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FIRST SESSION

Thursday, 21 August 1969, 2:00-5:30 p.m.
(Chairman: R. C. Rollins)
The chairman welcomed the participants and expressed his delight at having such a good turn-out at the Nomenclature Section. He was honored to be in the chair again and to recognize so many well known faces from all over the world. Unfamiliar to him was the presence in the audience and not on the podium of the dean of botanical nomenclature, Prof. Lanjouw. He hoped Professor Lanjouw did not feel deposed.

Several members of the nomenclature group passed away since Edinburgh. The chairman mentioned in particular Richard Kräusel, George Brizicky, and Noel Sandwith. Others such Humbert, Florin, and Bailey had also contributed to nomenclature.

A telegram was read from Mrs. Sprague: "Greatly regret absence, best wishes for happy and productive discussions".

Dr. Rollins placed before the Section the Code 1966, as printed, for formal approval. The Congresses have to ratify the Codes as official documents.

The proposal to approve the Code 1966 was unanimously accepted.

Dr. Voss suggested a procedure to be followed with respect to the mail votes. He will announce the final mail vote on each proposal. Proposals with more than 75% "no" votes would be considered rejected unless discussion is expressly asked for.

Dr. Rollins asked for approval by the Section of this procedure. Reconsideration would also be possible on special request. Proposal approved.

Dr. Voss explained the voting procedure and the use of the voting cards. Most votes were to be taken by show of cards. Since cards for institutions with more than one vote were of different colors, a show of cards could be more accurate than a mere show of hands. When an exact card vote is called for, the next numbered ticket from each card is to be detached and submitted to the "yes" or "no" collectors.
Dr. Rollins asked for a motion to provide the Editorial Committee with the necessary powers. Such a procedure had been used in the past. If a proposal is referred to the Editorial Committee, the Section approves in principle but leaves the final wording to the Committee.

Dr. Voss read the following motion based on the Edinburgh report:

I) 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 Code 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, sending them in writing to the Committee before January 1, 1970.

Dr. Cronquist stated: "The Editorial Committee must have the authority provided in this motion, in order to carry out its task effectively. However, I hope that the committee will use this authority cautiously and sparingly. There was an occasion some years ago in which the committee introduced the ending -opsida, for a particular taxonomic rank, at the insistence of one of its members, although the proposal had not been discussed on the floor. I trust that nothing like that will happen again."

Dr. Rollins assured Dr. Cronquist that the Editorial Committee would observe the spirit of the motion which gave the Committee simply a modus operandi.
Dr. Boivin suggested to the Editorial Committee that the numbering of articles be maintained unchanged except in cases of absolute necessity.

Dr. Stafleu pointed out that the previous two Congresses had insisted that the numbering of the articles be indeed maintained unchanged and such a suggestion from this Congress would be welcome. The proposals before the Section were such that it should be simple to retain the numbering.

Dr. Rollins moved from the chair that this suggestion be added to the instructions to the Editorial Committee, and that the motion empowering the Committee then be accepted. Seconded by Reeder and carried.

Dr. Rollins then appointed the following Nominating Committee: Papenfuss (chairman), Donk, Hara, Gilmour, Correll. All secretaries of committees were urged to contact the chairman of the Nominating Committee or any of its members in order to present their suggestions.

Dr. Papenfuss requested the help of the Rapporteur to survey the field and asked whether his group would also appoint ad hoc committees.

Dr. Stafleu confirmed that the Nominating Committee would bring forward suggestions for both the standing committees and the ad hoc committees set up by the president.

Dr. Rollins moved that the proposals in Appendix A of the Synopsis be admitted for consideration by the Section. They had been submitted prior to the October 1 deadline but had not been received by that date. Motion seconded by Ross and carried.

Dr. Nannfeldt proposed to send a telegram to Mrs. Sprague in answer to her telegram. Agreed by acclamation.

Dr. Tryon read the following suggestion in regard to voting on proposals:

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% 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.

Moved by Rollins and seconded by Boivin to adopt this procedure. Motion carried by an ample majority.

