<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST SESSION (29 July 1964)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals on procedure</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND SESSION (30 July 1964)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD SESSION (30 July 1964)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOURTH and FIFTH SESSIONS (31 July 1964)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilization</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Committee for Hybrids</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Committee for Fossil Plants</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neotypes</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIXTH SESSION (1 August 1964)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Committee on Orthography</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Committee for Fungi and Lichens</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Committee for Bryophytes</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Committee for Algae</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Nominations Committee</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVENTH SESSION (1 August 1964)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Committee on superfluous names</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Subcommittee for family names</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Editorial Committee</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on authority of the Code</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral roll Institutes</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of enrolled members of the nomenclature section</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Chairman opened the session by calling upon Dr Harry Godwin, president of the Tenth International Botanical Congress to address the meeting.

Dr Godwin: “The need for international agreement is particularly compelling for all concerned with nomenclature, and were there to be no other reason why botanists should meet from time to time in congresses of this kind, they would themselves require to hold such meetings. The purpose of speech is to permit one mind to communicate with another and this requires above all order and exactitude: it is the task of this Section to achieve just these purposes, mediating as you always do, pedantry with common sense. Before each Int. Bot. Congress there has been a preliminary meeting of all concerned with the machinery of the International rules of Nomenclature, and when the main Congress arrives a great deal of work has already been done. By the main body of Congress members these labours are perhaps taken too much for granted. It seemed to me, however, inappropriate that such an important part of the Congress should open altogether without notice or recognition.

I therefore thought it proper, despite the lack of precedent, to come here as President to welcome you at the beginning of your sessions.

You are well aware that your deliberations will affect not only the professional taxonomist, but every botanist, pure and applied, who uses the Latin names of plants, and you will realize that at the Plenary Session at the end of the Congress, botanists of all kinds will be anxiously awaiting the results of your discussions.

You have already expended much thought and labour upon the subjects under consideration: much has been published and read throughout the period since the Montreal Congress, so that the discussions you now begin represent the culmination of intensive labour, most particularly on the part of your devoted officers. The Congress should be deeply grateful to them and to you for all your work on their behalf.

Thanks to the courtesy of the Director of the Royal Botanic Garden, our Honorary Secretary, you meet in very pleasant surroundings, which may ameliorate the rigours of your work.

Permit me, on behalf of the Congress now to wish you successful and amicable meetings.

Dr Rollins thanked Dr Godwin for his kind and encouraging words, welcomed the delegates, and remarked that it was certainly a fact that much international work had been done in the past to obtain a satisfactory set of rules of nomenclature, and that much
work was still ahead. It was his sad duty to recall to the members of the Section the deaths of some of our colleagues who had contributed greatly to our work. Dr Charles Baehni had been a member of the Editorial Committee since 1950 and had devoted much energy to the subsequent editions of the Code, both in the English and French versions. Dr Wendell H. Camp’s interest was mainly in cultivated plants. He had large share in initiating the International Code for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants, and did great work towards the stabilization of names of plants of economic importance. Dr Boris Schischkin, though he did not participate often in the Nomenclature Sessions, was an outstanding botanist in our particular field and did much to promote the use of our Code among his colleagues. The Chairman was glad to strike a happier note by welcoming to the group Mrs Sprague, who was recorder at Cambridge, Amsterdam and Stockholm and who probably represented as neatly as anyone that particular part in our nomenclature activities.

"Before the deliberations on the Code start, it is necessary to approve the 1961 edition of the Code as printed. I now place before you for approval the Code 1961."

Mr Bullock pointed out that at Montreal Art. 40 was deleted and approval of the Code as printed should depend on recording this fact.

Dr Rolls pointed out that the Code could either be approved or disapproved, the changes were not up for discussion.

Mr Bullock insisted that the Code should be approved subject to the deletion of Art. 40.

Dr Stearn proposed that the Code should be accepted subject to the provision that this matter of Art. 40 be discussed later.

Dr Rousseau said that the proposal served only to table the Code as a basis for discussion.

Dr Rolls put the motion before the Section to approve the Code. After that we could go on.

Dr Proskauer referred to the statement on page 12 of the additional material reading "Art. 40 was deleted by the Montreal Congress because it duplicates part of Art. H. 1. It was kept by the Editorial Committee to preserve the present numbering."

Dr Stafleu stressed that the Editorial Committee was charged to keep the numbering as it was and re-affirmed the statement read by Dr Proskauer. This action was fully within the powers of the Editorial Committee because it was a purely technical matter. The article could still be deleted by this Congress.

Dr Fosberg asked whether this meant that consideration of the deletion of Art. 40 would be a new proposal as of this Congress, or still a discussion of the action at the Montreal Congress.

Dr Rolls stated that it would have to be a new proposal. The Editorial Committee was faced with a conflict in the decisions of the Congress and asked again for approval of the Code as printed.

The Code was adopted by a large majority (5 against, 9 abstentions).

Dr Rolls then asked for the appointment of the Nominations Committee as follows: Dr Lanjouw (Chairman), Dr Fulford, Dr Har, Dr Papenfuss (Secretary), Father San-tapau, Dr Weresub. This composition of the committee was accepted.

Proposals on procedure

Prop. A (98: 51: 0: 3).

Dr Rousseau asked for a vote rightaway without discussion.

Dr Rolls asked whether a card vote was necessary.

Dr Lanjouw explained that this proposal had been made a few years ago. As rapporteur he would now not support the proposal: many proposals had actually been made and printed; there had been a preliminary vote. It would not be wise to rule out of order all this work at this moment. Such an action could only be taken if the previous Congress had ruled that we would not take any proposals into account at this Congress. He hoped, however, that the items specially mentioned for discussion would receive due attention at this Congress.

Dr Solbrig said that there were botanists who thought that proposal A was going to be considered and who did not send in their suggestions for modifying the Code. There was consequently a reverse point to the one raised by Dr Lanjouw.

Mr Bullock asked the Section to throw out Prop. A. He pointed out that a number of proposals had been made to improve the Code by the removal of errors and equivalences and the present proposal would render them valueless.

Dr Proskauer welcomed the statement from the Rapporteur-général because he agreed that this proposal was a-moral. The Section was one of the oldest of its kind and
Its decisions depended on voluntary agreement by botanists all over the world. Changes in the Code should be kept to a minimum. He was in favour of the principle that alternative congresses should deal with the articles of the Code themselves. He felt that no change should be made, however, in the subject matter that was before the session, because this had not been agreed upon at Montreal. He thought that it was wrong of the Editorial Committee to make this proposal and it should be ruled out of order.

Dr Wood stated that contrary to Dr Pros-kauer's remarks it had been pointed out repeatedly that one international congress cannot bind a subsequent congress to action. It was for this Congress to decide upon the action to take.

As for the Code, 2 years elapse before a new one can be produced. The present Code had been available for 2 years only. As yet we did not know the full implications of many of the changes made at Montréal. Our Code was good, useable, even with minor errors. It should be left unchanged for the present.

Dr Papenfuss stressed that the delegates had come to this session with a great deal of sacrifice. Adoption of this proposal would mean that we would have come for nothing: we had not come for discussions without decisions.

Dr Chaloner supported the motion, understanding that we would discuss the proposals before the Congress but would agree not to approve actual changes to the Code.

Dr Lange said that Prop. A and Prop. B should be discussed together, since the acceptance of Prop. A might be influenced by the decision on Prop. B.

Dr Rollins said that the two were not tied together. We were discussing Prop. A only which dealt with a concrete decision on actual procedure at this Congress.

Dr Fægri said that the main effect of Prop. A would be to rule out those proposals which had received an affirmative postal vote. The great majority of the proposals had been either rejected or referred to committees and were not influenced by the adoption of this proposal.

Dr Staafleu explained that the Rapporteurs might have advised the reference of certain proposals to certain committees, but that this constituted no decision. The Section decided on all proposals.

Dr Rousseau, speaking on the coming vote stressed that the vote on procedure should be by simple majority.

The chair so ruled; a card vote was taken: 122 yes, 144 no, Prop. A was rejected.

Dr Rollins then ruled that the proposals should not be taken up in the order of the Synopsis, but that some groups of proposals would receive special attention.

Dr Rousseau proposed that there should be no discussion of proposals accepted by at least a two-third majority in the mail-vote. We should not be too inclined to make nomenclature an end in itself; it should be seen as a simple tool. He proposed also that some choice be made and we take up in first instance only those proposals which had received more than 50% of the votes in the mail-vote, and discuss the others at the end of the sessions if time permitted.

Dr Rollins promised to utilize the mail-vote as a guide. If a proposal was defeated in the mail-vote and nobody asked to speak on it, it would be rejected without discussion.

Dr Martin said that all proposals ought to be announced by the Chairman and discussion asked for.

Dr Robyns seconded the motion by Dr Rousseau and added that discussion of rejected proposals would only be allowed if new arguments were produced.

Mr Ross asked the Chairman to announce in general the result of the preliminary vote on each proposal, to give proper opportunity at the appropriate place to raise points that needed to be considered.

Dr Fuchs pointed out that the mail-vote was not necessarily conclusive: the voting on Prop. A (procedure) was exactly the reverse of the mail-vote. Why was this so?

Dr Rollins explained that there might have been second thoughts, that the institutional votes also counted now, and that the mail-vote was purely a guide to help the Section move on more rapidly.

Dr Schulze pointed to the circumstance that many of those who voted in the mail-vote could not attend. Was it possible to combine in any way the results of the two ways of voting?

Dr Rollins pointed out again that the mail-vote was a guiding vote. He saw no way of combining the two systems of voting. The Congress had the ultimate decision.

Dr Schulze was unhappy about this: some institutions could simply not send delegates.

Dr Staafleu emphasized that the word guiding in provision 4 left no doubt how the mail-vote was to be regarded.
Dr Schulze asked what would happen if a congress was held in Australia. Only few of us could go.

Dr Stafleu answered that this was precisely the reason why we still had institutional votes in the sessions on Nomenclature. This procedure would avoid the section being swamped by a local majority. Institutional votes could also be deposited.

Dr van der Wijk asked for a clear statement on the contents of Dr Rousseau's motion.

Dr Stafleu explained that there were actually two aspects to that motion: one to follow in general the mail-vote and not to discuss a proposal if this vote was clear (unless discussion was asked for), the second to shift to the end of the sessions those proposals that had been heavily defeated in the mail-vote. He was in favour of adopting the first part of the motion, thus underlining the significance of the mail-vote, but he was opposed to the second part because this would be extremely confusing.

Dr Rollins put the first part of the motion by Rousseau to the vote: unanimously accepted. The second part was then rejected by a large majority. He then ruled that there would be no automatic rejection, but that an opportunity to discuss any proposal would be given.

Dr Tryon asked to be allowed to make a proposal to add a second part to Division III, Provision 4 to follow the part on "Qualifications for voting" as follows:

"Final and binding vote at the Nomenclature Section of the International Congress:

1) Alterations in the Articles of the Code, including the addition of new Articles, but excepting items referred to the Editorial Committee shall require a majority of not less than 60 per cent of the votes cast by the Section.

2) Items referred to the Editorial Committee and alterations to portions of the Code, other than Articles, shall require a simple majority of the votes cast by the Section."

Dr Schopf seconded this motion.

Dr Lange pointed out that the proposal was a change of the Code and should be discussed in its due place.

Dr Stafleu said that Dr Tryon's motion was to amend the Code, but that there was also the aspect of the actual procedure at this session. If the Tryon motion was accepted it would still be necessary to decide whether such a rule would be operative now. The question of the majority required at this session was one of procedure and had to be discussed at this moment. A change in the Rules would have to be discussed later.

Dr Rollins asked Dr Tryon whether he intended his motion also to cover procedure at this session.

Dr Tryon answered that it was initially a proposal to change the Code, but he agreed that it should first be a proposal dealing with present procedure.

Dr Korff said that the proposal was in effect rather like the two-thirds majority for changes in the Code such as this Section used in 1954 at the Paris meetings. It was a kind of protection against close decisions here by a limited number of botanists in matters concerning all botanists.

Dr Proskauer asked Dr Tryon to change the 60% to two-thirds.

Dr Lange then moved an amendment to Dr Tryon's resolution to read that changes in the Code would only be admitted at this session if carried by a 60% majority.

Dr Papenfuss asked how we acted in Montreal.

Dr Stafleu: by a simple majority.

Dr Papenfuss did not want to deviate from this procedure.

Dr Nevling disagreed with the previous speaker with regard to the simple majority rule. In some very important cases which would come before us he believed that neither side would be satisfied with a decision based upon a 51 to 49 vote. He was therefore, in favour of Dr Tryon's proposal.

Dr Faegri asked whether a method could be found to shelve motions receiving between 50 and 60 (or 66)% of the votes, so that they, even if not accepted were not considered as rejected.

Mr Bullock recalled that at Montreal we had the same discussion.

Mr Ross said that a decision to reject in controversial matters could have just as positive an effect on nomenclatural procedure as a decision to accept. We should therefore stick to a simple majority.

Dr Rollins asked a vote on the 60% majority: the motion by Lange was carried in a card vote [yes 185, no 94]. He then stated that the initial proposal by Dr Tryon would be taken up at the appropriate time.

Dr Rollins then asked the Section to set up an ad hoc committee on superfluous names to study the proposals dealing with this problem and to report to the Section at a later time.
Dr Fosberg said that this proposal came five years too late, and there was an excellent proposal before us, which, if accepted, would make the work of such a committee unnecessary.

Dr Rollins doubted whether there would be a clear majority for any proposal at this early stage. Careful study and report was wanted.

Dr Donk was in favour of a committee because it was going to consider what many regarded as an error. The trouble might be that the discussions held inside the committee would be repeated during the general session.

Mr Ross was also in favour of a committee because the questions were so involved.

Dr Rollins thought it of advantage to bring together some of the protagonists of the various points of view. The question would certainly also require ample discussion in the general session. He then proposed that the following committee be appointed: Mr Ross convener, Drs S. T. Blake, Donk, Fosberg, Holttum, Rickett and Tryon, members. This committee was approved by the Section.

Dr Stapleu then explained that a number of ballots in the preliminary vote had carried a request for an ad hoc committee on orthography.

Dr Rollins proposed that such an ad hoc committee on orthography be set up consisting of Dr van Steenis (convener), and Drs Bonner, Christensen, Dandy, McVaugh and Schulze to study the proposals on Articles 73 and 75 and their Recommendations. This committee was then appointed.

Dr Rollins asked for a motion to provide the Editorial Committee with the necessary powers. Such a motion had been passed at all Congresses after Stockholm, its contents had not changed and it read:

1) That the Editorial Committee be empowered:

1. To change, if necessary, the wording of any article, and to avoid duplication.
2. To add or remove examples.
3. To place articles and chapters of the Rules in the most convenient places.
4. To place all or part of the recommendations as notes under the proper articles if necessary.
5. And, in general, to make any editorial modification not affecting the meanings of the provisions concerned.

II) All the delegates are invited to submit their recommendations concerning editorial aspects, and to send them in writing to the committee before January 1, 1965.

Mr Gilmour proposed the adoption of the same regulations as in Paris. This motion was seconded by Dr Reeder.

Dr Rousseau called for a vote on the motion with the date of January 1, 1965. The motion was carried unanimously.

Dr Fosberg suggested that the Editorial Committee be instructed never to insert something which it supposes to be the "sense" of the Congress, but to adhere to the definite decisions.

Dr Rousseau answered that it was very difficult never to make any mistakes. It may have happened that the Editorial Committee did insert a certain "sense" rather than a decision, but then perhaps the decision was not very clear and the committee did its best to interpret it.

Dr Martin proposed that the proposed motion be adopted.

Dr Donk seconded the motion and asked whether a list of the changes brought about by the Editorial Committee could be drawn up, that is of new editorial changes not adopted at this Congress.

The motion was then carried unanimously.

SECOND SESSION

Thursday, 30 July 1964, 9.00 p.m.-12.15 p.m.
(Chairman: R. C. Rollins)

Dr Rollins opened the session stressing that the Code as it stood now was a good one. The Code cannot be enforced by law and interpreted by lawyers or juries. The Botanical Code had always gone in the opposite direction: it had been a type of document which stands on its own and is interpreted by the Botanists themselves. The Zoological Code had gone more in the legislative direction with special interpreters leaving the Zoologists more or less unable to interpret their own Code. We should not move in that direction and should take care that our Code remained self-sufficient, clear enough to admit interpretation by the Botanists themselves.
Preamble
Prop. A (5: 147: 0: 17) Rejected
Prop. B (5: 146: 0: 18) Rejected
Prop. C (8: 144: 0: 17) Rejected
Prop. D (3: 150: 0: 16) Rejected
Prop. E (6: 150: 0: 16) Rejected
Prop. F (4: 152: 0: 12) Rejected

Principle I
Prop. A (3: 161: 0: 5) Rejected
Prop. B (3: 147: 0: 16) Rejected
Prop. C (6: 147: 0: 13) Rejected
Prop. D (20: 88: 0: 63) Editorial Committee
Prop. E (5: 146: 0: 15) Rejected

Dr Rollins explained that when a proposal was referred to the Editorial Committee, this Committee would look at it and use those items in it that would help in the interpretation of the Code without altering its basic meaning.

Dr Faegri mentioned with respect to the proposals referred to the various committees, that several committees might not yet be ready, but that all proposals on extraterrestrial taxa had been rejected by the Committee for Fossil Plants.

Principle II
Prop. A (2: 149: 0: 16) Rejected
Prop. B (4: 149: 0: 11) Rejected
Prop. C (7: 130: 0: 26) Rejected

Principle III
Prop. A (1: 149: 1: 12) Rejected
Prop. B (4: 153: 0: 7) Rejected
Prop. C (9: 146: 0: 13) Rejected
Prop. D (7: 137: 0: 22) Rejected

Dr van Steenis requested that his proposal [E] on Principle III, published in Taxon, June 1964, p. 157, no. i be taken into consideration by the Section [add “unless expressly limited for the purpose of nomenclatural stability”]. Two of the principles had already exceptions mentioned in them. In his opinion there were many exceptions to Principle III and he would like to make this principle accord with the other ones.

Dr Fosberg asked whether the limitation for the purpose of nomenclatural stability was the only reason for exception.

Mr Ross pointed out that the rule of priority is over-ridden when recent and fossil taxa are combined, not for reasons of stabilization but because recent specimens provide better types than fossil ones.

Dr Stapleu mentioned the names of imperfect fungi.

Dr Rollins considered all this to be an editorial matter.

Dr Donk thought that there were exceptions to all the principles and would like to have the principles clearly stated, mentioning in a note that the Code also dealt with exceptions to the principles.

Dr van Steenis referred to Principles II and V, which have no exceptions.

Dr Rollins then ruled that the proposal was referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Principle III bis
Prop. A (9: 148: 0: 9) Rejected

Principle IV
Prop. A (3: 144: 0: 13) Rejected
Prop. B (8: 148: 0: 8) Rejected
Prop. C (10: 72: 0: 82) Rejected

Dr Schulze thought that it was not necessary to make such a change. We should only make changes when they refer to essential nomenclatural matters, i.e. when they really affect nomenclatural work.

Mr Margadant said that the general feeling of the Section should be expressed if it wanted not to change the Code. Such a proposal should then not be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Mr Ross was of the opinion that the proposal ought to go to the Editorial Committee because half of what is omitted by it should be omitted and the other half retained, if the Principle is to be consistent with the rules.

Dr Prokschaer pointed out that “in accordance with the Rules” means all the Rules.

Dr Buchheim said that the Principle had been made in 1935 and thought an alteration undesirable.

The proposal was rejected.

Principle V
Prop. A (16: 132: 0: 18) Rejected

Principle VI
Prop. A (3: 151: 0: 8) Rejected
Prop. B (14: 139: 0: 9) Rejected

New Principle VIII
Prop. A (7: 160: 0: 8) Rejected

New Principle IX
Prop. A (13: 154: 0: 8) Rejected
New Principle X
Prop. A (2: 168: 0: 5) Rejected

Article 1
Prop. A (15: 150: 0: 10)

Dr Tryon said that the definition of taxon should be in the Code; it is a nomenclatural term and several elements of a definition were required by certain Articles. He would like an indication from the Section that an appropriate definition would be desirable.

Dr Fosberg wished to support this proposition, especially in view of the fact that the term taxon had been adopted widely and with more than one meaning. By providing a brief but clear and adequate definition we would be doing a service to taxonomy in general and the Code seems an appropriate place for such a definition.

Dr Stapleu said that we could of course consider an amplification of the present definition of the term ‘taxon,’ but that the version given by Dr Tryon went too far into taxonomic methodology. The Code ought to refer and to apply to such methods but not define them.

Dr Tryon referred to various other definitions in the Code which were brief and unsatisfactory. He felt the need for an elaborate definition of the term taxon for the application of certain articles of the Code.

Dr Lanjouw agreed that the definition in Article 1 might be too short. The Editorial Committee discussed this matter e.g. at Cheltenham where Merril and Sprague tried to find a good definition of ‘taxon,’ a term introduced at Stockholm. The Editorial Committee was not successful in finding a satisfactory definition and reached agreement only on the short definition given here. He felt that the Editorial Committee would not find a solution to-day either.

Dr Schulze asked Dr Tryon whether he thought that a change as proposed would affect nomenclature.

Dr Tryon was sure that it would not do so.

Dr Stearn proposed that Art. 1 should be kept as at present but that a glossary be prepared to include many technical nomenclatural terms at present scattered through the Code, together with illustrations if needed. This could be inserted as an appendix to the Code.

Dr Lange thought that special terms might be very inconvenient in a document like this. He was also in favor of a glossary.

Dr Rollins asked Dr Tryon whether this alternative proposal would meet his case: the introduction of a glossary would obviate his proposal.

Dr Stapleu was also in favor of a glossary. There was a great demand for explanations and definitions.

Dr Gier believed that a recognized definition of any technical term was very desirable. He taught both systematic zoology and systematic botany, and found the glossary of terms in the zoological code very helpful. He therefore moved that the Editorial Committee be authorized to prepare a glossary of terms to be appended to the next edition of the Code.

Dr Fosberg supported the idea of a glossary, but would like to point out that our experience with such things in the past had been bad. He would suggest that the Editorial Committee take this task seriously so that we would not find the definitions not in accord with one or other article in the Code.

Dr Robyns felt that we were going outside our field and that nomenclature must be kept separate from taxonomy. The definition of concepts and the making of a glossary was a matter for the taxonomists. He was against it.

Dr Lange proposed that the glossary be printed in Taxon and its inclusion in the Code considered only at a later state, so that we all would first have a look at it.

Dr Burtt asked whether it would not be a help to revert to ‘taxonomic group’ and drop ‘taxon.’

Dr Papenfuss supported Dr Lange’s suggestion. The glossary should be tried out first.

Dr Lanjouw was also of the opinion that the glossary should not be a part of the Code.

Dr Fægri said that the work of compiling such a glossary would be very considerable. It needed a committee of its own: the General Committee could decide if this was necessary.

Dr Rolla S. Rao asked about the role of the Editorial Committee in clarifying the terms in the Code itself.

Dr Rickett was very much in favor of a glossary. Many definitions are extremely controversial and all definitions are extremely difficult to phrase. A glossary should not be lightly undertaken nor with some commitment to a particular place of publication. Perhaps a standing committee should be appointed to study the matter over a sufficient term of years. He agreed with Dr Lanjouw that a glossary should not be a part of the Code, but rather an adjunct document.
Dr Rollins ruled that this matter of the Glossary Committee would be taken up later or decided upon by the General Committee. Proposal A was rejected.

Prop. B (2: 124: 0: 49)

Dr Stafleu pointed out that this was a minor editorial matter which had the disadvantage of changing the numbering of the rule.

Mr Margadant asked the Editorial Committee to avoid renumbering as much as possible.

Prop. B was rejected.

Prop. C (2: 112: 0: 61) Rejected

New Article 1

Prop. A (6: 159: 0: 10) Rejected

Article 2

Prop. A (2: 163: 0: 10) Rejected

Prop. B (4: 163: 0: 8) Rejected

Article 3

Prop. A (6: 16: 141: 7) [had been referred to the Committee for Fossil Plants. This committee later reported that the proposal had been withdrawn by its author.]

Prop. B (2: 21: 140: 3) [same remark]

Prop. C (4: 18: 146: 7) [same remark]

Prop. D (2: 84: 84: 5) Rejected

Prop. E (6: 157: 0: 12) Rejected

Dr Tryon knew of a definite example in relation to Art. 42, where a species name was validated by reference to a generic name. His proposal aimed at making it clear that this was inadmissible.

Dr Fuchs pointed out that it seemed to be difficult to cut in two the ranks for species and genus because in many cases a monotypic genus was described as a species with a monomial name and the specific and generic concept coincide [descriptive generico-specifica cf. e.g. B. Ehrhart’s “genera”].

Dr Tryon considered that to be an exceptional case.

Dr Stearn stated that if we applied this rule too rigorously we should have to reject many Linnaean names.

Prop. F (2: 53: 112: 8) Rejected


Prop. H (Potonie, see report Committee for Fossils) Withdrawn

New Recommendation 3A

Prop. A (4: 103: 62: 6) Referred to the Committee for Hybrids [and later rejected by this committee].
Section 2


Article 7

Prop. A (10: 160: 0: 4)

Dr PAPENFUS had been surprised by the Montreal decision in this respect. The algologists faced a serious problem because of this decision. Many new ordinal names had been proposed for Algae, and order was impossible in the ordinal nomenclature of Algae. The comments by the Rapporteurs in the Synopsis might have influenced the vote in this case; he was sure there were many botanists opposed to the abolition of priority and typification and he asked for a reconsideration.

Dr LANJOUW stated that we decided at Montreal that the rules of priority and typification would not apply to names of orders mainly because such names were mostly used only in text-books. We could of course typify orders and there might be a special case for having special rules for Algae; for phanerogams, however, we did not want to do so.

Dr PAPENFUS was convinced that a majority of algologists thought that a rule was needed.

Dr STAFLEU explained how the Montreal decision had come about. The Committee for Algae had then reported that it was in favor of abolishing these rules for orders: was the present committee of a different opinion?

Dr DOTY admitted that though there are, indeed, special problems as Dr Papenfuss had pointed out, it was his feeling that there should be and need be no special rules for the algae. The special Committee on Algae in its meetings at this Congress, contrary to some opinions, had indicated that it would prefer no special rules for the algae and there was a feeling among phycologists in general that priority above the rank of family should not now be applied only in the cases of algae.

Dr FOSBERG saw no reason for special rules for algae or other special groups. But on the other hand, there is no more reason not to have an orderly nomenclature for phanerogam orders than for any others. The mere fact that the application of the principle of priority may be difficult at the rank of order is no satisfactory reason why it should not be done.

Dr MARTIN said that the effect of this rule on mycological taxonomy would be most un-fortunate since many of the older authors and many since have included highly heterogeneous members in their orders. A rigid rule of priority should not be extended to orders.

Dr DONK explained that priority and typification should be considered separately. He found typifications of names of orders and higher taxa necessary to place them in synonymy.

Dr PAPENFUS: "That is the problem."

Dr PRUSKAUER stated that exceptions to the Code are odious. But here it might be worth while to return to the Paris Code and allow flowering plant taxonomists the right to have chaos at ordinal level by special dispensation.

Dr HOLLITUM said that as regards ferns, there was at present no general agreement as to the delimitation of families; it seemed to him quite premature to consider making a rule about names of higher taxa.

Dr STAFLEU was of the opinion that, in phanerogams, one would have to make a thorough search of the literature—in the absence of indices—to establish the correct name of an order. The amount of extra work to be done would be enormous. The committees were unanimous at Montreal, and after five years of study it could be presumed that they had by then come to a considered opinion.

