Pecten-Veneris; Veronica Anagallis ♀ L. must be transcribed as Veronica Anagallis-aquatica. — Helleborus niger, Brassica nigra, Verbascum nigrum.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9, '50 — 83; FURTADO)

Revise thus:
Names of species are binary combinations consisting of a valid name of the genus to which the species is referred followed by a single specific epithet. Symbols forming a part of specific epithets proposed by Linnaeus must be transcribed. But no specific epithet is admissible unless: (1) it is a univerbal, consisting either of one word or of two or more words united or hyphenated at the time of publication (an epithet of two disunited or unhyphenated words being allowed as exceptions in books and papers in which univerbal epithets have been generally employed); (2) it is intended definitely to be a botanical specific epithet and not merely a non-botanical designation; (3) it is not merely an ordinal adjective being used for enumeration; and (4) it is published in a work in which the biverbal binomial system of nomenclature for species as defined in the first sentence and the first alinea of this rule has been consistently employed (an occasional exception only in any work shall not render such work invalid).

Add: Examples: (1), (2) and (4) in Art. 68, but delete the last sentence in (4) because Apocynum foliis Androsaemi L. is a good binary binomial like Adiantum capillus veneris L. and Atropa bella donna L. discussed in Art. 27).

PROP. 2 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Add to the Art. Rec. XV (h): Specific epithets formed of two or more (hyphenated) words must be avoided.

PROP. 3 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Add to the article:

PROP. 4 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)

Insert the following new paragraph (between the first and second ones) and example:
Binary combinations of a specific epithet with the word Anonymos (and similar token words) are illegitimate, since the word Anonymos is not a generic name (Art. 67 (1)). Such combinations are not taken into consideration for purposes of priority of the epithet concerned.

Example: The binary combination, Anonymos aquatica Walt. Fl. Carol. 230 (1788), is illegitimate. The valid name for the species concerned is Planera
aquatica J. F. Gmel. (1791), and the date of the epithet aquatica, for purposes of priority, is 1791. The species must not be cited as Planera aquatica (Walt.) J. F. Gmel. If, however, it is desired to indicate that the epithet originated with Walter, the name may be cited as Planera aquatica [(Walt.)] J. F. Gmel."

**PROP. 5 (1950 — 14, ’50 — 62; ST. JOHN)**

Change it to read:

"Names of species are binary combinations consisting of the name of the genus followed by a single specific epithet. If an epithet consists of two or more words, these must have been originally united or joined by hyphens. As exception, the specific epithets of two or more words published by Linnaeus only, will be transcribed as single hyphenated epithets; and symbols forming part of specific epithets proposed by Linnaeus must be transcribed.

"The specific epithet, when adjectival in form and not used as a substantive, agrees in gender with the generic name."

Examples. — as given, but with corrections indicated below. If this is not accepted, two of the examples should be corrected. Linnaeus did not publish Impatiens noli-tangere or Adiantum Capillus-Veneris. He printed them as Impatiens noli tangere and Adiantum Capillus venenis in the text, though it is Capillus Veneris in the index. As now cited they give an incorrect impression.

**PROP. 6 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

Modify as follows: Names of species are binary combinations consisting of the generic name followed by a word called the specific epithet. This is a substantive in nominative or genitive or an adjective which (if not used as a substantive) has the nature of an adjective attribute of the generic name. Epithets consisting of two words joined with a hyphen are allowed if these words are a substantive with its attribute or together form a genitive attribute; also the epithets noli-tangere and non-scriptus are allowed. Such epithets not so joined when originally published are not to be rejected but when used must be hyphenated. Epithets consisting of three words are allowed under the corresponding conditions but only if they were validly published before January 1, 1952. The symbols ⊗ and ⊖ forming part of specific epithets proposed by Linnaeus must be transcribed to Veneris and aquaticus (or the corresponding fem. or neutral form) respectively.

Ex. Cornus sanguinea, Dianthus monspessulanus, Papaver Rhoesas, Sedum Rosea, Schinus Molle, Mycena Adonis, Uromyces Fabae, Pucciniastrum Abieti-Chamaenerii, Paeonia emodi, Fumaria Gussonei, Geranium Robertianum, Embelia Sarasinorum, Atropa Bella-donna (not Atropa Bella donna, as originally written), Adiantum Capillus-Veneris (not Adiantum Capillus ⊗, as originally written), Veronica Anagallis-aquatica (not Veronica Anagallis ⊖), Impatiens noli-tangere (not Impatiens noli tangere), Papaver corona-Sancti-Stephani, Melampsora Alli-Salicis-albae. — Helleborus niger, Brassica nigra, Verbascom nigrum.

Note 1. As to the use of initial capital, see art. . . .

Note 2. (68:1—2.) Words which follow a generic name in the place
of a specific epithet but are not intended as such or which are merely ordinal adjectives being used for enumeration, must not be taken as specific epithets and have no nomenclatural status as such.

Ex. Viola "qualis" Krocker (Fl. Siles. II, 1790, 512 and 517); Atriplex "nova" Winterl (in Ind. h. bot. Univers. Pest. 1788, fol. A 8, recto et verso), the word "nova" being used in connection with four different species of Atriplex. — Boletus vicesimus sexetus, Agaricus octogesimus nonus.

Note 3. (Rec. XII.) The epithet follows immediately upon the generic name, but if it is desired to indicate the name of the subgenus or section to which it belongs, this may be mentioned (when necessary with indication of its rank) in parentheses between the generic name and the specific epithet.

Ex. = ex. mentioned after rec. XII.

**PROP. 6 (1950 — 62; FOSBERG)**

Modify as follows:
Delete „or more“ and insert after „joined by hyphens“ the following: „Epithets not so joined when originally published are not to be rejected but when used must be hyphenated.***

*See also Art. 68 (4).