Action on Proposals

Preamble

Prop. A (10:143:1:37) Rejected
Prop. B (13:103:3:68)

Dr. Stafleu stated that the intent of the proposal was not clear.

Dr. Rogers thought the proposal undesirable since it could be read as excluding Bacteria and cultivated plants from the provisions of the botanical Code.

Dr. Stafleu affirmed that our Code does apply to Bacteria and Actinomycetes and it would be undesirable to stress too much at this place the special rulings for those groups.

Mr. Ross said it would be most unfortunate to remove the Bacteria entirely from botanical nomenclature for this would make a third system of names independent for purposes of homonymy. Having two (for plants
and animals) gives enough trouble already in the Protista.

The proposal was rejected.

Article 3

Prop. A (6:28:1h5:8)

Dr. Voss reported receipt of a communication from Krassilov admitting an unfortunate transposition of the terms "form-genus" and "organ-genus" in his proposal. The Committee for Fossil Plants, even with this transposition in mind, had unanimously rejected the proposal (Taxon 18: 481).

Dr. Rollins stated that although the mail vote had referred this proposal to the Special Committee, the Section should vote on it.

Dr. Donk called attention to the use of the term "form-genus" for imperfect fungi in Art. 59.

The proposal was rejected.

Prop. B. (64:76:50:2)

Dr. Rollins stated that the Committee for Hybrids will report on this and on further proposals on this subject. Dr. Stearn announced that the Committee expected duly to report later in the session. Dr. Tryon stated that Yeo's proposals should be considered as such and as to placement in the Code. Action deferred until report of Committee for Hybrids [Prop. B. then rejected].

New Recommendation 3A
Prop. A. Withdrawn.

Article 4

Prop. A. (hl:80:61:2) Referred to Committee for Hybrids [and later rejected].

Article 6

Prop. A (12:181:0:5) Rejected
Prop. B (h5:137:1:8)

Dr. Tryon explained that the first sentence of Art. 24 says that the name of an infraspecific taxon consists of three words. This should be followed in the example in Art. 6. The right to cite the full classification is given by the *Saxifraga* example in Art. 24, but the definition of a combination should use only the name itself.

Dr. Stafleu stated that both methods of quotation are permissible. For purposes of priority, legitimacy, etc., the ternary combination counts. The Code, however, has always allowed the mentioning of taxonomic opinion in the form of longer names.

Mr. Ross favored the proposed change: "var. *americanum*" is not part of the combination, and should therefore be deleted here. The ternary combination counts; the epithet *americanum* is an item of information but not part of the name.

Dr. Fosberg thought adoption of the proposal would clarify things
without eliminating the privilege of using intermediate categories.

Dr. McVaugh suggested that the Editorial Committee deal with the matter, but Tryon asked the section either to accept or reject his proposals.

A card vote being called for, the proposal was rejected (no: 143; yes: 142).

**Article 7**

Prop. A (35:148:10:1)

Dr. Donk asked whether this question could not be considered with the Guide for Determination of Types -- and without use of the word schizotype.

Dr. Rollins asked if this met with the approval of the Section.

Dr. Lanjouw asked what the precise wording of the note would be.

Dr. Stafleu explained that Donk wants the Editorial Committee to be sure the basic material of the proposal is in the Guide. It describes a common practice, provided we do not use the word schizotype.

Dr. Rollins ruled that although the proposal was rejected, the Editorial Committee would see that its substance was included in the Guide for Determination of Types, without referring to schizotypes.


Dr. Stafleu pointed out that some of these terms are already used in the Guide. Horton wants to use them also in the body of the Code. *Isoparatype* is, however, not a very clear concept. *Isosyntype* is taken from
the Guide. There are three different proposals here.

Dr. Rollins called for a vote on the first sentence of Prop. B. Rejected.

Dr. Cronquist said the procedure was making it very difficult to refer something to the Editorial Committee. We should have the opportunity to vote "yes", "no", or "Editorial Committee".

