Further exceptions might be warranted for species based on chimaeras or variegations. For example, *Echeveria hoveyi* was described by Rose from cultivated material and has since been shown by repeated reversions that it is a chimaerical mutant of *E. zahnii*. Because the former is the validly published name, the species has now become a subordinate taxon of the monstrosity.

47. **Article 70**: Delete paragraph (4).

**Discussion**: In view of the encouragement that Arts. 22 and 26 give to such names as *Rubus* Subg. *Rubus* § *Rubus* and *Sedum roseum roseum roseum*, what possible justification can there now be for retaining the old autonym rule forbidding such innocent repetitions as *Opuntia opuntia*? Can anyone support its survival as anything more than archaic pedantry?

48. **Appendix I Article H I**: After “Where binary “specific” names .. are used .. all offspring of crosses between individuals of the same parent species receive the same binary name.” Add: “An exception is made in the case of amphidiploids behaving as species, which bear a separate epithet without the × sign and are subject to the same rules as wild species.


**Discussion**: Not only does present jurisdiction ignore the existence of amphidiploids, but in the above-mentioned example it would have us make *kordesii*, the true-breeding species, a variety or subspecies of *× Jacksonii*, the sterile diploid hybrid.

**VI. PROPOSALS BY H. ST. JOHN (Honolulu)**

49. **Article 23**: After the first sentence, insert: This epithet is of one or two, but not more than two, words.

The second sentence now reads: “If an epithet consists of two or more words, these must either be united or hyphenated.”

Delete the phrase: “or more words.”

**Argument**: These changes will return the article to the wording of the Stockholm, 1950, Code. They will prevent the acceptance of long phrase epithets and make clear the distinction between binary and polynomial nomenclature.

50. **Article 42**: In line 2, after species, insert: or infraspecific taxon.

**Argument**: This addition would make the article equally applicable to varieties, subvarieties, formae, subformae, or other intercalated taxa. It is obvious that they, like species and subspecies, should be invalid if, when they are published, the higher taxon to which they are assigned has not been or is not simultaneously published.

**VII. NECKER'S ELEMENTA BOTANICA**

*R. Mansfeld (Gatersleben)*

N. J. Necker, Elementa botanica (1791), bezeichnet die Gattungen als species naturales und Gattungsgruppen als genera genuina. Das Buch enthält eine erhebliche Anzahl neuer Gattungsnamen, die bisher stillschweigend als gültig angenommen worden sind. Wenn man diese jetzt verwerfen würde, läßt sich schwer übersehen, was das praktisch für Änderungen in der Nomenklatur der Gattungen nach sich ziehen würde. Um neue Änderungen zu vermeiden, halte ich es für zweckmäßig.
in Artikel 5 einen Zusatz zu machen, das die species naturales bei Necker als weitere Ausnahme wie gültig veröffentlichte Gattungen behandelt werden. Der letzte Absatz des Artikels 5 müßte dann etwa heißen:

51. *Article 5 last para.*: An exception is made for names of the infrageneric taxa termed tribes (tribus) in Fries’ Systema Mycologicum and the generic taxa termed natural species (species naturales) in Necker’s Elementa Botanica, which are treated as validly published.

**VIII. PROPOSALS ON PALAEOBOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE**

C. A. Arnold (Ann Arbor, Mich.)

52. *Article PB 1*: Since the names of fossil plants are usually applied to detached parts of which the connections to other parts can seldom be demonstrated, it has been customary to name organ genera and form genera when the use of natural or biological genera is not feasible.

An *organ genus* is created for detached parts (or attached parts if they are considered independently) of the same morphological rank that are obviously related and of which affinity with some natural group is known.

A *form genus* is created for plant parts that are grouped together because of similarity in form or structure but without consideration of affinities either among themselves or with some natural group.

*Comments*: The above redefinitions of organ and form genera are suggested as substitutes for the present ones because the latter fail to set forth the distinctions between the two. The definition of the organ genus that is given on p. 55 can also be used to define the form genus. A form genus may consist of “single organs of the same morphological category” (leaves, seeds, etc.) or of “restricted groups of organs connected together”. This is essentially the definition that is given for an organ genus. The essential fact that to belong to an organ genus the parts must belong to some natural group is not even implied in the definition. This basic idea is not expressed at all except in Note 2. It should be embodied in the definition. Furthermore, the reasons for attempting to distinguish between organ and form genera are not, as implied in the first paragraph of Article PB 1, merely because the names are usually applied to detached parts. We distinguish them because the affinities of some detached parts are known while for others they are not known. When the affinities are known, we assign them to an organ genus: when they are not known, we assign them to a form genus. The distinction should be firmly implanted in the definitions.

I believe a restatement of Article PB 1 is desirable.

53. *Recommendation PB 4A*: The whole specimen or specimens used in formulating the diagnosis of a new taxon should be considered the type or types. If type specimens are cut into pieces (sections of fossil woods, pieces of coal ball plants, etc.) that are distributed among several institutions, those portions or sections that were originally used when the taxon was described should be clearly marked with an identifying label or other suitable designation.

*Comments*: This may be a curatorial matter rather than one of nomenclature, but a statement seems in order to settle the often recurring question whether the type is the whole specimen or merely the parts that happened to be used when the new taxon was described. Thus if the holotype of a new species of fossil wood is one section, what is the status of additional sections cut from the same specimen?