definition coincides with that of the category and might generally be given as a group of organisms which a "good taxonomist" recognizes as (a species, genus, family... etc.).

As an abstraction the term taxon is rather sharply definable if the condition is added that it should denote any nomenclatural category and that by nomenclatural categories we exclusively understand those enumerated in Art. 13 of the Code.

Even so, however, we must be aware that a botanist may be seriously tempted to identify "taxon" and "any natural group", the latter term being applicable to any group of organisms which have some "natural feature" in common.

In conclusion we may state, that taxon is a term which is unloosenable connected with the Code and should not be used in any other context.

THE COMPULSORY LATIN DIAGNOSIS

A. A. Bullock (Kew)

The Paris Code, most painstakingly edited by an international committee under the very able chairmanship of Prof. Lanjouw and astute guidance of Dr. Stafleu, is a vast improvement on all previous editions but there remain some few anomalies, and this note is intended to point out one of them.

Art. 34 of the Paris Code corresponds to Art. 44 of the Stockholm Code, but an attempt was made to close a loophole for escaping the compulsory Latin diagnosis. The Stockholm Code brought forward the effective date to 1 Jan. 1935 for all plants except bacteria and algae; the Paris Code fixed the date for those two groups at 1 Jan. 1958. But there is an addition in the Paris Code which goes far beyond the intention of the Congress and probably beyond the intention of the editorial committee. This is, "..... or by a reference to a previously and effectively published Latin diagnosis". The intention, clearly, is to cover the period since 1 Jan. 1935, prior to which descriptions in modern languages are sufficient for valid publication, but the effect of the wording of the article is to invalidate all new names published since 1 Jan. 1935 which depend upon a reference back to any previously published description, unless the latter was in Latin! It is impossible to say how many names will be affected, but the number must be large.

The following amended wording of Art. 34 will perhaps avoid this difficulty, and bring it into line with Art. 32, which also refers to previously published descriptions:

"Art. 34. In order to be validly published, a new name for a taxon of recent plants, the bacteria and algae excepted, published on or after 1 Jan. 1935 must be accompanied by a Latin description, or by a reference to a previously published description in accordance with Art. 32, provided only that such previously published description must be in Latin if it was published on or after 1 Jan. 1935.

The same considerations apply to new names for recent taxa of Algae, except that the effective date is 1 Jan. 1958."

It will be noted that I have substituted the word "description" for "diagnosis", as has been done already in Art. 32 and elsewhere in the Code. Although the word "diagnosis" includes perhaps more than a simple description, in the jargon of

1) Proposal no. 11 submitted to the 9th International Botanical Congress, Montreal 1959.
taxonomy it has come to mean very considerably less and many taxonomists attempt to satisfy the requirements of the Code by a very brief, often meaningless "diagnosis", followed by a description in a modern language.

I have also avoided the use of the expression "new taxon" since this is open to the objection that since a taxon is defined as any taxonomic group admitted or implied by the Code, such as "genus", "species", etc., a new taxon could be something different from these. Further, for the purpose of Art. 34, a taxon is not necessarily new (in the jargon of taxonomy) if a previously published description of it can be cited. In any event, the Code can legislate only as to the names to be applied to taxa.

---

**A SYMBOL FOR INTROGRESSANTS**

Hui-Lin Li (Philadelphia, Pa.)

In recent years it has been shown in an ever increasing number of genera and species of plants, and in some animal groups as well, that one of the sources of variation in natural populations is introgressive hybridization, hybridization followed by successive back-crosses between the participating species.

In a strict sense, these introgressants, the name by which these back-crosses and hybrid swarms are now generally known, are different from F1 hybrids, which are the hybrids recognized by most taxonomists. According to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (1956), the hybrid is designated by a formula (Art. H. 1, Appendix I of the Code) consisting "of the specific epithets of the parents in alphabetical order connected by the multiplication sign", or "When the hybrid is of known experimental origin, the formula may be made more precise by the addition of the sign to the epithet of the parent producing the female gamete and to the epithet of the parent producing the male gamete". The Code also provides that hybrids can be designated "whenever it seems useful or necessary", by a name with the multiplication sign before the specific epithet.

The multiplication sign had been commonly employed to designate hybrids before its official recognition by the Code. In my opinion, in most of the cases, the formula is sufficient for designating hybrids or putative hybrids. A Latin specific epithet for F1 hybrids seems superfluous as it greatly complicates the already extremely burdensome botanical nomenclature. A specific epithet is desirable only in such case when the hybrid establishes itself as a constant true breeding line by means of allopolyploidy. The notes under Articles H. 1 and H. 2 of Appendix I of the Code, "When polymorphic parental species are involved and if infraspecific taxa are recognized in them, greater precision may be achieved by the use of formulae than by giving the hybrids 'specific' names", and "In general greater precision will be observed with less danger of confusion if formulae rather than names are used for such [infraspecific] hybrids", should apply to all intra- and infraspecific hybrids and more emphatically stressed in the Code.

According to the above mentioned articles of the Code, it is clear that the formula and the name are designated for F1 hybrids only. However, the Code seems to neglect the very "precision" it wants to emphasize when in the same Article H. 1 it provides that "When binary 'specific' names of Latin form are used for hybrids, all offspring between individuals of the same parent species receive the same binary name". In Article C. 24 of the Code of Cultivated Plants (Art. C. 24 of Appendix III of the Code 1952), it provides that such a formula or "collective name"