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.
It was decided in the discussion on Art. 27 by the Utrecht Conference to refer in it to Art. 68 (1) and (2).
Proposal 2 and 3 (Handel-Mazzetti): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 4 (Sprague): Accepted as amended by the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 5 (St. John): Acceptance is not recommended. The proposal was rejected by the American Botanists.
Proposal 6 (Hylander): It can not be recommended to accept this proposal. Mentioning special exceptions in an article is not advisable.
Proposal 7 (Fosberg): This proposal was accepted both by the Utrecht Conference and the American Botanists.

**ART. 28**

Epithets of subspecies and varieties are formed like those of species and follow them in order, beginning with those of the highest rank. When adjectival in form and not used as substantives they agree in gender with the generic name.
Similarly for subvarieties, forms and slight or transient modifications of wild plants, which receive either epithets or numbers or letters to facilitate their arrangement. The use of a binary nomenclature for subdivisions of species is not admissible. It is permissible to reduce more complicated names to ternary combinations.

**PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)**

Omit. „When adjectival in form and not used as substantives, they agree in gender with the generic names.”

**PROP. 2 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)**

Antrag zu Art. 28:
Namen von, Untergruppen einer Art, die ohne Rangsbezeichnung dem Speziesnamen angereiht werden, entsprechen nicht der Binären Nomenklatur. Lateinische oder griechische Buchstaben gelten als „var.”, wenn ihnen nicht eine andere Rangsbezeichnung beigefügt ist. Zu den Beispielen: nicht *Andropogon ternatus macrothrix*.

**PROP. 3 (1940 — 11, 1950 — 62; GLEASON)**

Add as the first paragraph of the Article the following:
„For nomenclatural purposes, a species is regarded as the sum of its subspecific units. The description of a subspecific group which excludes the type of the species automatically creates a second subspecific group of equal rank which has as its type the type of the species.”

**PROP. 4 (1940 — 14; AIRY-SHAW)**

To read:
„Epithets of subspecies, varieties, subvarieties, forms and subforms (and supplementary intercalated categories: vide Art. 12, second paragraph) are formed like those of species and follow them in order, beginning with those of the highest rank. When adjectival in form and not used as substantives they agree in gender with the generic name.
„The use of a binary nomenclature for subdivisions of species is illegitimate. But if a binary name is proposed by an author for a subspecies, in order to avoid name-changes the generic name is ignored and the resultant ternary combination is attributed to the original author.
„It is permissible to reduce more complicated names to ternary combinations.”

„Examples: The name *Anemone alpicola*, published by Rouy and Foucaud (Fl. Fr. I, 42: 1895) for a subspecies of *A. alpina* L., is treated as equivalent to *Anemone alpina* subsp. *alpicola* Rouy et Fouc., and should be cited as such.”

**PROP. 5 (1950 — 5; LANJOUW)**

Add as the first paragraph of the Article:
For Nomenclatural purposes, a species and any taxon below the rank
of a species is regarded as the sum of its lower taxa, if any. The description of a subordinated taxon which does not include the type of the higher taxon, automatically creates a second subordinated taxon which includes the type of the higher taxon.

**PROP. 6 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)**

Add: When epithets of subspecific rank were inserted later under specific epithets, the name of the original author shall be retained in all subspecific epithets. (Conf. Art. 28).

Example. When *Aster ageratoides* Turczaninow var. *vernalis* Honda was changed to *Aster ageratoides* Turcz. subsp. *ovatus* Kitamura var. *vernalis* Kitamura, it must be indicated as *Aster ageratoides* Turcz. subsp. *ovatus* Franchet & Savatier var. *vernalis* Honda.

**PROP. 7 (1950 — 46; BOTANISTES BELGES)**

— Les botanistes belges demandent au Congrès d’incorporer, au texte de l’article 28, les lignes suivantes inspirées des amendements proposés par H. A. Gleason:

„Les systématiciens qui admettent qu’une espèce est une somme de variétés, qu’une variété est une somme de formes, etc., désigneront le groupe de rang inférieur à l’espèce qui inclut le type de l’espèce par la répétition de l’épithète spécifique mais sans désignation de l’auteur; il en est de même pour les subdivisions subordonnées compréhens le type de la subdivision supérieure.


**PROP. 8 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

Revise as follows: Names of subspecies consist of the specific name and an epithet formed after the same rules as the specific epithet and preceded by the word subspecies (mostly in abbreviated form); this is placed after the specific epithet, which must be excluded.

In names where the subspecific epithet was originally preceded by a sign (e.g. an asterisk), this sign should be replaced by the term subspecies (preferably in abbreviated form). Subspecific epithets published on or after January 1, 1952, without clear indication of their rank by mention of the term subspecies in connection with the epithet are not considered validly published.

A binary name which the author explicitly declared as designating a subspecies, is considered as validly published by its original author under the species mentioned by him as a regular ternary combination, into which it has to be transformed, but has no nomenclatural status as a specific name. The same holds for the type of combined binary and ternary names where the generic name or its initial letter is reiterated between the specific epithet and a following epithet which is explicitly declared as designating a subspecies. Subspecies names of these two types published on or after January 1, 1952, are not considered validly published either as specific or as subspecific names.
Ex. The name *Anemone alpina* subsp. *A. alpicola*, published by Rouy & Foucaud (Fl. Fr. I. 1895. 42) is treated as equivalent to *Anemone alpina* subsp. *alpicola* Rouy & Fouc. and should be cited as such.

New Art. to follow Art. 28: Names of lower taxa are formed in the same manner as subspecific names, the epithets always preceded by the corresponding term (mostly in abbreviated form) indicating the taxonomic category and arranged after descending rank. Names of varieties and lower taxa may be reduced by exclusion of all epithets between the specific one and the respective infraspecific category with exception of epithets designating a subspecies other than the typical of the species.