Mr BULLOCK remarked that he had found the listing of ordinal names impossible in the course of his compilation of the list of family names published in Taxon a few years ago.

Dr FUCS stated that the difficulty when expanding the principle of priority above the family was that in most cases it was difficult to find the first ordinal name because of the fact that order and family had not been clearly distinguished in previous times and it was difficult to understand if an original author intended a particular name to designate the rank of family or of order. Priority for ordinal names would only be possible if a relatively late starting point could be fixed.

Dr STAFLEU remarked that on the family level the solution had been found in a list of nomina conservanda in a new style. If we re-introduced priority and typification for orders we should have to do something similar because otherwise it was nearly impossible to obtain some sort of security that one worked with correct names.

Dr LANCE was of the opinion that a recommendation on names of orders might be acceptable in this article pointing towards a possible later rule to be adopted.
Dr Donk suggested a proposal in between 7, Note 4, prop. E means "validly published name" this proposal was unnecessary, for the present wording achieves the effect intended by this proposal.

The proposal was rejected.

Prop. F (38: 113: 9: 7)
Prop. G (44: 99: 8: 10)
Prop. I (6: 147: 0: 10)

Dr Tryon proposed that these proposals be referred to the ad hoc committee on superfluous names. [Prop. F and G were later referred to the Special Committee set up to study this problem, proposals H and I were rejected].

Prop. K (151: 10: 2: 8)

Dr Donk asked for a comparison with Art. 48 in connection with "in all circumstances" and whether 'stat. nov.' was really always supported inequivocally by the Code. In addition he referred to isonyms: did the types remain the same? If the generic name was retypified, e.g. in the course of conservation, will the substitute name have the new type or the old one?

Dr Stapfleu answered: "This is open."

Dr Tryon: "Entirely."

Dr Stapfleu explained that names could be conserved with new types. Dr Tryon's proposal was purely a clarification but we should be careful that it contradicted no other article.

Dr Donk was not so sure about this. What would be done if one applied an epithet to a species, originally given in varietal rank and one excluded the type. Did one have a new taxon? If this had to be accepted Article 32 did not make it clear.

Dr Tryon said that a conserved name when retypified did not fall under stat. novo or comb. novo and was not an exception to Art. 7, Prop. K.

Dr Buchheim said that stat. nov. was nowhere to be found in the Code; we should avoid new terminologies.

Dr Fcsberg explained that in the work of the Spermatophyta Committee he had frequently dealt with retypified names and had always regarded them as different names and cited different authors. Therefore they did not conflict with this proposal.

Mr Bullock pointed out a similarity to the position under Art. 33, where a proposal to clarify the term "replaced synonym" has been made. He thought that the provision under "stat. nov." could be evaded by changing the epithet concerned.
Dr Dunn could not see how it was possible to exclude the type specimen and still contend that we were able to make a new combination. The name had to remain with the type specimen.

Dr Lange asked Dr Tryon to delete the words stat. nov. and “in all circumstances”. Dr Tryon answered that stat. nov. should be kept in the proposal; it provided a definition for it.


Dr Donk explained that the various committees were to report later on this question of typification of pre-starting-point names.

Dr McVau has noted that application of this proposal would legislate against free interpretation of pre-Linnaean authors and might perpetuate errors of post-Linnaean authors.

Dr Lanjouw agreed with Dr McVau and saw some difficulties ahead if this proposal was adopted.

Dr Stearn said that in Linnaean typification it was necessary to consider Linnaeus’ protologue as indicating his intent and the manner in which he applied a name was accordingly decisive. This proposal was in complete accord with normal typification at Linnaean taxa.

Dr Lange pointed out that note 7 dealt with the starting-points after 1753, and was thus not a problem for phanerogamists. The proposal would raise problems for the mycologists.

Dr Donk asked: “What does ‘application’ really mean?” There were many instances in which it was completely impossible to find out what the application of a post-starting-point author really was (no description, but specimens in his herbarium, or distributed by him). The proposal as presented in Taxon gave very little documentation and argument. This matter had been thoroughly discussed at previous Congresses. A great amount of literature was involved: the problems behind this ought to be made completely clear before this proposal was adopted. The cases in point varied greatly. The first time a name was mentioned by a post-starting-point author was often in a simple list.

Dr Weresub said that the proposal was unworkable, the present text of Note 7 was understandable and should be kept.

Dr Martin explained that the starting-point for the Myxomycetes was 1753, unfortunately. The names used by Linnaeus and by a number of later authors could be interpreted adequately only by reference to pre-Friesian authors. The effect of this proposal on such groups should be carefully examined before passing this proposal.

The proposal was then rejected. Prop. P (2: 78: 8: 4) was referred to the Committee for Hybrids [and later rejected]. Prop. Q [van Steenis, Taxon 13: 218].

Dr van Steenis proposed the discussion of his proposal to effect an editorial change in Art. 7, Note 3 as published in Taxon July 1964. He stressed that if authentic material (syntypes, isotypes) was extant a lectotype must be chosen whereas in the case where the base of a species is only its original description a neotype may be designated. This is against current usage and opposed to other articles of the Code, e.g. Art. 37.

Mr Ross said that the final two sentences of Art. 7, Prop. Q, dealt with neotypes and should be discussed along with the neotype committee’s report.

Dr Proskauer was of the opinion that this was an editorial matter, that could be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Mr Dandy wished to draw attention to the fact that an isotype might also be a syntype, but sometimes it was not so. In any wording, therefore, it would be necessary to indicate that an isotype which is a syntype must be designated. This is against current usage and opposed to other articles of the Code, e.g. Art. 37.

Mr Dandy wished to draw attention to the fact that an isotype might also be a syntype, but sometimes it was not so. In any wording, therefore, it would be necessary to indicate that an isotype which is a syntype must be chosen in preference to an isotype which is not a syntype.

Dr Dunn said that there was a problem involved in the designation of a syntype as the type when the holotype is lost or destroyed. In several cases in Lupinus two or more taxa had been used in the original description of the species: the forced requirement of the selection of a syntype as the type would actually shift the name from one taxon to another.

Ex. L. arcticus Wats. included half material
from the arctic and half material from Montane Rocky Mts. later designated as L. subalpinus. Second example: L. wyethii Wats. the Wyeth specimen at PH would be the holotype while the second specimen is part of a taxon described later, L. prunophilus Jones.

Dr Fosberg objected to the statement that this was an editorial matter. The change from may to must was a very important one, and if adopted, Dr Dunn’s objection would become very pertinent. He could not subscribe to the change of may to must. We previously made the reverse change.

Dr Fosberg said that if the wording was to be made more logical than it now was, then the wording as suggested by Dr van Steenis should state “... when possible a lectotype must be chosen . . .”, not simply “... a lectotype must be chosen.”

Dr van Steenis argued that there should be a logical sequence in typification: 1. when the holotype is extant, 2. when this is absent but syntypes or isotypes are present, 3. when no material is extant.

At present it was not compulsory to choose a lectotype, hence there was no implicit statement that a taxon should by typified by saying one “may” designate a lectotype or neotype.

Dr Rollins stressed that we should keep our Code as open as possible. We should not write rules in it that would unduly upset the nomenclature. It would be bad to be forced too much to adopt strict patterns.

The proposal was then rejected by a large majority.

Recommendation 7A

Dr Robyns took the chair until the end of the morning.

Prop. A (60: 25: 0: 77)

Dr Schulze was opposed to this proposal since we could deposit only specimens. Families, for instance, could not be deposited.

Dr Stafleu explained that this proposal might help users of the Code to understand the rule more readily.

Mr Bullock remarked that it was a statement of fact.

Dr Fosberg did not know what the motive for the proposal was, but it was an excellent one, since within the last several years he had seen instances of publications referring to the holotype of a genus, which is nonsense. If to avoid such nonsense we needed a statement in the Code, let us have it.

Dr Donk said that in a number of cases, inter alia Tournefortian names, names were validly published without specific binomial names. In other cases a culture (not named) was the type of the generic name. Perhaps here it might appear possible to speak of the holotype of a generic name.

Dr Tryon thought the change to be advisable because taxa do not have types: names have types.

Dr Robyns then ruled that the proposal was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Recommendation 7B


Recommendation 7C


Prop. B (5: 23: 134: 12)

Both proposals were referred to the Committee for Fossil Plants [later Prop. A was rejected and B accepted].

New Recommendation 7D

Prop. A (Vassilkov, Taxon 9: 265)

Dr Donk said that this was an editorial matter.

Dr Stafleu was of the opinion that this was a matter of citation and asked whether it was really necessary to write such a recommendation into the Code.

Dr Faegri remarked that the proposal referred to good taxonomic practice which had nothing to do with the rules. The Committee for Fossil Plants had just resolved to propose for deletion a series of similar recommendations.

The proposal was then rejected by a large majority.

Article 9

Prop. A (96: 17: 0: 59)

Mr Bullock explained that the proposal was meant to clarify that we dealt with types of names and not with types of taxa.

Dr Schulze said that when we spoke of a “type” in the Code we understood that this is the “nomenclatural type.” It was not necessary to say “specific name” instead of “species”; the same held for the cases in the proposal of Bullock. Art. 9 read already “The nomenclatural type” of a species or taxon . . .

There was no doubt about the concept of “type”.
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The proposal was then referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. C (18: 20: 62: 71) was referred to the Committee for Fossil Plants [and later rejected].

Dr Donk asked to speak about the last sentence (note 3) of the Article; by an oversight the word Fungi had been kept in contrary to the Montreal decision. It should be deleted.

Article 10
Prop. A (11: 149: 0: 13) Rejected
Prop. B (11: 147: 0: 15) Rejected
Prop. C (89: 27: 0: 56) Referred to the Editorial Committee
Prop. D (Taxon 12: 349) Rejected

Section 3

Article 11
Prop. A (11: 148: 0: 12) Rejected
Prop. B (2: 152: 0: 12) Rejected
Prop. C (6: 117: 0: 46)

Dr Donk stated that this had some connection with the problem of the superfluous names.

Mr Ross, however, reminded the Section that he had pointed out in his article that some cross-references were omitted from the second para. of Art. 11. The Editorial Committee could consider his suggestions. It was not a matter for the Committee for Superfluous Names.

The proposal was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. D (16: 37: 0: 107) Referred to the Editorial Committee
Prop. E (1: 67: 0: 101) Referred to the Editorial Committee

Article 12
Prop. B (8: 64: 0: 97)

Dr Fosberg asked for a vote.

Dr Stafleu pointed out that this was a cross-reference: it was something for the Editorial Committee to check.

The proposal was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. C (1: 122: 0: 47) Rejected
Prop. D (0: 82: 0: 89)

Dr Stafleu explained that Dr Pinto da Silva thought that Arts. 12 and 13 would be more logically placed in Chapter IV. Acceptance of the proposal would again mean that the numbering of the articles had to be changed. The proposal had no bearing on the application of the Code.

Dr Lange reminded the Section of earlier moves to the effect that the Editorial Committee should make as few serial alterations as possible.

The proposal was rejected.

Article 13
Prop. A (19: 24: 122: 9) [later referred to a special committee for starting points]
Prop. B (20: 21: 104: 5) [idem]
Prop. D (0: 90: 78: 5) Committee for Fossil Plants [later rejected]
Prop. E (0: 90: 88: 7) Committee for Fossil Plants [later rejected]
Prop. F (1: 120: 5: 9) Rejected
Prop. H (Vassilkov, Taxon 9: 265)

Dr Stafleu stressed that this proposal would have far-reaching effects; the date of Fries's Systema was to be put at 31 December 1821, not 1 January 1821.

Dr Martin stated that this proposal was absurd. It was as though a meeting of historians should solemnly decide that the date of the battle of Gettysburg must be regarded as 1864, rather than 1863. The Code should not include a statement which is known to be historically incorrect.

Dr Stafleu was of the opinion that this was a matter for the mycologists to decide and that it would figure in their report [it was rejected].

Prop. I (Schopf, additional material) Referred to the Committee for Fossil Plants [was later accepted].

The meeting was adjourned at 12.15.
THIRD SESSION
Thursday, 30 July 1964, 2.00-5.30 p.m.
(Chairman: R. C. Rollins)

Article 13

Dr. Fuchs pointed out that a proposal had been made in Taxon 1963 (p. 205) to establish as a conventional date for Linnaeus's Species Plantarum the 31st of December 1753. Many books had been published in 1753 and their status (pre- or post-linnaean) was uncertain. One particular book might prove to be post-linnaean and upset the nomenclature of a number of genera. It would now be necessary to establish for all 1753 books the exact date of publication. Matters would be simplified by choosing either 1 January 1753 or 31 December 1753.

Dr. Fosberg asked if there were any of these 1753 publications from which there are now names in use which would be thrown out if we chose the December 1753 date.

Dr. Buchheim remarked that Guettard had published the name Acacia and other generic names in 1753; by a shift of the starting-point to December 31st, 1753 these names would be ruled out.

Dr. Stafleu added to Dr. Buchheim's statement that this particular publication was in the Histoire et Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences for 1749, published in 1753. It was not certain that the names in that article on certain anatomical details of various plants had to be accepted as validly published.

Mr. Dandy repeated what had been pointed out at a previous Congress, that some binomials, notably those published by Linnaeus in his Demonstrationes Plantarum, appeared after 1 May 1753 but before 31 December 1753. These would be invalidated by a change to 31 December.

Dr. Fuchs was aware of that and asked Mr. Dandy whether he knew of still other publications like that. If this were the only case we could easily rule that not only the species plantarum, but that all Linnaean publications of 1753 were published on 31 December 1753.

Dr. Rollins wanted to proceed and asked for a vote.

Dr. Faegri said that this was a much too important issue to be decided on the rather uncertain evidence presented here. The decision should be postponed until a further study had been made.

Dr. Cronquist remarked that it should first be made clear on what version of Fuchs' proposal we were voting.

Dr. Rollins stated that if the feeling was that the results of this proposal were uncertain it could be rejected for that reason. It might be brought up at a next Congress.

Dr. Stearn said that if the dates of the Demonstrationes and that of the Species plantarum were made the same by convention, there would be no problem.

Mr. Dandy supported Stafleu: he could see no immediate disadvantage in keeping the present rule. He had to admit, however, that he was afraid of the result of a real thorough research into the publication dates of the books published in 1753. Putting the conventional date at 31 December 1753 would rule all this out.

Dr. Lanjew wanted to follow Faegri’s proposal to postpone a decision on this point until the next Congress.

Dr. Lange recommended that the proposal be withdrawn for further study, since a rejection now would be as premature as an acceptance.

Dr. Fuchs was of the opinion, however, that such a postponement would leave the issue uncertain. He understood that more study was necessary.

Dr. Howard asked that the proposal be mimeographed and that a vote be taken before the end of the meetings.

Dr. Stafleu explained that the entire proposal simply consisted of the change of the conventional date of the Species plantarum from 1 May 1753 to 31 December 1753.

Dr. Pricеkauer said that works on either side of a starting-point date had in any case to be carefully examined to establish the exact date as opposed to the title-page date.

Dr. Stafleu asked for a vote on Fuchs's original proposal.

Dr. Fuchs, however, wanted a vote on the proposal as amended by Dr. Stearn: the starting-point date to be established also for Linnaeus's Demonstrationes.

Dr. Stafleu said that we knew exactly the date of the publication of the Demonstrationes and of similar dissertations. If they were to be changed arbitrarily, what would be the effect, and what of the publication of the corresponding volume of the Amoenitates published in 1754.
Dr Stearns said that Linnaeus was in a hurry to get the book out and that this was the reason why some of these names from the Dissertationes did not figure in the Species plantarum.

Dr Faegri thought that we should not act on such an improvised proposal.

Dr McVaugh asked how many names were involved and how important they were.

Mr Dandy answered that there were quite a few specific names in the Demonstrationes, of which only a few were really important. They were republished later in the Amoenitates, late in 1754, but in the meantime some other names had been published for them.

Dr Buchheim asked whether the amended version of this proposal would mean that *Species plantarum* and *Demonstrationes plantarum* were to be considered to be published at the same time? This solution would certainly be unwanted. Therefore, he was against shifting the starting-point to 31 December 1753. More bibliographic studies are needed.

Dr Rollins put the proposal by Fucns to the vote: it was rejected.

**Article 14**

Prop. A (withdrawn)


Prop. C (69: 17: 0: 88)

Dr Howard requested a definite vote.

Mr Bullock wanted that, if this proposal was referred to the Editorial Committee, it would be carried out in any event.

Dr Rollins ruled that the proposal was referred to the Editorial Committee.


Mr Ross wanted to refer this to the Committee for Orthography.

Dr Stafleu pointed out that the new term *paranym* was to be introduced by this proposal. This was not orthography although the Committee could of course be asked to advise on this question.

Mr Ross moved that the Section deferred action until the receipt of report of the Committee on Orthography.

This motion was *accepted* [after hearing this report the Section later referred the proposal to the Editorial Committee to be treated in accordance with the general spirit of that report].

Mr Bullock explained that this was a clarification of some implications of note 3 that were nowhere actually stated.

Dr Lanjouw stressed that this was an editorial matter.

Mr Bullock agreed.

The proposal was then *referred to the Editorial Committee*.

Prop. F (10: 45: 0: 61) *Referred to the Editorial Committee.*

Prop. G (164: 3: 0: 3) *accepted.*

Prop. H (Jeffrey, Taxon 10: 196)

Dr Stafleu pointed out that we had a decision from the Montreal Congress to adopt the procedure of prop. H. It did not seem desirable, however, to write it in the Code.

Dr Papenfuss asked whether the Montreal decision was limited to flowering plants.

Dr Buchheim pointed out that there was a completely new point in this proposal: if a conserved name is conserved for all time, errors could not be corrected, and this was undesirable.

Dr Fosberg thought that this went much farther than the Montreal decision and would prevent us from changing our minds or correcting our errors, which would not be good.

Dr McVaugh suggested that it was unwise to commit ourselves to a course that might be undesirable in future.

Dr Stafleu agreed with Dr Buchheim: the Montreal decision worked, but this proposal went too far and had undesirable implications.

Dr Dunn would like to question whether conservation for all time would conserve a name against an earlier genus even if it be later recognized that possibly even a Linnaean genus might become a synonym.

Dr Stafleu answered that the 1753 Linnaean names always had precedence over other ones.

Dr Dunn was of the opinion that this showed that the generic names could not be conserved for all time.

Dr Donk understood that accepting this proposal would make it binding not only for phanerogams but also for cryptogams. He was not prepared to vote for it now, without having looked through the list of conserved names of fungi.

Mr Bullock agreed with Dr Fosberg, and suggested deletion of the word undesirable from the proposal.
Dr Stafleu did not want to modify this proposal at this stage; the proposal was clearly unsuitable at the moment. The proposal was rejected.

Prop. I (Jeffrey, Taxon 10: 196)

Dr Stafleu was not in favour of this proposal. It introduced additional complications, whereas with the present procedure we knew exactly what to do.
The proposal was rejected.

Prop. K (unpublished; p. 10 of additional material) was not taken up by anybody from the floor and ruled out of order.

Dr van Steenis, Taxon 13: 157

Dr van Steenis explained the reasons which had led him to propose a new and simpler and clearer wording of Art. 14 and its intentions. This was intended to facilitate the work of the Committees on conservation of generic names. The diversity of opinion would remain, though more restricted.

Dr Faegri asked whether Dr van Steenis' proposal would imply that the last part of Art. 14 be deleted?

Dr van Steenis confirmed this; the last sentence was superfluous.

Dr Korf asked whether Dr van Steenis would be willing to change the wording of the last sentence of his proposal in which only generic names are mentioned, while the first sentence of Art. 14 refers to genera, families and intermediate taxa?

This could presumably be left in the hands of the Editorial Committee?

Dr Buchheim wanted to delete: nomina generica conservanda, since Appendix II refers to nomina familiarum conservanda; the same referred to “generic” in the last line.

Dr Tryon asked whether the proposal introduced into the Code a formal statement that the Code is concerned with stability of nomenclature. This would give too much official status to this opinion. This type of guidance was much needed but he questioned whether this proposal did not formalize such guidance too much.

Mr Bullock supported Dr van Steenis' proposal as a means of guiding the committees concerned to a more united opinion.

Dr Shehtler raised the question whether the change suggested by Dr van Steenis for Art. 14 would really make the task of coping with diverse opinions easier than before. The proposed amendment was less precise than the present wording.

Dr Rickett supported van Steenis' proposal as providing additional guidance in deciding on the desirability of conservation. At present the phrase “to avoid disadvantageous changes” opened the way to everyone to “grind his own axe” — every change being perhaps disadvantageous to some one. To introduce the idea of stability was to give an additional reason for conservation of any particular name or for rejection of a proposal to conserve.

Dr Rollins wanted to vote on the van Steenis proposal, permitting the Editorial Committee to effect slight modifications.

Prop. L was accepted by show of hands, 43 in favor 25 against.

Dr Tryon then proposed that the principle of retroactivity be explicitly stated in the article as it applied to conserved and rejected generic names.

Dr Stafleu explained that Rickett and himself had revised the lists of nomina conservanda. In this revision they had based themselves on full retroactivity of conservation. It had become clear during this work that the decisions taken by previous Congresses on proposals for conservation recognized de facto the principle of retroactivity of conservation.

Dr Tryon wanted to state this in Article 14.

Dr Stafleu recalled that there was no other precedent but full retroactivity.

Dr Fosberg thought that to make conservation retroactive would be very bad. This would make names become superfluous which were not so before. This was something we certainly did not want to do.

Dr Stafleu repeated that retroactivity had been the rule in the past. This retroactivity had caused sometimes conservation of subsequent names as a result of the conservation with retroactive effect of a certain name. Such cases were numerous in the list and it would be very undesirable to change this procedure now. Furthermore the date of conservation is nowhere mentioned in the lists.

Dr Rollins asked whether this could be referred to a Committee.

Dr Stafleu said that if it was the feeling of this group to revise this procedure, the General Committee should be instructed to study the case.

Dr Donk said that retroactivity did not involve superfluous names only.

Dr Stafleu pointed to the retroactive effect of the conservation of homonyms.
Mr Dandy said that this was a matter which could not be decided in a general meeting of this kind but only by those who have a knowledge of special cases involved. If it was to be considered at all it should therefore be referred to a special committee.

Dr Rollins referred this to the General Committee.

Article 15

Prop. A (29: 50: 0: 54)

Mr Ross wanted to refer this to the Editorial Committee.

Dr Fosberg recommended a vote: a recommendation would then become part of an Article.

Mr Ross said this was tied up with a previous proposal by Pinto da Silva. On second thoughts he moved rejection.

The proposal was rejected unanimously.

Article 16

Prop. A (12: 144: 0: 8) Rejected

Recommendation 16A

Prop. A (4: 163: 0: 6) Rejected

Prop. B and C (Zabinkova, Taxon 13: 160) Ruled out of order. No request to take these proposals into consideration was made by any of the attendants.

Article 17

Prop. A (3: 161: 1: 15) Rejected

Article 18

Prop. A (130: 13: 1: 30)

Dr Schulze pointed to the special status of family names not based on generic names. This status was not the same as those of regularly conserved names. For such names as Palmae we were completely independent of the regular procedure of conservation. He proposed the removal of these names from the Appendix and the insertion of a reference to them in the appropriate places.

Dr Buchheim said that the 9 family names not based on generic names were exceptions in several respects, and alternative nomenclature was permitted for them. But according to the text of Art. 32 they were not validly published, since their form does not comply with Art. 18. Therefore adoption of Prop. A was necessary. This proposal was brought forward unanimously by the sub-committee for family names.

Dr Stafleu confirmed the statement by Mr Ross: the mistake ought to be corrected. The proposal was accepted by a large majority.

Prop. B (66: 52: 0: 50)

Mr Bullock pointed out that the first point emphasized the fact that we have names of taxa, not of categories, the second merely inserted "natural order" as the technical name of a group equal to "family".

Dr Papenfuss asked how we were to know we were dealing with 'natural orders'.

Dr Wood said that there existed a possible confusion between ordo and ordo naturalis, — natural order not being the exact translation of ordo, although these are treated as taxonomically equivalent.

Dr Stearn explained that the term 'natural order' is a translation into English of the Latin term as used by Linnaeus and was used by English-speaking authors until modern times in the sense of 'family' as used by French authors from Magnal onwards; the term 'natural order' is a technical term equivalent to family whereas 'order' is not.

Dr Rollins asked for a vote: 23 in favour, 22 against (show of hands).

Dr Papenfuss would really like to decide now whether this term was to be introduced or not.

Dr Rollins would like to rule that this was to be placed before the Editorial Committee. The first part of the proposal could perhaps first be considered.

Dr Cronquist said that the show of cards indicated a near tie of individual votes; what about the institutional votes.

Dr Rollins explained that anybody could call for a counted vote by cards.

Dr Faegri said that the actual implication of the last line of p. 25 in the Code was clear. The only problem was to introduce the word 'natural order' in such a way that no misunderstanding would arise and nobody would be better suited to do this than the Editorial Committee.

Dr Martin moved that the previous vote be reconsidered.

Dr Proskauer asked for an informal vote for the information of the Editorial Committee.

Dr Fosberg did not see why we could not vote on these matters to indicate what we wanted the Editorial Committee to do. If we could not make up our minds or were too lazy to, why should we expect the Editorial Committee to do it for us?
Dr Rollins pointed out that this was really a minor point.

Mr Ross asked for a first vote “Editorial Committee versus no, then if defeated, yes versus no”.

Dr Rollins took the first vote; there was a clear majority for referring this to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. C (15: 141: 0: 6) Rejected
Prop. D (9: 154: 0: 9) Rejected
Prop. E (10: 32: 1: 129) Referred to the Editorial Committee (This vote was later confirmed at the request of Dr Proskauer).

Dr Rollins then requested Mr Ross to take the Chair.

Recommendation 18A
Prop. A (7: 14: 139: 1) Referred to the Committee for Fossil plants (later withdrawn).
Prop. B (unpublished), idem (later also withdrawn).

Article 19
Prop. A (7: 151: 0: 14) Rejected

Article 20
Prop. A (5: 164: 0: 4) Rejected
Prop. B (11: 8: 0: 153) Referred to the Editorial Committee,
Prop. C (67: 54: 0: 44)

Dr Donk asked what would be the status of generic names written with a small initial letter? It would be retroactive! Would they be validly published? In early French literature many names were published with small initials.

Mr Ross affirmed Dr Donks statement and said that we could only state it was desirable to write these names with a capital initial. Should the Editorial Committee be empowered to make it a Recommendation?

Dr Stapleu thought that this would go too far: the historical point made by Dr Donk was important.

Dr Cronquist thought this would only make the rules more complicated. He objected to the great number of proposals, such as this one, to change the wording of the rules, or insert new items which are not intended to produce any significant change in procedure. He did not think such proposals should be referred to the Editorial Committee; they should simply be voted down.

Dr Martin said that it was too late to accept a rule like this.

Dr Schultze asked to have a clear yes or no vote first.

A vote was taken: the proposal was rejected by a large majority.

Prop. D (2: 58: 0: 112)

Mr Ross explained that this was not a regular proposal and asked for an expression of opinion of the group whether this should go to the Editorial Committee or not.

Dr McVauh asked clarification of whether vote to send to Editorial Committee should be by simple majority or 60/40.

Dr Stapleu explained that this was after all a minor point. Generic names not hyphenated when published were to be left out of account: they are not validly published. Specific epithets so published could either be hyphenated or be made into one word; but their publication was not declared invalid. On the whole this rule worked quite well. Pinto da Silva wanted to do away with what he sees as a contradiction between these two cases, and he wanted also to have a definite ruling for epithets. This was clearly not necessary, it was better to stick to accepted usage.