Dr. Stafleu thought the present proposal was controversial. The Editorial Committee should receive instructions from the Section.

Dr. Buchheim observed that the second sentence of the proposal was already in the Code. Dr. Stafleu explained that the proposal aimed at duplication; a vote "yes" is a vote for duplication in the body of the Code.

The second sentence of Prop. B was rejected. The third sentence was rejected.

Prop. C (5;186:1:2) Rejected
Prop. D (3;192:2:2) Rejected
Prop. E (3;190:2:3) Rejected
Prop. F (8;191:1:1) Rejected
Prop. G (7;194:1:1) Rejected
Prop. H (5;125:1:68) Rejected
Prop. I (6;196:1:1) Rejected
Prop. J (6;194:1:1) Rejected
Prop. K (15;78:55:12) Referred to Special Committee on Art. 63 (Superfluous Names)

Dr. Voss reported that Prop. 155 was by error omitted from the Synopsis: Add a note to Art. 7: "The designation of a type is admissible only for the name of a new taxon".
Dr. Tryon supported his proposal, observing that the principle of Art. 37 -- which effectively expresses a conclusion as to which names should be typified and, by implication, which should not be -- ought to be stated in Art. 7.

Dr. Cronquist expressed the hope that the proposer would make himself clear. One would not designate a type when this is done by someone else.

Dr. Tryon had in mind a lectotype.

Dr. Stafleu remarked that the wording was not a very happy one. Let the Committee on Superfluous Names look at the proposal. There are some good elements in it, but as it stands it will run into opposition.

Dr. Fosberg said that special committee was in hopeless disagreement; they will not do any better on this.

Dr. Rollins: "In any case we should hear the report of that Committee. We postpone this for the moment, along with Prop. 7-X".

Prop. L (88:67:15:6) Referred to Committee for Hybrids [and later referred to Editorial Committee].

Prop. M (77:86:7:9) Rejected

Mr. Meikle stated that Dr. Brummitt had re-worded his proposal as follows:

When the type of the name of a taxon is known but insufficient information about it is available to enable it to be assigned with certainty to either or any of the subordinate taxa recognised, an auxiliary type for which the required information is available is to be chosen. This auxiliary type has no bearing on typification of the name of the major taxon concerned but determines the application of the typical epithet at any subordinate rank. The author who first designates an auxiliary type
must be followed unless it can be shown with certainty that the holotype of the name of the major taxon is not taxonomically the same.

Example: In the species *Mimosa pudica* L. three varieties are recognizable but the type of the specific name is a sterile specimen which cannot be referred with certainty to any of the three varieties. A specimen in which the varietal characters may be observed must therefore be chosen as the *auxiliary type* of the name *Mimosa pudica* L., and the epithet *pudica* at varietal or any other infraspecific rank must be permanently attached to this specimen.

Mr. Meikle added the observation that this is indirectly Mr. Bullock’s proposal A under Article 25.

Dr. Fosberg asked: What authority would an auxiliary type have other than an author’s opinion? Why put an authorization for an author’s opinion in the code?

Mr. Meikle replied that the example by Mr. Bullock and Mr. Brummitt (see Art. 25, prop. A) and Mr. Brummitt (see above) makes the situation clearer. The Bullock proposal is that the type of a species should stand on its own. The auxiliary type would be for the varietal name only. Brummitt’s ‘auxiliary type’ would not interfere with the type of the species.

Mr. Ross said that to accept Art. 25, prop. A, would involve the nomenclatural recognition of an infraspecific taxon which has no taxonomic counterpart, and this is in principle wrong.

Dr. Tryon observed that one can arbitrarily assign the type of the species name to one of the existing varieties. (This would in effect be done by the new type chosen under Prop. M).

Dr. Stafleu remarked that there are other cases in the Code where we follow a similar procedure.
Dr. McVaugh: "If proposal M to Art. 7 is rejected, we already have authority under the neotype rule to assume this particular type is 'destroyed'."

Dr. Stafleu: "Do you want to change something in the neotype rule?"