In cases where the epithets of varieties and similar categories below subspecies were preceded when originally published by a sign or a letter as only indication of their rank instead of the corresponding category term, this sign or letter must be replaced by the corresponding term (preferably in abbreviated form). Epithets of that type published on or after January 1, 1952, are not validly published.

Epithets of taxa inserted between subspecies and varieties are nomenclaturally treated as belonging to varieties; for taxa intercalated between varieties and lower taxa but without clear indication as to their rank, this is nomenclaturally treated as equal to that of the subsequent higher taxon with clearly indicated rank.

Epithets preceded only by a Greek letter (α, β etc.) without special designation as to their rank are considered as belonging to varieties.

The regulations in art. 28, mom. 3, hold in applicable parts also for varieties.

Ex. Acharius (Meth., 1803, 214), published the name *Parmelia olivacea* 3. *P. aspidota* and 4. *P. proliza*. These should not be rejected as illegitimate but considered published as legitimate varietal names under the form *P. olivacea* 3. *aspidota* and 4. *proliza*, respectively; these names should be retained if the taxa are treated as varieties under *P. olivacea*.

Note. „Fancy” epithets of garden forms are not considered as taxonomic designations and have no status in scientific nomenclature.

PROP. 9 (1950 — 85; FURTADO)

Omit the words „of wild plants” in the first line of the second paragraph.

Revise the last two sentences in second paragraph thus: „The use of a binomial nomenclature for subordinate groups of a species is not admissible, nor is it permissible to reduce more complicated names to trinomials except by removing subspecific epithets, and the conventional epithets used to denote a group sensu stricto. In the case of the names of forma and subforma, the epithets denoting subspecies may not be omitted.

Delete the examples of *Saxifraga Aizoon* subforma *surculosa* as it is misleading.

Add: „Note 1: Binomials published before 1905 as varietal names shall
have a valid status only as ternary names obtained by linking the varietal (second) epithet to the specific name under which the variety is established; the varietal binomials themselves, being invalid, are no obstacles to the priorability of their specific homonyms.

Examples: *Petroselinum sativum* Hoffm. var. *P. crispum* (Mill.) Nym., Consp. Fl. Eur. (1879) 309 shall be considered as having been published as *P. sativum* var. *crispum* (Mill.) Nym. Gandoger's varietal binomials must be considered as having been published as ternary varietal names. As binomials they shall have no standing under the Rules.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Acceptance not recommended.
Proposal 2 (Handel-Mazzetti): No decision was reached at the Utrecht Conference. The proposal is not recommended for acceptance before its possible effects have been studied.
Proposal 3 (Gleason): This proposal was accepted by the American Botanists. A revised edition of this motion was accepted by the Utrecht Conference. (See proposal 5).
Proposal 4 (Airy-Shaw): Not recommended for acceptance, through the principle of par. 2 has to be incorporated in the Rules.
Proposal 5 (Lanjouw): This proposal is an amended version of proposal 3. It was accepted by the Utrecht Conference.
Proposal 6 (Japanese Botanists): There seems hardly any reason to make this addition. The taxon concerned has not changed in rank nor has it been removed to another species, and there is therefore under the present rules no reason to attribute its name to a new author.
Proposal 7 (Botanistes Belges): Not recommended for acceptance. Proposal 5 is clearer and has the form of a rule. The text given in this proposal is not unconditional.
Proposal 8 (Hylander): It is my opinion that the provisions proposed by Hylander must be left to the judgment of those who have to deal with vague indications in older works. The sentence beginning with: „Subspecific epithets published on ...“ is recommended for acceptance. The new Art. proposed by Hylander is not recommended for acceptance.
Proposal 9 (Furtado): It is not advisable to accept the proposal. See proposal 4.

RECOMMENDATION XIII

The specific epithet should, in general, give some indication of the appearance, the characters, the origin, the history or the properties of the species. If taken from the name of a person, it usually recalls the one who discovered or described it, or was in some way connected with it.

NO PROPOSALS
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RECOMMENDATION XIV

Names of men and women and also of countries and localities used as specific epithets, may be substantives in the Genitive (Clusii, saharae) or adjectives (Clusiana, dahuricus). It will be well, in the future, to avoid the use of the genitive and the adjectival form of the same epithet to designate two different species of the same genus; for example Lysimachia Hemsleyana Max. (1891) and L. Hemsleyi Franch. (1895).

PROP. 1 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Delete the last sentence.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

It is recommended to leave the recommendation unaltered.

NEW RECOMMENDATION XIV bis

PROP. 1950 — 47, ’50 — 79; HERTER

Zwecks Uniformierung der Nomenklatur sollten die Artnamen (binären Namen) den Namen der Unterabteilungen von Arten (ternären Namen) gegenüber bevorzugt werden, zumal in volkstümlichen Werken, botanischen Gärten usw.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This is out of place in the Rules.

RECOMMENDATION XV

In forming specific epithets botanists will do well to have regard also to the following recommendations:

(a) To avoid those which are very long and difficult to pronounce.
(b) To avoid those who express a character common to all or nearly all the species of a genus.
(c) To avoid using the names of little-known or very restricted localities, unless the species is quite local.
(d) To avoid, in the same genus, epithets which are very much alike, especially those which differ only in their last letters.
(e) Not to adopt unpublished names found in traveller’s notes or in Herbaria, attributing them to their authors, unless these have approved publication.
(f) Not to name a species after a person who has neither discovered, nor described, nor figured, nor in any way studied it.
(g) To avoid epithets which have been used before in any closely allied genus.
(h) To avoid specific epithets formed of two or more (hyphened) words.
To avoid epithets which have the same meaning as the generic name (pleonasm).

PROP. 1 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)

Add to (d) at the end of the sentence:
or names differing in the arrangement of two letters.