The proposal was then rejected.

Prop. E (107: 39: 0: 35)

Dr Deighton asked for a further clarification. Why were epithets mentioned here in an article referring to genera?

Mr Ross stated that the proposal, if accepted, would also apply to the relevant article dealing with epithets.

Dr Tryon stressed that the word “epithet” should be retained since the original publication of a generic name may have been as the epithet of a subgenus.

Dr Proskauer stated that there was a lack of logic in the proposal because it negated the provisions for correcting errors.

Dr Cronquist thought this would only make the rules more complicated. He objected to the great number of proposals, such as this one, to change the wording of the rules, or insert new items which are not intended to produce any significant change in procedure. He did not think such proposals should be referred to the Editorial Committee; they should simply be voted down.

Dr Rickett disliked arbitrary Latin.

Dr Christensen asked Mr Bullock whether his wording implied that e.g. virridis was not to be corrected to viridis?
Mr Bullock further clarified his intentions. This rule was proposed to make it more clear that names were purely arbitrary.

Mr Ross asked for the vote: the proposal was defeated by a considerable majority.

Recommendation 20A

Prop. A (33: 37: 0: 104)

Mr Ross declared the proposal open for discussion since it had not been taken into account by the Committee on Orthography.

Dr Stapleu pointed out that the intention of this proposal was to introduce the term paronyms.

The proposal was rejected by a large majority. Prop. B (64: 8: 1: 100) Rejected by show of cards.

Recommendation 20B

Prop. A (2: 15: 150: 6) Referred to the Committee on Fossil plants [later withdrawn].

Prop. B (3: 16: 148: 6), idem [later accepted].

Prop. C (Potonié, additional material p. 1 c), idem [later withdrawn].

Recommendation 20C

Prop. A (8: 11: 150: 4) Referred to the Committee on Fossil plants [later withdrawn].

Prop. B (3: 19: 147: 4), idem [later accepted].

Article 21

Prop. A (8: 8: 0: 147) Referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 22

Prop. A (47: 34: 0: 81) Referred to the Editorial Committee.


Dr Fosberg asked why there could be no firm yes or no vote.

Mr Bullock pointed out that the word "valid" is necessary in this position, since even effective publication is not sufficient to ensure valid publication.

Dr Stapleu explained that the motion empowering the Editorial Committee to handle such cases was quite clear. The amendment had nothing to do with the sense of the Code. If it would have, the Committee would not change the Code. In this particular case the word "valid" was put in because of the contrast with effective publication. The Editorial Committee ought to check whether deletion would change the meaning of the article or not.

Dr Van Steenis asked for a vote.

Dr McVaugh saw no point in this. We were here to act on proposals and use the mail vote as a guidance.

Mr Ross said that the Section had confirmed the postal vote. He asked for another vote: the proposal was again referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. C (92: 28: 0: 54)

Mr Meikle objected to the term "designated by implication" in the first example cited. The meaning of that phrase was not clear to him. It should be simply "implied".

Dr Lange proposed a vote on the principle and if accepted, to refer the wording to the Editorial Committee.

Mr Ross said that the Editorial Committee would certainly make the present text more understandable.

Dr Papenfuss agreed with Dr Lange's suggestion. In principle this was an excellent article which in practice most of us had been following.

The proposal was put to the vote and accepted.

Article 23

Prop. A (7: 10: 0: 154) Referred to the Editorial Committee.


Dr Deighton suggested reference to the Special Committee for Orthography. The object of the proposal was to insert some recommendation in the Code to the effect that publication of a specific epithet in the ablative case is at least undesirable.

Dr Proskauer thought that this provision did not belong into an article.

Mr Ross said that this report had already been prepared.

Dr Faegru said that Art. 23 "prop. B" was no formal proposal. It came in the same category as 20 "prop. D" which was passed over for that reason.

Dr Proskauer thought that this provision did not belong into an article.

Mr Ross said that the Section might consider a definite proposal if this were made.

Prop. C (5: 148: 0: 16) Rejected

Prop. D (34: 38: 0: 84) Rejected

Prop. E (10: 150: 0: 6) Rejected

Prop. F (Tennant, Taxon 10: 267) Rejected
Recommendation 23A
Prop. A (8: 12: 0: 153) Referred to the Editorial Committee.
Prop. B (7: 36: 0: 130) Rejected

Recommendation 23B
Prop. A (8: 62: 0: 102) Rejected
Prop. B (5: 71: 0: 86) Rejected
Prop. C (74: 12: 0: 87)

Mr Bullock said that the proposal should be treated in the same way as Art. 22 prop. B.

Dr Cronquist said that the only effect of this proposal would be to increase the length of the Code. Those who would follow it did not need it; those who needed it would not follow it.

Dr Lange said that recommendations helped editors to correct authors who wanted to do unsuitable things.

The proposal was rejected.

Article 24
Prop. A (99: 36: 0: 42)

Dr Tryon remarked that Art. 24 should be in harmony with Arts. 21 and 23.

Dr Fosberg asked whether this meant that we should be unable to reduce complicated names to ternary combinations. In that case we should reject it as most of us want to do this.

Dr Stafleu explained that the proposal was intended to make it clear that it was the ternary combination that counted. An infraspecific epithet cannot be repeated with a different type under one specific name.

Dr Stearn proposed keeping the Saxifraga example, but the other way around.

The proposal as amended by Dr Stearn was accepted.

Prop. B (5: 71: 0: 86) Rejected
Prop. C (Tennant, Taxon 10: 267). [This proposal really dealt with article 23 and ought to have been Art. 23 prop. F].

Dr Stafleu did not quite grasp the consequences of this proposal and would prefer not to change the text of Art. 23 at present.

Mr Bullock explained that the proposal dealt simply with the transcription of Roman numerals.

Mr Dandy thought this example concerning Roman numerals would be a useful addition to the Code. Any botanist in his right senses faced with such a name would transcribe it as Leptactina leopoldi-secundi, but not all botanists are in their right senses and it would be useful to have the procedure in such cases made clear. Cases like this were rare and established nomenclature was unlikely to be affected.

Dr Stafleu asked then for a restriction to Roman numerals. The amendment should not be made too indefinite.

Dr Dunn stressed that it should be understood that the name would be hyphenated and should not be considered as a trinomial.

The proposal was voted upon by means of a counted card vote: 136 in favour, 168 against. Rejected.

Recommendation 24B
Prop. A (Deighton, Taxon 11: 70) Accepted [after hearing the report of the Committee for Fungi].

Article 25

Article 26
Prop. A (16: 47: 0: 110)

Mr Ross explained that acceptance of the proposal would only affect the numbering of the articles.

Mr Margadant repeated his motion that the Editorial Committee be instructed not to change the numbering of Articles (seconded by Lange).

Dr Cronquist said that we should avoid, insofar as possible, any changes in the numbering of articles in the rules. However, with regard to Mr Margadant's verbal proposal for firm instructions to the Editorial Committee in this matter, he thought we should avoid getting in a position where we might have an article 27 bis, or not have an article 36. It would be better to change the numbers of same articles than to have peculiar numbering.

Mr Margadant added "as much as possible".

The motion by Mr Margadant was accepted.

Dr Faegri said that there was nothing unusual in having missing article numbers in the Code. Such things occur again and again in legal material, a paragraph number standing empty with the remark "Deleted".

Dr Stafleu said that the Code had been
criticized frequently because of the changes in the numbering of the articles every five years. In the last edition the changes had been kept at a minimum. For purposes of quotation stability of numbering was preferable although this might seem to be a minor matter.

Dr Papenfuss said that as taxonomists we always had to learn to call plants by names different from those by which they were previously known. Why should we wish to retain the old numbers of articles?

Dr Lange considered the matter settled by the vote.

Dr Schubert would like to suggest that since we had been satisfied with the efforts of the Editorial Committee in the past we now stop to argue whether or not to refer each proposal to the Editorial Committee when the preliminary vote clearly indicated such a decision.

Proposal A was then referred to the Editorial Committee on the understanding that it had to be treated in the light of Margadant's motion.

### Article 28
Prop. A (4: 104: 56: 7) Referred to the Committee for Hybrids [later rejected].
Prop. B (6: 30: 121: 15), idem [idem].
Prop. C (Committee for Hybrids, see report) [later accepted].

### Article 31

### Article 32

### Article 33

### Article 34

Dr Stafleu remarked that Dr Prokhanov had provided an example (Add. mat. p. 9).

### Article 36
Prop. A (2: 83: 77: 9) Committee for Fossil plants [later rejected].
Prop. D (5: 60: 100: 7) Committee for Hybrids [later rejected].
Prop. E (7: 164: 0: 3) Rejected.

### Article 39
Prop. A (1: 83: 82: 4) Committee for Fossil plants [later rejected].

### Article 40
Prop. A (2: 82: 80: 8) Committee for Hybrids [later rejected].
Prop. B (1: 80: 81: 10) idem [idem].
Prop. C (Committee for Hybrids) idem [later accepted].

### Article 41
Prop. A (0: 88: 75: 5) Committee for Fossil plants [later rejected].
Prop. C (0: 170: 0: 2) Withdrawn.

Session closed at 6.00 p.m.

### FOURTH AND FIFTH SESSIONS
*Friday, 31 July 1964, 9.00 a.m.-17.30 p.m.*

(Chairman: R. C. Rollins)

**Stabilization**

Dr Rollins explained that the Montreal Congress passed a resolution requesting the General Committee to study the problems of the stabilization of names of economic plants and present to the next Congress a report on this question as the result of the study of a great many cases. He invited Dr Stafleu, secretary of the General Com-

mittee to open the discussion and referred to the Preliminary report on the Stabilization of names of plants of economic importance, the so-called Punt report, which was in the hands of all delegates.

Dr Stafleu: "In the introduction which I had to write to the book before you which I have to present to you on behalf of the General Committee, I have explained the
meaning of these lists as such, the meaning of the symbols and the significance of the various conclusions as presented in the list. Since this introduction may not have been read by all of you, the Chairman wants me to make a few remarks. On previous occasions the main point in the discussion was always that we had no idea about the number of cases involved. There were always two points of view: one was that any system for stabilization would lead to our being swamped with proposals, and another that we should find that there would be relatively few cases. It was not possible to solve this question in the absence of relevant material. After a long discussion at Montreal, the Rapporteur Général, together with Drs McVaugh and Ross, proposed that this particular point be studied during the next five years. The General Committee — the continuing body representing nomenclature in between Congresses — was charged to obtain lists of names from people in practice, names which those applied botanists thought ought to be kept stable. The request was not for specific cases that were in danger, but for general lists of names of plants of great economic importance. In order to fulfill this charge we asked the International Commission for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants to provide us with such lists. This Commission works directly under IUBS and consists of representatives from forestry, agriculture and horticulture. This Commission sent us indeed such lists, but it must be said at once that these lists did not cover the entire field. However, since we received a total of about 2000 names we were not dissatisfied. This group of names was sufficient material to enable us to study the scope of the problem. We were lucky in finding somebody who had some previous training in nomenclature: Dr Punt had been working previously at the Utrecht institute on the Index Nominum Genericorum. We were also fortunate to find funds to pay his salary. I should like to stress again what I said in the introduction to the report: we are extremely grateful to the various organizations listed there for their fine and generous support. It is because of the support received from these national and international organizations that made it possible for us to engage Dr Punt. The funds of IAPT alone would certainly not have been sufficient to finance this undertaking.

Dr Punt received the nine lists mentioned on page 8, lists received from various working groups set up inside the International Commission for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants. In addition some requests were received from outside.

Dr Punt’s work had to be of a very limited scope. It is not difficult to imagine the intricacy of going into the nomenclatural history of 2000 cases of names of long standing, often with a very involved history. Anybody envisaging this problem will realize that even four years were too short to go deeply and thoroughly into all problems. One should, for instance, take into consideration the type specimens in every case: this was obviously impossible. Punt had to restrict himself to checking the original literature against the Code, at any rate in first instance. He first tried to find out whether a name was nomenclaturally correct, legitimate, etc. After that he tried to study the synonymy and used the usual and maybe some unusual sources for this purpose. Punt used modern revisions, monographs, and floras as much as possible. The ultimate result of his study is not yet before you: we have in our hands to-day only a preliminary report. The final report is not yet ready for publication. In this final report Punt will have to give his reasons for accepting or rejecting certain names. At this point I should therefore like to request you not to enter into arguments pertaining to one or two specific cases only. It is only human that there will be quite a few mistakes in these lists. Punt cannot have seen everything. Some of you have already told me that Punt has made wrong decisions in particular cases, but since he has not given the arguments yet it is uncertain whether you or he is right. Please refrain therefore at this moment from making any detailed criticism of specific cases. Anybody who has anything to suggest in this respect is urgently requested to send his remarks to us so that they may be taken into consideration in the final report. For some of you this may be quite a job, for others it will be just a matter of one name: we shall be very grateful for all your remarks.

The lists as submitted here are four in number. There is a fifth one, a list of names that are in general quite safe from the point of view of stabilization: the Linnaean names dating from 1753. Quite a few of them were also submitted.

In order to show the scope of the problem we presented the names in four different lists. In the first list (A) the very few cases
of names are listed for which Punt found that they were contrary to the Code and for which he had no alternative. These cases are of course the really troublesome ones. The last one, for instance, *Viburnum fragrans* is a homonym for which no substitute name is available. Apart from this there are a few other important cases in this list, but the number is very restricted.

List B is considerably longer. It contains names for which a change is necessary and has already been effected. The significance of the capital T in front of some of the names in the second column should not be overlooked. These synonyms are purely taxonomic and their acceptance depends upon a certain taxonomic opinion. These cases really fall outside our field. We always agreed that we should never legislate against such taxonomic synonymies. This would be anti-scientific in many cases. The reason why they are still there, is that the lists will be consulted by many people. Some of these synonymies are so generally accepted that it might be somewhat confusing and at any rate a pity not to draw attention to them.

The asterisks in the second column have a direct bearing on the question of the scope of the problem. They indicate that the change in question is reported here for the first time after the action of the original author. An example is *Primula sinensis* Lindley, a later homonym. A few months after its publication a substitute name was published. As far as Punt knows at any rate, this has not yet been pointed out in the literature afterwards.

Lists A and B combined should present us to-day with an approximate estimate of how many names out of the 2000 have to be changed or are in real danger.

Most of the changes reported in list B therefore were already known: there are relatively few asterisks. At previous Congresses it was agreed that action on stabilization, if any, should on no account be retroactive. The *Pseudotsuga* example is a good one: the change to *P. menziezii* has been widely reported and no action should be taken to conserve the old name. It was always agreed that if we did something at all, that we should do something for the surprises: the new cases. These surprises are the names of list A and the asterisked ones in list B. The total number of these surprises is around fifty. The other name-changes listed here were pretty well known to working taxonomists, although often not to people in practice.

List C contains minor corrections which do not interest us now. List D gives the names found to be fully correct.

We have now reached a point therefore at which we know the scope of the problem. Out of the 2000 names submitted, fifty are found to be incorrect and have to be changed without sufficient previous knowledge.”

Dr Rollins declared the discussion open.

Dr Little spoke as follows: “I have been in research work with the United States Forest Service more than thirty years and have worked with foresters more than thirty years. Also, I have been asked to serve here as representative of the Society of American foresters, the professional society with membership of more than 15,000 foresters in the United States and Canada.

In a letter dated April 22, 1964, the Executive Secretary of this Society reported to Dr. J. Lanjouw the action taken by its Council (fourth paragraph, letter attached).

As the member for forestry from the United States on the International Commission for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Forestry, I helped to compile the list of names of tree species important in forestry.

We ask the Nomenclature Section, please, to take some positive action on the principle of stabilization of scientific names of important plant species. Such action would improve relations between plant taxonomists and other workers in plant science.

There are several methods: conservation of specific names or epithets, nomina rejicenda, rejection of obscure overlooked names, or adoption of a list of economic plants. The Amsterdam Congress in 1935 authorized a list of economic plants, but no list was published.

We thank Dr W. Punt for his valuable "Preliminary Report on the Stabilization of Names of Plants of Economic Importance." Several names listed are controversial, and I shall submit to him my notes. If the taxonomic synonymies are omitted, the list contains only about 100 to 200 names for which conservation might be considered. This list of economic plants will serve as a guide for workers outside of taxonomy.

Mr Linehan made the following statement: On behalf of the International Seed Testing Association I would like to further stress the point made by the previous speaker. ISTA is very much in favour of stabilization.
and of absence of change ideas which ISTA have defended at various International Botanical Congresses since 1950. The practical reasons influencing ISTA are obvious — there is a large and increasing movement of seed of economic plants in international commerce — there is increasing volume of seed legislation not only in developed but in developing countries. All this adds up to the increasing need for uniformity of nomenclature. While of course ISTA and similar organizations can proceed to formulate lists yet in so far as is possible ISTA would welcome a positive lead from the International Botanical Congress. Personally I hope a stabilized list will emerge. I care less about the philosophy behind the list.”

Mr Gilmour: “As the Section knows, I have always been a strong advocate of action for the stabilization of generic and specific names. We are all agreed, I think, that we can never have a hundred per cent stability from a taxonomic point of view, but I do urge that we consider once again the possibility of increased nomenclatural stability by introducing a rule for the conservation or rejection of specific epithets. As Dr Stafleu has emphasized, the object of the motion carried at Montreal, and of the “Punt Report” resulting from it, was to discover the scale of the operation involved if such a rule were adopted, and the Report has, I think, accomplished just this. There were two main arguments against the introduction of the conservation or rejection of specific epithets; one envisaged that there would be so many names proposed that the task of dealing with them would be too great; the other that there would be so few that the introduction of a new rule would not be justified. The Punt Report, I suggest, has shown that the figure involved is nowhere between these two extremes — perhaps fifty or sixty names, depending on one’s interpretation of retro-action — and it would seem that such a figure would amply justify the introduction of a new rule, without imposing too great a burden on those administering it. There is a further point that I would emphasize, namely that the number of users of names is a criterion of greater importance than the number of actual names involved. For example, the changing of the names of fifty tropical mosses, however undesirable, would inconvenience comparatively few people, whereas the alteration in the name of a single timber tree, like the Douglas Fir — or of a plant like Primula sinensis, called into question by the Punt Report — affects thousands of users all over the world — however little the change may inconvenience the botanist who actually makes it!

Following the Montreal Resolution, therefore, and in the light of the position revealed by the Punt Report, I would ask the Section seriously to consider once again this problem of the stability of specific names and not to flinch from altering the Code if, as appears to be the case, such action is the simplest and most effective method for its solution.”

Dr Dunn remarked that most foresters do not even use the scientific name and are quite happy to market the lumber of a specific species under several names. This is not stable. “It would be just as easy to cite a synonym of the name, which was learned, along with the correct name.

At present the forestry journals very rarely mention the scientific names.

We have tried to form a set of rules to work by to form a stable nomenclature. Every time we vote in an exception, we nullify a portion of the rules and in effect make a mockery out of the entire system of international rules of nomenclature”.

Dr Shetler requested to be permitted to make a few remarks, apologizing that he did not represent 15,000 foresters. His points were:

1) Everyone is for stabilization, only the best road to conservation is in question.
2) An enormous amount of work has gone into preparation of the present lists, yet two questions are raised:
   a) Is the problem worth this effort?
   b) On the other hand, is not the list misleading? Will not the final list be much larger?

In conclusion, I believe a solution on principle rather than on practice is the only effective long-range solution here”.

Dr Cronquist: “I believe that the people who have been speaking in favor of a list of conserved specific names are being unduly optimistic, and thus misleading, as to the number of names that would be involved. Dr Stafleu speaks of 30 to 50 names. Dr Little speaks of 200, or perhaps only 100. I believe that ultimately there would be a great many more, so many that we might well be overwhelmed by the work involved.

When the list of conserved generic names was established, a number of years ago, it was thought that only a limited number of names would be involved, and that the establishment of this list would not in itself
create any great problem. Yet that list has
grown until it has almost gotten out of
hand. On balance, it is probably useful, but
it certainly does cause difficulties. I have in
my hand a pamphlet, which all of you have
also, listing generic names proposed for con-
servation at this Congress. It is 68 pages
long. Taking care of this work properly
comes close to being more than we can
effectively do.

If we introduce a list of conserved specific
names, it would be much larger than the
list of conserved generic names. Just how
much longer I don’t know. Would it be ten
times as long? Perhaps.

A great deal of work has obviously gone
into the preparation of the “preliminary
report on stabilization” which we have with
us. Yet I am sure that there are many debat-
able items on the several lists. On the first
list of some eleven names, there are two
which I do not believe belong there. Perhaps
they do, but I would have to be convinced.
On the subsequent lists, there are a number
of things that I would do differently. Ob-
viously each one of these entries would have
to be considered and discussed in detail.

There is one thing, perhaps a small one,
which could be done toward avoiding un-
necessary nomenclatural changes, without
introducing any significant new problem.
That is the proposal, first made by Dr
Gleason some years ago, that any generic
or specific name of a phanerogam that was
published prior to 1885, but not included
in the original edition of Index Kewensis or
any of its supplements up to the next one,
be considered as not validly published. That
would avoid the possibility that someone
will dig up a name in the Saturday Evening
Post that would upset an existing name.
That sort of thing has happened. This pro-
posal would probably be useful, but to set
up a list of conserved specific names would
be to open Pandora’s box."

Dr Stafleu did not want to enter into the
argument at this point of the discussions,
but wanted to make some remarks to clarify
some of the remarks made by Dr Cronquist.
In 1905 when the list of nomina generica
conservanda was introduced it contained
circa 400 names. They are listed in Rickett
and Stafleu’s revision. There was really no
argument at the time about its adoption.
Everybody knew that Otto Kuntze had
thrown out so many names that there was
unanimous agreement to do something. It
was known that the job was a big one: the
work was done by Engler and his associates.

Another point was that he did not want
to go on record as having spoken in favour
of a list of nomina specifica conservanda as
might perhaps be concluded from Dr Cron-
quist’s remarks. He had given the number
of 50 names on the basis of the Punt list
to give an idea of the magnitude of the
problem.

Mrs M. L. Sprague: “A problem that has
interested me for many years — Cambridge,
Amsterdam and Stockholm, the problem
comes up under various headings: nomina
specifica conservanda — nomina specifica
rejicienda and now stabilization.

Although opposed to conservation at first,
I am now a convert and am in great favour
of stabilization in some form.

The economic botanist is a fieldworker
with little chance of a large botanical library
— so let us do something to relieve the lot
of the economic botanist.

At Amsterdam I was appointed Secretary
of the Committee for Economic Plants — the
Committee consisted of about 6 nomen-
claturists, the result was not uniform. It is
in my opinion better to have lists drawn
up by one man as at the present time. This
makes for uniformity.

I sincerely hope something will be done
in this meeting to alleviate the lot of the
economic botanist. I therefore ask you if
you would consider doing something for sta-
bilization to-day and not refer it to the next
Congress. Let us do something now”.

Dr Faegri made the following remarks:

1. List C and D of the Punt report are,
to me, at least as important as A and B in
safeguarding against future undesirable
changes of names.

2. Please remember also that in addition
to economic botanists there is a great group
of botanists — phytogeographers, palaeobot-
anists etc. — who want to use the correct
names, but whose work is made much more
difficult by frequent name-changes. They
may be unavoidable, but they do add to
the difficulties of phytogeographical work.

Dr H. E. Moore: “The Bailey Hortorium
staff in revising Hortus Second for publica-
tion as Hortus Third must deal with 25,000-
26,000 entries of names of plants cultivated
in the U.S.A. We operate on the premise
that we must provide, to the best of our
ability, the correct name of cultivated plants,
that we must make this information available
to users (i.e. in Baileya), and we have found
acceptance when these names or changes
of names are fully explained. I do not know how many users I represent, but in this way we have tried to educate the horticultural public.

Problems fall in 3 categories, taxonomic changes which we agree cannot be avoided, bona fide nomenclatural changes which are usually accepted, and changes owing to pure misidentification (witness locos australis = Arecastrum Romanzoffianum var. australie of botany but Butea capitata in horticulture).

The extent of horticultural names is very considerable, the problems are numerous but they are best solved by working out the problems and presenting the results to the users. It is my plea that we do not bind ourselves to a list of nomina specifica conservanda or rejicienda or anything else. I would beg the taxonomists to accept the motion of Dr A. C. Smith at the Montreal Congress and do some investigation in cultivated plants and see if indeed these names and if necessary their changes are accepted.

Dr Blake said that a good deal of the trouble we had was due to mis-identification. In the present list there were also many such cases of mis-identification. A list would not remove these mistakes. Australian foresters had adopted a list of accepted trade names. His institution had provided the necessary guidance here. Stabilization was not fixation: stabilization should be achieved through the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature.

Dr M. Lange: “The fact pointed out that men in practice in many fields tend to use vernacular names only is a matter which should really worry us. If we become a nomenclature clan we are failing. At the same time, the growing international cooperation makes Latin names the only tool which can be used, also in dealing with legal matters remote from botany. Both these points indicate that action to serve these and other groups, for which scientific names are only an auxiliary tool, is highly necessary. It will not mean that we shall deal with a list without end. It can be agreed what plants are of economic importance, and this list should then only be amended, if a plant (e.g. Penicillium notatum) has ceased to have economic importance which can be proven”.

Dr Fcsberg: “I would like to use the foresters as an example of a group who, at the same time as being vociferous about stabilization of nomenclature, are doing something constructive about it. They, at least the U.S. forest service, have employed a taxonomist, Dr Little, whose job for over 30 years has been just this. He has prepared a fine list of trees of the U.S. that provides about as good stabilization as can be desired. The other groups of practical plant users should follow suit and employ good botanists to work out the problems and prepare lists of correct names for the plants that concern them. I suggest not closed, short term lists of conserved names, where we will make mistakes and have to go to great trouble to change them, but open lists, subject to change when necessary. These lists can be used by the groups concerned and will bring about a measure of stability, consistent with the current status of taxonomy. This is the kind of stabilization the practical people need”.

Dr Dunn: “Economic botanists and others can certainly send a specimen to a specialist to obtain the correct name. In addition a voucher specimen should be left in a reputable herbarium to verify what plant the botanist worked on. I published an article entitled “Have Modern Botanists Forgotten the Herbarium” in which the case was presented”.

Mr Dandy: “The trouble about the question of stabilization is that sound arguments can be advanced on both sides. I find myself in agreement with Mr Gilmour, Mrs Sprague, Dr Faegri and Dr Moore. The discussion so far has centred on the stabilization of specific names of plants of economic importance. Mr Gilmour has stressed the importance of this and suggested that no-one would worry much if names of antarctic mosses were changed. But there is a large area in between which concerns working botanists and especially European botanists. Many Linnaean specific names — and Linnaeus named many European species — have been applied in more than one sense by different authors, and recent typifications of Linnaean names have shown that in many cases his names have been misapplied. Dr Moore suggested that if we put our shoulders to the wheel we could in time clear up these nomenclatural problems. But we have been putting our shoulders to the wheel, and turning it, and the result has been more nomenclatural instability. Already in the Code there is provision under Art. 69 for dealing with the question of misapplied names, but this does not work satisfactorily because judgments are subjective and botanists do not always agree whether a name is to be rejected under this Article. I would therefore like to see the
Article made fully operative by the addition of a definite list of the names to be rejected. I would finally point out that some other more recent names would be concerned besides those published by Linnaeus".

Dr Tryon pointed out that _nomina specifica conservanda_ would undermine the **Principles**
1) of the individual operation of the Code; 
2) of the final strong-hold of priority.

