cannot be emphasized too strongly that the botanical code is designed to govern
the nomenclature of plants rather than animals and should not be complicated by
taxonomic vicissitudes. A name should enter into consideration of one or the other
code depending only upon the taxonomic placement of the type and not whether
it was originally considered applicable to plants or to animals or whether at any
time in its taxonomic history it has been transferred from one to another kingdom.

The effect of a strict interpretation of Article 64(3) on the preparation of text for
the Index Nominum Genericorum is too profound to be more than merely mentioned
at this time, but in brief, nomenclature thereby is needlessly implicated with taxo-
nomic history. There is no good reason why a name of a plant originally classified
as an animal should not compete on the same terms with a name of a plant originally
classified as a plant: the only consideration should be that, in the opinion of the
person using the code, both names apply to plants. Similarly, merely because a
taxon was originally assigned to the plant kingdom is not a good reason for allowing
the name of an animal to cause rejection of a name of a plant: the only consideration
should be that, in the opinion of the person using the code, one name applies to
an animal, the other to a plant, and therefore the two names, being governed by
different codes, are non-competitive.

280. In view of the preceding discussion and in the interest of adherence to prin-
ciples, common sense, and practicability, I should like to propose that section (3)
of Article 64 be deleted.

NOMENCLATURE PROPOSALS
FOR THE MONTREAL CONGRESS

XXIV. PROPOSALS BY C. V. MORTON (Washington, D.C.)

281. Proposal for Change of Example under
Article 6.

The example given for legitimate and
correct names is Leptostachya Nees and
Dianthera L. I suggest that a better and
clearer example can be found. For one thing,
the Note states that Leptostachya is "based
on L. virgata Nees," suggesting that this
species is unequivocally the type, but this
is not true. No type was originally indicated,
and there were six species referred to the
genus. The species L. virgata can at best be
only a lectotype, and L. wallichii might per-
haps be considered an equally good choice.
The Note goes on to say that "Bentham
reduced Leptostachya Nees to Dianthera L."
This is probably technically true. But the
fact is that Nees’ concept (at least in the
DC. Prodromus treatment) was confused, and
Bentham actually split up the species of
Leptostachya between Dianthera and Justicia.
There is the further complication that the
taxonomic validity of Dianthera itself is
debatable; for instance Fernald (in Gray’s
Manual, 8th ed., 1908. 1950) and Leonard
(Contr. U.S. Nat. Herb. 31: 487. 1958) con-
sider it a synonym of Justicia. The examples
given in the Code ought to be as simple,
uncomplicated, and undeniable possible.
Therefore, I suggest that the example of
Leptostachya and Dianthera be deleted and
the following substituted; ¹

Example: The generic name Cashalia
Standley (Journ. Washington Acad. Sci. 13:
440. 1923), based on the single species C.
cuscattinica, is legitimate because it is in
accordance with the rules. The same is true
of the generic name Dussia Krug & Urban
(ex Taubert in Engl. & Prantl, Nat. Pflan-
zenfam. III, Abt. 3: 193. 1894), based on the
single species D. martindicensis. Both generic
names are correct when the genera are
thought to be separate. Steyermark (Fiel-

¹ I chose this example as it came readily
to my mind. Others equally simple and
appropriate can be found easily.
diana: Botany 24, pt. 5: 248. 1946) however, reduced Cashalia Standley to Dussia Krug & Urban; when this concept is accepted the latter name is the only correct one for the genus with this particular circumscription. The legitimate name Cashalia may therefore be correct or incorrect according to different concepts of taxa.


The Note appended to this Article is new with the Editorial Committee. It reads: “The name of a taxon below the rank of genus, consisting of the name of a genus combined with one or more epithets, is termed a combination.” The examples are of species, varieties, and formae. The Editorial Committee certainly did not intend to imply that these are the only classes of combinations, but it does rather suggest it. The epithet of a subgenus or section together with the name of its genus is a combination (cf. Art. 21), and examples of these should be added. I propose adding to the examples: Mouriri subg. Pericrene\(^1\) and Arytera sect. Mischaryt
era.\(^2\)


The Article deals with the starting dates for the different groups of plants. Note 4, reading, “For nomenclatural purposes names given to lichens shall be considered as applying to their fungal components,” seems surely misplaced here, as this is not a question of dates. It would seem to find its proper position in Chapter III, Section 4. “Names of genera and subdivisions of genera” as a Note (or footnote).