Dr. Cronquist: "Recognizing the significance of the objections which have been made to the alternative (Bullock) proposal (Prop. A, Art. 25), I wonder if the present proposal would do all that it seems to do. Would we not frequently be faced with the necessity of determining who first applied the name in such a way as to imply or require a particular typification, even though the author did not formally typify the name? The Bullock proposal at least avoids this difficulty."

Dr. Voss said that the Bullock proposal allows for continuity if new information comes forward to allow assigning of the type to one variety or another.

Dr. Donk said the word "type" or "auxiliary type" can be avoided if one speaks of "sustaining specimen".

Dr. Rollins: "If we are going to use the word 'type' one might think of 'reference type', showing the interpretation of the person doing the work."

Dr. Tryon asked what was the difference from an annotated specimen.

Dr. Stafleu agreed that we must get away from using the word type.

Dr. Margadant stated that Donk had clarified the situation: this is a description of procedure. The proposal is more a commentary on the Code than a typical rule.

Proposal M was rejected.


Dr. Voss: "The question is whether an epithet can have a type."
Mr. Meikle: "That is Brummitt's point."

Mr. Ross: "This proposal is sound but needs rewording in the second line of 3rd paragraph to '...the name which, or the epithet of which,...'"

Dr. Proskauer suggested referring the proposal to the Editorial Committee.

Dr. Fosberg called attention to his remarks in the mimeographed paper circulated at the session. "If an epithet cannot have a type, must we re-typify each new combination?"

Dr. Tryon pointed out that the old name furnishes the type for a new name and the epithet is not individually involved. The type comes as a 'member' of the taxon.

Mr. Ross: "New combinations have the same type as their basionyms and both combinations and basionyms are names. Epithets can have no independent existence and so cannot by themselves have types."

Dr. Donk said that much confusion could be avoided by introducing an antonym to basionyms; call all substitute names and recombinations based on the same basionym (which have of course the same type) isynyms.

Dr. Fosberg: "It seems to me that one can move an epithet around and that the type then follows it."

Dr. Rogers moved to refer the proposal to the Editorial Committee.

Dr. Rollins stated that the section should decide now.

Dr. Proskauer said that at an earlier occasion the Editorial Committee would not accept such a question.

Dr. Schopf: "It seems to me we are dealing with a semantic problem, mostly, because the Code at present is workable. There is a question whether a different word might not serve as a better means of expression. I would greatly prefer to have the matter considered by the Editorial Committee. It need not be a substantial matter for discussion."
Dr. Rollins asked for a vote. Majority opposed.

Dr. Boivin asked for a card vote.

The proposal was rejected (169 yes, 123 no -- insufficient support under the 60% majority rule).

Recomendation 7B

Prop. A (90:78:1:20) Accepted

New Recommendation 7C

Prop. A (13:177:1:5) Rejected

Article 8

Dr. McVaugh distributed a proposed new wording and suggested that discussion be deferred until the next day in order to allow time for study. The proposal aims at establishing full agreement between Art. 8 and the Guide for the Determination of Types.

Article 2

Prop. A (46:112:2:132) Referred to the Editorial Committee

Article 10

Dr. Weresub suggested that Prop. B be taken up first so that Props.
A and C could be considered together. Prop. A contradicts Prop. C.

Prop. B (24:140:1:12) Rejected

Prop. A (57:114:7:11)

Dr. Resub summarized her position on Prop. A:

"This proposal has been made in order to stabilize an obligate link from genus, generic name, type species, & its name on to its type specimen. Proposal C would interpose taxonomic controversy between generic name & the type species as designated by the author of the new generic name. Proposal A will be presented in a re-phrased version for your consideration. But if it is rejected, let me stress the danger of stabilizing an insecurity of typification by accepting Prop. C."

Dr. Rollins deferred consideration of Props. A & C until the new text for Prop. A was received.