Example: Carex albata and Carex abtata.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Delete XV (d).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Japanese Botanists): Acceptance is recommended.
Proposal 2 (Hylander): Not recommended for acceptance. Names that differ so slightly are apt to be confused.

§ 5. Names of groups below the rank of species
(ternary names)

NEW ARTICLE 28 bis

PROP. 1950 — 5; LANJOUW

Delete Rec. XVIII and replace it by the following new Art.

"If a taxon of whatever rank lower than a species, which includes the type of the species, is to be referred to by name, it must be designated by the correct specific epithet of the species, but contrary to Art. 46 without citation of an author's name. This epithet when used for a taxon within a species can only be transferred, when the species name to which it is subordinated is itself transferred."

Examples The binary combination Lobelia spicata Lam. var. originalis McVaugh, which includes the type of Lobelia spicata Lam., must be altered in Lobelia spicata Lam. var. spicata. Since under Lobelia siphilitica L. there is also described var. ludoviciana A. D. C., one must write Lobelia siphilitica L. var. siphilitica if only that part of L. siphilitica L. which includes the type is meant.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 11, 1950 — 62; GLEASON)

New Art. proposed in place of Rec. XVIII:

"Each subspecific group, of whatever rank, which includes the type of the species, shall be designated by the legitimate specific epithet of the species. For nomenclatural purposes this epithet, when used for a subspecific group, has no authority and no citation and cannot be transferred, except as the species to which it is subordinated may be transferred.

"Each subspecific group which includes the type of the next higher
subspecific group but which excludes the type of the species shall be designated by the valid subspecific epithet of the next higher group."

Tentative examples (not a part of the proposal): Lobelia spicata Lam. var. spicata, Not Lobelia spicata Lam. var. originalis McVaugh, Rhodora 38: 308 (1936); Lobelia siphilitica L. var. siphilitica and Lobelia siphilitica L. var. ludoviciana A.DC., Not Lobelia siphilitica L. and Lobelia siphilitica L. var. ludoviciana A.DC.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The proposal Lanjouw is a modified wording of the proposal Gleason. It was in the given version accepted by the Utrecht Conference.

Gleason's proposal was accepted with a slight majority by the American botanists.

NEW ARTICLE 28 ter

PROP. (1940 — 9, 1950 — 83; FURTADO)

No varietal or subvarietal epithet having a valid status shall denote the species sensu stricto (i.e. the taxonomic form represented by the type specimen).

Different ecologic variations in plants and in parts of plants belonging to species, subspecies, variety or sub-variety may be indicated with appropriate epithets preceded by the words forma and subforma; and the names thus formed are not reducible to simpler combinations without intercalating the epithet of the species, subspecies, variety or subvariety to which the forms belong.

Note 1 — When a species is interpreted sensu lato and it is desirable to indicate the division to which the type belongs, the type variety of the species may be indicated by repeating the specific name preceded by the prefix eu or by the epithet typicus or genuinus but none of these epithets shall have a status under the Rules. (See Rec. XXXV).

Examples: The name Nelosuma polynesicum var. typicum H. J. Lam (Bern. Bishop Mus. Hawaii, Occ. Pap. XIV, 1938 p. 148) is invalid because it is given to the type of N. polynesicum (Hillebr.) Baill. (1891), but the formae genuinum, longipetiolatum, and longipetiolatum subforma originarium published by Dr. Lam, under N. polynesicun sensu stricto are valid and are not formal homonyms (Art. 61 B) of formae genuinum, longipetiolatum and genuinum subforma originarium published respectively under N. polynesicum var. glabrum H. J. Lam (1938).

Note 2: Two subordinate groups of the same species may not bear the same epithet in the same position. No subdivisionary or disjunctive group may bear the epithet of its immediately superior group. This rule also applies even when the epithets are preceded by such conventional prefixes as Eu.

Examples: transfer here the examples under Art. 30 but amend the wording of the second example as follows:
"The following is incorrect: *Erysimum hieraciifolium* subsp. *pannonicum* var. *longisiliquum*, the subspecific epithets being omissable, the varietal names are homonyms (see Art. 37 A bis —5)."

Add: The expression *Andropogon Sorghum* subsp. *Sorghum* or *A. Sorghum* var. *Sorghum* is permissible (as a practical devise) to denote only the type form of *A. Sorghum*.

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Acceptance is not advisable.

**ART. 29**

The same epithet may be used for subdivisions of different species, and the subdivisions of one species may bear the same epithet as other species.

Examples: *Rosa Jundzillii* var. *leioclada* and *Rosa glutinosa* var. *leioclada*; *Viola tricolor* var. *hirta* in spite of the existence already of a different species named *Viola hirta*.

**PROP. 1 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)**

Delete the Art.

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Acceptance of the proposal is not recommended. Though the article is perhaps superfluous it is well to mention the case.

**ART. 30**

Two subdivisions of the same species, even if they are of different rank, cannot bear the same subdivisional epithet, unless they are based on the same type. If the earlier subdivisional name (ternary combination) was validly published, the later one is illegitimate and must be rejected.

Examples: The ternary combinations *Biscutella didyma* subsp. *apula* Briq. and *Biscutella didyma* var. *apula* Halácsy (see Briquet, Prodr. Fl. Corse, II, 107, 108: 1913) may both be used because they are based on the same type, and the one includes the other.

The following is incorrect: *Erysimum hieraciifolium* subsp. *strictum* var. *longisiliquum* and *E. hieraciifolium* subsp. *pannonicum* var. *longisiliquum* — a form of nomenclature which allows two varieties bearing the same name in the same species.

*Andropogon Sorghum* subsp. *halepensis* Hack. is permissible; the two subdivisions bearing the same epithet but representing subordinate grades based on the same type, *A. halepensis* Brot., and thus being synonymous except that the epithet of the lower subdivision is used in a restricted sense.