He was of the opinion that it was because of these principles that the Code was an effective instrument and he did not want to see the Code undermined. The Code was effective as it stood now, although we had some problems. The other choice was to have no effective Code but still the problems.

Dr Moore wanted to ask three questions:
1) Who is to say which of two names — one correct and in use, one incorrect and in use was to be proposed for conservation?
2) What mechanism has the IAPT or any other organization for determining in an adequate fashion the real use of names and the true basis for conservation?
3) As far as action is concerned, would not the publication in the next few years of _Hortus Third_ in fact provide an authoritative list of names?

Mr Rcss: "A basic principle of nomenclature is that names are words that is, they are vehicles of communication. They only do their job properly when the recipient of a message understands by them with the least possible effort the concept intended by the sender. There is no particular difficulty about one synonym replacing another. Equivalents can be listed where necessary. The difficult cases are those where a name has been consistently applied in one sense and examination of its type shows that it has been mis-applied. Changes so caused will cause immediate protest which will soon die down, but there will be a very detrimental long-term effect. People in 30 years time reading past literature will not know on which side of the divide the works of earlier authors lie, or will not realize that such a divide exists. The establishment of a list to back Art. 69 and the placing of such names on it is probably the best way of dealing with this difficulty.

Dr Schulze pointed out that he is a member of the German Committee for Horticultural Nomenclature. When discussing the problem of stabilization with the practical people he discovered that they were only interested in conservation of the names for their own use irrespective whether they were correct under the Code or not. He was sorry to have to make this remark, but this was his experience.

Dr Rolla S. Rao pointed to his connections with Indian forestry departments. There was a general feeling that the names ought to be stabilized. There was a vivid interest in correct botanical nomenclature because of the variety of languages and vernacular names. The English vernacular names are clear to a limited group of people only and also available only for part of the species. The foresters therefore definitely want authentically standardized lists of the correct names in Latin. He recommended the setting up of a stabilized list. Many Indian botanists faced problems in economic botany.

Dr Cowan then presented a proposal in the form of a motion based on the Montreal motion. We could do sound work only if it were basic. Many people had mentioned the principle of priority. This principle presented us with a basic guide towards establishing a correct nomenclature. He should like to see the foresters and horticulturists presented with the correct names from the point of view of nomenclature, correct to the best of our knowledge. A system of conserving specific names would be far too rigid. The motion presented by him contained several elements of the proposal by Dr A. C. Smith that had been adopted in the form of a motion by a large majority at Montreal.

"The Section on Nomenclature believes that careful monographic and revisional studies of groups of plants, utilizing the principle of priority and its modifications as outlined in the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature offer the best means of achieving future stabilization of specific names.

The Section further recognizes its responsibility to cooperate with users of plant names in arriving at correct nomenclature. It proposes, therefore, that a standing committee be established to assist organizations in determining the correct names, in accordance with the Code, for plants with which they are concerned. This committee will be composed of taxonomists experienced in nomenclatural procedure and it is expected that the committee will consult specialists whenever appropriate.

Dr Shetler believed that Dr Cowan's proposal was the only proposal that would meet the needs of both the applied and allied field and the taxonomic botanists. The
names that had been suggested for conserva-
tion would never provide the adequate
standardized lists that the economic people
need and spoke about.
Dr Faegri said that the motion in reality
represented a flat refusal of the wishes of
economic botanists, phytogeographers etc.
Mr Bullock wished to associate himself
and Kew with Dr Cowan’s proposal, and
appealed to all botanists to transmit names
omitted from Index Kewensis to Kew without
delay.
Dr Lance said the proposal would not
meet the reasonable request of groups of
botanists less familiar with taxonomy. A
more active procedure could be created, also
inside the provisions of the Code.
Dr Wood pointed out that it is not the
obligation of taxonomists to provide as a
free service to other groups the correct names
of plants without the support of such groups.
Taxonomists certainly will assist, but deserve
support.
Dr M. Weiss said that with increased inter-
national cooperation in agricultural research
it is important, more than ever, to have a
common international language so far as
plant nomenclature is concerned. We needed
this very badly. The agronomist looks to
the taxonomist to provide such language.
The motion as proposed will not provide a
solution to the agronomist’s nomenclatural
problems, at least within the foreseeable fu-
ture. The agronomists look for a list, they
need it.
Dr Schopf had listened to this discussion
of conservation all his professional life. The
problem of nomenclature of economic plants,
as with other plants, is a continuing one.
Those who ask for a list of conserved specific
names fail to recognize this fact. There seems
to be a great desire, however, for practical
people to have a list of names. I wonder if
this need could be provided by publicizing
the results of advice by the Committee en-
visioned in Dr Cowan’s motion.
Dr Holtum made the point that as
regards tropical plants, there is a very great
need for monographers, but the work is so
great, the number of taxonomists engaged
on it so inadequate that no committee which
could at present be appointed would be able
in many cases to give a satisfactory answer
to a query requesting the correct name for
a particular plant.
Dr Rickett: “I am generally in symp-
athy with the proposal read by Dr Cowan,
with the authorization of a committee to
help non-taxonomic persons determine cor-
rect names. I came here with, I think, an
open mind. I have sympathized with the
needs of the lay public, non-taxonomic bo-
antists, and others who must use plant
names. On the other hand I am appalled by
the work necessary in providing lists of con-
served (or “stabilized”) plant names. (I base
this on my several years of experience with
conservation of generic names.) Is not the
whole matter to a larger extent one of edu-
cation? People seem generally disposed to
accept a name when they have some assu-
rance from a reputable scientific body that
the name is correct. When Hortus III appears,
for instance, horticulturists will have a
reliable index to (according to Dr Moore)
some 26,000 names (more or less). And they
will use the names, as they have used those
in Hortus II. Those who sell plants, in the
United States at least, are generally very igno-
orant of the meaning, reference, and use
of botanical names. (Lychnis coronaria
is
very generally sold as Agrostemma githago.)
But they would use correct names if they
were easily accessible to them. I suggest,
therefore, that the committee suggested by
the proposal read by Dr Cowan should un-
dertake the publication of correct names as
they become available; publication in ve-
hicles easily available to the lay public, not
enshrined in our own technical journals and
books. This would, I think, go as far as
anything can to the solving of our problem.
Dr Rollins concluded that such a Com-
mittee as asked for by Dr Cowan would
have assigned to it more responsibility than at
first indicated. The Committee could do basic
work in providing guidance for horticulturists
and foresters in establishing the correct names
of the plants with which they were dealing.
Dr Little stated that the motion evaded
the question. The question was whether we
wanted to adopt the principle of stabilization
of specific names or not.
Dr Rollins answered that it was clear that
we all wanted stabilization. It was the method
by which stabilization was to be achieved
which was under discussion.
Dr Moore suggested that Baileya might
be one avenue for publicizing results of in-
vestigations of names and that the editor Dr
Dress might be sympathetic.
Dr Cowan said that, with Dr Rickett’s
remark in mind, the decisions reached by the
Committee would constitute the list as re-
quested. The body of these decisions would
be something positive and to the benefit of the users of plant names.

Dr Mathias said that State Legislature of California requires that all ornamental woody plants in wholesale trade in California must carry correct botanical names. Many of these plants have not yet been described. 8,000 names were involved for some 2800 taxa. A list prepared by Mathias and McClintock with the help of many colleagues was now used as a standard by nurserymen and others. This check list provided a standard source of reference for plant names.

Mr Gilmour said that it was not absolutely clear what Dr Cowan's motion involved. Dr Cowan wants a Committee that is open for requests concerning any group of economic plants. He wondered whether this was a practical solution. He asked whether this would work if put in terms like "open to the whole world".

Dr Stapleu said that the answer would be 'no'. As far as he understood the motion, however, the Committee was to act as a kind of clearing house. The Committee would turn to the specialists for advice. On the other hand he knew that the various groups of people in practice would support special projects if they were worth while. Dr Cowan's intention seemed to be to let the Committee act as an intermediary between the practical people and the specialists.

Dr Linehan delivered the following statement: "Since the formulation of a conserved list under authority of this Section of the International Botanical Congress does not appear to be possible I regard the present motion as the next best alternative and therefore I support it. Under this motion the different associations concerned with economic plants may formulate their own lists but will have the proposed standing committee of taxonomic experts to refer to for advice. An additional advantage of such a committee is that it will help to maintain uniformity between various associations.

Regarding Dr Stapleu's point that additional financial assistance will be necessary for nomenclature investigation of economic plants I think that the matter is of considerable importance to ISTA and hence if the present motion is adopted by the Congress I will ask ISTA to sympathetically consider making a financial contribution."

Dr Rollins wanted to take a vote on the motion as presented.

Dr Lange had a protest: correct procedure would be to know the actual motion on which the Section was to vote. The different proposals ought to be circulated. He wanted to present another motion:

"The Tenth International Botanical Congress further instructs this Section to set up a list of names of plants of economic importance and to have this list distributed as widely as possible. The list will become official only by action of the International Botanical Congress after appropriate study."

Dr McNell said that if Dr Lange's proposal related to the matters contained in the motion before the Section, then surely the correct procedure would be for him to present it as an amendment.

Dr Dunn asked how Dr Lange recognized a plant of economic importance?

Dr McVaugh stressed the same point.

Dr Lange said that everybody had a list in hands. It would hardly be a problem.

Dr Solbrig asked that the amendment of Lange be voted first and then the proposal of Cowan.

Dr Christensen, putting things in a short way said: "I understand that what was thought of by the first speakers was an authorized list containing the left hand columns in Section C of the preliminary report, and what is suggested by Professor Lange is a list largely containing the right hand columns. But a list in any case."

Dr Shetler thought we were a trifle naive to assume that the list of names presented here included all economically important plants. This point should be kept in mind in the discussion.

Dr Rollins remarked that the Committee would be charged with a large responsibility under this amendment. Where would the funds come from? We should not repeat the Montreal decision.

Dr Lange said that the already existing list had been paid for. It would probably be considered a good beginning of a list such as had been asked for. The societies which had paid so far, should be persuaded to pay also for a continuation of the work.

Mr Gilmour remarked that Dr Lange thought that the lists had been easily paid for. He wanted to point out that several of the groups that had given financial support in the past five years would not go on giving money; certainly not if no tangible result was reached at this Congress.

Dr Stapleu explained that it had been very difficult to raise the money. Some of the organizations listed in the preliminary report had paid only once or twice and certainly not
every year. To make a list like the one envisaged by Dr Lange would take much more manhours. He had not yet given his opinion on the quality of the 'Preliminary list' but now that Dr Lange suggested taking it as a starting point he wanted to point out that it was of course far from perfect. It had been extremely difficult for one man to do all this work: he simply could not avoid making certain mistakes. Dr Punt had been the first to state this to him. If we were to follow Dr Lange's proposal we had to face the practical difficulties of again starting on a general list. We would be instructed to present a full list with all the cases thoroughly studied. We could then no longer ignore the question of typification. The Punt report had been drawn up to give us an idea of the scope of the problem. The list was not satisfactory, however, as the basis for a list as called for by Dr Lange. The amount of work that would still lie ahead was staggering. He asked the Section to find a solution that would work. A new instruction to make a general list simply would not work. The solution ought to be such that the practical people could turn to our existing organization and receive an answer. As far as he could see at this moment, the suggestions by Drs Cowan and Linehan could at any rate be put in operation. There would not be at once a fixed list of names, but there would be the published results of specific cases solved by or through the Committee. The preliminary list had been an experiment. He had been associated with the work to some extent of course and had become convinced that this was not the way to do it. A short-cut was impossible: the present list could not be used at once as a basis for a list with legal status. A compromise should be found on the basis of Dr Cowan's motion.

Dr Fosberg said that he was glad to hear Dr. Stafleu admit that the list of economic plants published as Regnum Vegetabile vol. 36 would not be satisfactory for the purposes proposed by Dr Lange. Actually a list satisfactory for his purpose would be many times that large and enormously difficult to do. He would, as one who was doing some of the work envisaged, be willing to serve on such a Committee as would be set up by Dr Cowan's proposal, but he would not, under any consideration, serve on it if Dr Lang's amendment were adopted. He was sure that few, if any, of those competent to do this work would, or could, take the time that would be required, and this was no task to be entrusted to a new inexperienced graduate.

Dr Faegri said that the economic expenses involved on account of Dr Lange's amendment would be higher but the project due to the original proposal is far from self-financing. If, instead of a final list, there was a growing one (like the Index nominum genericorum), Dr Lange's proposal would not entail excessive cost.

Dr Rolls said that under Dr Lange's proposal the Committee would be charged with a heavy task. If we accepted the mechanism put forward in the first motion, however, there seemed to be a possibility of actually doing something. Lists prepared by others could for instance be checked, but there would be no responsibility for the Committee to make these lists itself. We would like to be in a position to help the people who wanted the lists, but the lists ought to be drawn up in first instance by or through the interested parties themselves.

Dr Proskauer said that if the motion were passed, a new motion to instruct the new Committee ought to be drawn up to try to set up a machinery to achieve the purpose of Lange's amendment provided finance could be found.

Dr Cronquist said that the phraseology of this proposed amendment was very important. In its present form it was ambiguous. Such a list might be interpreted by some people as essentially a list of conserved specific names, whereas other people might consider it as merely a list of suggestions.

Dr Stafleu greatly appreciated Dr Proskauser's remark and was in general impressed by the amount of goodwill that had been shown. He asked for a compromise between the motion of Dr Cowan and the Lange amendment. During the lunch hour such a solution could certainly be found.

Dr Lange then withdrew his original motion and proposed the following new amendment:

"The Committee is invited to set up a list of names of plants of economic importance and to submit this list to a coming session of the Nomenclature Section of the International Botanical Congress."

Dr Dunn remarked that many people might wish to have access to the list before the next Congress. Would such a list be available in less than five years? and would it satisfy the desires of some of the interested parties?

Dr Little asked whether this list was to be submitted to the next international bota-
nical Congress or to any botanical Congress. Was there a time limit?

Dr Lange stated that the new motion was the only remaining part of the original amendment. No time limit was attached to the submission of the list called for.

Dr Tryon asked what was the purpose of the list.

Dr Rollins explained that the purpose was to lay before the Committee one of the ideas born in this session.

Dr Cronquist said that the motion in its new form sounded like a part of a political party platform. It was all things to all men. On one hand it said we wanted to apply the rules as they exist, and on the other it said we wanted to set up a list of names. As things stood, we did not know how to vote on it in order to vote against conserved specific names.

Dr Rollins asked for a vote by show of cards on the original motion and on the motion as amended.

Dr Cronquist asked for a card vote on the original motion as amended.

Dr Proskauer asked whether the date could be dropped from the motion.

The motion as amended was also accepted by a great majority.

Dr Little then presented the following motion: “The Nomenclature Section affirms its ardent desire for stable nomenclature, to be employed by all who use scientific botanical names. Over the years, the International Botanical Congresses have carefully dealt with improvements and clarifications of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature. With such stabilization in view, the Section appeals to all to adhere carefully to this Code.”

Dr Rollins explained that this was actually the real purpose of the Code and suggested that the Section reaffirm Dr Little’s motion.

Dr Schulze reminded the Section that stabilization and a stable method of nomenclature were two different things. He was primarily interested in ‘a stable method’.

Mr Dandy then presented a motion to amend Art. 69 which was amended several times and of which the final version is given here below on p. 36.

Dr McVauacht asked how (if Mr Dandy’s proposal was accepted), we could predict that a name would become a persistent source of error. How could we guarantee that this new rule would not be misapplied?

Dr Rollins said that if the article was deleted, as suggested by prop. A, there was still prop. B which could take its place. He now first put the proposals to Art. 69 to the vote.


Art. 69, prop. B. Withdrawn by Mr Bullock.


Dr Rollins now declared that the proposal by Mr Dandy was again up for discussion.

Dr Schulze said that in Mr Dandy’s proposal it would be better to say “it may become”.

Dr Dandy accepted the amendment.

Dr Donk was more or less in favour of this proposal but he was of the opinion that it would involve a lot of work to get a name on the list or to get it deleted from it. In the future it might become a special section of the Code.

Dr Tryon questioned the applicability of this article in cases of later misapplications.

Dr Proskauer was at a complete loss to understand the proposal. The second part of the proposal (“or if by transfer to a taxon to which it may become attached”) threw the door wide open for abuse. There were still people who used the Code in bad faith. It would now be possible to make such transfers on purpose in order to throw out a name.

Mr Dandy explained that there had to be set up a machinery to deal with the list. A committee like that on Spermatophyta ought to be set up. He did not think that it would be a list with many names. He aimed at those species which were very well known to-day but which had no stable name to-day. The Flora Europaea group had decided to make notes of names that came into this category.

Dr Fosberg was of the opinion that the clause on transfer did not mean anything. What mattered was the typification of the name or epithet involved.

Mr Dandy said that “to which it had not been previously applied” could be inserted if necessary.

Dr Martin said that he had dealt with cases where he had to use Article 69. In cases where the types were unknown or lost it might be well to apply this article. The article was extremely useful just as it stood in the Code at the present time.

Dr Faegri quoted an example taken from zoology. The common songthrush had been known since Linnaeus as Turdus musicus L. The type-specimen of that name, however, turned out to be the redwing thrush T. iliacus. The species hitherto known as T.
iliacus therefore became *T. musicus*. *T. iliacus* could no longer be used, the old *T. musicus* became *T. philomelos*, and later even *T. ericer- torum*. It was this kind of confusion that could be prevented if Mr Dandy's proposal was accepted.

Dr Stearn quoted an example from Linnaeus where the name of species in question was now generally applied in the wrong sense but where precise interpretation of the protologue showed that it really ought to be applied to an entirely different species. The correct interpretation had not yet been taken up by anybody. Mr Dandy's amendment would make it possible to reject this name.

Dr Fosberg had already referred to *Cerastium viscosum*. There were several instances where the unhappy consequences of a strict application of the type method to Linnaean names could be avoided by means of rejection under Art. 69.

Mr Ross asked Dr McVaugh whether he knew what was meant in literature written forty years ago by *Prunus virginiana*.

Dr McVaugh said that this was a kind of problem that arose with every name-change. It was the problem of the older literature.

Mr Ross said that one could avoid changes of meaning that arose on transfer by means of this amendment.

Dr Cronquist said that the wording might be altered in such a way that it read “a name may not be rejected under this rule until it appears on the list”. There might perhaps be less resistance to the proposal in that case.

Mr Dandy said that the whole question was to which names this article referred and to which it did not. The most important thing was the definite list.

Dr Shetler thought that we were changing the sense of Art. 69 to apply to a different kind of confusion. The present wording seemed to apply to confusion where typification was not possible. The new wording seemed to apply to cases where typification was not in question but the result of changes required were deemed undesirable.

Mr Dandy said that Linnaeus had described *Cerastium vulgatum*. In a subsequent work, either intentionally or in error he transposed it. In all later European floras the name had been used in Linnaeus's second sense. The name could be typified but if this was done the original sense had to be restored. If we applied the article we could call the species *Cerastium viscosum*.

Dr Korf asked whether Dr Dandy would agree that then both of the species he mentioned would require new names?

Dr Papenfuss said that it seemed to him that this emendation was conceived to salvage what had been lost in the previous action of the Section in its rejection of the proposal for the conservation of specific names. He should like to know why Mr Bullock had changed his mind and withdrawn his proposal to delete Art. 69.

Dr Proskauer said that the proposed wording was nonsense and in conflict with the type method.

Mr Bullock replying to Dr Papenfuss protested that he had not changed his mind, but was in favour of Mr Dandy's proposal because it made the article thoroughly workable and objective. Article 69 as it stood was nonsense. The actual wording was not important, the appendix was.

Dr Faegri said that Article 14 provided already a mechanism to handle such lists. He did not think that this was unduly difficult.

Dr Rollins asked for a card vote: 133 yes, 199 no. The proposal was defeated.

[The precise wording of the proposal as written on the blackboard was: ”A name must be rejected if it is used in different senses and so has become a long persistent source of error or if by transfer to a taxon to which it had not previously been applied except by the original author it may become such a source of error. A list of names to be rejected under this article is given in Appendix . . .”.]
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REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR HYBRIDS

Art. 3, Prop. F. Rejected unanimously.


Art. 7, Prop. P. Rejected unanimously.

Art. 28, Prop. A. Rejected unanimously.

Art. 28, Prop. B. Rejected unanimously.

Art. 28, Prop. C (new). The Committee felt the need for some modification of Art. 28 and propose the following new version:

Plants brought from the wild into cultivation bear the names that are applied to the same taxa growing in nature.

Variants which arise in cultivation through hybridization, mutation, selection, or other processes, and which are of sufficient interest to cultivators to be distinguished by a name, receive cultivar epithets preferably in common language (i.e., fancy epithets) markedly different from the Latin epithets of species and varieties. Variants found growing in the wild which are brought into cultivation because of their value to man, may also be given cultivar epithets.


Examples: (to follow).

Art. 36, Prop. D. Rejected unanimously.

Art. 40, Prop. A. Rejected unanimously.

Art. 40, Prop. B. Rejected unanimously.

Art. 40, Prop. C.

The following re-draft of Art. 40 is proposed by the Committee (see under Appendix I, at end of Report):

For purposes of valid publication, the name of a hybrid group of generic, subgeneric, or sectional rank, which is a condensed formula or equivalent to a condensed formula (see H.3 and H.4), must be published with a statement of the names of the parent genera, subgenera, or sections respectively, but a Latin diagnosis or other description is not necessary.


For purposes of valid publication, names of hybrids of specific or lower rank with Latin epithets are subject to the same rules as are those of non-hybrid taxa of the same rank.


The name Rheum X cultorum Thorsrud & Reisaeter, Norske Plantenavn, 95 (1948), being here a nomen nudum, is not validly published.

The name Fumaria X salmonii Druce, List Brit. Pl. 4 (1908), is not validly published, being stated here.

For purposes of priority, names and epithets of Latin form given to hybrids are subject to the same rules as are those of non-hybrid taxa of corresponding rank.


Art. 50, Prop. A. Rejected unanimously.

Art. 50, Prop. B. Rejected unanimously.

Appendix I. The Committee agreed that this Appendix should be kept separate from the main text of the Code. They rejected unanimously all proposals for its alteration except for H.4, Prop. B, which is here incorporated in a new proposal (see below), and H.5, Prop. B, which received 2 votes in favour, 6 against, and is here rejected.

In their first Report, the Committee put forward two new articles, 20 bis and 21 bis, which with their proposed re-draft of Art. 40
(see above), embodied the following important new principles: (1) that "generic names" of hybrid genera should be regarded as condensed formulae and should be validly published by an accompanying statement of their parentage, without any Latin diagnosis or other description, and (2) that as a consequence, such "generic names" should be applicable only to the plants which are accepted taxonomically as derived from the parent genera named.

Following a thorough discussion at their meeting on 29 July, the Committee, recognizing (1) that it was undesirable to insert two new articles in the Code, with consequent renumbering of articles, and (2) that the principles involved could be equally well embodied in Arts. H.3 and H.4 (Appendix I), accordingly agreed to recommend the deletion of their proposed new Arts. 20 bis and 21 bis, and the adoption of the following revised texts for Arts. H.3 and H.4:

H.3. Intergeneric hybrids (i.e. hybrids between species of two or more genera) are distinguished at the generic level by a formula and, whenever it seems useful, by a "generic name". The formula consists of the names of the two or more parents connected by the multiplication sign X.

The "generic name" of a bigeneric hybrid (i.e. the name of a bigeneric hybrid corresponding to a genus) is formed by combining the names of the two parent genera, i.e. the first part or the whole of one name and the last part or the whole of the other, into a single word.

Examples: X Agropogon (etc. as on p. 20 of Report).

The "generic name" of an intergeneric hybrid from four or more genera is formed from the name of a person eminent as a collector, grower, or student of the group, to which is added the termination -ara; no such name may exceed eight syllables.

Examples: X Potinara (= Brassavola X Cattleya X Laelia X Sophronitis).

The "generic name" of a trigeneric hybrid is formed either like that of bigeneric hybrids, by combining the names of the three parent genera into a single word not exceeding eight syllables, or, like that of a hybrid derived from four or more genera, from a personal name, to which is added the termination -ara.

Examples: X Sophrolaeliacattleya (= Cattleya X Laelia X Sophronitis); X Wilsonara (= Cochlioda X Odontoglossum X Oncidium).

**Note.** The "subgeneric name" or "sectional name" of a hybrid between two subgenera or two sections (or other intrageneric categories) of the same genus is formed in the same way as the "generic name" of an intergeneric hybrid.

**Examples:** Iris subgen. X Regelocyclus comprising the hybrids between species of Iris belonging to subgenus Regelia and subgenus Oncocycles.

H.4. "Generic names" of intergeneric hybrids are regarded as condensed formulae; they are preceded by the multiplication sign X (see examples above). All hybrids between the same genera bear the same "generic name".

In order to be validly published, the "generic name" of an intergeneric hybrid must be accompanied by a statement of the parentage (see Art. 40), and is applicable only to plants which are accepted taxonomically as derived from the genera named.

Example: If the genus Triticum L. (etc. as on p. 21 of Report).

Mr Gilmour presented the above report. He stated that this report replaced the preliminary report drawn up by Dr Stearn and incorporated in the 'additional material' distributed before the meeting. Three main questions of principle were involved in the recommendations contained in the report.

The proposal by Dr. Grassl to rewrite Appendix I entirely contained among other items the provision that hybrids, both specific and generic, should be designated by a formula. Any special names for hybrids should fall outside the Code. This principle was unanimously rejected by the Committee. He stressed, however, that the Committee was very grateful to Dr Grassl for the enormous amount of work done by him to put forward his proposals. The names for hybrids (in addition to the formulae) were thought to be essential for nomenclature, and neither in science nor in practice could they be omitted.

The second principle concerned the status of names of intergeneric hybrids, that is names made up of parts of the names of the parent genera. Such names now required a diagnosis for valid publication. The Committee unanimously felt that there were various objections to this. First a philosophical one: it is impossible to draw up a satisfactory diagnosis while dealing with such a potential range of forms. The Committee felt that such a name, which was in fact a condensed for-
mula, should stand for all possible hybrids of that particular parentage. The second was a factual point. There were hundreds of such 'names' that has been published without descriptions. Furthermore the 'names' had to change if the names of the parent genera had to be changed for taxonomic purposes. On the whole it seemed therefore better to face the consequences of these names being condensed formulae and to treat them as such. For this reason revised articles H 3 and H 4 had been put forward. For valid publication of these condensed formulae only a statement of the parentage would be sufficient.

Mr Bullock asked whether the position of hybrids in relation to Art. 2 and Art. 3 was satisfactory.

Dr Stearn pointed to the last line of Art. 4.

Mr Gilmour said that as long as hybrids were treated as taxa it was all-right. He added some words on the reasons behind the Committee's rejection of Art. 7, prop. F. Art. 28, proposal A had been rejected because it was thought to be cumbersome. Mr. Bullock's prop. B could be rejected because it was now included in the new draft. This new draft was the result of a long discussion in which the Committee had not been unanimous. It had been thought necessary to include a statement that cultivar epithets could also be given to variants found growing in the wild which were brought into cultivation.

The I.C.N.C.P. had not yet incorporated such a sentence like the present one, but this would be done in the next edition. He also remarked that the phrase about 'differing in no fundamental way' had been left out on purpose.

Mr Bullock asked whether horticulturists had by now agreed to use the term cultivar-epithets.

Mr Gilmour referred to the meeting of the I.C.N.C.P. Commission to be held the next day.

Mr Burtt proposed to delete from the new text: "because of their value to man".

Mr Gilmour agreed.

Dr Rollins asked for a vote: prop. C as modified by Dr Burtt was carried.