Prop. D (13:12:1:162) Referred to the Editorial Committee
Prop. E (4:10:1:131) Referred to the Editorial Committee

Mr. Ross suggested that the terms of reference of the committee proposed in General Proposals, Prop. B (p. 41 of Synopsis) be extended to include the consideration of the application of typification and priority to names of ranks above family.

Dr. Stafleu: "This committee would have to draw up a list of names. We still want a decision on whether or not to do this."

Mr. Ross: "I should like this Committee to have an extended mandate to study the problem as a whole. Should there be some stability above the
rank of family?"

Dr. Stafleu: "The instruction will then be different from that of General Proposal B. We cannot just refer Proposal 10-F and your suggestion to the committee mentioned in Gen. Prop. B. Does the Section want a change in the status quo of names of taxa of higher rank?"

Dr. Rollins: "This is a very important matter which deserves a bit of discussion."

Dr. Cronquist: "I hope we do not refer this to the next Congress. In considering this proposal, we should realize that its acceptance would imply the eventual substitution of names based on generic names for descriptive names of higher taxa. Names such as Spermatophyta and Gymnospermae would probably tend to be replaced by names such as Magnoliophyta and Pinophyta. I am in favor of this change, but we should recognize this probable effect of accepting the Linczevski proposal. Expansion of the principle of typification is in practice tied in with the use of names based on genera."

Dr. Stafleu: "Can we perhaps discuss this when we discuss Cronquist's proposal on the names of higher taxa?"

Dr. Cronquist: "Linczevski's proposal is a little more far reaching than mine."

Dr. Rollins: "Let us discuss Prop. F later as suggested by the Rapporteur."

Dr. Proskauer: "These other proposals are matters of practice, endings etc. It is infinitely better to discuss this general problem in the absence of the other proposals."

Dr. Rollins: "The discussion is open."

Dr. Fosberg: "This is limited to typification. Priority questions are excluded from this proposal."
Dr. Cronquist stated that this is a matter of having a reasonable confidence in the modus of typification. "Names based on types go now up to the level of family; beginning with the ordinal level we suddenly change practice to a pre-typification model. I do not know that there would be so much confusion. To me it is more a question of a logical approach to the principle of typification as introduced in 1930. We are still expanding the application of this principle. There are still some rules which do not yet fit the principle of typification. Since we are expanding we might just as well take the next reasonable and logical step."

Dr. Fosberg: "I do not object to the idea of typification of higher taxa but this proposal is so vague that it does not say what is to be done to the Code or how it should be changed."

Dr. Papenfuss: "We discussed this at Paris, Montreal, and Edinburgh. It is gratifying to see that more people are beginning to worry about the status of the taxa above the rank of families. In the past the majority of people attending the Section have felt that they did not know enough about these taxa to wish to have them conform to the principles of typification and priority. In my opinion we do not know less about these taxa than those below the level of order. In fact, I think we will agree that we do not know what a species is. I should like to propose for discussion therefore, the desirability of having the principles of priority and typification apply to all taxa, not only those at the level of family and below."

Dr. Cronquist: "As long as we are stuck with names based on circumscriptions rather than on types we are ill advised to apply the principle of priority. You may then wind up with extremely misleading names."

Dr. Stafleu: "Dr. Papenfuss is quite right in referring to our decisions at Paris, Montreal, and Edinburgh. One of the great difficulties is that we have no lists of these names. The introduction of strict priority is very difficult and many problems can simply not be solved until we
have the necessary documentation. We can dissociate the two procedures.

We could re-introduce typification and not priority. This is essentially Linczevski's point. The Russians at Leningrad have given much thought and attention to this. Even they are hesitant at the moment to adopt the principle of priority at this early state.

"If the Section thinks that we should reintroduce priority as well as typification for the names of higher taxa it will be necessary to have a definite proposal."

Dr. Schopf: "We all agree that a species has a point of contact with physical reality through its holotype. A genus, however, is a first order abstraction quite divorced from any physical representation. Families are completely synthetic in their attributes, third order abstract concepts, and higher categories are even more abstract. I should like to inquire of Dr. Cronquist whether typification of any of the higher taxa would improve their taxonomic precision. I think it will make little difference."