**PROP. 1 (1940 — 1; WHEELER)**

Modify as follows: Two subdivisions of the same species, even if they are of different rank, cannot bear the same subdivisional epithet, unless they are based on the same type. Of the two homomymous
subdivisions of one species the name of the later is illegitimate and to be rejected provided that the earlier were validly published. Names of subdivisions of a given species which include the type must be based on the type of the species.

**PROP. 2 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)**

Delete the Art. as it is incorporated in the proposed Art. 61 Bis.

**PROP. 3 (1940 — 12, 1950 — 62; FOSBERG)**

Add as second paragraph:

"Such subdivisional epithets as typicus, originarius, genuinus, etc. or subdivisional epithets which are repetitions of the specific epithet are to be treated, nomenclaturally, the same as any other epithets for groups below the rank of species."

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

Proposal 1 (Wheeler): If Art. 28 bis is accepted, the proposed amendment of this article is not necessary.

Proposal 2 (Furtado): Not recommended for acceptance.

Proposal 3 (Fosberg): Acceptance not recommended. See the proposed new Art. 28 bis.

**NEW ARTICLE 30 bis**

**PROP. 1 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)**

Delete Rec. XVIII including the examples, and substitute the following:

"Art. 30 bis. The description of a subspecific group which excludes the type of the species or of the next higher subspecific unit automatically creates a subspecific group of equal rank which has as its type the type of the next higher unit and is automatically designated by repeating the epithet of the next higher unit. This repeated epithet needs no formal publication and has no authority. Any other epithet for a subspecific group including the type of the next higher unit is treated as illegitimate.

"Example: the publication in 1843 of *Lycopodium inundatum* L. var. Bigelovii Tuck, automatically creates another group of equal rank which shall be called: *Lycopodium inundatum* L. var. *inundatum* and not *Lycopodium inundatum* L. var. *typicum* Wherry."

Add the following note:

"Note. The greek letter α is a traditionally reserved for the variety which includes the type of the species (sometimes of the subspecies)."

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

The proposal aims at the same end as the proposed new Art. 28 bis. The addition of the note is not recommended.
NEW ARTICLE 30 ter

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Inconstant aberrations (modifications) must not be given taxonomic designations but may, if desired, be designated with aid of a special terminological system. The term modification (modificatio, mf.) has no status in the system of taxonomic categories, and epithets formed under this heading have no nomenclatural status. The same holds for epithets formed as belonging to „aberrations” (aberr.) or „lusus”; these two terms should only be used for accidental modifications and not for hereditary units, as has often been the case. They must in the latter case be replaced by „form” (forma, f.), or, in interspecific hybrids, by „nothomorph” (nothomorpha, nm.).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Acceptance is not recommended. Categories which have „no nomenclatural status” need not to be dealt with in the Rules.

RECOMMENDATION XVI

Recommendations made for specific epithets apply equally to epithets of subdivisions of species.

NO PROPOSALS

RECOMMENDATION XVII

Special forms (forma specialis) are preferably named after the host species; if desired, double names may be used.

Examples: Puccinia Hieracii f. sp. villosi; Pucciniastrum Epilobii f. sp. Abieti-Chamaenerii.

NO PROPOSALS

RECOMMENDATION XVIII

Botanists should avoid giving a new epithet to any subdivision of a species which includes the type either of a higher subdivisional name or of the specific name. They should either repeat that epithet, with or without a prefix, or use one of the customary epithets, typicus, genuinus, originarius, etc.

Examples: Andropogon caricosus subsp. mollissimus var. mollissimus Hackel Arthraxon ciliaris subsp. Langsdorfii var. genuinus Hackel.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Delete the Rec.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 11, 1950 — 62; GLEASON)

Delete the Rec.
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PROP. 3 (1940 — 13; BOLLE)

In Empfehlung XVIII bleibt der erste Satz bestehen, das übrige ist abzuändern. Der neue Wortlaut sei der folgende:
Das Beispiel Arthraxon ciliaris Beauv. subsp. Langsdorffii var. genuinus Hackel ist zu ersetzen durch: Cyperus laetus Kth. subsp. eu-laetus Kükenth.

PROP. 4 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)

The second sentence to read as follows:
„They should adopt the epithet of the type for that subdivision if it requires a new epithet.”
Add the following Note:
Note. „The customary conventional terms, typicus, genuinus, originarius, etc., where already used in place of epithets, should be retained for the groups concerned, unless it is proved that these groups do not include the type, in which case the terms concerned should be rejected. The conventional terms typicus etc. are not epithets, and cannot serve as the basis of new combinations.”
In the Examples, correct „mollissimus” (twice) to „mollicomus”.

PROP. 5 (1950 — 5; LAM)

Line 1- inst. of subdivisions of species, read: taxa of lower rank.

PROP. 6 (1950 — 5; LANJOUW)

Delete the Rec.

PROP. 7 (1950 — 29; MANSFELD and ROTHMALER)


PROP. 8 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

Delete the Rec.

PROP. 9 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

Should Rec. XVIII be retained substantially under its present form the following proposal may be considered:
Add the following note:
"Note. When a tautonym is or has been proposed to designate the subdivision which includes the nomenclatural type of a higher subdivision, this tautonym is treated as a new name (nom. n.) and not as a new combination (stat. n.).

Example: Achillea Millefolium L. ssp. Millefolium Hayek (and not ssp. Millefolium (L.) Hayek); Daucus Carota L. ssp. Carota Thellung (and not ssp. Carota (L.) Thellung)."

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

It is recommended to delete the recommendation and to reject all the other proposals. See also the proposed new Art. 28 bis.

RECOMMENDATION XIX

Botanists proposing new epithets for subdivisions of species should avoid such as have been used previously in the same genus, whether for species or for subdivisions of other species.