Mr Gilmour continued his explanatory remark.

Art. 36, prop. D had been rejected by the Committee. The point was dealt with in the new version of Art. 40.

Dr Rollins asked for a confirmation: prop. D rejected.

Mr Gilmour speaking on Article 40 explained that the new proposal C dealt with the points raised by prop. A and B.

Article 40

Prop. C (Committee for Hybrids)

Dr Donk asked whether he was correct that if he first published a name for a new fungus as an intergeneric hybrid name without any diagnosis and later stated that it was not a hybrid at all, he had validly published a new generic name?

Mr Gilmour said that the bigeneric hybrid "names" were condensed formulae. They remained condensed formulae. If the plant was thought to represent a new genus, the formula could no longer be used.

Mr Garay objected to proposal C because anyone might publish a list of telescoped names or condensed formulae without actual material backing the necessity of such names. Such names, however, were validly published and would have priority over future names i.e. with which "grex" names will be published simultaneously.

Mr Ross said that if these formulae are not based on plants, they are provisional and could not be regarded as validly published.

Dr Tryon was also of the opinion that a hybrid name given in a way with the thought that such might eventually exist but without there being such a plant at that time did not need to be guarded against because there could not be a name without a plant.

Dr Stafleu said that condensed formulae were not generic names and could not become such names.

Dr Buchheim made a technical remark and asked whether this proposal did not belong to Art. 34 which deals with valid publication? Was it not necessary to insert a reference in Art. 34?

Dr Stearn pointed out that it was completely correct as it stood.

Dr Lange thought that the word "names" was used in error — in the first line of the examples.

Mr Gilmour said that the word name could perhaps be put in quotes.

Dr Burtt asked what provision was made for names not in condensed formula form (e.g. X Encodenopsis = Achimenes X . . .).

Mr Gilmour said that there were only a few.
Dr. Burtt anyhow wanted to keep them stable.

Dr. Proskauer recommended that the Hybrid Committee should make recommendations to remove double talk from the Code about "names".

Dr. Rollins asked for a vote on prop. C to Art. 40, 5 were opposed, proposal accepted.

Art. 50, prop. A, rejected.
Art. 50, prop. B, rejected.

Mr. Gilmour explained, with respect to the proposal B to indicate the author who changed the status of a name of a hybrid to that of a species and vice versa, that the work involved was so enormous that it was impossible to do it.

Dr. Stearn remarked that in some cases one should have to look through some 50 volumes of the Gardener's Chronicle.

Mr. Gilmour further read the introduction from the above report to the proposals on the Appendix. All of Grassl's proposals under Appendix I were then rejected and so was prop. B to Art. H 5. The new proposals on Articles H 3 and H 4 were a consequence of the changes made in Art. 40.

The present texts elaborated in more detail the new provisions about intergeneric hybrid names.

The proposals to amend articles H 3 and H 4 as proposed were carried.

Mr. Gilmour remarked that most of the work on the hybrid report has been done by Dr. Stearn.

Dr. Rollins thanked the Committee for its thorough report.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR FOSSIL PLANTS

Dr. Chaloner presented the following report:

MEETING AT EDINBURGH AUGUST 29, 30 and 31

Present: T. M. Harris (Chairman), W. G. Chaloner (Acting Sec.), K. Faegri, R. Potonié and J. Schopf.

1. W. F. Harris, L. A. Kuprianova, N. W. Radforth and O. Selling are understood to have resigned from the Committee.

2. A. Takhtajan (Leningrad), F. P. Jonker (Utrecht) and L. Grambast (Montpellier) were proposed as new members of the Committee to be recommended for nomination to the Nominations Committee.

3. T. M. Harris tendered his resignation as Chairman, with effect from the end of this Congress; this was accepted and J. M. Schopf was unanimously elected to succeed him.

4. W. Chaloner agreed to act as temporary secretary in the absence of S. Mamay.

REPORT

Preamble:

These recommendations contain no innovations. They deal mainly with three issues:

(a) Extra-terrestrial taxa. We agree with the Comments Rapporteurs in advocating no special mention of these taxa in the Code.

(b) The definition of organ-genera and form-genera is clarified mainly by deletion of a number of rather over-pedantic recommendations which were collectively either unhelpful or at worst confusing. No change in the concept or handling of organ-genera and form-genera is implied.

(c) The treatment of combination genera (based on fossils combining parts previously only known separately) is recommended for continued study and clarification by the Special Committee for Fossil Plants.


Article 3. Props. A–C (Faegri), Prop. I (Potonié) all withdrawn by proposers. In place of Prop. C the Committee recommend (i): Delete the word "Artificial" in the article after "within which species may be recognised" add "and given names according to this code".

Recommendation 3A bis Prop. A (Doty and Lamoureux). Reject.

Prop. L (Claus and Nagy). Reject.

Prop. N (Faegri). The Special Committee for Fossil Plants proposed that the questions of combination names and neotypes of fossils be further studied by a commission to report to the next Congress and that the Special Committee for Fossil Plants be established as such commission.


Prop. C (Claus and Nagy). Reject.

Unnumbered Prop. of Schopf (p. 6 of "Tentative Agenda" circulated). Draft as circulated, but beginning "Fossil Plants are distinguished..." and delete the term "or subfossil" throughout, including in the heading.
Accept.

The Committee also wish to strongly recommend to the Editorial Committee that here and elsewhere in the Code the word "Recent" when used in the sense of "in contradistinction to fossil" should be capitalised (as is the customary practice in any geological or palaeobotanical context).

Recommendation 18A. Prop. A (Faegri) and Prop. 2 (Potonié) withdrawn.
The Committee recommends deletion of the entire Recommendation 18A.

NOTE: the intention of this deletion is that this recommendation is superfluous in the face of what is stated elsewhere, and merely serves to produce a rather absurd circular argument concerning the definition of form-genera.

Recommendation 20B. Prop. A (Faegri), Prop. 3 (Potonié) withdrawn by proposers.
Prop. B (Schopf: Deletion of the Rec.). Accept.


Prop. A (Hugues). Reject as being fungi, the word 'collective' could be used.

Recommendation 41A. Prop. A (Faegri) withdrawn, replaced by joint proposal of Faegri and Schopf: to delete Rec. 41A. Accept.
Prop. B (Doty and Lamoureux). Reject.


Prop. A (Claus and Nagy). Reject.


Prop. A (Faegri). For further consideration by the Committee. see comment under Article 7 Prop. N.

Fossil names proposed for Conservation:
The Committee feels that each of these cases deserves study, but reserves its opinion until this can be done. It therefore recommends no action on these proposals at this Congress.

The various recommendations by the Committee were then read and all approved. The following additional remarks were made.

Art. 7, prop. N (Faegri) was withdrawn but recommended for study to the next Committee on Fossil plants.

Art. 9, prop. C.

Dr Fosberg asked what would be the status of this proposal about the question of neotypes in light of the report of the Neotype Committee?

Dr Doty said that in the case of fossil plants successive sections or peels could be considered together as "a preparation serving as the holotype".

Dr Schopf said that the various preparations were separate parts of the type.

Dr Fosberg saw no difference between calling several twigs from the same tree isotypes and calling peels from a single specimen isotypes if the latter were distributed to different barbaria.

Dr Lellinger was of the opinion that it was a matter of timing. If a man distributed a new species, he put a holotype sheet in his own herbarium, and sent out isotypes. If he was, for instance, Lucian M. Underwood, he might remove a portion of a holotype sheet, and call this a "holotype fragment" — not an "isotype fragment".

Dr Doty said that where a specimen consisted of several items, e.g. a collection of fungi, the word 'collective' could be used.

Dr Rollins asked whether there was anything new in prop. C to Art. 9.

Dr Stafleu proposed to follow the recommendation of the Committee for Fossil plants to reject the proposal. This was approved.

Art. 13 proposals by Schopf.

Mr Ross asked whether in the new note to Art. 13, the words "from Recent plants" should be added after "are distinguished". Would Dr Schopf agree?

Dr Schopf agreed.
Proposal Schopf accepted as amended.
Recommendation 57 B.

Dr Schopf said that the Recommendation was confusing. It should be deleted. Accepted.
All recommendations by the Committee were confirmed by the Section. Dr Rollins expressed the thanks of the Section to the Committee.

NEOTYPES

Mr Ross presented the report of the Special Committee on Neotypes set up by the Montreal Botanical Congress. This report was published in Taxon 13: 110–114. 1964. He emphasised that the word “type” (even in combination) indicated greater authority for a specimen than was justified in the case of “Neotype” and that the Report proposed to substitute the phrase “Standard Specimen”, in a new Recommendation 9A.

Dr Dunn was of the opinion that it was necessary to include a statement to the effect that a syntype reviewed by the first author which had subsequently been found to belong to a different taxon could not be selected as a lectotype for the former taxon.

Dr Tryon suggested that, in the new Rec. 9A, line 17 of the report “considers” should be replaced by “can present substantial evidence”.

Mr Meikle thought that a change from “considers” to “shows” would be sufficient.

Dr Morton said that the term “standard specimen” was English and not in Latin form. It is not directly translatable into Japanese, Russian, and other languages.

Drs Lanjouw and Robyns favoured retaining the term “Neotype”. The latter pointed out that “Standard Specimen” could not be satisfactorily translated into French, and Schulze made the same point about German.

Dr Donk reminded the Section of the fact that the term Standard (species) had been used in the past for type species itself and that, if now reintroduced in a different sense, it might cause confusion.

Mrs Sprague pointed out that years ago the term Standard species was greatly criticized and had to be given up. — The present discussion was a case of “history repeats itself”.

Dr Rollins pointed out the difficult problem that the Committee had had to tackle.

Mr Ross stated that the term “Exemplar” had been considered by the Committee, but had been rejected, as it had different meanings in different languages.

Mr Dandy pointed out that we were trying in our debate to find a term when the necessity for such a term did not exist. So long as a monographer makes it clear which specimen he is regarding as representing a taxon then it does not matter what he calls it, though personally he thought Neotype was an undesirable word because its termination “type” suggested a higher status for the chosen specimen than it actually has. He proposed that the words “standard specimen” in new Rec. 9A be replaced by “representative specimen” (in Roman type).

Dr Stearn proposed to delete the last sentence: “the term Neotype should not be used since such a specimen is not a type”.

Dr Rickett stated that if the proposed new recommendation, in any form, with or without the last sentence, was accepted, this would involve also a redefinition of “type”.

In the Code as it stands, type is defined simply as a specimen associated with a name. He believed that we may wish to interpret a type as something studied by the original author, then the Code must be modified to clarify this.

Dr Proskauer emphasized that our Code was based on types and that hence a substitute for the holotype should also be a type.

New proposals introduced no new safeguards, just changed terms and thus would be a source of new confusion. The new “glossary” was likely to take care of this educational aspect.

He proposed that the Section thank the Committee and place its report on file.

Mr Margadant asked how many name changes would result if the Committee’s proposals were accepted.

Dr Fosberg: none.

Mr Margadant: then it is unnecessary.

Dr Fosberg said that the Committee certainly intended more than merely to change the word neotype. The Committee wanted particularly to point to the fact that the word neotype may imply that such specimens carry more weight than they actually have. They merely represent the opinion of a monographer, or, possibly not even of a monographer, a floristic writer, or, possibly, only of a person who searches for species which lack types so he can designate them.

Dr Robyns asked for examples of such confusion.

Dr Stearn said that he could give examples but that he preferred not to pillory the authors concerned.

Dr Korff strongly objected to the reduction of the concept of neotype — under whatever name — to the status of a recom-
mendation. The neotype is indeed a kind of type, and is frequently necessary to the cryptogamic botanist who finds that often there is no material which can be designated as a holotype or lectotype. In these cases a neotype specimen is a necessity, which must agree of course with the protologue. If this proposal was reduced to a recommendation, subsequent authors can choose another specimen and another interpretation of the taxon at will. With the force of a rule, the neotype fixes the application of a name, but only with certain limitations, i) it can be overthrown if it is shown not to agree with the protologue, ii) on rediscovery of any of the original material. Likewise a lectotype which is chosen when the holotype is lost or missing has its limitation, i) it will be overthrown on rediscovery of the holotype.

It is thus true that even though neither such a lectotype nor a neotype may truly represent the taxon of the original author, they have the force of a type and must be followed in the absence of better evidence. This will act toward stability of nomenclature as a rule, not as a recommendation. Dr McVAUGH suggested "typus pro terni" to replace neotype.

A vote by show of hands was then taken on the acceptance of New Recommendation 9a as contained in the Committee's Report and the Recommendation was defeated. With respect to Neotypes the Code remains unaltered.

Dr ROLLINS expressed thanks to the Neotype Committee for their contribution towards a further clarification of the Code.

SIXTH SESSION
Saturday, 1 August 1964, 9.00-12.00 a.m.
(Chairman: R. C. ROLLINS)

Dr LITTLE asked for a formal vote on his resolution presented in the previous Session.

The resolution was again read and carried with two voting against.

Dr GIER then read the following motion, seconded by Dr DOTY:

"I wish to propose, as a motion if in order, that the Rapporteur général submit the "Synopsis of Proposals", in the future, without his comments and suggestions.

Too many members, perhaps, are too lazy to look up references before voting by mail and send in their ballots marked as suggested by the Rapporteur-général so their mail votes are meaningless in the total. This proposal will eliminate many of their votes as they will not take the time to look up anything or to mark their ballots. This will make the mailvote much more meaningful.

I appreciate the study made by the Rapporteur-général and agree with most of his comments but feel that his suggestions prejudice the votes in too many cases".

Dr LANGE thought that the wording was too definite, it limited the work of the rapporteur too much and would make the work by the members unnecessarily difficult.

Dr MARTIN wanted to point out that in the past he had found the notes by the Rapporteur to be extremely helpful. It would be most unfortunate if there were no suggestions how to vote. There were for instance many matters that should go to special committees and for these matters the remarks by the rapporteur were essential. Every reasonable botanist would use the rapporteur's remarks as a time-saving guide helping him to come to his own independent conclusion.

Dr SINGER believed that the technical remarks by the Rapporteur were extremely useful. Otherwise qualifications like 'undesirable' might be misleading to people who did not read the rest of the proposal with the necessary care. The recommendations by the Rapporteur might influence the postal vote. He was therefore in favour of the resolution.

Dr ROLLINS said that since this discussion had arisen, it would have its effect on subsequent synopses. He asked whether Dr Gier was satisfied to have the matter raised in this way and whether he then wanted to withdraw his motion.

Dr GIER was satisfied and withdrew his motion.

Dr FOSBERG wanted to point out that he was completely in favour of Dr Singer's remarks.

Dr FÆGRI said that there were quite a few members of the section that were not satisfied with the ultimate result of the discussions on Mr Dandy's proposal. It had
obviously been not well prepared and the implications had not been clear. He put forward the following two motions.

"I. In view of the arguments put forth in favour of changing Art. 69 to avoid future nomenclatural confusion because of consistent usage contrary to result of typification of old names which were previously not typified, the section of nomenclature of the Xth International Botanical Congress appoints a Committee instructed to study the problem and to report to the next Congress".

"II. In the meantime taxonomists are urged not to take any step prejudicial to the outcome of the work of the Committee".

Dr Rollins put motion I to the vote: it was carried unanimously.

Dr Fosberg did not understand the purpose of the second proposal at all.

Dr Faegri did not think it was important. There were people that rushed into a herbarium, concluded that a typification had been wrong and rapidly changed a name. Dr Heywood said that this whole problem affected the Flora Europaea very considerably. He was in favour of the first part of the motion. He would not know, however, how the second motion would work. If someone was willing to change he did so anyhow.

The second motion by Faegri was then rejected.

Article 42

Article 43

Article 45
Prop. B (7: 44: 114: 7) [later rejected after hearing the report of the Committee for Algae].

Article 46

Recommendation 46A

Dr Faegri said that Rec. 46A belonged to a type which hardly belongs in a Code of nomenclature, but in a guide for good taxonomic practice. The Committee for Fossil plants proposed a number of them for deletion, and this was adopted by this Section. There are many similar cases in the present Code (especially under Arts. 20 and 23), and the whole problem should be studied by the Glossary Committee.

Dr Rollins asked for a vote: proposal rejected.

Recommendation 46C
Prop. A (28: 118: 0: 3).

Mr Bullock asked for another vote on account of alleged undue influence of the Comments of the Rapporteurs on the mail vote. He tried to show that the comments were not quite accurate and that his proposal would lead to greater precision.

Dr Fosberg asked Mr Bullock what he would do with names merely ascribed to one author by another, without his having designated a type.

Mr Bullock said that the publishing author might not have chosen a type.

Dr Cronquist read the following statement: "I think the rules as they now stand are adequate to deal with cases in which a name proposed by one author is published by another. We have several such sets of cases in the United States, involving names proposed by Nuttall, or Douglas, or Lindley; or Spruce names in South America. Thus we can cite Nuttall in Torrey and Gray in cases where Torrey and Gray merely quote Nuttall's description, and Nuttall ex Torrey and Gray in cases where they obviously wrote the description themselves. Some of Lindley's names were usually cited as having been published by De Candolle, but it was actually published two years earlier by Hooker. I think it is useful in such cases to keep the name of the proposing author in the citation. We should not be restricted to doing it only for some particular purpose as envisaged in this proposed recommendation".

Dr Donk said that since the author's names were part of the name, both author's names should point at the same type. If this was what Mr Bullock meant he was in favour of the proposal.

Dr Deighton said that there are several recent instances of the intended validation of invalidly published fungus names (e.g. Arnaud's) where the validating author has designated as type his own specimen and
not the specimen described or designated as type by the original author of the invalidly published name. In this case, the validly published name must be ascribed to the second author (B) alone and not referred to as (e.g.) "Arnaud ex B".

Dr Lange was of the opinion that the present Recommendation was clear enough. The actual author was the name after the ex. He was not afraid of confusion, both examples and text were good; if necessary more examples could be given.

Mr Brummitt gave an example in favour of the proposal: names distributed by Hochstetter in his exsiccata without descriptions were applied by Richard to plants which had already been described by him in manuscript before seeing Hochstetter's specimens. The types of these names are clearly the plants described by Richard and not Hochstetter's exsiccata specimens. To cite the authority of such names as 'Hochstetter ex Richard' is thus misleading. Mr Bullock's proposal would abolish this source of confusion.

Dr Rollins asked for the vote: proposal rejected.

Dr Stearn wanted the Section to authorise the Editorial Committee to add some examples.

New Recommendation 46F

Dr Faegri said that this did not belong to nomenclature but to good taxonomic practice. The proposal was then rejected.

Dr Donk wanted to draw the attention of the section to the fact that Rec. 46E was a telescoped version of two former Recommendations. As it stood now it was erroneous. He had pointed this out to the Editorial Committee. There ought to have been made (or rather retained) a difference between citations of pre-linnaean authors, and post 1753 but pre-starting-point authors of taxa belonging to later-starting-point groups.

Dr Rollins said that the Editorial Committee would look into this question.

Recommendation 46G
Prop. A (137: 14: 0: 9) Accepted.

New Article 46 bis

Dr Rollins explained that the proposal was important because it was not a recommendation but an article that was asked for.

Dr Faegri thought that this was again nothing for the Code to deal with.

Mr MARGADANT objected to the proposal as an article. This would be much too strong considering the part "Diacritical marks are not used"; the Swedish name Angström should definitely not be changed in his opinion.

A vote was taken: proposal rejected.

Article 48

Article 49

Mr Yeo remarked that Art. 49 was now not quite correct. It should be clear from the article that on transfer of a variety from one subspecies to another under the same specific name the name of the author who first made the ternary combination was the one to be cited in accordance with Art. 24. The second sentence of Art. 49 might lead to a different interpretation. He proposed to add to the last sentence of Art. 49: "except when the taxon transferred is infra-specific and is transferred without change of rank to another infra-specific taxon: in such a case the author who first combined the epithet, in the stated rank, with the specific name must be cited".

Dr Stafleu said that this was a good point. In such cases Article 24 had precedence. Mr Yeo's question could perhaps be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Dr Cronquist said that Art. 49 referred to taxa that were altered in rank.

Dr Stafleu said that the second sentence stated "with or without alteration of rank". He asked Mr Yeo to write to the Editorial Committee.

Mr Bullock asked the Editorial Committee also to look at proposal B in this respect. That proposal contained an additional means of indicating types.

Dr Stafleu thought that the broken brackets proposed by Mr Bullock were hard to find in printers' shops.

Dr Rollins promised that all these suggestions would be taken into consideration by the Editorial Committee.

Article 50
Prop. C (0: 65: 0: 107). Rejected since prop. B to Art. 49 had been rejected.

Recommendation 50D

Recommendation 50E

Recommendation 50F

Chapter V
Prop. A (112: 24: 0: 33). Accepted.

REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ORTHOGRAPHY (ARTS. 73, 74)
Dr. Van Steenis presented the following report:

Committee Members: Van Steenis, Dandy, Christensen, McVaugh, Bonner, and Schulze.

The Committee stresses that the difficulty with the subject of orthography is the necessity of providing sufficient rule and guidance and at the same time to keep it as short as possible. Many botanists nowadays are already not in sufficient command of the classical languages and still want to do botany. They must be able to do this without being philological experts. We should by all means avoid including a Latin grammar in the Code. In ruthlessly applying orthographic corrections often no credit is given to the scholarship of predecessors; Linnaeus wilfully wrote Boerhavia instead of Boerhaavia; Brown wrote Malcomia instead of Malcolmia, etc. The Code is supposed to encourage uniformity and stability in orthography, without involving the correct grammatical spelling as a primary aim. The Committee unanimously feels that the version of Art. 73 in the present Code works well and is satisfactory for our needs. The Committee therefore has no proposals of its own.

Of the proposals made before the Section which the Committee has reconsidered one by one, the Committee advises the rejection of them all, except:

Art. 73, Prop. A, F, M, N, refer to Editorial Committee.
Rec. 73-B, Prop. A. Accept.
Rec. 73-C, Prop. A, B, C; to Editorial Committee.
Rec. 73-E, Prop. B; reject first part, accept second part (deletion of example).
Rec. 73-G, Prop. A; Editorial Committee.
Rec. 74, Prop. A; to Editorial Committee.

Dr. Van Steenis further explained that the above report expressed the unanimous opinion of the ad hoc Committee. The group had felt the need to elaborate to some extent the point on how far we should go in nomenclature with orthographical precision. Most proposals had been rejected unanimously. The ones that had been accepted or referred to the Editorial Committee were enumerated separately.

Dr. Rollins wanted to act on the report without going into details. These matters were anyhow mainly editorial.

The report was then unanimously accepted.

Dr. Rollins then proposed to refer to the Editorial Committee the proposals D to Art. 14 and B to Art. 23 which had been passed over awaiting the report of the Orthography Committee. The Editorial Committee was to treat these proposals in accordance with the report of the Orthography Committee. Carried.

Dr. Stapleu explained that this meant that the term paranym was not accepted.

REPORT COMMITTEE FOR FUNGI AND LICHENS
Dr. Donk presented the following report:
Since Dr. Marcelle Le Gal resigned from the Committee earlier during the year, a chairman had to be selected. Dr. G. W. Martin was appointed as such.
It was proposed and accepted to obtain votes from all present, but to record separately also the results of the votes of the Committee members.
The report of the Secretary (as published in Taxon 13: 178–180, 1964) was approved.
The Secretary remarked that a number of voting-forms were received shortly after the closing-day and introduced a revised ‘Report of voting’ (Taxon 13: 180) with the request that this were made the basis of the discussions of the proposals for conservation of generic names instead of the one previously published. It was agreed to do so. The proposals to conserve Lepraria, Nidularia, and Cistella were confirmed. Also confirmed
was the proposal to conserve *Stereocaulon*, but with the remark that it needs renewed editing as to author’s names. The conservation of *Claviceps* was rejected as being superfluous. This annotation was agreed upon as desirable for future reference. All present were in favour of keeping the proposal to conserve *Monochaetia* and *Rhodophyllus* pending actions of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens on Proposals.

*Art. 3, Prop. H*

Though brought to our attention as of possible interest because of the use of the term “form-genera”, no action was taken by the Committee.

*Rec. 4A, Prop. A*

Overwhelmingly accepted by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

*Art. 7, Prop. B*

Defeated on the floor of the Section, and not considered further by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

*Art. 7, Prop. O*

Same as Prop. B.

*Art. 13, Prop. A*

Rejected unanimously by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

*Art. 13, Prop. B*

Rejected by a small majority of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

*Art. 13, Prop. H*

Rejected unanimously by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

*Rec. 24B, Prop. A*

Accepted unanimously by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens in view of their action in accepting *Rec. 4A, Prop. A*.

*Art. 59, Prop. A*

As written, this proposal apparently refers only to paleobotany, and the Committee for Fungi and Lichens chooses to take no action.

*Art. 59, Prop. B*

Amended by changing the word “spores” to read “cells of the kind”, and then unanimously approved by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens. (See Prop. E below).

*Art. 59, Prop. C*

Rejected by a large majority of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

*Art. 59, Prop. D*

Rejected unanimously by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

*Art. 59, Prop. E*

Almost unanimously accepted, as modified by the substitution for the second sentence of the wording of *Art. 59, Prop. B* as amended above, by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

*Art. 64, Prop. K*

An error or errors in numbering occurred here. This should be: *Art. 67*, new Prop. B. Amended to read: “After the word ‘rank’ in the 4th line, to add the words ‘or when it was published in contravention of *Art. 59*’,” and then almost unanimously approved by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

*Art. 73, Prop. I*

The Committee for Fungi and Lichens voted strongly in favor of deleting the word “fungus”, and in that form wish to submit it to the Section of Nomenclature of the Congress as a general proposal, without a recommendation on acceptance or rejection.

*Art. 73, Prop. K*

Unanimously referred to the general session of the Section for action since this is not a matter only of concern to mycologists and lichenologists by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens. We suggest that the first 3 lines may be treated either as a Rule or a Recommendation. The remaining lines should be revised to prepare an Example in the form used elsewhere in the Code.

Note: No action on the proposals concerning superfluous Names was taken by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

Dr. Donk explained that all mycologists present at the meeting had voted but that for security’s sake the votes of the Committee members had been counted separately.

A novelty in the report was that the Committee, in the case of the proposed conservation of *Claviceps* had expressed the opinion that retention of the name was certainly highly desirable but that technically the proposal to conserve it was superfluous. In case in future doubt might arise, it should be noted that the Committee was wholly in favour of retaining this important name.

Dr. Stapfleu explained with respect to the cases of proposed conservation that if the Committee’s report was accepted, the General Committee would still have the task to ask the other committees whether they approved. The procedure for conservation would follow its usual lines through the General Committee.

Dr. Werkersun drew the attention of the Editorial Committee to the case of Tomentella and its type: an editorial change from Code to Code should not be taken in the
same way as new proposals for nomina conservanda.

Dr Donk also had some additional changes of a technical character to be made in the list of nomina conservanda. This would have to be dealt with by the new committee in the ordinary way.

Dr Lanjouw said that leaving Claviceps out was still dangerous since the name would now not be found in the list.

Dr Donk explained that this was the reason why he should like to have it put on record in the proceedings of this meeting that the only reason why the proposal had been rejected was that the Committee thought it to be superfluous. The name Claviceps can be retained without conservation.

Dr Korf, who had drafted the report from Recommendation 4A onward gave some further information on the rest of the report.

Dr Rollins said that we now had to vote on the various recommendations of the Committee one by one.

Art. 3, prop. H, left out of consideration.

Rec. 4A, prop. A, accepted by the section.

Art. 13, prop. A & B, rejected by the Committee for Fungi, had been accepted by the Committee for Bryophytes.