Dr. Cronquist: "The problem is of the same magnitude at every level above that of species. This is a matter of individual opinion, judgment, and tradition. The concept of typification works for names of genera and families and I think it would also be useful for names of higher taxa for much the same reasons. Typification is always clearer than circumscription."

Dr. Reeder: "Whether or not a group is called Angiospermae vs. Magnoliophyta it is necessary to circumscribe the group. In my opinion the arguments of Dr. Cronquist do not have a great degree of validity for the reason that the higher groups are so large. At lower levels - probably through families - typification is a very useful principle. Another question is: do we have sufficient stability in the usage of the higher taxa at this moment in history to consider typification?"

Dr. Burkart: "If typification is to be adopted for the higher ranks,
instead of maintaining the traditional names formed by circumscription, one main question has to be answered by the reformers: how can we maintain the concept of Vegetable Kingdom or Vegetable Dominion for the whole of plants as opposed to other beings? This demonstrates that the higher ranks (above the orders) have to be maintained as at present. This is also in accordance with one of the main aims of the Code: stability in nomenclature.

Dr. Dunn raised the question as to whether the use of typification for higher taxa does not simply open the door to considerable splitting and subsequent typification of numerous additional higher taxa which are probably quite unnecessary.

Dr. Proskauer in answer to Burkart, supplied an example where typification could be of help: Psilopsida and Psilophyta are obviously inspired by both Psilotum and Psilophytum. At this stage it is important to know which one is to be regarded as the type of the name.

Dr. Cronquist explained that Psilophyta was not based on a name of another (lower) taxon, but was coined anew by its author. So it happens that the same word (but not name) was used to form the names Psilotum and Psilophyta. The latter is simply a descriptive name.

Dr. Proskauer: "Is this not an example that worries us?"

Mr. Ross: "Because the Section cannot in its sessions decide whether the taxonomy of groups above family is sufficiently stable for typification and priority to be applied to them, and also because the mechanism of doing so needs to be carefully worked out, I propose that a committee be set up to examine whether it is desirable that the principles of priority and typification be applied to taxa above the rank of family, and, if so, to propose the method by which this should be done."

Dr. Rollins: "Do you wish to make a formal motion?"
Mr. Ross: "Yes, I so move."

Dr. Cronquist seconded the motion.

Dr. Rogers: "There was also a proposal about conservation."

Dr. Rollins: "My understanding is that the Committee would come back with recommendations and the reasons for them. This might include the advice to start lists of nomina conservanda but their compilation would be a separate matter."

Dr. Lanjouw: "I thought the proposal was to consider whether we have reached already the stage to start conservation. From this discussion I have the impression that we have not reached this stage."

Dr. Heywood: "I wish to propose that Mr. Ross's motion be extended so as to consider all the effects that typification of higher ranks would have on the botanical community at large, educational, teaching, etc., since they affect all botanists not just taxonomists. If accepted, the fact should be indicated to the Congress at large at the Plenary Meeting and opinions invited."

Dr. Papenfuss: "I should like to remind the Section that the present situation breeds instability. Inasmuch as priority does not apply to the names of orders we now have a situation which allows the creation of names, e.g., ordinal names, which include the type genus of previously established orders. I am in full agreement with Heywood's remarks."

Dr. Stafleu: "There is now a motion by Ross. You may amend that motion, e.g., to 'above the rank of order.' You then leave 'order' open for further discussions."

Dr. Papenfuss so moved, and Dr. Fosberg seconded the motion to amend.

Dr. Stafleu explained voting on the amendment: "Yes" means let us leave aside ordinal names for the moment; we shall then later give serious consideration to the introduction of the principles of priority and typifica-
tion for the names of orders.

Dr. Reeder expressed opposition to the motion. "As far as grasses are concerned higher taxa are a mess. Papenfuss makes it sound much more simple than it is."