This Article deals with the names of subdivisions of genera. As an example of a subgenus is cited Banisteria subg. Hemiramma. The examples in the Code ought to be of correct names, and therefore Banisteria is a poor choice, for Banisteria is a nomen reificiendum. There are any number of entirely correct examples that might be substituted. I propose Costus subg. Metacostus.\(^3\)


Article 22, as originally worded at Stockholm (Art. 32, Stockholm Code), provided that the subgenus containing the type species of the genus should repeat the generic name unaltered, but this concept was expanded by the Paris Congress so that not only the subgenus concerned should repeat the generic name but also the section containing the type species, i.e. the type species of Alpinia being A. galanga, the subgenus and section containing this species should be known as Alpinia Subg. Alpinia sect. Alpinia rather than Alpinia subg. Autalpinia K. Schum. sect. Hellenia K. Schum. This being a decision of the Congress, it has to be abided by.

At the Paris Congress, M. Leonard suggested that the “type” section of every subgenus bear the subgeneric name unaltered. This was not extensively discussed, and it was not put into the form of a motion or voted on. Nevertheless, it has been included in the published Code, reading: “Similarly, a section including the type species of any subgenus must bear as its epithet the correct epithet of the subgenus.” The example cited is: “The section of the genus Mouriri Aubl. containing the type species of the subgenus Taphroxylon Morley (M. acutiflora Naudin) must be called Mouriri subg. Taphroxylon Morley sect. Taphroxylon and not sect. Acutiflos Morley.” It is a little doubtful if the full implications have been realized. The section is the traditional subdivision of the genus, as for instance in Bentham and Hooker, Genera Plantarum, and in much of Die Natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien, and in many genera subgeneric names have never been proposed. It would be quite possible for someone to take a genus like Columnea and propose a new subgeneric classification adopting all new subgeneric names and thereby invaliding and deleting at one stroke all the well-known sectional names like Collandra, Pentadenia, Ortholoma and so forth. Literally hundreds of sectional names could be invalidated by this provision.\(^1\) It is unnecessary, for botanists have got along very

\(^1\) Of Morley.
\(^2\) Of Radlkofer.
\(^3\) Of K. Schum.
well so far without any such rigid and artificial system, and it is not by any means a basic principal of the nomenclatural type method but just one way of doing things, not necessarily better or more precise than the traditional way. I propose that the sentence and example quoted above be deleted from the Code. I believe that they have no status under the Code in any case, since they are an unauthorized addition of the Editorial Committee. The Committee was authorized to make changes in wording not involving changes of meaning; in this case it is not a question of a mere verbal change but of a fundamental alteration of the Rules.

286. Proposal for minor emendation in Article 23.

This Article, dealing with the names of species, says (in part): "The specific epithet, when adjectival in form and not used as a substantive, agrees grammatically with the generic name." After examples of masculine, feminine, and neuter adjectival epithets (Helleborus niger, Brassica nigra, Verbascum nigrum) occurs the example Rubus amnicola. This is correct as an example of a specific epithet that is a substantive, but it could be made clearer to those lacking a classical background, for on the surface it might appear to be similar to Quercus nigra, where Quercus is feminine in spite of ending in "-us" and consequently takes a feminine adjective. Rubus is masculine and amnicola is not an adjective but a substantive meaning "a dweller by a river." I propose adding after "Rubus amnicola", "the specific epithet being an invariable Latin substantive."

287. Minor emendation in Article 31.

In the example is mentioned "Lundell & Nannfeldt, Fungi Exsiccatae Suecici." "Exsiccatae" is an error for "Exsiccati."

288. Proposal for an orthographic emendation in Article 32.

In the examples are mentioned the names Cymbopogon martini and Andropogon martini. Examples in the Code ought to be strictly in accordance with the Code. Although the original spelling of this epithet by Roxburgh was "martini," in honor of General Martin, Article 73 specifies that the use of "i" instead of "ii" as prescribed is treated as an orthographic error and further that orthographic errors should be corrected. Therefore, I propose that these names be changed to Cymbopogon martinni and Andropogon martinni in this Article.