Dr Papenfuss said that the Algal Committee had also handled these proposals and accepted them.

Mr Margadant proposed to appoint a special committee to study these proposals and to report on them to the next Congress. This was a difficult problem on which no agreement had as yet been reached. Proskauer's proposals aimed at legalizing actual practice. When the new starting-points were accepted it had certainly not been intended to invalidate e.g. the Linnaean name Lycopodium (treated with the Musci by Linnaeus). One might perhaps write the names of those particular Linnaean names in the rules to safeguard them. On balance he thought it to be a typical case for a special committee.

Dr Rollins proposed that this committee should be set up by the General Committee: accepted.

Dr McVaugh suggested that the proposal was superfluous, and that valid publication should depend on actual affinity without regard to mistaken opinions of earlier authors.

Mr Ross said that the later starting-points provided an awful lot of very difficult problems. He endorsed Mr Margadant's proposal to set up a special committee to study this problem. However, prop. A involved overriding the taxonomic judgement of the publishing author, and that was all wrong.

Dr Proskauer agreed with Mr Margadant that his proposal was in a way a platitude because it would fix actual practice. He thought, however, that this was the only way to deal with the problems created by the special starting-points. The making of exceptions to such basic concepts in the rules had led to great difficulties in operating. These problems had to be solved one way or another. In quite a number of groups special dispensation had been given. This special dispensation should not harm the people working in other groups that had not asked for such dispensation. The proposals put forward by him were in complete agreement with the type-method.

Dr Donk agreed with Dr Proskauer as far as prop. A to Art. 13 was concerned. The matter was indeed of great importance. The application of several starting-points by mycologists tends to make things so involved that it kept them away from taxonomic work. In the case of Gasteromycetes things were very difficult. It had turned out that certain genera originally considered as Gasteromycetes were indeed Hymenomycetes. This implied that because of this change of taxonomic opinion another starting-point had to be used for the species in question. With proposal A this would work out quite well, but he did not want to commit himself to Art. 13 prop. B.

Dr Lange felt that the Committee for Fungi had touched upon a question of principle. Before we put a final wording into the Code he wanted further study. On the whole the Committee would be in favour of putting some sort of regulation into the Code, but only after appropriate study. This could be done by the Special Committee that had been proposed.

Dr Martin was also of the opinion that this was an extremely important matter. As long as we had the problem of the different starting-points the application of these rules should be taken seriously. In the myxomycetes he had encountered the same sorts of problems as Dr Donk with the Gasteromycetes. He was also of the opinion that Proskauer's proposals were to be referred to a special group for careful study, but it was clear that a rule had to be provided.

Dr Proskauer said that he was in full accord with the Code as it stood spelled out
to protect students of plants other than those which have later starting-points against mis-
interpretation of the Code.

Dr Rollins asked for a vote on Art. 13 prop. A, and stated that if rejected Mr Margadant’s proposal would be taken up.

Prop. A was defeated. Mr Margadant’s proposal was accepted. Prop. B was then also referred to the Special Committee. Dr Rollins added that the Committee would be set up by the General Committee.

Art. 13, prop. H (Vassilkov, Taxon 9: 265), Committee’s decision was endorsed after an explanation by Dr Korff that the Committee had been unanimously against a changing of the dates of the starting-points.

Rec. 24 B, prop. A (Deighton, Taxon 11: 70), to delete the Recommendation was accepted.

Art. 59, prop. B, accepted.
Art. 59, prop. C, rejected.
Art. 59, prop. D, rejected.

Dr Donk said that from now on it would be impossible for mycologists to give a ‘perfect’ name to a fungus if he does not know the perfect state. If one had a tree and one did not know the flowers one could not name it, if this rule were applied to flowering plants. In many cases it was quite well possible to say to what perfect fungus an imperfect state belonged, but it would now not be possible to give the perfect name in the absence of the perfect state itself.

Dr Deighton said that the imperfect state could be given a name.

Dr Donk said that the Committee had put on record that this point would be looked into later.

Dr Rollins proposed that the Section follow the Committee’s action. This was approved.

Art. 6, prop. B, accepted.
Art. 73, prop. I. Had been rejected by the Committee on Orthography.

Art. 73 prop. K, idem.

REPORT COMMITTEE FOR BRYOPHYTES

Dr van der Wijk presented the following report:

(1) The Committee agreed unanimously to the conservation of the names (a) Conocephalum Wiggers, and (b) Mnium Hedwig, and does not object to the conservation of the name (c) Harrisonia R. Brown.

(2) The Committee accepted unanimously the proposed amendments included in Props. A and B to Article 13.

(3) The Committee rejected unanimously the proposed amendments included in Props. E and O to Article 7.

(4) The Committee expresses no opinion on the subject of superfluous names.

(5) The Committee takes under advisement the proposals numbered 139 to 143 for the conservation of names of genera of liverworts published by Bonner and Schuster in Regnum Vegetabile 34: 49–51, 1964, but cannot take any further action on these proposals at this time.

Dr van der Wijk remarked that item (2) had already been discussed and that the proposals had been referred to a special committee, and that the proposals under item (3) had already been rejected by the Session at an earlier hour. The report was approved.

REPORT COMMITTEE FOR ALGAE

I. Fourteen proposals particularly affecting the nomenclature of algae were placed before the Committee for Algae, with a request for an expression of acceptance or rejection and comment. These are as follows:

Art. 3, prop. G: “It is suggested that phylum be sanctioned by the Code in place of division”. Accepted by the Committee.

Art. 7, prop. A: “that the application of the names of orders should be governed by the rules of priority and typification.” Accepted by the Committee.

Following the rejection of this proposal by the section, the Committee for Algae wishes to propose a new recommendation 17A: “Authors are recommended not to publish new names of orders for taxa of that rank which include the family from which an existing ordinal name is derived”.

Art. 7, prop. E: accepted by the Committee.

Art. 7, prop. O: accepted by the Committee.

Art. 13, prop. A: accepted by the Committee.

Art. 13, prop. B: accepted by the Committee.

Art. 45, prop. B: rejected by the Committee. The proposal seriously affects the nomenclature of such groups as Dinoflagellates, many new taxa of which are currently being
described as animals and without Latin diagnosis.

II. Proposals for the Conservation of Generic Names.


64. Phacus Dujardin 1841 (Euglenacea) vs. Phacus Nitsch 1827 (Affinity?). Agreed.

65. Lepocinclis Pertz 1849 (Euglenacea) vs. Crumenula Dujardin 1836 (Euglenacea). Agreed.


68. Nostosolenus Stokes 1884 (Peranemataceae) vs. Solenotus Stokes 1884 (Peranemataceae). Agreed.

sn Ulva Thieret 1854 vs. Ulva Linnaeus 1753. Agreed.

sn Carteria Dill. 1895 (Chlamydomonaceae) vs. Carteria Diesing 1866 (Chlamydo- monaceae). Rejected.

The proposition of Monostroma for conservation has been withdrawn.

Dr Dixon made a remark with respect to the Committee’s proposed new recommenda- tion 17A.

The report was accepted except for the items that conflicted with former decisions taken by the section.

Dr Proskauer, speaking on Article 45 prop. B said that there was a great danger of assigning proposals to special group committees and then taking their opinion, overlooking the fact that this tends to favour in practice those that tend to benefit over those at whose expense a change may be made.

REPORT NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

The following committees and officers were appointed by the section following a short discussion in which the composition of the Committee for Fungi was slightly changed after some discussion.

Dr Lanjouw explained that the Nominations Committee proposed to make the president of the nomenclature section an ex-officio member of the Editorial Committee. It seemed appropriate now and in the future to have the president also participate in the work of that committee.

He furthermore explained that the nominations for the Committee on Fungi and Lichens were open for further suggestions.

Dr Konf mentioned one of the proposed names and stated that it was unknown to him and his colleagues.

Dr Santesson made a similar remark about two of the proposed lichenologists, and proposed another scientist for adoption.

Dr Singer proposed two additional names of mycologists.

Dr Holttum asked whether it was appropriate or at any rate desirable to have botanists on the nomenclature committees who were not members of IAPT.

Dr Stafleu said that such membership was not absolutely necessary, but certainly desirable.

Dr Weresun delivered the following statement: “Since the Committee for Nominations presents only a slate of nominees, it is advisable to have the slate considered carefully by name by the members of the section. Hence I have deliberately placed on the slate of nominations for the Committee for Fungi, Lichens, all names presented to me, to invite thought on the matter, so that the voting will have some meaning”.

Dr Rollins explained that it was the role of the Nominations Committee to express an opinion on the suggestions made to them. If this had to be done in all instances from the floor this part of the procedure would become extremely difficult. He proposed that the nominations – amended in the case of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens – be accepted by the section and furthermore referred the appointment of the special committees, as in the past, to the General Committee.

Dr Deighton moved the adoption of the proposal from the chair. Seconded and carried.

The slate adopted was the following:

Rapporteur-général:
F. A. Stafleu, Utrecht, Netherlands.

General Committee

Chairman:
H. W. Rickett, New York, U.S.A.

Secretary:

Appointed members:
H. Hara, Tokyo, Japan.
J. S. L. Gilmour, Cambridge, Great Britain.
M. Lange, Copenhagen, Denmark.
G. F. Papenfuss, Berkeley, Calif., U.S.A.
W. Robyns, Bruxelles, Belgium.
R. C. Rollins, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
H. Santapau, Calcutta, India.
G. M. Schulze, Berlin, Germany.

Ex-officio members:
J. Lanjouw, Utrecht, Netherlands (as president of I.A.P.T.).
F. A. Stafleu, Utrecht, Netherlands (as rapporteur-général and as secretary of I.A.P.T.).
The secretaries of the regular and standing committees.

Editorial Committee

Chairman:
J. Lanjouw, Utrecht, Netherlands (ex officio, as rapporteur-général of the previous Congress).

Secretary:
F. A. Stafleu, Netherlands.

Appointed members:
W. Robyns, Bruxelles, Belgium.
R. McVaugh, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.
J. Rousseau, Montreal, Canada.
J. M. Schopf, Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A.
G. M. Schulze, Berlin, Germany.
R. de Vilmorin, Verrières-le-Buisson, France.

Ex-officio member:
R. C. Rollins, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A. (as president of the nomenclature section of the previous Congress).

Committee for Spermatophyta

Chairman:
A. R. Pinto da Silva, Oeiras, Portugal.

Secretary:
R. McVaugh, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.

Members:
R. Bakhuisen van den Brink, Leiden, Netherlands.
G. Buchheim, Pittsburgh, Pa., U.S.A.
A. A. Bullock, Kew, Great Britain.
F. R. Fosberg, Falls Church, Va., U.S.A.
H. Hara, Tokyo, Japan.
N. Hylander, Uppsala, Sweden.
R. D. Meikle, Kew, Great Britain.
J. Léonard, Bruxelles, Belgium.
Y. Prokhanov, Makhatchkala, U.S.S.R.
C. G. G. J. van Steenis, Leiden, Netherlands.

Committee for Bryophyta

Chairman:
M. Fulford, Cincinnati, U.S.A.

Secretary:
G. Sayre, Troy, N.Y., U.S.A.

Members:
C. E. B. Bonner, Genève, Switzerland.
F. Demaret, Bruxelles, Belgium.
P. A. Florschütz, Utrecht, Netherlands.
S. Hattori, Kyushu, Japan.
K. Holmen, Copenhagen, Denmark.
W. D. Margadant, Pittsburgh, Pa., U.S.A.
J. S. Proskauer, Berkeley, Calif., U.S.A.
W. C. Steere, New York, U.S.A.
E. F. Warburg, Oxford, Great Britain.
Committee for Pteridophyta

Chairman: R. E. Holttum, Kew, Great Britain.
Secretary: R. E. G. Pichi-Sermolli, Cenova, Italy.
Members:
M. L. Tardieux-Blot, Paris, France.
R. M. Tryon, Jr., Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
R. C. Ching, Peking, China.
H. Ito, Tokyo, Japan.
M. Tindale, Sydney, Australia.

Committee for Algae

Chairman: G. F. Papenfuss, Berkeley, Calif., U.S.A.
Secretary: P. C. Silva, Berkeley, Calif., U.S.A.
Members:
P. Bourrelly, Paris, France.
T. Christensen, Copenhagen, Denmark.
T. Desikachary, Madras, India.
P. S. Dixon, Liverpool, Great Britain.
M. Doty, Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.
B. Fott, Prague, Czechoslovakia.
J. Gerloff, Berlin, Germany.
H. Luther, Helsinki, Finland.
M. Parke, Plymouth, Great Britain.
R. Scagel, Vancouver, Canada.
T. Tanaka, Kagoshima City, Japan.
C. R. Tseng, Peking, China.
H. B. S. Womersley, Adelaide, Australia.
A. D. Zinova, Leningrad, U.S.S.R.

Committee for Fossil Plants

Chairman: J. M. Schopf, Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A.
Secretary: S. H. Mamay, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Members:
N. A. Bolkhovilina, Moscow, U.S.S.R.
K. Faegri, Bergen, Norway.
J. W. Funkhouser, Bogota, Colombia.
T. M. Harris, Reading, Great Britain.
L. Grampast, Montpellier, France.
P. P. Jonker, Utrecht, Netherlands.
R. Potonie, Krefeld, Germany.
K. R. Surange, Lucknow, India.
A. Takhtajan, Leningrad, U.S.S.R.
A. F. Traverse, Houston, Tex., U.S.A.

Committee for Hybrids

Chairman: J. S. L. Gilmour, Cambridge, Great Britain.
Secretary: W. T. Stearn, London, Great Britain.
Members:
P. AeIlen, Basel, Switzerland.
B. K. Boom, Wageningen, Netherlands.
J. E. Dandy, London, Great Britain.
S. Danert, Gatersleben, Germany.
N. Hylander, Uppsala, Sweden.
G. H. M. Lawrence, Pittsburgh, Pa., U.S.A.
E. L. Little, Jr., Washington D.C., U.S.A.
L. B. Moore, Christchurch, New Zealand.
F. Meyer, Beltsville, Md., U.S.A.
R. C. Rollins, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
W. Wagner, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.
P. Wendelbo, Bergen, Norway.

The members of the following committees will be appointed by the General Committee.

Standing committee on stabilization
Special committee for nomina ambigua (art. 69)
Special committee on superfluous names
Glossary committee
Special committee on post-Linnaean starting points.

SEVENTH SESSION
Saturday, 1 August 1964, 14.00-18.00 p.m.
(Chairman: R. C. Rollins)

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SUPERFLUOUS NAMES

At present Art. 63 provides that names that were superfluous when published, i.e. that were published for taxa for which a different but legitimate name or epithet was available, are illegitimate and can never be legitimately used. Where the name is a straight substitute for the one which ought to have been used, the rule of priority would in any case prevent such a name being a correct name. There are cases, however, where an author, whilst including in his circumscription the type of an older
name that he should have adopted, indicates a different type for his name. If these two types come to be considered later as belonging to different taxa, the name published by the second author cannot be used for the taxon which includes its type and frequently a new name has to be coined for it. Another consequence of the present rule is that the epithet of a superfluous name for an infrageneric taxon has no status and, if a new name in combination with a different generic name is required for a taxon for which a superfluous name has been published, that epithet can be adopted or not at the choice of the author publishing the new name, providing that there is no other legitimate synonym or other obstacle.

Two different ways of modifying the present rule have been proposed:

Art. 63, prop. B (Weresub and Hennebert) proposed that a superfluous name published with an explicit statement designating a type other than that of the name which should have been adopted for a taxon with the circumscription given by the author, should be treated as legitimate but incorrect when published. This would enable such a name to be used if the two types come to be considered as belonging to different taxa. Furthermore, if the two types continue to be considered as belonging to the same taxon, the epithet of an infrageneric name of this kind would have to be adopted if the epithet of the earlier names could not be used in a new combination. On the other hand, this proposal would not change the status of epithets of superfluous names not explicitly typified by a different type from that of the name that should have been adopted.

Art. 63, prop. E, is intended to provide that all names superfluous when published should be regarded as legitimate but incorrect. The difference between this proposal and prop. B is that it would make it necessary to take into consideration for priority purposes the epithets of superfluous names that are direct substitutes for names which should have been adopted.

There are therefore three possible courses of action: to let the rules continue to have their present effect, or to modify them in one of the ways proposed. The arguments for each of these solutions are:

A. For maintaining the present position

(a) None of the names should ever have been published as in all cases another name should have been used under Art. 11. For this reason none of them should be taken into account for purposes of priority in any circumstances. To do so would be inconsistent with Art. 11 and the definitions of "legitimate" and "illegitimate" in Art. 6.

(b) In those areas where correct names have been worked out carefully in accordance with current taxonomic opinion and the Code since the introduction of the type method, the present rule has normally been followed. To re-investigate all these names and change an appreciable proportion of them purely as a consequence of a change in the rules after they had been carefully established as correct in accordance with the Code would require much unnecessary work and many unnecessary changes. The efforts of taxonomists could be better spent on other work. Name changes are always an inconvenience to many but those made for such reasons are particularly bad for the image of taxonomists in the eyes of other botanists, and are detrimental to taxonomy by affecting adversely the support that can be obtained for the subject.

B. For Art. 63, prop. B

(a) The present status of superfluous names with designated types different from those of the names that should have been adopted is inconsistent with the type method and this is unsatisfactory.

(b) The only changes in names that will result from acceptance of this proposal are those required by a strict adherence to the type method. The changes that it does involve ought to be made.

C. For Art. 63, prop. E

(a) The present rule involves much creation of unnecessary new names.

(b) It is not possible to define a superfluous name in such a way that it is easy to recognize one or, in some cases, to decide unequivocally whether a name is superfluous. It is particularly difficult in the case of generic names, where lectotypification of one name can make another superfluous, and much lectotypification is still being done.

(c) In many areas the present rule has not been followed and to comply with it would involve a large number of changes in standing names. To alter these for such a purely technical reason would be detrimental. This
is the same argument as that advanced in A (b) above but applied in the opposite direction.

The committee has been unable to reach a unanimous decision in favour of any one of these alternatives. It did not have adequate information to balance arguments A (b) and C (c) and was unable to agree on which of the other arguments were valid.

Blake, Rickett, Ross and Tryon consider that changes in carefully established names are more detrimental than in those whose correctness has not be worked out. They also rejected argument B (a) considering that a superfluous name can never be regarded as the name of a new taxon and hence its type, like that of a new combination or an avowed substitute for an illegitimate name, should be that of the previous name for the taxon. They therefore recommend maintenance of the present effect of the Code.

Fosberg accepts the arguments put forward for Art. 63, prop. B, and recommends its acceptance in principle, and Holttum would recommend that it be adopted if Art. 63, prop. E, is rejected in principle.

Donk and Holttum consider that superfluous names should be typified in the same way as legitimate new names and that the Code should provide that all these names are legitimate though incorrect when published and therefore recommend that Art. 63, prop. E be accepted in principle.

A majority of the committee therefore considers that the Section should defer a decision to alter the operation of the Code until further information on the effects of any change has been considered.

The action which the committee recommends is:

1. **If the present position is to be maintained:**
   
   Prop. 1 i to Art. 63. Add at the end of the first paragraph the last sentence of Art. 63, prop. B, para. 1, viz. “Including a type... of the type” with the addition of “or an illustration of a type specimen” after the words “type specimen”.
   
   Prop. 1 ii to Art. 63. Add as Note 2 “The designation of a lectotype of another name subsequent to the publication of a name shall not be considered as making that name superfluous.”
   
   Prop. 1 iii to Art. 7 = Art. 7, prop. G.

2. **If the Section decides to accept Art. 63, prop. B, in principle.**
   
   Prop. 2 i to Art. 63. Accept Art. 63, prop. B, with omission of Note 2, which is redundant. It simply says that if a name is found not to be nomenclaturally superfluous when published, it is not nomenclaturally superfluous.
   
   Prop. 2 ii to Art. 63 = Prop. 1 ii.
   
   Prop. 2 iii to Art. 7 = Art. 7, Prop. G.

3. **If the Section decides to accept Art. 63, prop. E, in principle.**
   
   Prop. 3 i to Art. 63. Replace Art. 63 by “No name is to be considered illegitimate and rejected because it was nomenclaturally superfluous when published. It is to be taken into consideration for purposes of priority if the name or epithet which should have been adopted for the taxon becomes unavailable, or if its type and that of the name that should have been adopted are considered to belong to different taxa.”
   
   Prop. 3 ii to Art. 7 = Art. 7, prop. H.


Art. 63, prop. A, deals with orthography and not superfluous names.

Art. 63, prop. C, has been withdrawn and replaced by new prop. 1 i.

Art. 63, prop. O, is editorial.

Art. 63, prop. E, is withdrawn and replaced by new prop. 3 i.

Art. 7, prop. F, is covered by Art. 7, prop. G.

Art. 7, prop. I, is recommended for rejection by all the committee-members.

Mr Ross, introducing the report, stated that the unanimous adoption by the ad hoc committee of the present report recorded their fundamental disagreement. The committee hoped that the Section would first decide on what general course (1, 2, or 3) it wanted to follow.

Basically there were several attitudes: some people held that the present Code worked satisfactorily. Four members of the committee took that view. Two members were in favour of item 2, one in favour of item 3.

Dr Holttum made the following statement:

“The rules of nomenclature should only be applied after the taxonomic facts have been investigated. This is a basic principle, and might well be incorporated in the Code.
But Art. 63 has been invoked as authority for rejecting names *without* examining their taxonomic significance.

It is my contention that if the taxonomic significance of each name is examined, Art. 63 is superfluous.

If an author publishes a new name A, with description and citation of specimens, and cites an earlier name B as a synonym, it should be possible, by examination of the taxonomic facts, to decide whether or not A and B are to be regarded as synonyms.

If they are so regarded, clearly the name A has to give place to B, by principle of priority.

If B is found *not* to be synonymous with A, then A should stand as the name of a new species, provided that the description and citation of type meet the requirements of the Code.

If a decision cannot be made as to whether or not A and B are to be regarded as synonymous, this must be because the information concerning A or B is insufficient for clear typification. A name which is not adequately typified ought not to be used; this may be true of either A or B or both.

In the past, some authors have erroneously cited earlier names as synonyms (or apparently as such) without having seen type or authentic specimens corresponding to those earlier names. If such an author cites as a synonym a species which in fact conflicts with his description, he cannot reasonably be regarded as having included the type of that species in the circumscription of his new species. To suppose that he has done so is a legal fiction, not a scientific fact; and legal fictions have no place in a scientific Code.

Dr Weresub, although disagreeing that the first and second sentence of paragraph one of the report on superfluous names stated what the present Art. 63 does actually connote, or that sentence one paragraph three of the report accurately reflects what is involved in Art. 63, prop. B, or that the statement regarding differences between prop. B and prop. E is complete, did not want to take up time with this. She added that the arguments for Art. 63, prop. B were accurate except that an important argument on its behalf is the distinction between nomenclatural and taxonomic superfluity had not been given. She wanted to accept items 2(i) and 2(iii) of the recommended action. With reference to point 3 of the report she pointed at the loose use of "nomenclaturally" superfluous. She made a plea for the recognition of the central importance of the type-method.

Dr Tryon replied to Weresub and Holtum: authors of superfluous names have no right to choose new types — hence if done this constituted a violation of the type method. Original authors should have done their taxonomy first, now we had to do their nomenclature.

Dr Proskauer pointed out that the Rapporteurs on p. 45 Synopsis described Donk's solution as "in principle correct". This conclusion had not been challenged. Whenever we make exceptions to items which we believe correct for the purposes of convenience only, we face ultimate disaster and by experience have to keep on providing patches to our legislation at successive congresses.

Dr Donk thanked Mr Ross for the way in which he had put this matter before the Section.

He did not think that Mr Ross' personal opinion was correct, however, and neither was Dr Tryon's. Not so long ago he had asked one of the supporters of the rule as it stands now what he would do if the rule on superfluous names did not exist. Would he now incorporate it? The answer was "no". Now that it is in the rules one has to bend it towards the type-method. The type-method has been bent all over again and again and given new meanings. The last statement by Dr Tryon was an example of such misinterpretation of the type-method. Each validly published name should receive fair treatment. It should be typified and if the type was not the same as that of a previously published name for the taxon, it was not superfluous at all. For the moment it was not to be used because there was an older name for the taxon, but it should be available for later use if necessary. If one had a taxon and had decided on its taxonomic circumscription one had to choose the correct name. A superfluous name as now in the Code is superfluous when published. For a long time many names were published without indication of a holotype. The process of selecting lectotypes is still going on. At the moment many names had not yet been typified. He had been faced with the application of the rule as it stood, and knew that a really strict interpretation would require the killing of hundreds of names. "I go back to my desk and write a bunch of new combinations and I am a bloody man again; I simply refuse to do that." He drew attention to Art. 62 which
clearly stated that if a name-change was introduced one had superfluous names; but those names, isonyms, were not superfluous for the Code; if the original name which one of them replaced were illegitimate we can take it up, but if it was a taxonomically superfluous name we could not take it up. This was another inconsistency. If all names were correctly typified and the types were different, their names should be available for use. Let us not waste them: that was precisely what Drs Weresub and Holttum asked for. It had been said that the abolition of the illegitimacy of superfluous names would greatly endanger many names in the European flora. Among the Fungi he knew hardly three such examples. Mr Ross had said that this argument of name-changes had been used by both sides. Donk maintained that in such a case one should follow the logical course. Strict application of the rule as it stood now, in mycology, would have such an effect that it would create aversion from the Code. The number of future users of the Code would be greater than the present number. If the Code was illogical they would perhaps not follow it. Botany required a precise and simple system. Through the abolition of the notion of superfluous the Code would indeed become simple. That ought to be our common aim. In the long run, correct and easy to understand rules would help much more to stabilize nomenclature than anything else.

The notion of illegitimacy in the Code had become more and more involved. There were so many doubtful cases of superfluity where the rule was difficult to apply. Names became superfluous long after their publication because of the ultimate typification: still-born friends 100 years ago: "I do not want to go down in history as bloody Donk, Donk, the Ripper."

Mr Ross pointed at prop. 1 (ii) of the committee which would take care of this particular point. Apart from this the present status of superfluous names in the Code was in agreement with its general principles as expressed by Article 11.

Dr Fosberg agreed thoroughly with Dr Ross's last point. He was, however, doubtful if the provision referred to by him just previously will stand. It says that subsequent designation of a lectotype may not render another name superfluous. The designation of a lectotype is simply the classification of what the author meant. This may or may not make another name superfluous regardless of what we say. We can legislate that black is white, but it really still remains black.

Dr Trayon said that the principle of retro-activity need not apply to Article 63 because this concerned particularly "when published". This was in relation to a name not becoming retroactively superfluous by lectotypification of another name.

Mr Bullock, in reply to Dr Donk, pointed out that lectotypification could and should be carried out to avoid the destruction of genera whose enlarged circumscription overlap and where the historic type of one of them may occur in the region of overlap. He pointed the analogy of the selection of standard species of Linnaean generic names by Miss Green (Mrs Sprague) in 1929 (Prop. Brit. Bot.).

Dr Donk said that he disagreed with Mr Ross that Article 11 led one to choose the correct name. With respect to Mr Bullock's remarks he said that he found nowhere in the Code Mr Bullock's view. If one typified a name one had to be fair. One had to go through the history and see how the name had been used. One could use the residue method and then one might well be left with the smaller part of the genus.

Dr Hennebert said that there were three imperfections in the Code:
1. about the way a type of an earlier name can be included in the circumscription of a new name;
2. about the definition of the term "superfluous names", the Code using this term nomenclaturally as well as taxonomically superfluous names.

The proposal of Weresub and Hennebert deals only with the two first imperfections and the one of Dr Donk deals with the third one and by the way would solve the two first ones.