PROP. RAPPORTEUR

It is proposed to delete this recommendation, as it is practically impossible to follow it.

NEW RECOMMENDATION XIX bis

PROP. (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Botanists are advised to follow the horticultural rules when dealing with cultural and hybrid forms which cannot be segregated taxonomically.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Acceptance not recommended. If botanists are working on horticultural lines, they will of course have to follow any special rules that have been laid down for that branch of botany. If on the other hand they are dealing with cultivated plants in an ordinary taxonomic work they will have to treat them in the same way as they would treat any other plant.

§ 6. Names of hybrids and half-breeds

PROP. 1 (1950 — 72; CAMP)

Delete the title and replace it by the following new title:
§ 6. Names of special categories, with particular reference to experimental taxonomy”.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Modify the title as follows: § 6. Names and designations of hybrids, esp. interspecific hybrids.
ART. 31

Hybrids or putative hybrids between species of the same genus are designated by a formula and, whenever it seems useful or necessary, by a name.

(1) **Sexual hybrids.** The formula consists of the names or specific epithets of the two parents in alphabetical order and connected by the sign \( \times \). When the hybrid is of known experimental origin, the formula may be more precise by the addition of the signs \( \varphi \), \( \delta \), the name of the female (seed-bearing) parent being placed first. The name, which is subject to the same rules as names of species, is distinguished from the latter by the sign \( \times \) before the name.

(2) **Asexual hybrids** (graft hybrids, chimaeras, etc.). The formula consists of the names of the two parents in alphabetical order and connected by the sign \( + \). The name has a "specific" epithet different from that of the corresponding sexual hybrid (if any), and is preceded by the sign \( + \).

Examples of sexual hybrids: \( \times Salix capreola \) (Salix aurita \( \times \) caprea), \( Digitalis lutea \varphi \times purpurea \delta \); Digitalis purpurea \( \varphi \times lutea \delta \).

Example of asexual hybrids: \( + Solanum tubingense \) (Solanum lycopersicum \( + \) nigrum).

**PROP. 1 (1940 – 4; ALLAN)**

Proposed is that a representative committee will be set up to explore the possibilities of international agreement on this matter.

**PROP. 2 (1940 – 5, 1940 – 14; SPRAGUE)**

Omit the words "between species of the same genus". The first sentence will then read: "Hybrids or putative hybrids are designated by a formula, and, whenever it seems useful or necessary, by a name".

**PROP. 3 (1950 – 5; VAN DIJK)**

Replace the Art. by the following three Recommendations:

B. If no systematic status is assigned to forms as meant in Prop. 2, Art. 14 these are designated by a formula, consisting of the names or epithets of the (reputed) parents in alphabetical order and connected
by the sign X. When the form is of known experimental origin, the
formula may be made more precise by the addition of the signs ♂ and ♀, the name of the female (seed-bearing) parent being placed first, or especially in the case of ternary hybrids or hybrids of a still higher complexity, or where different forms issued from the same parents are to be distinguished, by the use of other appropriate means in use or still to be invented by workers in the field of genetics.

C. Forms known genetically as asexual hybrids (graft hybrids, chimaeras, etc.) may be designated, if no systematic status is assigned to them, by a formula consisting of the names of the parents in alphabetical order, and connected by the sign +.

D. Species of (supposed) hybrid origin may be marked by having their names preceded by the sign ×.

PROP. 4 (1950 — 5; LANJOUW)
Delete § 6 and § 7 (Art. 31—35, Rec. XX).

PROP. 5 (1950 — 12; HELLYER)
Second paragraph to read:
"The name, which is subject to the same rules as names of species,
is distinguished from the latter by the sign × before the „specific epithet”.

Examples of sexual hybrids: Salix × capreola (Salix aurita × S. caprea), Digitalis lutea ♂ × D. purpurea ♂, Digitalis purpurea ♂ × D. lutea ♂.

PROP. 6 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)
Hybrids between species of the same genus are designated by a
formula consisting of the genus name and the specific epithets of the parents in alphabetical order and connected by the sign ×. If the origin of a ternary hybrid (or a hybrid of higher order) is sufficiently known to admit a more precise designation, the epithets of the two (or more) species from the crossing of which the one or the other of the parents of the ternary (etc.) hybrid emanates, may be included in parentheses (and within that arranged in alphabetical order). Of the two parents thus designated the one should be placed first which consists of or contains the specific epithet coming first in the alphabet. When the hybrid is of known experimental origin, the formula may be made more precise by the addition of the signs ♂ and ♀ after the respective parental epithet or complex of epithets. The sign × is also used for designating crosses between subdivisions of the same species and is then placed between the subdivisional epithets, which are arranged after the same regulations.

PROP. 7 (1950 — 72; CAMP)
Hybrids or putative hybrids between species of the same genus are
designated by a formula and, wherever it seems useful or necessary, by a name.

"The formula consists of the specific epithets of the two parents in alphabetical order, connected by the sign ×. When the hybrid is of known experimental origin, the formula may be made more precise by the addition of the sign ♀ in the case of the parent producing the "female" gamete and ♂ in the case of the parent producing the "male" gamete.

"The name, which is subject to the same rules as names of species, is distinguished from the latter by the sign × before the binary ("specific") name.

Examples: Salix × capreola (= Salix aurita × caprea); Digitalis lutea ♀ × purpurea ♂.

"Note 1: Where polymorphic parental species are involved, and if infraspecific taxa are recognized in them, greater precision will be achieved by the use of formulae than by giving the hybrids "specific" names.

"Note 2: Graft chimaeras (sometimes called "graft hybrids"), being horticultural objects, are dealt with in Appendix VII."

