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

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

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


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

M. Rousseau déclare que les textes anglais, français et allemands devraient tous être officiels mais qu’en cas de divergences d’opinion entre les versions, il pourrait être entendu qu’on choisirait arbitrairement le texte anglais comme le texte correct. Ce point de vue est soumis au vote et accepté par 40 voix contre 9.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**APPENDICE I**

**RAPPORT DU COMITE SPECIAL POUR LES QUESTIONS D’ORTHOGRAPHE**

**REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ORTHOGRAPHY**

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

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

**Article 82**

A. (98). Brenan’s proposal raises Rec. 82B(c) and 82C(c), in effect, to the status of an article by adding their substance as a note to Art. 82. This would enable us to eliminate accents, umlauts, etc. from older names in which they may be found and would prohibit their use in future. Furthermore these provisions for transcribing signs and letters not found in classical Latin would then concern all names, not only those derived from personal names.

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

“The consonants w and y, foreign to clas-
sical Latin, and $K$, rare in that language, are permissible in botanical Latin.

“Diacritic signs are not used in botanical Latin. In names (either new or old) drawn from words in which such signs appear, the signs must be suppressed with the necessary transcription of the letters so modified; for example, $â$, $ô$, $û$ become respectively $ae$, $oe$, $ue$; $ë$, $è$, $ê$ become $e$, or sometimes $ae$; $o$ becomes $oe$. The diaeresis, however, is permissible (Cephaëlis not Cephaëlis).”

Pichon proposes the following more detailed wording:

“Les consonnes $w$ et $y$, étrangères au latin classique, et la consonne $k$, rare en latin, sont admises dans le latin des botanistes. Le tréma est employé (et doit, au besoin, être ajouté) pour indiquer que deux voyelles, habituellement liées en latin, doivent être prononcées séparément (ex.: Cephaëlis, non pas Cephaëlis). Le tréma placé sur les lettres $a$, $o$ et $u$ doit être transcrit par un $e$ faisant suite à la lettre ($â$, $ô$, $û$ deviennent $ae$, $oe$, $ue$). De même $o$ devient $oe$. Tous les autres signes diacritiques, et le tréma dans tous les autres cas, doivent être supprimés.”

He also proposes to replaces Rec. 82B(c) and 82C(c) by the following:

“Les autres syllabes du nom conserveront leur orthographe exacte, ou modifiée seulement dans les cas prévus dans la note 5 de l’art. 82. Toutefois, on pourra transcrire les $ê$ et les $è$ de la langue française par $ae$, pour leur conserver l’accentuation originale.”

It is suggested that the exact wording may be left to the Editorial Committee, if the proposed change is accepted in principle. It may be pointed out that the more sweeping disposal of diacritic signs in Pichon’s version (“all others to be suppressed”) may perhaps lead to trouble. No mention is made of such letters as $â$, $ç$, $ê$.

Article 7

Part of Brenan’s proposal, omitted from the Recueil Synoptique, is to add the following to Article 7:

“In names taken from languages other than Latin the consonants $k$, $w$ and $y$ may be used in addition to the letters found in classical Latin. No other letters, nor any diacritic signs, are permitted in botanical Latin, but the diaeresis sign may be used where required, e.g. Cephaëlis, not Cephaëlis.”

In the opinion of the Committee, Art. 7, which is a “guiding principle”, should not be encumbered by such detail; the provisions, in themselves desirable, are incorporated in to the proposed new note to Art. 82 (above).

Sprague further proposes that the last sentence of Art. 7 should be deleted as, being a recommendation, it is out of place in the first chapter. He suggests that its substance be incorporated in a new recommendation as follows:

“Rec. 30A(i). To use Latin terminations as far as possible.”