Prop. B intended (1) to give a clear statement about the way to decide whether the type of an earlier name is included (and we said that we must see whether it is "not excluded") and (2) to give a definition of what is a nomenclaturally superfluous name.

The prop. E changes the status of superfluous names which solves the problem. The intent of this prop. E is perfectly in agreement with prop. B and may work all right.

The prop. 1 i in the report is perfectly compatible with the prop. B.

Dr Burr asked whether the Committee had considered a compromise by which some
accommodation of the Holttum-Donk view could be made in the Rules for the future while now causing work that had been done to be undone by being made retro-active?

Mr Ross said this had not been considered. A rule of that type would not work. Retro-activity could be avoided only when dealing with names published before or after a certain name. We could not have a workable rule asking for the date of the application of a certain rule to a particular case dealing with names that had already been published. It would be impossible to find out from the literature which cases had been dealt with already and which not.

Dr Singer remarked that Dr Bullock had put his foot on an essential point in the motivations of Dr Donk's argument, i.e. the over-idealistic bookish and impractical manner of lectotypifications of superfluous or "superfluous" names which was much more to blame for the "killing" of these names than was the "handmaiden", i.e. the Code as it stood.

Dr Van Steenis said that we had applied in the tropical floras Art. 63 as law-abiding botanists. Of the two examples of the proponents of the legitimacy of superfluous names the one was of unwise typification and the other of bad taxonomy. He could not understand how Dr Holttum could show otherwise. In Art. 6, the definitions of legitimate and illegitimate names were very clear and according to these definitions it is clear that superfluous names are illegitimate. To change the concept legitimate would mean violation of Principle IV and Art. 11 paragraph 3. The definitions are simple; why should we change them which would make our work and that of other important works futile?

Mr Dandy made the following statement: "I appeal to the Section to present the status quo in this matter, on grounds of principle and of practice. Dr Donk considers that all names, including superfluous names, are entitled to fair treatment. I do not see how a superfluous, i.e. unnecessarily published name, can be entitled to anything. On the practical side, stability of names is concerned, and it is pointed out that under either proposal changes will be necessary. I do not pretend to know how many changes Dr Donk might make, but I do know that the names of many flowering plants would be affected if the rules relating to superfluous names were changed in the way suggested. I and others have during the past years worked out the correct names of very many plants, both tropical and European, according to the present method, and much of this work would have to be done all over again if there were changes in the Code. The European flora is particularly concerned owing to the existence of such works as Lamarck's "Flore Francaise" in which large numbers of superfluous names were published".

Dr Rollins said that it was now clear what the issues were. The committee has not been able to come forward with a single proposal. He therefore put before the Section a motion handed to him by the Vice-Rapporteur in which the Section was asked first to re-affirm that Article 63 was to be maintained in principle. If that was accepted we should know where we stood. I accepted we should then vote on proposals 1(i) and 1(ii). The motion was therefore to vote first on line 1 of item 1 of the report.

This motion was carried by a large majority. Prop. 1 (i) was then before the Section.

Mr Ross shortly explained the intention of the proposal. It had the character of a clarification of the meaning of "including a type". Accepted.

Prop. 1 (ii).

Mr Ross stated that this was meant to deal with Dr Donk's remark that names became superfluous later because of lectotypification. The consequences of the present wording had not been precisely examined. He trusted that if accepted, the Editorial Committee would make sure that no undesirable side-effects were involved.

Dr Fosberg did not think much of adopting a proposition the consequences of which were dubious and then hoping the Editorial Committee would bail us out.

Dr Proskauer said that this proposal was perfectly ludicrous and based on a lack of understanding of the type method. If an author in his protologue covers an earlier name his name hangs, if he includes among his material something that was covered by an earlier name it does not hang.

Dr Papenfuss proposed that this matter be further considered by a committee between this and the next congress with the charge that it attempt to come up with a solution to the problems involved.

Dr Solbrig wanted to leave the composition of this committee open. It should not
necessarily include the present people who had not come to an agreement.

Dr Tryon said that this motion was unfortunate: prop. 1 (iii) should come to a vote in this Section.

Mr Ross asked for the terms of reference of Dr Papenfuss' committee: would they start anew completely, or were they to make proposals inside the area covered by item (1)?

Dr Rollins was of the opinion that the Committee should not be bound too much. The charge would be to solve the problem and to come with a proposal, if needed, to be put before the Section.

Mr Ross thought it difficult to believe that in a general consideration of this matter the present committee would arrive at a more common mind than they had done so far.

He believed that when given this responsibility the members would write long letters without convincing each other. If the Section thought however, that this body really ought to do so without changing the general operation of the Code, but improving it in detail, the committee might have some success.

Dr Rollins asked whether the Section agreed to set up a committee on superfluous names (the members to be appointed by the General Committee) with the general instruction to come up to the next Congress with some kind of proposal. Carried.

Prop. 1 (iii) = Art. 7, prop. G.

Dr Donk asked Mr Ross whether he considered this a tache-de-beauté on the rules? In his opinion it did not change anything at all.

Mr Ross agreed that the proposal would not change the status of any names but would simply clarify the relation between the superfluous names and their synonyms.

Dr Donk said that the matter of the specific exception of an indicated holotype had been accepted at Montreal. A committee had now been set up. Would it not be better to leave this to them?

Dr Fosberg did not agree with either of the speakers that no names were affected, as one name that he was concerned with would be affected. With this clause included in Art. 7 he did not know what to do with this name, while if it was deleted he would know what to do with it.

Dr Green formally proposed that prop. 1 (iii) be referred to the superfluous name committee too.

Dr Tryon explained that the last clause of the present note 4 to Art. 7 was not in opposition to the type method but was in opposition to a number of other working principles of the Code.

Mr McVau suggested adoption of Art. 7, prop. G. It might militate against future acceptance of names published in good faith but with inadvertent or provisional inclusion of earlier names.

Dr Rollins asked for a vote on Mr Green's amendment. Carried.

Mr Ross then asked whether it was agreed that no action was to be taken on the rest of the report.

Dr Rollins so ruled.

Chapter V

Article 54


Article 55


Prop. B (1: 57: 0: 133) Referred to Editorial Committee.

Article 56


Prop. B (101: 16: 0: 43) Accepted.

Recommendation 57A

Prop. A (7: 64: 0: 94) Referred to the Editorial Committee.

Recommendation 57B


Prop. B (5: 19: 149: 4) Accepted.

Article 59


Prop. B (3: 10: 557: 2) Accepted as amended by Committee for Fungi (see its report).


Prop. E (Deighton, Taxon 9: 240) Accepted.

Article 60


Article 62


Dr Proskauer suggested that the change
affects the homonym rule detrimentally. What is relevant to our purpose under the homonym rule is whether a name exists and can be confusing. The proposal would remove validity from certain changed names and thus prevent the operation of the homonym rule.

Dr Donk pointed to Art. 72 in which Article 62 was not mentioned. The proposal was rejected.

Mr Ross asked whether misspellings were indeed to be treated as validly published.

Dr Stafleu said there was a precedent: throughout the list of nomina conservanda the Code treats later orthographic variants as validly published names.

Dr Van Steenis disagreed with Dr Stafleu in that conserved orthographies raised orthographic variants to validly published homonyms. Bullock's proposal Art. 62, prop. A and B would be most useful anyhow we would reject all orthographic variants as having no nomenclatural status.

Dr Rollins re-affirmed however that the Section had rejected prop. A.

Prop. E (Prokhanow, add. material) Referred to the Editorial Committee (concerns the correction of the citation of an author's name).

Article 63
Prop. A (24: 67: 72: 7) Referred to the Editorial Committee to be treated in the light of the report of the Committee on Orthography.
Prop. B (8: 90: 58: 0) Rejected.
Prop. C (27: 87: 56: 7) Withdrawn and replaced by prop 1(i) of the ad hoc Committee on Superfluous Names which was accepted.
Prop. D (7: 104: 56: 0) Referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 64

Article 65

Article 66

Article 67
Prop. B (Deighton, Taxon 9: 241) Accepted.

Article 69
Prop. A (44: 119: 0: 2) Rejected.

Article 70

Dr Holm stated that in Arts. 69, 70 and 71 the text should read "A name is illegitimate and must be rejected..."

Dr Rollins referred this remark to the Editorial Committee.

Mr Bullock pointed out that in the examples given, no name has to be rejected on account of it. He said he would be happy to withdraw the proposal.

Dr Donk asked whether the Editorial Committee would study Arts. 66, 67 and 68, and tell us in Taxon what they meant.

Dr Rollins stated that we were dealing with Art. 70.

Dr Fosberg did not know if Mr Bullock had really withdrawn his proposal, but he wished he would not. He thought this Article completely useless and we should have a chance to throw it out.

Mr Ross said that this Art. was sometimes useful as in the case of a fragment of alga, very difficult now to identify, with the remains of an encrusting polyzoan used to
provide the diagnostic characters. This enabled a name which might later cause trouble to be rejected.

Dr Proskauger was completely in agreement with Bullock that this article should be deleted.

Dr Rollins then pointed out that the proposal had been withdrawn. Nobody had asked for its formal re-introduction.

Article 71

Article 72

Chapter VI

Article 73
The ad hoc Committee on Orthography had dealt with the proposals on Arts. 73 and 74 as follows. These decisions were endorsed by the Section.
Prop. A (147: 11: 0: 14) Referred to the Editorial Committee.
Prop. F (101: 51: 0: 15) Referred to the Editorial Committee.

Recommendation 73B
Prop. A (52: 13: 0: 103) Accepted.

Recommendation 73C

Recommendation 73D

Recommendation 73E
Prop. B (36: 38: 0: 104) Rejected, but delete example.

Recommendation 73G

Article 74
Prop. A (7: 12: 0: 146) Referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 75
Prop. C (9: 9: 0: 150) Referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Article 75bis

Recommendation 75A
Prop. C (11: 29: 0: 92) Referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Recommendation 75Abis
New Article 76

New Article 77
Prop. A (0: 143: 1: 11) Rejected.

New Article 78
Prop. A (0: 155: 0: 11) Rejected.

Division III

Appendix I
Dealt with by the report of the Committee for Hybrids. This report was approved in an earlier session. The proposals had been treated as follows:

Article H1

Recommendation H1A

Article H2

Article H3
Prop. B (Committee for Hybrids) Accepted.

New Recommendation H3A

New Recommendation H3B

New Recommendation H3C

Article H4
Prop. C (Committee for hybrids) Accepted.

Article H5

Appendix II
Dr Buchheim presented the following report:

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR FAMILY NAMES OF THE COMMITTEE FOR SPERMATOPHYTA

Presented to the Section of Nomenclature of the 10th International Botanical Congress at Edinburgh.
The Subcommittee for Family Names was instituted at the Ninth International Botanical Congress held at Montreal, 1959. In the report of the Nomenclature Section presented by the Bureau of Nomenclature as published in Proceedings of the IX International Botanical Congress, Montreal 1959, pp. 27-116. 1960 and reprinted as Regnum Vegetabile vol. 20, 1960, no specific mention of a discussion concerning this subcommittee is made; it is just included as a body among the committees presented in the report of the Nominations Committee (op. cit. p. 108).
The following persons were nominated and all agreed to serve:
A. Burkart (Argentina), Chairman
G. Buchheim (Germany), Secretary
R. C. Bakhuizen van den Brink (Netherlands)
R. S. Cowan (U.S.A.)
C. E. Wood (U.S.A.)

Later, in June 1960, Dr Burkart resigned; the members co-opted Mr J. E. Dandy (Great Britain) who willingly agreed to fill the vacancy.
The main task of the subcommittee was to carry into effect the decision taken at Montreal to incorporate in the new edition of the Code a list of conserved family names based upon the publication “Nomina Familiarum Conservanda Proposita” by A. A. Bullock (Taxon 8: 154-181, 189-205, 1959).
The entry with regard to Bullock’s proposal E to Appendix III reads (Proceedings . . ., p. 31): “Dr Rousseau then asked for a vote on the proposal by Mr Bullock to have in principle a list as proposed by him (see Taxon 8: 154. 1959), the actual names to be studied further by the Committee. This proposal was accepted by a large majority (5 against).”

Therefore, as Dr Stafleu, Secretary of the General Committee wrote, (letter of 4 November, 1959), the task of the subcommittee would be to study the actual names to be incorporated in the list, not the principles
on which this list is based. These principles were definitely accepted at Montreal. They are given by Mr Bullock in his introduction.

In essence they are:

1. Names may also be included in the list when they are not actually in danger;
2. The list should be as complete as it can possibly be in order to assure current usage;
3. Nomina rejicienda will not be mentioned: Any name which is not included in the list and which competes for priority by either nomenclatural or taxonomic synonymy is to be regarded as rejected;
4. If two or more names in the list itself compete, they do so on the simple basis of priority unless otherwise stated;
5. A. L. de Jussieu, Genera Plantarum 1789, is taken as the starting point book and date for these names. Even if a name in the list was used legitimately before 1789, it will still be attributed to either Jussieu or the first author after Jussieu to use the name. It should be clear that this "starting-point" of 1789 is purely one of convenience for the list only. The normal 1753 starting-point will hold in general for all names that are not conserved;
6. The type-genera and the type-species of the type-genera will be cited. No type-specimens of type-species are mentioned.

With these guiding principles in mind the subcommittee started its practical work. To ensure a complete coverage of names even in the case of rare original literature each family name contained in Bullock's list was allotted to two members, and as a matter of fact this system worked fairly well and reduced errors to a minimum. Some members even voluntarily checked more than their share and thus provided a valuable source of information available for the preparation of the final list. The comments of the members were distributed in a synoptical form; on the basis of further remarks received a final list of names was prepared, and, after revision and approval, sent to the International Bureau of Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature at Utrecht. Here the list was rewritten in order to bring literature citations into conformity with those used in Appendix III of the Code (Nomina generica conservanda). As a matter of fact the subcommittee feels that at least some of the citations contained in the original list would have been preferable to those which are employed now. The final product of the joint efforts mentioned is the Appendix II of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature 1961, headed "Nomina Familiiarum Conservanda. Angiospermae" (pp. 187-201).

To turn from these technical remarks to the more important topics being discussed and decided upon by the subcommittee the following points deserve mention: Selection of the names to be included. Bullock's original list was composed of all the family names of angiosperms used in the systems of Bentham and Hooker fil. and Hutchinson and nearly all of the Englerian system as laid down in "Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien," "Syllabus der Pflanzenfamilien" and "Das Pflanzenreich"; apart from these a few names used by recent authors other than Hutchinson were included. While a unanimous opinion with regard to the names treated by Bentham and Hooker fil. and Engler was reached there was considerable opposition to the inclusion of all the names employed by Hutchinson, especially of such names first proposed and published in the latest edition of "Families of Flowering Plants" (1959). Finally it was agreed to include all family names which were accepted by at least 5 different authors and were used in the period between 1916 (closing date of the first edition of "Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien" is 1915) and 1961. Compared with the original figure of 449 names the final list shows a slightly reduced number of 422 names. However, it should be noted that in the meantime 17 additional family names have been found which should have been included, but were not known to be eligible at the time of the composition of the list.

Their names are: Balanitaceae, Cartonemataceae, Colchicaceae, Convallariaceae, Cordiaceae, Dodonaeaceae, Donatiaceae, Draeanaeeae, Francoaceae, Hydrocotylaceae, Ixonanthaceae, Mitrastemonaceae, Montiniaceae, Penthoraceae, Podophyllaceae, Symphoremataceae, Tetragoniaceae. Of these, only Convallariaceae Rydberg and Tetragoniaceae Nakai need conservation. It is for the members of the Section of Nomenclature to decide whether these or other additional names, especially those of Gymnospermae, should be conserved. Any other solution such as the inclusion of all validly published family names used since 1935, 1920 or even since 1759 would have been unrealistic and completely impossible to achieve in the time available for this purpose.

To be true, also some opposition within the subcommittee arose as to whether the guiding
principles mentioned earlier were to be regarded as final and decisive or not, especially since the official report published by the Bureau of Nomenclature did not specifically mention the fact that the Congress at Montreal had accepted those principles. With the exception of one point the majority of the subcommittee felt that it was advisable to keep these basic principles as formulated in the publication by Mr. Bullock even if they admittedly depart from those which guide the selection of nomina generica conservanda. Such principal differences are: 1) The inclusion of names which are not known to be in need of conservation. Two important purposes are served by this procedure: a) The elimination of possible synonyms or homonyms. b) The advantage and convenience of finding the correct names of families and their type genera at one place without being forced to consult numerous publications and making time consuming studies. By the way, the possible restriction of the list of Nomina familiarum conservanda to names in actual danger was brought forward upon the request of Dr. A. C. Smith (U.S.A.), to the members of the General Committee early in 1961; by a majority vote the restriction was rejected and the Secretary of the subcommittee for family names was instructed to proceed with the work as outlined from the beginning.

2) A special "starting-point" (1789) for the accepted names. While Bullock's argument that Antoine-Laurent de Jussieu's Genera Plantarum is the earliest work in which modern families become recognisable is debatable (as a matter of fact, F. A. Stafleu has shown in two recent publications that Linnaeus, Adanson, Bernard and Antoine-Laurent de Jussieu, judged from our present-day taxonomic knowledge, reached almost the same results as to the amount of the naturalness of their families), his choice was certainly well founded since it avoided a difficult and time consuming search in the early literature.

3) Provisions for certain family names competing within the list itself to be retained or rejected, thus preserving current usage. The exception mentioned above where all members of the subcommittee held that a guiding principle should be definitely neglected refers to the citation of the type species of the type genus of the family name. The choice of a type species for a genus is principally a matter of taxonomy, not of nomenclature, and therefore it is monotypic genera excepted — very difficult for those not familiar with the taxon in question to decide without intensive studies whether a certain choice of a type species is correct or not. In this respect the subcommittee felt that the task referred to them went far beyond their capabilities and therefore unanimously decided to leave out the citation of typespecies. Apart from the decision of the General Committee already mentioned two other items were referred to this body by the secretary of the subcommittee. The first concerned family names published with non-latin terminations. The result of the voting of the members of the General Committee was that such names are not to be considered as validly published. In the present Appendix II of the Code names in this category are added in brackets to show the first usage of a certain name. Item no. 2 was the special case of the 2 families named Stilbaceae namely Stilbaceae Kunth (1831) based on Stilbe Bergius (aff. Verbenacearum), and Stilbaceae Corda (1838) based on Stilbium Merat (Basidiomycetes). Since Stilbium has no known synonym it would be impossible to base a family name on this genus. The General Committee was of the opinion that the committee for Fungi should consider the question of conserving the name Stilbaceae Corda, and the Secretary of this committee was requested to draw up a proposal along these lines, publish it in "Taxon", and have it studied by the members of that committee. It is a pity that the Committee of Fungi could not become active in the period between April 1961 (decision of the General Committee) and the end of September 1961 (begin of second proof). Thus no other choice was left than to keep the legitimate phanerogamous family name Stilbaceae Kunth in the list.

Turning to the list itself an analysis shows that all the names with which the majority of taxonomists and even of botanists is familiar are included. Exceptions are family names not derived from generic names such as Scitamineae, Cupuliferae, Chlaenaceae or Hydrocaryaceae, since they are not validly published. On the other hand, the 9 family names not derived from generic names mentioned in Art. 18 Note 3 of the Code which are treated as exceptions to the rule are included, and there seems to be no cogent reason to remove them as has been recently proposed. When names used in the systems of Bentham and Hooker fil. and Engler competed of course a decision had to be
made; in this case the rejected name has been included for convenience with a reference to the accepted one. Very few names are presented in a form different from common usage; the subcommittee could not avoid introducing these names, since Art. 18 of the Code prescribes that a name of a family is formed by adding the suffix -aceae to the stem of a legitimate name of an included genus; thus Balanopaceae (instead of Balanopsidaceae), Bataceae (instead of Batispaceae) and, Capparaceae (instead of Caparidaceae) and Misodendraceae (instead of Myzodendraceae, the correct name of the type genus being Misodendrum not Myzodendron).

Thus the subcommittee has done its best to produce a reasonable list agreeable to all botanists. A list of printing errors and minor corrections has been prepared, and it is to be hoped that the contents will be incorporated in the next impression of the Nomina Familiarum Conservanda. The subcommittee proposes only one significant change: The replacement of the type genus of the family name Proteaceae, Protea L. 1753 (= Leucaden dron R. Br.) by Protea L. 1771, in accordance with change of the entry in Appendix III of the Code. The opinions of the members of the subcommittee on various proposals concerning family names are given in an annex to this report.

The subcommittee expresses its hope that the Section of Nomenclature of this 10th International Botanical Congress will give its consent to the list of Nomina Familiarum Conservanda (Angiospermae) as print ed in Appendix II of the present edition of the Code and accept this report favorably.

Dr Stafleu explained that no proposals on specific names ought to be discussed here. They would be treated in the normal way by the subcommittee and the General Committee.

Dr Buchheim then asked whether the names of Gymnosperm families were to be inserted.

Dr Rollins asked the opinion of the Section whether this should be done.

Dr Stafleu was in favor of requesting Dr Buchheim’s committee to tackle these names as well.

Dr Schulze asked for the removal from the Appendix of names like Labiatae etc. mentioned in Article 18. These names were exceptions provided for by Article 18 but should not be listed here. Dr Schulze later submitted the following text:

“I should like to put forward the following motion which refers to Appendix II (Nomina familiarum conservanda):

The 9 family names not based on generic names should be removed from Appendix II. There should be added to each of the corresponding names based on generic names which are listed in Appendix II: “But see Art. 18, Note 3.”

Comments: Nomina conservanda are names which must be retained as exceptions as stated in Art. 14, par. 1. It is clearly said in Art. 14, Note 3 what that means. Only the name listed as conserved must be used for the corresponding taxon.

The 9 family names not based on generic names are not nomina conservanda in that sense but they are, as stated in Art. 18, “treated as exceptions to the rule”. “The rule” refers to the proper forming of family names.

The 9 family names not based on generic names have not all the status of nomina conservanda in the sense to which is pointed above. They are, as rightly stated in Art. 11, only “permitted” for usage, i.e. for alternative usage.

Therefore these names are out of place in App. II. The motion submitted above will not conflict with the acceptance of Prop. A of Dr Buchheim to Art. 18 which was carried out by voting.

I refer also to my Remarks in Taxon XIII (May) No. 4, pag. 146-147. 1964.”

Dr Buchheim said that the subcommittee had unanimously rejected this proposal (see his report).

Dr Stearn asked if Schulze’s proposal involved the elimination from alphabetical sequence at the names Labiatae, Umbelliferae, etc. an act which would much reduce its utility as a reference list.

Dr Stafleu affirmed that Dr Schulze indeed wanted to remove these names from the list in Appendix II.

Dr Wood said that there was no bibliographical reference contained in the article which retains the 9 exceptional names. These references are needed; the complete references should be retained in Appendix II.

Dr Faegri suggested a different typography.

Dr Lange wanted to refer this to the General Committee.

Dr Rollins wanted to dispose of the proposal by Dr Schulze. He asked if the Section would affirm the position of the Committee’s vote: carried. (Names to be retained).
Prop. A (0: 64: 0: 100) Rejected.

Dr Wood asked about the Gymnosperms. They ought to be included.
Dr Rollins put the motion before the Section: carried.

Guide types
Prop. A (15: 50: 2: 100) Rejected

Guide citation

Mr Bullock wanted to know which was the opinion of the Section with respect to Dr Stafleu's proposal that Dr Van Steenis' paper in Taxon (13, p. 156) should in principle be accepted and made available. This did not imply acceptance of Dr Van Steenis' own principles.

Dr Stafleu said that if such a list was prepared it could be published independently by IAPT if necessary.

Dr Rollins asked whether the Section wanted such a list, to be published independently: The Section was in favour of such a list.

Appendix III
Prop. E (30: 15: 13: 7) The proposals to be studied by the various special committees.
Prop. F (122: 12: 10: 5) Accepted.
Prop. G (123: 12: 9: 5) Accepted.
Prop. H (123: 12: 9: 5) Accepted.
Prop. General Committee, third report:

The General Committee approved, on 1 October 1961, the third report of the Committee for Spermatophyta [Taxon 10: 122, 1961] with the exception of the rejection of the proposal on Piliostigma [this proposal was accepted in second instance by the Committee for Spermatophyta, see its fifth report in Taxon 12: 235-238 (1963)]. This means that the following names have obtained status as nomina conservanda

2691 Enneastemon Exell
3424 Rourea Aublet
3753 Clinanthus Solander (add Sarcodum Lour. as nom. rej.)
5215 Hopea Roxburgh
6914 Dregea E. Meyer
sub 7604 Agalinis Rafinesque
7645 Barisia Linnaeus
8428 Gaertnera Lamarck
9712 Heteropyxis W. H. Harvey

The Xth Congress is requested to approve these conservations as well as the third report of the Committee for Spermatophyta amended as indicated above.

This proposal was also accepted.

Dr Tryon proposed that Dr Van Steenis' paper in Taxon (13, p. 156) should in principle be accepted and made available. This did not imply acceptance of Dr Van Steenis' own principles.

Mr Margadant said that the articles by Rickett and Stafleu in Taxon already contained such guiding lines. They were sufficient.

Dr Donk wanted the procedure spelled out.

Dr Stafleu referred to his introduction to Regnum Vegetabile vol. 34.

Mr Ross said that he did not think it necessary to do all this as Dr Stafleu had said. The procedure had been described in Regnum Vegetabile vol. 34. Unless somebody made a definite proposal to change this procedure things would remain as they are.

Mr Bullock said that of all members of the General Committee concerned with nomina generica conservanda Dr Stafleu surely knew the procedure best. He had published on this in Taxon, and later again with Rickett. There was no need to go any further. All information could be found in those publications.

Dr Rollins interpreted the sense of the group as in favour of the status quo. Material on this subject was available. The General Committee was not to be charged to do something special in this respect.

Index
Prop. A (7: 5: 0: 43) Referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Appendix
Procedure


Prop. B (105: 40: 0: 1)

Dr Lange wanted to amend this proposal: “Future International Botanical Congresses should convene a Section of Nomenclature.” When convened this Section it could be decided what to do at each particular Congress. On the whole we had not enough time to deal with the entire Code.

Dr Faegri said that we could not bind future Congresses. The General Committee ought to take such action.

Dr Rollins said that the Section had the power to restrict itself at any Congress.

Dr Proskauer said that this was a very fundamental point. Could we impose a rule on future congresses. We could not predict what was going to happen the next time this body was to convene. There was no practical and fair way to limit a future Section’s activities.

Dr Martin stressed that none of us could foresee what was going to be important.

Dr Lange then said that the General Committee could take its decision to limit the subject matter of the following Congress only after a certain period, say of three years.

Dr Fosberg said that the main argument seemed to be to avoid having a new Code every five years.

The time available for trying out a new Code was rather inadequate. But since the Code had to be re-published anyhow if only part of it had been considered, this circumstance would not disappear. He thought therefore that all these proposals for limitation of future discussions were rather impracticable.

Dr Stafleu would like to inform the Section on the way the proposals came in. This started only after the official announcement in Taxon. This announcement had to be made two years in advance of the next Congress. Most proposals then came in during the last three months before the closing-date. If Dr Lange’s proposal was to be entertained, one should be faced with a conflict in dates. The host country issued the directives; they were not bound by any directives but only by tradition.

Dr Van Steenis wanted no announcement to be made at all.

Dr Stafleu said that this would mean changing Division III.

Dr Lange read the following final text of his motion: “The General Committee shall, in cooperation with the organizers of future Congresses convene a Section of nomenclature. When convening this Section it can be decided that only specific parts of the Code be considered.