PROP. 8 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Transfer the Art. to Appendix VII.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The soundest proposals for the modification of this article and the following ones I still believe are my own (Proposal 4) and that of Allan (Proposal 1) c.q. Furtado (Proposal 8). The articles on hybrids should be placed in a special supplement to the Rules. The matter has to be discussed with horticultural experts and advice should be obtained from geneticists.

In my opinion it is undesirable to discuss it on the Congress. The articles in the special Supplement ought to be made simple and concise.

For the present I strongly recommend to delete the pertinent articles from the Rules.

As an alternative to this, the proposal of Camp is recommended. However I should like to propose the following alterations: to read instead of "and wherever it seems useful or necessary" the words "or by special preference", and to delete the third paragraph and Note 1. Information of this kind can be given in the description. These present difficulties have in my opinion partly arisen because botanists tried to incorporate part of the description in the names of the hybrids. That is however not what nomenclature is aiming at. I want to emphasize that I perfectly see the importance of the information, but it should not be a source of confusion in nomenclature.

The Utrecht Conference decided to appoint a small committee to report on these articles. Dr Camp was asked to act as a secretary. As a result
of that Dr Camp has provided a complete set of proposals for the naming of hybrids etc.

NEW ARTICLE 31 bis
PROP. 1950 — 72; CAMP

Hybrids or putative hybrids between infraspecific taxa of the same species may be designated by a formula and, wherever it seems useful or necessary, by a name. In the formula the order of the names and the use of the signs ♀, ♂ will follow the principles set down in Art. 31.

„Note: In general, greater precision will be achieved with less danger of confusion if formulae rather than names are used for such hybrids.

„Examples: (To be supplied.)”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See comment under Art. 31.

NEW ARTICLE 31 ter
PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Hybrids between species of the same genus may also be designated by a binary name of the same type as a specific name but provided with the sign × between the genus name and the „specific” epithet. Hybrids between different subdivisions of one or both of the same parental species as well as different forms (segregates, backcrossings) originating from the same parentage should be united under one and the same binary name. When it is desirable to give special designations to such different forms, they should be recognized as nothomorphs (nothomorphae) and designated by epithets in the same way as forms of species. The epithet, preceded by the term nothomorpha (abbreviated nm.) may be placed after a binary name or after a formula of the type mentioned in art. 31.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See comment under Art. 31.

NEW ARTICLE 31 quater
PROP. 1950 — 48; HYLANDER

Hybrids between species of two or more genera (bigeneric, trigeneric or polygeneric hybrids) are designated by a formula consisting of the names of the parental species connected by the sign ×;
the parental names are arranged in the alphabetical order of the generic names. Such hybrids may also be designated by a binary name, preceded by a $\times$, by raising so called hybrid genera, each of which contains all hybrids originating from the same parental genera. The „genus” name of such hybrids is formed as the name of a real genus, usually by some sort of combination of the names of the parental genera. The „specific” epithet of an intergeneric hybrid must not be placed under the name of the one or the other of the parental genera. In the same way „hybrid subgenera” and „hybrid sections” may be raised.

Ex.: Iris subg. $\times$ Regeliocyclus, including the hybrids between species belonging to subg. Regelia and to subg. Oncocyclus, respectively.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See comment under Art. 31.

ART. 32

Bigeneric hybrids (i.e. hybrids between species of two genera) are also designated by a formula and, whenever it seems useful or necessary, by a name.
The formula consists of the names of the two parents connected by a sign, as in Art. 31.
The name consists of a new „generic” name usually formed by a combination of the names of the parent genera, and a „specific” epithet. All hybrids (whether sexual or asexual) between the same two genera bear the same „generic” name.
(1) Sexual hybrids. In the formula the connecting sign $\times$ is used. The name is preceded by the sign $\times$.
(2) Asexual hybrids. In the formula the connecting sign $+$ is used. The „specific” epithet is different from that of the corresponding sexual hybrid (if any) between the same species.

Examples of sexual hybrids: $\times$ Odontioda Boltonii (Cochlioda Noezliana $\times$ Odontoglossum Vuylstekkeae); $\times$ Pyronia Veitchii (Cydonia oblonga $\times$ Pyrus communis).

Examples of asexual hybrids: $+$ Laburnocytisus Adami (Laburnum anagyroides $+$ Cytisus purpureus); $+$ Pyronia Daniellii (Cydonia oblonga $+$ Pyrus communis).

PROP. 1 (1940 — 4; ALLAN)

Proposed is that a representative committee will be set up to explore the possibilities of international agreement on this matter.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 5, 1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)

„The name of a bigeneric hybrid (i.e. a hybrid between species of two genera) consists of a new „generic name”, usually formed by a
combination of the names of the parent genera, and a 'specific' epithet. All hybrids between the same two genera bear the same 'generic' name. As the generic characters of the parent genera may be very variously combined in these hybrids, no useful purpose would be served by attempting to supply a generic description. Hence, the 'generic' name is considered as validly published if it is effectively published with a mention of the two genera concerned. The present examples might be left under Art. 32.

**PROP. 3 (1950 — 5; VAN DIJK)**

To be replaced by recommendation (E):

E. Where a new genus is to be established the type-species of which is a (supposed) bi- or plurigeneric hybrid, the generic name is preferably formed by a combination of the names of the (supposed) parent-genera, or, in the case of many genera entering into the parentage of the type-species a name is chosen ending in -ara.

**PROP. 4 (1950 — 5; LANJOUW)**

Delete § 6 and § 7 (Art. 31—35, Rec. XX).

**PROP. 5 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

The „specific” epithet mentioned in art. 31 should be of the same type as the true specific epithets, but such formed by some sort of combination of the epithets of the parental species are also allowed. Words standing in the place of epithets and consisting of the parental epithets combined in unaltered form or only with the change of the ending of one of them, or consisting of such an epithet combined with the generic name of one of the parents with or without change of its ending are considered as formulae and not as true epithets.