Article 82

B(98). St. John proposes to delete Note 2 (with the associated examples), on the grounds that Rec. 82H, on which it is based, being a recommendation, does not permit the changing of an existing name; a recommendation is not retroactive. With this argument two members of the Committee are in accord. Sprague, however, writes: “it has been the general practice to alter epithets like salviaefolius and viciaefolius to salviifolius and viciifolius and this practice was authorized at Cambridge in 1930”; and, further, “if you insist on the retention of the original spelling, there will always be botanists who decline to obey the rule. So the best thing, in my opinion, is to leave the recommendations concerned as they stand, but to allow sticklers for compliance with them to treat any contravention of them as an orthographic error which may be corrected.”

A similar problem arises with Rec. 82C(b) and (c). The Stockholm congress accepted a Note 2 bis in Art. 82 to permit the correction, as orthographic errors, of terminations at variance with these recommendations. For the same reason, i.e. that a recommendation cannot “prescribe” the form of future names or permit changes in existing names, the Editorial Committee placed the substance of this note in the recommendation (last sentence of (b)) instead of in the article. Sprague proposes the restoration of the note as follows:

“Art. 82. Note 2bis. The use of the terminations $i$, $ae$ or $anus$ instead of $ii$, $iae$ or $ianus$ prescribed in Rec. 82C(a), (b) and (d) and Rec. 82D, and the reverse errors, are treated as unintentional orthographic errors.”

It cannot be denied that Sprague’s contentions have weight. R. Ross has urged the same considerations in a letter. Two difficulties must be considered if any such modification of the existing rule is made: 1) permission to change the original spelling (as in salviaefolius to salviifolius, Dioscorea lecardii to Dioscorea lecardii) must form
part of the article and be stated as an exception to the rule; 2) such permission will also open the way to such changes as that from *atropurpureus* to *atirimpurpureus* and *Myosurus* to *Myourus*, if any one wants to make them. It should also be pointed out (especially to the Editorial Committee) that the "ae" and "i" of *salviaefolius* and *salvii-folius* are not, strictly speaking, "connecting vowels". Rickett suggests that the only way to make such changes permissible is to include in Art. 82 a note to provide specifically for such changes, as exceptions to the rule.

Two of the three members of the Committee endorse St. Johns proposal.

C(98). St. John proposes to add to Note 3: "An author has the right to correct typographic or orthographic errors in his own earlier publications...".

Since any botanist has the right to correct the errors of any author, including his own, the Committee is unanimous in rejecting this proposal.

D. This proposal is a consequence of B above.

E(98). Janchen proposes to delete *Mesembryanthemum* and *Amaranthus* as examples of spellings to be retained; he regards them as orthographic errors. The Committee is unanimous in rejecting this proposal, and in supporting the conclusions of Sprague in Kew Bull, 1928 : 113, 287.

(It is suggested that it would be well to include in the Code references to the literature in which the status of such troublesome orthographies is discussed.)

(The English text of the Code contains a serious error; the two spellings *Amaranthus* and *Amarantus* are transposed; the French text is correct.)

Janchen's remarks on *Desmostachys* and *Desmostachya*, *macrostachys* and *macrostachya* reveal a point which he and perhaps others may not have clearly grasped. He objects to listing the generic names as "different names" while the specific epithets are given as examples of "orthographic variants". But generic names and epithets are capable of quite different treatment. Epithets can only be confused if they apply to species of the same genus; there is no reason whatever to class them as "different names" if they are taxonomically separated. Generic names stand alone; they encounter the homonym rule if they are orthographic variants of the same name; only the earliest may be retained. In order to avoid such a loss of names the Code provides that they may be "treated as different names" when they are sufficiently distantly related that there is little or no risk of confusion.

The question of "hemsleyi" vs. "hemsleyanus" is taken up under Rec. 821. F(99). Pinto da Silva proposes to delete the words "and the plants so closely related" from Art. 82. In the opinion of two members of the Committee, to do so would completely change the article and necessitate rejection of *Rubia* or *Rubus*, Monochaete or Monochaetum, *Peponia* or *Peponitum* (which-ever was later in each case); since these names, belonging to taxa in widely separated groups, are not likely to be confused, such action is unnecessary: on the other hand *Astrostemma* and *Astero-stemma*, both in Asclepiadaceae, obviously invite confusion. Pinto da Silva points out, correctly, that the principle of relationship is not used for the four names derived from Bradley; but the other examples show clearly that the principle is in fact utilized in determining which names are "different names" and which are "orthographic variants". In recognition of the objection, the following rewording of the second sentence of the article is proposed: "When two or more generic names are similar and are likely to be confused because they are applied to related taxa or for any other reason, they are to be treated as variants of the same name."