The motion was rejected.

Prop. B was then also rejected.


Dr Stafleu said that this was actual practice, but that it put the date forward. It should be realized that it always takes a long time before the Congress organization approves the invitation. If we bound ourselves to a deadline of one year in advance of the Congress, there would mostly be only a few months left for printing the announcements and receiving the proposals.

Dr Van Steenis asked whether acceptance of prop. C would rule out proposals from the floor.

Dr Rollins said that such proposals were dealt with by tradition. If prop. C was accepted we might face a greater number of proposals presented from the floor. This would create confusion.

The proposal was rejected.


Prop. E, out of order.

Prop. F, out of order.

Diagnosis and monstrosities

Dr Stafleu presented the following report:

REPORT EDITORIAL COMMITTEE ON 'DIAGNOSIS AND MONSTROSITY'

Diagnosis

This report on the use of the words “description” and “diagnosis” in Chapter IV, Section 2, of the Code is presented in accordance with the instructions given to the Editorial Committee by the Section of Nomenclature of the Montreal Congress.

The practice of authors publishing names of new taxa has been and is very diverse, but they usually adopt one of two methods. Some give a statement, which may be very short, of the distinctive features of the taxon; such a statement is termed a diagnosis in normal botanical parlance. Others give a description of the taxon in which its distinctive characters and those also possessed by related taxa are intermingled. A diagnosis and a descrip-
tion are both given in many cases, but often there is only one or the other.

It has always been the custom of botanists to regard either a diagnosis or a description as constituting both a “description” as required by Arts. 32, 41, and 42 and a “diagnosis” as required by Art. 36. Considerations of language apart, the requirements of all these four Articles have been regarded as identical. The Editorial Committee therefore considers that the same word should be used in all these Articles, and, since it more accurately indicates the minimum required to comply with the provisions of the Articles, that the term “diagnosis” should replace the term “description” throughout these Articles.

A definition of this term must take into account the fact that the character or characters which the author thought were distinctive of his taxon may be found not to be so at a later date. The Committee therefore suggests the following: “A diagnosis of a taxon is a statement of a character or characters considered by the author to be distinctive of it, whether given separately or within a description.” This will admit all true diagnoses however short, and all descriptions which include distinctive characters.

The Editorial Committee therefore recommends to the Nomenclature Section of the Xth International Botanical Congress that the word “description” in Arts. 32, 41 and 42 be replaced by the word “diagnosis”, that the same change be made elsewhere where consistency requires it, and that the above definition of diagnosis be added as a footnote to its first occurrence in the Code.

**Monstrosity**

A monstrosity is an organism having a non-hereditary morphological or anatomical anomaly.

Dr Fosberg thought that the definition of diagnosis was a very optimistic one: it did not seem to be very practical.

Dr Lange was in favour of adopting the recommendation by the Editorial Committee to change description to diagnosis and to insert the definition of diagnosis. Dr Donk recommended de Candolle’s point of view: a description is a description, a rose is a rose.

Dr Schulze was opposed to putting in a footnote. He also wanted to retain a distinction between diagnosis and description. In the past there had been such a distinction.

Mr Bullock was of the opinion that the proposal by the Editorial Committee on diagnosis and diagnosis embodied a considerable improvement. He referred to an example taken from Robert Brown which constituted in a way an indirect description. The members of the Committee for Spermatophyta had been divided over it, but the present new definition would leave no doubt.

Dr Rollins pointed out that an amendment had been put forward by Dr Schulze to omit the footnote and definition.

Dr Faegri said that the definition ought to come in the glossary.

The amendment by Schulze was defeated, the proposal by the Editorial Committee was accepted.

Dr Stafleu then explained that the Editorial Committee had not been unanimous about the definition of monstrosity. They had been charged to give a definition so they had done so, but a majority was of the opinion that no such definition could be given at the moment.

The Section then decided not to insert the definition of monstrosity as given in the above report.

**COMMENTS ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE CODE**

Dr Martin presented the following statement:

In the 1912 edition of the Rules of Botanical Nomenclature, Chapter I, Article 3, reads: “The rules of nomenclature should neither be arbitrary nor imposed by authority. They must be simple and founded on considerations clear and forcible enough for everyone to comprehend and be disposed to accept.”

This is Art. 2 of de Candolle’s *Lois* of 1867, with the addition of the words “simple and”. This change was evidently made in 1905 at the Vienna Congress and accepted at Brussels in 1910.

In the 1935 edition of the Rules, as revised by the Cambridge Congress of 1930, Art. 3 reads: “The rules of nomenclature should be simple and founded on considerations sufficiently clear and forcible for everyone to comprehend and be disposed to accept.” It will be noted that the phrase “should neither be arbitrary nor imposed by authority” is omitted. As so modified, the same wording was used in the 1952 Code based on the discussions at the Stockholm (1950) Congress.
Before the Paris Congress, a Proposal was presented to delete Art. 3 on the ground that it was superfluous. The preliminary mail vote was: Yes, 199; No, 80; Refer to Ed. Comm., 2. The final vote at the Congress was: Yes, 232; No, 83; Refer to Ed. Comm., 6. This was accompanied by adding the first sentence of the Preamble, which, it was claimed, preserved the intent of the deleted Article. These are impressive majorities. Nevertheless, it might be well to reconsider this action on two grounds: first, that the sentence in the Preamble, while excellent in its place, does not put enough stress on what Art. 3 affirmed; second, that it is desirable to have in the Code a clear statement that botanists recognize that its provisions are advisory only.

Certainly, there is no legal authority which compels authors to conform to the Code. The only sanction which can be invoked is the disapproval of the botanical community, and there will be few cases where that will be unanimous. That the Code is faulty is apparent from the constantly increasing number of attempts made to revise it at each succeeding Congress. Any author has the right to disregard the Code in any case where he believes adherence to the letter of the Code will not be to the best interest of the advancement of knowledge in the field in which he is working. It is, of course, advisable, but in the nature of the case it cannot be mandatory, that he state the reasons for his action.

In order to make this perfectly clear, it is highly desirable that the statement which appeared in the Rules and Codes from 1867 to 1912 be reinserted. On the basis of the present Code, this can most conveniently be done by deleting the words “and simple” from the first sentence of the present Preamble and inserting the two sentences of Art. 3 of the 1912 Rules as a short paragraph following the first paragraph of the Preamble and before the statement defining Principles.

Mr Bullock said that the Code was arbitrary from the beginning to the end.

Dr Schulze: "The Code is not made only for botanists rising in the morning with the Code and going to bed at night with the Code under the arm. Therefore I am much in favour of the proposal of Prof. Martin."

Dr Rollins stated that Dr Martin had not asked for a formal vote, but that he had asked for a re-consideration by the Editorial Committee. He asked whether the Section agreed to accept Dr Martin’s proposal in this sense. Carried.

Dr Rollins then explained that Dr Tryon had asked to write the 60% rule for votes into the Code. He thought that this was a matter of procedure that did not belong in the Code, but should be decided upon by the Section at each Congress.

Dr Mathias expressed the thanks of the Section to Dr Rollins and his Bureau for doing such a good job.

Miss Sprague thanked the president for the kind words he had said about her late husband and about herself. It had been a tremendous joy to her to hear that her husband’s work had been so much appreciated.

Dr Rollins speaking on behalf of the Bureau, thanked the Section and the officers and in particular Drs Green and Solbrig who had given such welcome technical support. He also thanked the members of the ad-hoc committees who had worked so hard, and also the special group that had taken care of the copying of the various reports, Dr Mathias, Dr Schubert and Dr Cowan. Furthermore he thanked Dr Watling for everything he had done to let all operations run smoothly in collaboration with Dr Burtt and other members of the institute.

Dr Papenfuss expressed special thanks to the Bureau for the amount of work done in the preparation of the proceedings of the Section.

At 18.00 p.m. Dr Rollins declared the sessions closed.
APPENDIX I

ELECTORAL ROLL — INSTITUTES*

Aberdeen (Great Britain) Dept. of Botany, the University votes 1
Abeyystwyth (Great Britain) The Painter Herbarium 1
Achimota (Ghana) The Ghana Herbarium 1
Adelaide (S. Australia) Botany School, University of Adelaide 1
Ames (U.S.A.) Iowa State College (Bot. Dept.) 1
Amherst (U.S.A.) Dept. of Botany, University of Massachusetts 1
Amsterdam (Netherlands) Hugo de Vries Laboratories 1
Ankara (Turkey) Ankara Universitesi Fen Fakultesi Botanik Enstitüsi 1
Ann Arbor (U.S.A.) University Herbarium, University of Michigan 5
Athens (U.S.A.) Herbarium of the University of Georgia 1
Auckland (New Zealand) Auckland Institute and Museum 1
Austin (U.S.A.) University of Texas 1
Avignon (France) Museum Requien d'Histoire Naturelle de la Ville d'Avignon 1
Baarn (Netherlands) Centraal Bureau Schimmelcultures 1
Bangkok (Thailand) Botanical Herbarium, Plant Division 1
Barcelona (Spain) Instituto Botánico de Barcelona 3
Basel (Switzerland) Botanisches Institut der Universität Basel 1
Belem (Brazil) Instituto Agronómico do Norte 1
Beltsville (U.S.A.) Division of Mycology and Disease Survey, Plant Industry Station 3
Beltsville (U.S.A.) Crops Research Division, Plant Industry Station 1

Bergen (Norway) Universitetsetens Botaniske Museum 1
Berkeley (U.S.A.) Herbarium of the University of California 6
Berkeley (U.S.A.) Jepson Herbarium and Library 1
Berlin (Germany) Botanisches Museum 5
Bern (Switzerland) Herbarium des Botanischen Instituts und Gartens der Universität Bern 1
Bern (Switzerland) Schweizerische Gartenbau-Kommision 1
Birmingham (Great Britain) Dept. of Botany, The University 1
Bloomington (U.S.A.) Indiana University 1
Bogor (Indonesia) Herbarium Bogoriense 3
Bogota (Colombia) Herbario Nacional de Colombia, Instituto de Ciencias Naturales 1
Bombay (India) Blatter Herbarium, St. Xavier's College 1
Bordeaux (France) Jardin Botanique de la ville de Bordeaux 1
Boulder (U.S.A.) University of Colorado 1
Bozeman (U.S.A.) Montana State College 1
Bratislava (Czechoslovakia) Botanický ústav Slovenskej univerzity 1
Brignoles (France) Salgues Foundation of Brignoles for the development of Biological Science 1
Brisbane (Australia) Dept. of Agriculture and Stock 3
Brno (Czechoslovakia) Botanical Institute and Herbarium 1
Bruxelles (Belgium) Jardin Botanique de l’Etat 7
Bruxelles (Belgium) Institut de Botanique de l’Université 2
Bucuresti (Roumania) Institutul si Muzeul Botanic al Universitatii Bucuresti 1

*) Italics indicate that the respective institute was represented at the Edinburgh meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budapest (Hungary)</td>
<td>Museum of Natural History, Dept. of Botany</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires (Argentina)</td>
<td>Instituto de Botánica del M.A.G.N.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires (Argentina)</td>
<td>Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales Bernardino Rivadavia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Pringle Herbarium, University of Vermont</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caen (France)</td>
<td>Institut botanique de la Faculté des Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo (Egypt)</td>
<td>Herbarium Agricultural Museum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo (Egypt)</td>
<td>Dept. of Botany, Faculty of Science, Cairo University</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcutta (India)</td>
<td>Indian Botanic Garden</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge (Great Britain)</td>
<td>Botany School, University of Cambridge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Gray Herbarium of Harvard University</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Botanical Museum of Harvard University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Farlow Herbarium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town (S. Africa)</td>
<td>National Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town (S. Africa)</td>
<td>Bolus Herbarium, University of Cape Town</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town (S. Africa)</td>
<td>South African Museum Herbarium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caracas (Venezuela)</td>
<td>Instituto Botánico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbondale (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Southern Illinois University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff (Great Britain)</td>
<td>Department of Botany, National Museum of Wales</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapultepec (Mexico)</td>
<td>Instituto de Biología</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charkow (U.S.S.R.)</td>
<td>Herbarium of the Ukrainian Institute for Scientific Research of Socialist Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chengtu (China)</td>
<td>The Herbarium of the Dept. of Biology, National Szechuan University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Chicago Natural History Museum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Botany Dept., University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Herbarium of Pomona College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont-Ferrand (France)</td>
<td>Institut Botanique de la Faculté des Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluj (Roumania)</td>
<td>Institutul Botanica Sistematica, Muzeul si Grăd. Botanica, Universitate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coimbatore (S. India)</td>
<td>Madras Herbarium, Agricultural College and Research Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coimbra (Portugal)</td>
<td>Botanical Institute of the University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>University of Missouri Herbarium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen (Denmark)</td>
<td>Botanical Museum and Herbarium</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen (Denmark)</td>
<td>Department of Plant Pathology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordoba (Argentina)</td>
<td>Museo Botánico, Facultad de Ciencias E.F. y Naturales</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsaillis (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Oregon State College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakar (Africa)</td>
<td>Institut Français d’Afrique Noire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Herbarium of Southern Methodist University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>University of California at Davis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrecen (Hungary)</td>
<td>Institute of Botany, University of Debrecen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehra Dun (India)</td>
<td>Forest Research Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin (Ireland)</td>
<td>School of Botany, Trinity College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durban (S. Africa)</td>
<td>Natal Herbarium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lansing (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Michigan State College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh (Great Britain)</td>
<td>Royal Botanic Garden</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firenze (Italy)</td>
<td>Herbarium Universitatis Florentinae, Istituto Botanico</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukuoka (Japan)</td>
<td>Herbarium of Botanical Institute, Faculty of Agriculture, Kyushu University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Herbarium, Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatersleben (Germany)</td>
<td>Institut für Kulturpflanzenforschung</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneve (Switzerland)</td>
<td>Conservatoire et Jardin botaniques</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow (Great Britain)</td>
<td>Dept. of Botany, University of Glasgow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothenburg (Sweden)</td>
<td>Göteborgs Botaniska Trädgård</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottingen (Germany)</td>
<td>Systematisch-Geobotanisches Institut</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graz (Austria)</td>
<td>Institut für systematische Botanik</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greencastle (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>DePauw University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenoble (France)</td>
<td>Institut de Botanique de la Faculté des Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greifswald (Germany)</td>
<td>Institut für Agrobiologie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groningen (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Botanical Laboratory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habana (Cuba)</td>
<td>Herbario de la Salle, Colegio de la Salle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habana (Cuba)</td>
<td>Jardín Botánico de la Universidad de Habana</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg (Germany)</td>
<td>Staatsinstitut für allgemeine Botanik</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki (Finland)</td>
<td>Botanical Museum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Bernice P. Bishop Museum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>University of Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iasi (Roamnia)</td>
<td>Laboratorul si Muzeul Botanic, Facultatea de Stiinte Naturale, Universitatea din Iasi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan (Nigeria)</td>
<td>Forest Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innsbruck (Austria)</td>
<td>Botanisches Institut der Universität</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa City (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>State University of Iowa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Bailey Hortorium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Dept. of Plant Pathology, Cornell University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Wiegand Herbarium of Cornell University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica Plain (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Arnold Arboretum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jena (Germany)</td>
<td>Institut für Spezielle Botanik und Herbarium Haussknecht</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem (Israel)</td>
<td>Dept. of Botany, Hebrew University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg (S. Africa)</td>
<td>The Moss Herbarium, University of the Witwatersrand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepong (Malaya)</td>
<td>Forest Research Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kew (Great Britain)</td>
<td>The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kew (Great Britain)</td>
<td>Commonwealth Mycological Institute</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxvile (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>The Herbarium, University of Tennessee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krakow (Poland)</td>
<td>Herbarium Horti Botanici Universitatis Jagellonicae</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto (Japan)</td>
<td>Dept. of Botany, Kyoto University</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Plata (Argentina)</td>
<td>Museo de La Plata, División Botánica</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Plata (Argentina)</td>
<td>Instituto de Botánica C. Spegazzini</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramie (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain Herbarium, University of Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lausanne (Switzerland)</td>
<td>Musée botanique cantonal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds (Great Britain)</td>
<td>Botany Department, University of Leeds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legon (Ghana)</td>
<td>Botany Department, University of Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester (Great Britain)</td>
<td>Botany Department, University of Leicester</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiden (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Rijksherbarium</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leningrad (U.S.S.R.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komarov Botanical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leningrad (U.S.S.R.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbarium of Cultivated Plants, Institute of Plant Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leningrad (U.S.S.R.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptogamic Herbarium, Akademia Nauk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liège (Belgium)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institut et Jardin Botaniques de l'Université de Liège</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima (Peru)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbario San Marcos, Museo de Historia Natural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska State Museum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linz (Austria)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologische Abteilung am O. Ö. Landesmuseum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisboa (Portugal)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museu, Laboratório e Jardim Botânico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisboa (Portugal)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto Superior de Agronomia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisboa-Belem (Portugal)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jardim Colonial e Museu Agrícola Colonial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool (Great Britain)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartley Botanical Laboratorece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (Great Britain)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Museum (Natural History)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (Great Britain)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South London Botanical Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbarium, University of Southern California</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Museum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvain (Belgium)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnoy Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucknow (India)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Botanical Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund (Sweden)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Museum and Herbarium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbarium of the University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid (Spain)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto “Antonio José Cavanilles”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid (Spain)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbario del Laboratorio de Botánica de la Facultad de Farmacia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ottawa (Canada) votes Rio de Janeiro (Brazil)
Plant Research Institute, Canada
Department of Agriculture 4
Jardim Botânico (Brazil)

Oxford (Great Britain) votes
Fielding Herbarium, Druce Herbarium 1
Divisão de Botânica do Museu Nacional

Oxford (Great Britain) votes
Forest Herbarium, Dept. of Botany, University of Oxford 1
Istituto Botanico Città Universitaria

Padova (Italy) votes
Istituto Botanico 1
Botanico Darwinion

Paris (France) votes
Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Lab. de Cryptogamie 5
Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Lab. de Phanérogamie

Paris (France) votes
Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Lab. de Phanérogamie 7

Pavia (Italy) votes
Botanical Institute and Italian Cryptogamic Laboratory 3
Instituto de Botânica Darwinion

Peking (China) votes
Institute of Botany, Academia Sinica 3
Herbarium of the Institute of Botany, Academia Sinica

Philadelphia (U.S.A.) votes
Academy of Natural Sciences 3
Botanical Department of National Museum

Philadelphia (U.S.A.) votes
University of Pennsylvania, Morris Arboretum 1
Departement van Plantkunde, Universiteit van Stellenbosch

Pittsburgh (U.S.A.) votes
Carnegie Museum Herbarium 1
Herbarium of the Natural History Museum of Canada

Pisa (Italy) votes
Istituto Botanico della Università 1
Herbarium of the Department of Botany, Stockholm University

Porto (Portugal) votes
Instituto de Botânica "Dr Gonçalo Sampaio" Universidade de Porto 1
Herbarium of the Department of Plant Systematics, National Taiwan University

Praha (Czechoslovakia) votes
Botanical Institute of the Charles University 3
Botanical Institute of the Charles University

Praha (Czechoslovakia) votes
Botanical Department of National Museum 3
Botanical Department Swedish Museum of Natural History

Pretoria (S. Africa) votes
Division of Botany, National Herbarium 5
National Herbarium of New South Wales

Pullman (U.S.A.) votes
State College of Washington 1
Herbarium of the National Museum of Natural History

Quezon City (Philippines) votes
Herbarium of the Department of Botany, University of the Philippines 1
The Herbarium, National Taiwan University

Rabat (Morocco) votes
Institut Scientifique Chérifien 3
Hortus Botanicus Bergianus

Raleigh (U.S.A.) votes
North Carolina State College, Department of Botany 1
Sydney (Australia)

Renner (U.S.A.) votes
Lundell Herbarium, Texas Research Foundation 1
National Herbarium of New South Wales

Stellenbosch (S. Africa) votes
Department van Plantkunde, Universiteit van Stellenbosch 1
National Herbarium of New South Wales

St. Louis (U.S.A.) votes
Missouri Botanical Garden 4
The Herbarium, National Taiwan University

Stockholm (Sweden) votes
Botanical Department, Naturhistoriska Riksmuseet 5
Stockholm (Sweden)

Stockholm (Sweden) votes
Palaeobotanical Department, Swedish Museum of Natural History 1
Stockholm (Sweden)

Stockholm (Sweden) votes
Hortus Botanicus Bergianus 1

Sydney (Australia) votes
National Herbarium of New South Wales 3

Taipei (China) votes
The Herbarium, National Taiwan University 1
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution 1</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University, Tallahassee (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institut de Recherche Scientifique de Madagascar, Tananarive (Madagascar)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escuela Agrícola Panamericana, Tegucigalpa (Honduras)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois, Urbana (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State Natural History Survey, Urbana (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Museum and Herbarium, Utrecht (Netherlands)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wageningen (Netherlands)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory for Plant Taxonomy and Plant Geography, Washington (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States National Arboretum, Washington (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Service Herbarium, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Geological Survey, Washington (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. National Museum, Smithsonian Institution, Washington (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Museum, Wellington (New Zealand)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturhistorisches Museum, Wien (Austria)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Institut der Universität, Wien (Austria)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester (U.S.A.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuhan (China)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbarium of Wu-Han University, Wuchang (China)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagreb (Yugoslavia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Institute and Garden, Faculty of Sciences, University</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zürich (Switzerland)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanischer Garten und Museum der Universität</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LIST OF THE ENROLLED MEMBERS OF THE NOMENCLATURE SECTION

Ahti, T. (Finland); Almborn, O. (Sweden); Balfour Browne, Mrs. F. L. (Great Britain); Barkley, E. D. (Iraq); Barkley, F. A. (Iraq); Benjamin, C. R. (U.S.A.); Blake, S. T. (Australia); Bonner, C. E. B. (Switzerland); Boom, B. K. (Netherlands); Borssum Waalkes, J. van (Netherlands); Bourrelly, P. (France); Brickell, C. D. (Great Britain); Brummitt, R. K. (Great Britain); Buchheim, G. (U.S.A.); Bullock, A. A. (Great Britain); Burtt, B. L. (Great Britain); Carsson, G. (Great Britain); Chaloner, W. G. (Great Britain); Christiansen, T. (Denmark); Cowan, R. S. (U.S.A.); Cronquist, A. (U.S.A.); Dandy, J. E. (Great Britain); Davis, F. H. (Great Britain); Deighton, F. C. (Great Britain); Demiriz, H. (Turkey); Desikachary, T. V. (India); Dixon, P. S. (Great Britain); Donk, M. A. (Netherlands); Doty, M. S. (Hawaii); Dress, W. J. (U.S.A.); Dunn, D. B. (U.S.A.); Earle Smith, C., Jr. (U.S.A.); Ernst, W. R. (U.S.A.); Faegri, K. (Norway); Farr, Marie L. (U.S.A.); Feldmann, J. (France); Fosberg, F. R. (U.S.A.); Frankton, C. (Canada); Fuchs, H. P. (Netherlands); Fullord, Margaret (U.S.A.); Garay, L. A. (U.S.A.); Gerloff, J. (Germany); Gibby, A. N. (South Africa); Gier, L. J. (U.S.A.); Gier, Mrs. L. J. (U.S.A.); Gillespie, W. H. (U.S.A.); Gilmour, J. S. L. (Great Britain); Gould, S. W. (U.S.A.); Grassl, C. O. (U.S.A.); Green, P. S. (U.S.A.); Hara, H. (Japan); Harrison, S. G. (Great Britain); Hedge, J. C. (Great Britain); Heine, H. (France); Hennep, G. L. (Belgium); Henssen, A. (Germany); Hermann, F. J. (U.S.A.); Heywood, V. (Great Britain); Hodgdon, A. R. (U.S.A.); Holm, L. (Sweden); Holttum, R. E. (Great Britain); Hossain, M. (China); Hou, D. (Netherlands); Howaro, R. A. (U.S.A.); Hu, S. Y. (U.S.A.); Hughes, N. F. (Great Britain); Ingram, J. A. (U.S.A.); Jablonski, E. (U.S.A.); Jimenez, J. de J. (Dominican Republic); Korff, R. P. (U.S.A.); Koster, J. Th. (Netherlands); Kraina, V. J. (Canada); Lange, M. (Denmark); Lanjouw, J. (Netherlands); Lawrence, G. (U.S.A.); Lellinger, D. B. (U.S.A.); Leonard, J. (Belgium); Li, H. L. (U.S.A.); Linehan, P. A. (Great Britain); Little, E. L. (U.S.A.); McNeill, J. (Great Britain); McVaugh, R. (U.S.A.); Margadant, W. D. (U.S.A.); Martin, G. W. (U.S.A.); Mathias, M. E. (U.S.A.); Matuda, E. (Mexico); Meikle, R. D. (Great Britain); Melderis, A. (Great Britain); Meyer, F. G. (U.S.A.); Mitchell, M. E. (Ireland); Moore, H. E., Jr. (U.S.A.); Morton, C. V. (U.S.A.); Moser, M. (Austria); Muirhead, Miss C. W. (Great Britain); Neving, L. E., Jr. (U.S.A.); Nicolson, D. H. (U.S.A.); Papenfuss, G. F. (U.S.A.); Pichi Sermolli, R. E. G. (Italy); Poinsot, H. (France); Ponoma, R. (Germany); Pricey, J. H. (Great Britain); Prijanto, B. (Indonesia); Proskauer, J. A. (U.S.A.); Rao, R. S. (India); Reeder, Charlotte I. (U.S.A.); Reeder, J. R. (U.S.A.); Rickett, H. W. (U.S.A.); Robyns, W. (Belgium); Rollins, R. C. (U.S.A.); Ross, R. (Great Britain); Ronayne, E. (Canada); Rousseau, J. (Canada); Rudd, Velva E. (U.S.A.); Rycroft, H. B. (South Africa); Santapau, H. (India); Santesson, R. (Sweden); Sayre, Miss G. (U.S.A.); Schelpe, E. (South Africa); Schoepf, J. M. (U.S.A.); Schulze, B. B. (U.S.A.); Schubert, B. G. (U.S.A.); Seear, M. (Germany); Seater, R. B. (U.S.A.); Shetler, S. G. (U.S.A.); Singer, R. (Argentina); Skovsted, A. (Denmark); Solbrig, O. T. (U.S.A.); Sprague, M. L. (Great Britain); Staflin, F. A. (Netherlands); Staplin, F. L. (Canada); Steam, W. T. (Great Britain); Steenis, C. C. J. van (Netherlands); Steere, W. C. (U.S.A.); Subramanian, C. V. (India); Sweet, H. A. (U.S.A.); Tavares, I. (U.S.A.); Taylor, W. R. (U.S.A.); Thomas, J. Th. (U.S.A.); Thorne, R. F. (U.S.A.); Tobling, T. (Great Britain); Torrey, C. E. (U.S.A.); Tryon, Alice F. (U.S.A.); Tryon, R. M. (U.S.A.); Wagner, W. H., Jr. (U.S.A.); Walsh, Th. J. (Ireland); Watling, R. (Great Britain); Weber, C. (Switzerland); Weiss, M. G. (U.S.A.); Wendelboe, P. (Norway); Wereasub, L. K. (Canada); Wight, W. (Great Britain); Wilde, J. J. F. E. de (Netherlands); Williams, L. O. (U.S.A.); Winter, B. de (South Africa); Winter, M. de (South Africa); Wood, C. E., Jr. (U.S.A.); Wood, D. (Great Britain); Wood, R. D. (U.S.A.); Wijk, R. van der (Netherlands); Yaltirk, F. (Turkey); Yeo, P. F. (Great Britain).