Ex.: The designation *Potentilla atrosanguinea-formosa* published by Maund should be considered as a formula meaning *Potentilla atrosanguinea × formosa*. — Designations as *Agropyron pratensis-repens* (Lange, Haandb. danske Flora, ed. 4, 1886-'88, 49) and *Verbascum nigro-lychnitis* (Schiede, Pl. hybr., 1825, 40) are not considered as legitimate binary names, only as hybrid formulae; the correct binary names for these hybrids are × *Rouxia Langei* (A. & G.) Hyl. and *Verbascum × Schiedeanum* Koch, respectively. — The designation *Potentilla tormentillo-formosa*, published by Maund for a hybrid given as *Potentilla formosa ♀ × Tormentilla reptans ♀, is not considered as a legitimate binary name; if both parents are considered, as now usually is the case, as belonging to *Potentilla*, its correct binary name is *Potentilla × Tonguei* hort.

Note. „Fancy” epithets of horticultural forms of interspecific hybrids, which may according to art. 35 be placed immediately after the generic name in place of the „specific” epithet must not be considered as such and have no nomenclatural status.

**PROP. 6 (1950 — 72; CAMP)**

Bigeneric hybrids (i.e. hybrids between species of two genera) are
also designated by a formula and, wherever it seems useful or necessary, by a name.

The formula consists of the names of the two parents connected by the sign \( \times \), as in Art. 31.

The name consists of a new "generic" name usually formed by a euphonic combination of parts of the names of the two parent genera, and a "specific" epithet. All hybrids between the same two genera bear the same "generic" name, this to be preceded by the sign \( \times \).

Examples: \( \times \text{Chionoscilla} (= \text{Chionodoxa} \times \text{Scilla}) \); \( \times \text{Heucherella} (= \text{Heuchera} \times \text{Tiarella}) \); \( \times \text{Odontioda Boltonii} (= \text{Cochlioda Noezliana} \times \text{Odontoglossum Vuylstekeae}) \).

**PROP. 7 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)**

Transfer the Art. to Appendix VII.

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

See comment under Art. 31.

**ART. 33**

Ternary hybrids, or those of a higher order, are designated like ordinary hybrids by a formula and, whenever it seems useful or necessary, by a binary name. Such as are trigeneric or polygeneric are given new "generic" names usually formed by a combination of the names of the parent genera.

Examples: \( \times \text{Salix Straehleri} = \text{Salix aurita} \times \text{cinerea} \times \text{repens} \) or \( S. (\text{aurita} \times \text{repens}) \times \text{cinerea} \).

Examples of new generic names: \( \times \text{Brassolaeliocattleya} \) (composed of the three names \text{Brassavola}, \text{Laelia} and \text{Cattleya}); \( \times \text{Potinara}; \times \text{Vuylstekeara} \).

**PROP. 1 (1950 — 5; VAN DIJK)**

Replace Art. 32 and 33 by the following Recommendation: Where a new genus is to be established the type species of which is a (supposed) bi- or plurigeneric hybrid, the generic name is preferably formed by a combination of the names of the (supposed) parent genera, or, in the case of many genera entering into the parentage of the type species, a name is chosen ending in -ara.

**PROP. 2 (1950 — 5; LANJOUW)**

Delete § 6 and § 7 (Art. 31—35, Rec. XX).

**PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)**

Interspecific chimaeras, i.e. chimaeras composed of tissues belonging to different species or to different interspecific hybrids or to a species and an interspecific hybrid are designated by a formula after the
same method as described for interspecific hybrids in art. 31, but the sign $\times$ is replaced by a $\ast$. Interspecific periclinal chimaeras may also be designated by a binary name in the same way as interspecific hybrids; also in this case the sign $\times$ is replaced by a $\ast$. If the components of the interspecific periclinal chimaeras belong to separate genera, a special "generic" name should be used for the binary combination as in hybrids. This name must not be the same as the "generic" name of the hybrid between the same genera, nor should the "specific" epithet of a chimaera be the same as that used for a hybrid between the same species as the components of the chimaera.

Ex.: Solanum + tubingense = Solanum Lycopersicum + nigrum, or, if the components are considered not congeneric, + Lycosolanum tubingense = Lycopersicon esculentum + Solanum nigrum. — Syringa + correlata = Syringa × chinensis + vulgaris. — + Laburnocytisus Adami = Cytisus purpureus + Laburnum anagyroides. — Pyronia has been used both for hybrids between Pyrus and Cydonia species and for chimaeras composed of species of the said genera, × Pyronia Veitchii being Cydonia oblonga × Pyrus communis and + Pyronia Danielli being Cydonia oblonga + Pyrus communis, but should be used only for the true hybrids; the chimaeras ("graft hybrids") should bear the name + Pirocypodia.

**PROP. 4 (1950 — 72; CAMP)**

Ternary hybrids, or those of a higher order, are designated like ordinary hybrids by a formula and, wherever it seems useful or necessary, by a binary name. Such as are trigeneric or polygeneric may be given new "generic" names formed by a combination of parts of the names of the parent genera; usually, however, multigeneric hybrid groups combining three or more genera receive a conventional name consisting of the name of some person eminent as a student, collector or grower of the group, to which is added the termination -ara; no such name may exceed eight syllables.

"Example 1: Salix × Straehleri (= Salix aurita × cinerea × repens), or alternatively, Salix (aurita × repens) × cinerea.

"Example 2: × Sanderaara (= Brassia × Cochlioda × Odontoglossum), × Potinara (= Brassavola × Cattleya × Laelia × Sophronotis). Accepted existing compounds such as × Brassolaeliaacattleya (composed of parts of the generic names Brassavola, Laelia and Cattleya) must, however, be retained."

**PROP. 5 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)**

Transfer the Art. to Appendix VII.

**COMM. RAPPORTEUR**

See comment under Art. 31.