308. Article 24. To make this article a bit tighter it is proposed that the words “and must be rejected” be added to the first sentence of paragraph 4.

For further comments on proposals ... and ... see discussion under Datura cornucopaeae, D. laevis and D. inoxia in an article by F. R. Fosberg (Nomenclatural notes on Datura) to be published shortly in this Journal.


309. Article 26 (example): It is proposed to treat the spelling *siphilitica* of Linnaeus (in his *Lobelia siphilitica*) as an orthographic linguistic error and to use the correct spelling ‘syphilitica’.

Proposed by: N. Y. Sandwith (Kew).

310. Article 48: The second sentence to read: “When a name is conserved with a type different from that of the original author, it must not ..........; instead the name of the author of the name as conserved, with the new type, must be cited”.

Comment: A name cannot be used if its type is excluded. Under the type-method the conservation of a later circumscription excluding the type means the creation of a later homonym by conservation with a new type.


311. Article 68(3). Add a note stating that the names of Necker’s ‘species naturales’ in his *Elementa Botanica* 1790 are not to be regarded as unitary designations of species but that they are to be accepted as validly published generic names.

Proposed by: J. Proskauer (Berkeley).

312. Article 73. The alteration of the original wording of this article in the Stockholm and Paris codes, omitting the words “clearly unintentional” seems to have been a retrogressive step, introducing the possibility of extensive “corrections” based on opinion and also making several of the examples inconsistent with the wording of the article. For instance, it seems impossible to construe the spelling *Lespedeza* as other than an error, since the name commemorates de Cespedes, yet it is offered as an example of what we are not to correct. The only conceivable justification for retaining the spelling with *L* is that Linnaeus may have so spelled it deliberately, though this is not even likely. We are told that “orthographic errors should be corrected” but are then told that this one must not be corrected. It is admittedly not desirable to change the spelling of *Lespedeza*. Therefore the way to make the best of a bad situation and also to prevent wholesale corrections of what may be construed to be errors would seem to reinsert the words “clearly unintentional” and to make the first paragraph of Article 73 read “The original spelling of a name or epithet must be retained except that typographic or clearly unintentional orthographic errors and those indicated in notes 2 and 3 should be corrected.”


313. If organ genera or form genera based on detached organs are referred to genera or based on groups of organs connected together it should be a rule that the name of that group of organs which contains the organs on which the other name is based must be adopted, even if published later. That means, names of spores dispersae may be replaced by those of sporangia, these by names of sporophylls, these by names of fertile shoots. But this would only be allowed, after it has been absolutely proved that the spore shape etc. in question only occurs in one genus.

Proposed by: R. Potonié (Krefeld).

XXIX. REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON STABILIZATION

J. S. L. Gilmour (Chairman)

1. The Special Committee on Stabilization was set up at the Nomenclature Section of the Eighth International Botanical Congress, Paris, 1954 (see Taxon 3: 220). At the meeting of the Section there was a “general feeling” that “something should be done” about the future stabilization of specific names, and the meeting “was nearly unanimous in its wish that some solution should be found”. The Committee was appointed to find it.

2. The membership of the Committee is as follows:

Chairman — J. S. L. Gilmour, University Botanic Garden, Cambridge.

Vice-chairman — R. C. Rollins, Gray
3. A brief preliminary meeting of the Committee was held during the Congress at Paris. Since then, owing to the wide dispersal of the members, it has not been possible to hold a further meeting, and the work of the Committee has been carried out by correspondence. Four circular letters have been sent by the Chairman to members of the Committee, and the views of each member have been made known to the others. Owing to difficulties of communication, it has not been possible for the final text of this Report to be agreed by all members, but I hope that it gives a fair summary of the views of the Committee.

4. In the first place, it should be recorded that a large majority of the Committee supports the proposal that some modification of the Code designed to reduce the number of changes in specific names should be adopted at Montreal. Only two members express clear doubts on this: Fosberg and Lange both feel that it would be best simply to report lack of agreement by the Committee, though both express some support for particular proposals.

On the particular modifications to be adopted, however, the views of the Committee are not so clear cut. This, I think, is not surprising. The subject of the Committee’s deliberations is such a controversial one among botanists that it would have been very extraordinary if its members, representing, as they do, a cross-section of botanical opinion, had reached agreement on it.

5. I will first give a brief, overall, picture of the support received for various proposals, followed by a more detailed report on them.

6. (a) Members of the Committee were asked to give their votes for proposals in order of preference, and there were six proposals for which a definite first preference was expressed by various members, namely: Nomina specifica conservanda (5 first preference, 2 favourable, and 5 against); Provision of lists to accompany Arts. 65 and 66 (2 first preference, 2 favourable, 3 against, and 5 not committed); Nomina specifica rejicienda (1 first preference, 4 second preference, 2 favourable, 4 against, and 1 not committed); Rejection of names not typified by holotypes (1 first preference, 3 in favour, 4 against, and 4 not committed); Deletion of Arts. 65 and 66 (1 first preference, 7 against, and 4 not committed); Compilation of lists of names (see para. 7 (x), 1 first preference, remainder have not had a chance to consider).