The third member of the Committee objects that the taxonomic position of genera should not influence nomenclature, being subject to variation with different authors. In Rickett's opinion, the examples mentioned above sufficiently dispose of this argument; it is extremely unlikely that any author will place *Monochaete* and *Monochaetum* in the same family, or *Astrostemma* and *Astero-stemma* in different families.

G (99). Conners proposes to treat the nominative case, in names of parasites involving the name of a host, as an orthographic error, to be changed to the genitive. He gives as an example *Puccinia coronata* f. *sp. agrostis*, which he would correct to *P. coronata* f. *sp. agrostidis*. Most unfortunately for his argument, "agrostidis" is not the genitive of *Agrostis*; "agrostis" is; the name as originally written is grammatically and orthographically sound. The name that needs correction among these examples (if any may be corrected on such grounds) is *Puccinia coronata calagrostidis*. The Committee rejects the proposal.

(Fichon suggests that the case is already
covered by the third paragraph of Art. 33 and the second sentence of the second paragraph of Art. 34.)

Recommendation 82A
A, B (99). Buchanan and Paclt present detailed tables for transliteration of alphabets other than Roman. Both, in the opinion of the Committee, need further study by qualified linguists as well as by botanists. The international system which serves as a basis for transliteration of the cyrillic alphabets may not be the best for botanists. For example, the use of je, ju, ja for what would be spelled in English ye, yu, ya (or ie, iu, ia) would confuse those who speak English. Ch for the guttural would be difficult for those who speak English, Spanish or French. The reintroduction of diacritic signs (ě, š) would necessitate revision of Art. 82 and of our manner of writing botanical names. Buchanan’s table for transliteration of Greek, though useful to some persons, raises difficulties.

To substitute the Latin ending -um for the Greek -on is not merely transliteration, it is translation, and was not always practised in classical times (Buchanan and Paclt have different concepts of what transliteration is). Several statements need modification, as that the ending -os is a “masculine nominative ending”; so it is, but it is also a common ending of the genitive.

The Committee is of the opinion that the incorporation of such tables in the Code at this time would be premature at best and perhaps more confusing than useful; also, as Mr. Ross writes, any such tables would be incomplete if they did not cover also Arabic, Hindustani, Japanese, Chinese, etc. The botanist confronted by such problems should consult a student of language.

Aside from the table, the introductory statement made by Buchanan as a substitute for Rec. 82A is worthy of consideration:

“When a new name or epithet of a taxon is to be derived from Greek, the transliteration to Latin form should conform to classical usage.” (The wording is slightly modified.)

C (100). Janchen proposes to insert an initial h wherever the spiritus asper appeared in the original Greek word, by raising the recommendation to the status of an article. Since one cannot make the existing literature uniform by such a rule, and since botanists would find it confusing to write, for example, Helodea while using manuals (e.g. in teaching) in which the name appears as Elodea, such a rule would not be conducive to nomenclatural stability. The proposal was rejected by the Committee.

Recommendation 82B
A (100). La Société Mycologique de France proposes an addition which the Committee rejects as already provided for in Art. 7 (“to avoid giving to names of genera and species a form which is too gravely at variance with the orthography and phonetics of Latin.”). The same applies to the proposal to “suppress” “les éléments morphologiques inconnus du latin”. Are any specific epithets published as “de l’Eclusei”? They add a proposal that the derivation of names should be given when not obvious, which the Committee endorses and proposes as a new Recommendation:

“Rec. 30A (f). To give the derivation or origin of new generic names”.