289. Proposal for minor emendation in Article 42.

Throughout the third paragraph of this Article the generic name Phylyctidia is abbreviated as "Ph." There would seem to be no reason to abbreviate "Ph." rather than "P." except to distinguish this genus from some other beginning with the letter "P," and in this instance the only other genus mentioned is Phylyctis. It is true that this "ph" is the transcription of the single Greek letter Ω but these generic names are treated as being Latin and the "P" and the "h" are two letters and not one. Therefore, I propose that the seven instances of "Ph." be changed to "P."

290. Proposal concerning Recommendation 45C.

Recommendation 54D (Stockholm Code) reads: "Authors should avoid adoption of a name or an epithet which has been previously published as a nomen nudum." In the Paris Code this appears (as Rec. 45C) as follows: "Authors should avoid adoption of a name or an epithet which has been previously but not validly published for a different taxon." Now this says quite a different thing. The intent of the rewording was apparently to avoid using the expression nomen nudum (although this term is widely used and readily understood even though it is not defined in the Code), but as reworded the sense is widely enlarged, because "not validly published" includes much more than "nomina nuda", e.g. epithets lacking Latin diagnoses or lacking citation of types, which are not now validly published. Perhaps invalid epithets of this sort should be included within the scope of this recommendation, but the matter is clearly beyond the scope of mere editorial rewording. I propose that this enlarged concept be formally submitted to the next Congress for discussion and decision.

291. Proposal for minor alteration in Article 50.

This Article deals with the citation of authors for hybrids. The various Recommendations appended (50A-50H) do not deal with hybrids but refer to general matters regarding the citation of author's names. I propose that they be appended to Article 46, which is the appropriate Article dealing with these matters.
292. Proposal for minor emendation in Recommendation 50G.

As an example, Combretum Loefl. is cited. I propose that this be changed to "Combretum L. in Loefl." as it appears in the list of nomina conservanda on page 258.

293. Proposal for minor change in Article 51.

This Article refers in line 4 to "Articles 57-58A," but there is no "Article 58A." I propose that the passage in question read "Articles 57, 58, Recommendation 58A."

294. Proposal for modification of the wording of an example under Article 52.

Article 52 states that when a genus is divided into two or more genera, the generic name must be retained for one of them. The example given is: The genus Glycine L. (Sp. Pl. 753. 1753) was divided by Adanson (Fam. 2: 324, 327, 562. 1763) into the two genera Bradlea and Abrus; this procedure is inadmissible: the name Glycine must be kept for one of the genera, and it is now retained for part of Glycine L. (1753)."

The example of Glycine is not ideal, for it is exceedingly complicated nomenclatural case. The original Glycine L. contained eight species belonging to almost as many genera by modern concepts. But in any case, the example, which was in the Code before the type method, should be modified to accord with this method.

I propose that the clause "and it is now retained for part of Glycine L. (1753)" be changed to read: "and it is now retained for that part of Glycine L. (1753) containing the type [lectotype] of that genus."

296. Proposal to change an example under Article 55.

Article 55 deals with the procedure to be followed in transferring a species from one genus to another. It reads: "When a species is transferred to another genus ... without change of rank, the specific epithet, if legitimate, must be retained, or (if it has not been retained) must be reinstated, unless one of the following obstacles exists: ... (2) that there is available an earlier legitimate specific epithet."

In the example given, Statice karelinii Sttschegl (1851) is the species being transferred, the genus to which it is being transferred is Acantholimon; the combination Acantholimon karelinii (Sttschegl) Bunge was made in 1872; the competing name is stated to be Acantholimon szovitsii Boiss & Buhse (1860). But this is not at all an example of the workings of obstacle 2 of the Rule (as it is stated to be), for the name A. szovitsii is not "an earlier legitimate specific epithet" but a later one. This example should be deleted and another inserted. It is not at all easy to find good uncomplicated examples of the workings of the Code, but the following may be suggested as an alternative:

Polypodium tetragonum Swartz (1788) is a validly published, legitimate species. In transferring this to the genus Dryopteris, Urban proposed the combination D. tetragona (Swartz) Urban (1903); but this is illegitimate, because it is a homonym of the earlier and different Dryopteris tetragona (Presl) Kuntze (1891). Therefore, Dr. Maxon took up the next oldest taxonomic synonym, Polypodium subtetragonum Link (1833) and made the new combination Dryopteris subtetragona (Link) Maxon (1926), the correct name under Dryopteris. Recent students have considered that this species belongs in the genus Thelypteris, and the combination Thelypteris subtetragona (Link) E. P. St. John (1936) was proposed. Article 55 makes it clear that when this species is being transferred to Thelypteris, the earliest legitimate specific epithet i.e. tetragona must be retained, and therefore Small was right in making the new combination Thelypteris tetragona (Swartz) Small (1938), which is the correct name at present under the genus Thelypteris. This article gives one reason why the same species can have two (or conceivably even more) correct epithets depending on what genus it is referred to.