(b) It will be seen from the above that, if one takes into account only first preference votes, Nomina specifica conservanda, with 5, receives considerably greater support than any other proposal. If one takes into account first preference, second preference, and favourable votes, conservanda and rejicienda each receive 7, whereas none of the other four proposals receive more than 4.

(c) With regard to the proposals that received no first preference votes, none received more than five favourable votes, and each received either 2 or 3 votes against it.

7. The following is a summary of all the proposals that were supported by at least one member, a record of the support given to each by members of the Committee, and the main arguments for and against each proposal.

(i) Nomina specifica conservanda.

Proposal. (a) In Art. 14, first sentence, insert the word “species” before the word “genera”. (b) After Note 1 to Art. 14, insert
the following new Note: “In the case of specific names, the Committee will consider for conservation only those names which have been used for a long period, are still widely current, and the changing of which would cause serious inconvenience among a large number of users; for example, the names of important economic plants, plants often used as text-book examples, and plants that have been the subject of important scientific work”. (c) In the Example to Note 3 under Art. 14, add an example at the species level, illustrating that the specific epithet in a conserved specific name will not necessarily remain unchanged if the species is transferred to another genus.

Voting. First preference: Gilmour, Keck, Le Gal, Rollins, Stevenson; In favour: De Wit, Lange; Against: Baehni, Dandy, Fosberg, Mansfeld, Schulze.

The arguments for and against this proposal are set out under Nomina specifica rejicienda.

(ii) Nomina specifica rejicienda.

A revised proposal, based on the British proposal in Taxon 1: 78-80, has been put forward by Dandy and Ross in Taxon (8: 16).

Voting. First preference: Dandy; Second preference: Gilmour, Le Gal, Rollins, Stevenson; In favour: Mansfeld, Schulze; Against: Baehni, De Wit, Fosberg, Keck; Not committed: Lange.

The main motive of those putting forward a proposal for either Nomina specifica conservanda or Nomina specifica rejicienda, is, I think, that they feel, if any amendment to the Code is to be made, that it should be a simple and effective one, attaining its object of preventing future name changes by direct and straightforward means. The main objections that have been raised to both these proposals are (a) that there would be great difficulty in defining satisfactorily the type of names to be considered, (b) that there would be a flood of names sent to the Committee, (c) that there are now so few further names to be changed that it is not worth making an amendment to the Code to deal with them, and that the normal working of priority should be allowed to operate until all outstanding changes are made.

Supporters of conservanda point out that the adoption of this proposal would enable changes in all four categories to be avoided, whereas the adoption of rejicienda would cover only category (a), and they feel that, if any amendment to the Code is to be made, it should cover as many categories as possible. Supporters of rejicienda, on the other hand, object to a method which “permits the conservation of misapplications and other inaccuracies” (Dandy), and they maintain that rejection does not involve the difficulties and complications attendant on strict typification, as does conservation.

(iii) Provision of lists attached to Arts. 65 and 66 (proposals 314 and 315).

Proposal. Add the following sentence at the end of Art. 65 and Art. 66: “A List of names to be rejected for this reason will form Appendix . . . .”
Voting. First preference: Mansfeld, Schulze; Favourable: Baehni, Dandy; Against: Fosberg, Le Gal, Rollins; Not committed: the rest (5).

Mansfeld and Schulze feel that “many changes of names are caused by the fact that the application of these articles, especially of Art. 65, is practised in different ways”, and that a provision for lists would help to standardize their application.

(iv) Avoidance of strict typification (proposal 316).

Proposal. In Appendix IV, para. 4 (d), delete closing words “unless another element agrees better with the original description and (or) figure”.

This proposal was put forward by Mansfeld and Schulze too late for other members of the Committee to consider it in this form, but as a proposal “to avoid strict typification, if this would be in contradiction to the traditional use”, it was opposed by Baehni, Dandy, Fosberg, Le Gal, and Rollins, the rest (5) of the Committee being not committed.

(v) Non-recognition of nomina specifica nuda.

This proposal was put forward by De Wit in Taxon 5: 6, where supporting arguments are given.

Voting. In favour: Baehni and Fosberg (both with qualifications), De Wit, Rollins; Against: Dandy, Mansfeld, Schulze; Not committed: the rest (5).

Baehni’s support is qualified by the statement that “it should be made clear that a name without a description but with a reference to an earlier author is not a nomen nudum; see Ross in Taxon 5: 41”.

Fosberg would support the proposal provided the wording of the suggested note to Art. 42 is altered to read “... accompanied by descriptive information or (prior to Jan. 1, 1908) by an illustration with analysis showing essential characters...”

(vi) Rejection of names not typified by holotypes (proposal 317).

This proposal is put forward by Baehni as a new Article, Art. 10 bis: “Beginning on 1 January, 1961, a specific name accepted as correct can only be replaced by an older legitimate name if the latter is typified by a holotype in the form of an authentic herbarium specimen”.

Voting. First preference: Baehni; In favour: Keck, Le Gal (qualified), Rollins (qualified); Against: Dandy, Fosberg, Mansfeld, Schulze; Not committed: the rest (4).