B. See under Art. 82 above on the “suppression” of diacritic signs.

C (100). Pinto da Silva wishes to recommend that a generic name formed from a personal name ending in ea, ia, oe or ua be identical with it; e.g. Garcia instead of Garciaea. The example “Correaeae” seems not so formidable to the Committee as it does to Pinto da Silva; we already have Andreaeae. It is true that names of tribes formed from such names are difficult, as “Garciaeaeae.” But they are likely to be few. (cf. Andreaeaeaeae.) The Committee is opposed to cumbering the code with such a recommendation.

In any case the word “must” is out of place in a recommendation.

Recommendation 82C
A (101). Sprague’s suggestion to change “subspecific” to “infraspecific” is endorsed by the Committee.

B (101). In the Prop. A of the Société Mycologique de France under Rec. 82B, part relates to this recommendation: that every “terme spécifique” having a termination identical with a Latin ending be declined as a Latin word. This would apparently suggest such forms as “Hi” as the genitive of Hus, “Bli” from Blum, “Jonis” or perhaps “Jonei” from Jones, “Andri” from Andrus, “Fris” or “Friei” from Fries. It was rejected by the Committee.

C (101). See Prop. B under Rec. 82B.

D (101). See under Art. 82.

E (101). Herter recommends adding a list of examples of Greek and Latin genitives; there seems no need for such an addition.
Recommendation 82E

A (102). Pinto da Silva proposes to add -inus to the suggested endings. The Committee endorses the proposal, with the addition of the example argentinus.

B (103). Ponce de León and Alvarez propose to substitute for this recommendation a more elaborate one in which they suggest different endings for names drawn from independent nations, from countries subordinate to another or provinces, and from geographical regions. The proposal seems impractical. It is often difficult to ascertain which countries are “independent,” and such status may change from time to time; existing names would further nullify such provisions (cf. virginiana, virginiensis, virginica, all used interchangeably as far as meaning is concerned). The Committee rejects the proposal.

Recommendation 82F

A (102). Baehni proposes the verbal change of “specific (or other) epithets” to simply “epithets”.

B (102). Sprague corrects this to “specific and infraspecific epithets”, since subgeneric epithets are not here meant.

The Committee endorses Sprague’s wording.

C (102). Janchen proposes to make classical spelling obligatory both for new and old names, changing sylvatica to silvatica, etc. This would mean a revision of Art. 82.

D (103). Pinto da Silva proposes exactly the reverse, but only as part of the recommendation.

In the opinion of the Committee both these proposals should be rejected. To make such rules or recommendations is to open the door to an effort towards standardized spelling, and botanists would become involved in an endless controversy over such names as pensylvanicus vs. pennsylvanicus, kashmiriana vs. cachemiriana, himalaiicus vs. himalayicus, nepaulensis, napaulensis, nepalensis and nipalensis, allegheniensis and alleghanienisi, and many others. We should also have to worry about standardizing transliteration from Greek (Callicarpa but Kallophyllon). In short, we should have to abandon the present Art. 82. It is our opinion that Art. 82 contains a workable principle, retention of the original spelling, even if the results seem at times “illogical”. It is less trouble to refer to the place of original publication than to become involved in philologic or linguistic disputes.

Recommendation 82G

This, since it is typography rather than orthography, was not assigned to the Committee. For that very reason the Committee suggests that it either be deleted altogether or removed to a new section on “Typography”.

One member supports Prop. C.

Recommendation 82H

A, B (105). St. John’s verbal changes were not considered by the Committee. They seem acceptable to Rickett.

Recommendation 82I

A (105). Janchen’s proposal to disallow such epithets as hemsleyi and hemsleyanus in the same genus is rejected by the Committee, who feel that there are few such examples and that they are not likely to cause confusion.

Two members of the Committee suggest the deletion of this recommendation. Being only a recommendation, it cannot provide a basis for changes in existing names; and it is of no use as a guide to the making of new names.

Recommendation 83A

A, B (106). St. John proposes either to restore this to the status of an article, or to make extensive changes in its wording. Sprague writes: “It represents a compromise between two opposing points of view and was purposely changed from an Article to a Recommendation at Amsterdam.” In this he is supported by Rickett.