297. Emendation of Article 57.

This Article deals with the choice of names when two or more taxa are united. One of the examples cited is: "When H. Hallier (Bot. Jahrb. 18: 123. 1893) united three species of Ipomoea, namely, I. verticillata L. (1759), I. rumicifolia Choisy (1834) and I. perrottetii Choisy (1845), he rightly retained the name I. verticillata L. for the resulting species because verticillata is the oldest of the three specific epithets." This statement is not in accord with the facts. Hallier’s species is “I. verticillata Forsk. Ag. (1775). p. 44?, Vahl, Symb. 3 (1794). p. 33! non L.” with the synonym Convolvulus forskalei Spreng. (publ. as “Forskalet”). That is,
Hallier’s plant is definitely stated not to be *Ipomoea verticillata* L.\(^1\) This example is therefore entirely incorrect, and I propose that it be deleted.

298. Article 73. Proposal to delete one of the examples.

This article specifies that typographic or orthographic errors should be corrected. But Note 4 remarks that “The liberty of correcting a name must be used with reserve, especially if the change affects the first syllable and, above all, the first letter of the name.” One example given is that the generic name *Lespedeza* must not be altered, although it was an unintentional typographic error for *Cespedeza*, commemorating Vicente Manuel de Céspedes. This is certainly in accordance with the note quoted.

However, among the other examples cited is a contradictory one, where it is recommended that *Gluta benghas* L. be corrected to *Gluta renghas*, since the vernacular name on which it was based was “renghas” and not “benghas.” This is another case involving the initial letter of a name and is different from *Lespedeza* and *Cespedeza*, except that these are specific epithets rather than generic names. But this Article and Note 4 are intended to apply to all names, not just generic names. Therefore, it seems unwise to cite the correction of “benghas” to “renghas” as a good example to be followed, and I propose that this example be deleted from the Code.

299. Proposal to change the wording of the examples given under Recommendation 75A (2).

This recommendation concerns the gender of generic names formed from two or more Greek or Latin words, which take the gender of the last if the ending is not altered. The first three paragraphs of examples seem illogically organized. The wording proposed below does not alter the material but merely rearranges it in three paragraphs dealing respectively with masculine, feminine, and neuter compounds. Examples of names formed from Greek words:

Modern compounds ending in -*codon*, -*myces*, -*don*, -*panax*, -*pogon*, -*stemon*, and other masculine words should be masculine. The fact that the generic name *Andropogon* L. was originally treated as neuter by Linnaeus is immaterial.

Similarly, all modern compounds ending in -*achne*, -*carpha*, -*cephala*, -*chlamys*, -*daphne*, -*mecon*, -*osma* (the modern transcription of the feminine Greek word *osme*) and other feminine words should be feminine. The fact that *Dendromecon* Bentham and *Hesperomecon* E. L. Greene were originally ascribed the neuter gender is immaterial. An exception may be made in the case of names ending in -*gaster*, which strictly speaking ought to be feminine, but which may be treated as masculine in accordance with botanical custom.

Similarly, all modern compounds ending in -*ceras*, -*dendron*, -*nema*, -*stigma*, -*stoma*, and other neuter words should be neuter. The fact that Robert Brown and Bunge respectively made *Aceras* and *Xanthoceras* feminine is immaterial. An exception may be names ending in -*anthos* (or -*anthus*) and -*chilos* (-*chilus* or -*cheilos*) which ought to be neuter, since that is the gender of the Greek words *anthos* and *cheilos*, but which have generally been treated as masculine; botanists are recommended to assign that gender to them.

300. Emendation to Appendix I, Article H. 1.

Among the examples of designations of formulas of hybrids is: “The designation *Potentilla tormentillo-formosa* published by Maund is considered as a formula *Potentilla formosa* × *Potentilla reptans*.” This is a misunderstanding, for the plant in question is *Potentilla formosa* × *Tormentilla reptans*, and of course *Tormentilla reptans* L. is a different species from *Potentilla reptans* L. When the genus *Tormentilla* is reduced to *Potentilla*, this species *T. reptans* has been referred to a number of other names, among them *Potentilla tormentilla*, *P. procumbens*, and *P. erecta*. I propose that this example be deleted from the Code, as it is not one to be followed as a model — the combination of a generic name with a specific epithet as “tormentillo-formosa.”