Baehni comments that, after putting forward this proposal, he found that it was, in essence, the same as that put forward by Rickett and Camp in Taxon 4: 37. He realises that it will not cover all cases, but feels that it should be given a trial. Rollins suggests that the article should make it clear that the existence of the specimen must be proved and not merely assumed. Le Gal suggests that the words “matériel de collection” should replace “authentic herbarium specimens”, and that the following should be added at the end: “Sauf dans les cas de destruction accidentelle ou de modification ultérieure de ces holotypes”.

(vii) Proscription of certain works.

This has not been embodied by any of the Committee as a formal proposal, but, in one form or another, it received support from Dandy, Fosberg, Lange, Mansfeld, and Schulze; Baehni, Keck, Le Gal, and Rollins are against it; the rest (3) not committed.

Fosberg supports “with reluctance” the idea of “placing certain very unfortunate works, mainly non-taxonomic, on a proscribed list”. Mansfeld and Schulze suggest regarding “certain works which will become known for the first time not before the date of the edition of the Code as not existing for nomenclatural purposes”.

(viii) Deletion of Arts. 65 and 66.

Fosberg’s proposal to delete these articles (plus Art. 67) appeared in Taxon 7: 150, with supporting arguments; only a briefer version of these arguments had been seen by the Committee when they voted.


(ix) Rejection of names not in the Index Kewensis.

Keck draws attention to a suggestion by Gleason that “all specific names published prior to 1875 that had not been picked up by the Index Kewensis up to the first supplement following the Congress adopting the article” should be outlawed. The other members of the Committee have not had an opportunity to comment on this suggestion.
(x) Compilation of lists of names.
Lange has proposed the following, but there has not been time for the rest of the Committee to consider it:

1. Compiling lists of names of all species considered to be of real significance with the correct names as now understood.

2. Regarding this whole list as conserved against all future changes, whether the names are known to be in danger or not.

3. Ask institutions which hold the various holotypes concerned — and other institutions or persons of sufficient standing to be designed — to prepare ample neotypes with all information on cytological data, etc. etc. If possible to have neo-cotypes distributed widely as exsiccata.

8. It would, I think, be appropriate and helpful to conclude this section of the Report with an extract from a recent letter from Fosberg, one of the strongest opponents of Nomina specifica conservanda and rejicienda, together with a brief personal comment by myself as a representative of the other point of view.

Fosberg writes: "Why do we not as a committee recommend giving the present code, with a few changes to add clarity and remove ambiguity and sources of difference of opinion, a change to function? The name changes that result from its application will, in all likelihood, be only an infinitesimal fraction of what are certain to result from more accurate knowledge of the plants. If we could make such a recommendation as this, rather than the sort of thing that is now contemplated, I think we could settle, once and for all, this clamor and perhaps bring about wholehearted acceptance of the Code".

I have considerable sympathy with this point of view, but there is, I feel, another aspect of the problem which should also receive consideration. I agree that only comparatively few additional name changes for nomenclatural reasons will probably be made if no proposal is adopted at Montreal, but some of those few may concern plants whose names are of importance to more "name-users" than all the taxonomists in the world put together. These users include agriculturists, foresters, horticulturists, plant breeders, physiologists, teachers, and others who, together with taxonomists, form one single community on which the future progress of the plant sciences depends. From my contacts at Kew, Wisley and Cambridge with a wide range of name-users, I am convinced that a decision to adopt at Montreal a proposal (involving no compromise on any basic principle of sound, scientific taxonomy) which was clearly and unambiguously designed to reduce changes in specific names would constitute an important and statesmanlike contribution towards future co-operation between all those concerned with the study of plants.

9. The Committee was asked, in addition to their main task, to consider Art. 67 (Monstrosities) and Grumman's proposal in Taxon 3: 124. The following is the result:

(i) Art. 67 (Monstrosities).
In favour of maintaining the Article: Dandy (but needs further study), De Wit, Gilmour, Keck, Rollins, and Stevenson; Add lists to Article: Mansfeld and Schulze; Delete Article: Fosberg; Not committed: Baehni, Lange and Le Gal.

(ii) Grumman's Proposal.
Include in Code as a recommendation, not as a rule: De Wit; Against inclusion: Dandy, Fosberg, Gilmour, Mansfeld, Rollins, Schulze, and Stevenson; Not committed: Baehni, Keck, Lange and Le Gal.

---

NOMINA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA

(49) Proposal for the conservation of the generic name 6914. Dregea E. Meyer (Asclepiadaceae) versus Dregea Ecklon et Zeyher (Umbelliferae).


Adopted by: Decne. in DC. Prodr. 8: 618 (1844); Bentham in Bentham et Hooker f., Gen. Pl. 2: 775 (1876); Hooker f., Fl. Brit. Ind. 4: 46 (1883); K. Schum. in Engler et Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenf. 4(2): 293 (1895); Trimen, Handb. Fl. Ceylon 3: 160 (1895); Dalla Torre et Harms, Gen. Siphonog. 418