None of us can see that there is any necessity for any changes in the wording of the recommendation as suggested by St. John, if it remains a recommendation. The Committee, then, rejects both proposals.

C, D, E (106). The Committee endorses these proposals.

F. Ponce de León and Alvarez (107) propose to make the recommendation an article; which is opposed by a majority of the Committee.

Article 28

A (45) was shown by Rickett to introduce confusion into nomenclature; an alternative proposal (6; 46) was made by Rickett and one to much the same effect by Pichon (B; 45); subsequently Ponce de León and Alvarez have advanced a new proposal (D; 46), substantially the same as B and C, with a long explanatory note and examples.

The object of all these proposals is the
same: to render more precise the words dealing with the formation of family names. The present article says only that the name of a family is “taken from that of its type genus”. This vague statement leads to such alternatives as Melastomaceae and Melastomataceae, Haloragaceae and Haloragidaceae. It is the object of all the proposals to legalize the latter of each of these pairs. In English this is expressed by Prop. C, to add the suffix -aceae to the stem of the name of the type genus. It has developed in correspondence that the “stem” of a word is a concept not in use in the teaching of Latin in France; instead, French latinists speak of the “radical”, which is in effect the stem without any terminal vowel which it might have. The effect of Pichon’s and of Rickett’s proposals is therefore the same in their respective languages; and it is recommended that, if the principle is accepted by the Section, as it is by the Committee, the

Editorial Committee be instructed to adopt the appropriate wording for each version, though one is not an exact translation of the other.

A subsidiary point is whether the genitive should be cited as a guide to the “stem” or the “radical”. It seems to be a safe guide for the latter, though it will not always show the stem. Rickett proposes to add to his original proposal: “(For the treatment of final vowels of stems in composition, see Rec. 82H). The long explanatory note and examples of Prop. D seem both unnecessary and inadequate.

The proposed Note 2 of Prop. D (47) is emphatically opposed by the Committee. This would apparently reduce such names as Fabaceae, Sapotaceae, Cactaceae to synonymy.

This, however, is not a matter of orthography; certainly the proposed Note 3, and Prop. E are not, and are not here considered.

**APPENDICE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LISTE ELECTORALE-INSTITUTS</th>
<th>ELECTORAL ROLL-INSTITUTES *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen (Great Britain)</td>
<td>Auckland (New Zealand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Botany, the University</td>
<td>Auckland Institute and Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberystwyth (Great Britain)</td>
<td>Avignon (France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Painter Herbarium</td>
<td>Museum Requien d'Histoire Naturelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achimota (Gold Coast)</td>
<td>de la Ville d'Avignon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gold Coast Herbarium</td>
<td>Bangkok (Thailand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelade (S. Australia)</td>
<td>Botanical Herbarium, Plant Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany School, University of Adelaide</td>
<td>Barcelona (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alger (Alger)</td>
<td>Instituto Botánico de Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratoire de Botanique de la Fac. des Sciences</td>
<td>Basel (Switzerland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Botanisches Institut der Universität Basel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State College (Bot. Dept.)</td>
<td>Belem (Brazil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Instituto Agronómico do Norte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Botany, University of Massachusetts</td>
<td>Beltsville (U.S.A.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Division of Mycology and Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo de Vries Laboratories</td>
<td>Survey Plant Industry Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara (Turkey)</td>
<td>Bergen (Norway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara Universitesi Fen Fakültesi Botanik Enstitüsü</td>
<td>Universitetets Botaniske Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Berkeley (U.S.A.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Herbarium, University of Michigan</td>
<td>Herbarium of the University of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antwerpen (Belgium)</td>
<td>Berkeley (U.S.A.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natuurrwetenschappelijk Museum</td>
<td>Jepson Herbarium and Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Berlin (Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbarium of the University of Georgia</td>
<td>Botanisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bern (Switzerland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herbarium des Botan. Instituts und Gartens der Universität Bern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bern (Switzerland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schweizerische Gartenbau-Kommission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birmingham (Gr. Britain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Botany, The University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Italics indicate that the respective institute was actually represented at the Paris meeting.
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