301. Proposal for a change of example in Appendix I, Article H. 3.

This Article deals with the names of bigeneric hybrids, and provides that the name consist of a “euphonious combination of part of the names of the two parent genera.” One of the examples given is × *Asplenosorus*, i.e.
**Asplenium × Camptosorus.** Examples under the Code ought to be of correct names. I recently pointed out that the name *Asplenosorus*, although rather widely used, has never been validly published. Article 40 provides that names in Latin form given to hybrids are subject to the same rules as those of nonhybrid taxa, and this includes the requirement for a description and also, after 1935, a Latin diagnosis. In the first publication of the name *Asplenosorus* by Wherry there was no description at all. Later, Wherry did provide a description but no Latin diagnosis has ever been published. I propose that the example *Asplenosorus* be deleted and that *Asplenophyllitis*, i.e. *Asplenium × Phyllitis* be substituted. The latter name was validly published with a Latin diagnosis by Alston.

**XXV. ADDENDUM TO NOMENCLATURE PROPOSALS BY BRITISH BOTANISTS**

The drafting of the following was not complete when the series of proposals by British botanists published in *Taxon* 7: 257 (1958) were submitted. The introductory remarks to that series apply to this proposal also.

**NOMINA SPECIFICA REJICIENDA**

(J. E. Dandy and R. Ross)

The need for some provision in the Code whereby disadvantageous changes in the nomenclature of specially important species may be avoided has been increasingly felt in recent years. The kind of change referred to does not arise from any alteration in taxonomy but is due to the existence of an overlooked or little-used name which is an earlier synonym of an established name and must, by the Code, replace it. Various proposals, mostly incorporating such devices as *nomina specifica conservanda* and *nomina specifica rejicienda*, have been put forward at previous International Botanical Congresses and have failed to gain acceptance; but at Paris in 1954 the subject was so strongly debated, and a decision on it considered so urgent, that a Special Committee on Stabilization was set up, to report at Montreal in 1959. At the Paris Congress the British members of the Committee to Deal with Urgent Taxonomic Needs had proposed a new and elaborate Article (see *Taxon*, 1, 78-80; 1952) aimed at securing a large measure of stability in the nomenclature of important species by introducing *nomina specifica rejicienda* and at the same time embodying the present Articles 65-67 which already permit the rejection of specific names in certain conditions. This proposal was defeated, largely, perhaps, because of its too wide scope. Nevertheless we agree most strongly with its advocates that in the interests both of nomenclatural stability and of the continuance of friendly co-operation between taxonomists and other users of the scientific names of plants, it is highly desirable that some alteration in the existing Code should be made whereby changes in widely used specific names of plants of special economic and other importance, at present rendered necessary by the application of the Code, may be reduced to a minimum in the future; and that the establishment of a list of *nomina specifica rejicienda* would be the simplest and most satisfactory way of achieving this aim.

We accordingly put forward the following limited proposal:

**302. New Article 14bis.** "In order to avoid disadvantageous changes in the nomenclature of species entailed by the strict application of the rules this Code provides, in Appendix —, a list of specific names which are to be rejected (*nomina specifica rejicienda*). The object of this list is to further the attainment of stability in the names of species of special horticultural, economic or other importance; the names included in it, if not rejected in this way, would by the provisions of the Code replace widely accepted names well established in botanical literature or in commerce.

Examples: *Lilium lancifolium* Thunb. (Trans. Linn. Soc. 2: 333; 1794) would replace *L. tigrinum* Ker-Gawl. (Curt. Bot. Mag. 31: t. 1237; 1810), the well-established name of the widely cultivated tiger lily. *Lassonia heptapeta* Buc'hoz (Pl. Nouvellem. Découv. 21, t. 19 fig. 1; 1779) would prevent the retention of *Magnolia denudata* Desr. (apud Lam. in Encycl. Méth. Bot. 3: 675; 1791), the accepted name of an important cultivated species.

---

2 Amer. Fern Journ. 27: 56. 1937.