Dr. Schopf: "At Stockholm we adopted the principle of priority and typification to the level of order. At Montreal it was decided that priority and typification were mostly presumption at the ordinal level and so priority and typification were limited to the level of family. I should like to ask others who know more about the present trend to speak on this point. At the moment I see no justification for a move back to the pre-Montreal situation."

Dr. Stafleu: "The action at Montreal was based upon reports from the special committees. Both the Spermatophyta and Cryptogam people then agreed that priority and typification were impractical at the ordinal level."

Dr. Cronquist stated that Dr. Copeland had tried to apply priority and typification in his scheme.

Dr. Stafleu: "If we reintroduce the principles of priority and typification for ordinal names we shall also have to conserve ordinal names. The Montreal discussion was about this point. The question is now: has a substantial change occurred since Montreal? Many botanists have dealt with the nomenclature of orders."

Mr. Ross: "It is also possible to introduce a very late starting point. This would also be some sort of conservation. The new Committee that we shall set up should consider this point."

Dr. Lanjouw: "In Stockholm we decided that priority and typification did apply to ordinal names. This was more or less a continuation from Cambridge and Amsterdam. Later we discovered that the situation with orders was much more difficult than with families; I think we still have
not reached this stage. Conservation of ordinal names is difficult: it might include the forcing of certain taxonomic opinions upon the botanical world. I am not in favor of this reintroduction."

Dr. Stafleu again explained the meaning of "yes" and "no" votes and Dr. Cronquist reiterated that this amendment would exclude ordinal names from the charge of the proposed committee.

The amendment was defeated by a show of cards. The original motion by Ross carried. [Prop. F was formally rejected at the next session.]

SECOND SESSION

Friday, 22 August 1969, 9:00 a. m. - 12:15 p. m.

(Chairman: R. C. Rollins)

Dr. Papenfuss said, in connection with the names of higher categories, that he seriously doubted that the committee which will be appointed to report at the next Congress on these names and including the question of priority with respect to these names, would be able to arrive at a decision in this matter without a catalogue of the names of the various higher categories. He moved therefore, that the committee be charged with the responsibility of preparing such a catalogue. It is understood of course that it is the prerogative of the committee to enlist the aid of other botanists.

Dr. Dunn seconded this motion.

Dr. Rollins: "Will these lists have to be placed before the next Congress in printed form? It is a good idea to have them but should we be so
specific? We cannot really force the committee to do all this bibliographic work on its own. For such lists they should have special support."

Dr. Heywood: "Does Dr. Papenfuss mean listing names or ranks? If names, the number is likely to be very large. There is no fear of such names. The fact that we have agreed to set up a Committee answers that but we should make the terms of reference wide enough to cover all such matters."

Dr. Stafleu thought that Dr. Papenfuss meant a list of names such as the Index Kewensis.

Dr. Lanjouw thought such a list would be useful. It should, however, be accompanied by a statement of the taxonomic "contents" of those names.

Dr. Proskauer: "Fear of numbers of names of higher categories is unfounded. I have made a search of such names covering the group I am concerned with. The number of relevant names is remarkably small. Those of us who have such lists should mail them to the committee."

Dr. Donk asserted that it is often difficult to find out the rank of names above the rank of an order. He had tried to do so for the Hymenomycetes and it took much research and interpretation to establish the rank.

Dr. Rogers affirmed that the chief difficulty in compiling a list of orders is that under the Code (Art. 18, par. 2) it is in many cases impossible to know whether a name published as an order retains that rank.

Dr. Stafleu: "You recognize an order by its inclusion of families."

Dr. Rogers: "You have to recognize whether they are orders or families."

Dr. Schopf: "Paleobotany exemplifies this point. Authors have fairly freely used what I presume are ordinal names but have been much less inclined to use taxa of familial rank. I should think the compilation of such a list could be very useful if undertaken from the standpoint of defining usage. The list then should be accompanied by an extensive bibliography."
Dr. Fosberg: "This would indeed be one of the most useful outcomes of such an enterprise. The committee could not be expected to solve all the problems of this sort, but at least if they isolated the problems, later authors would be greatly facilitated in working on them."

Dr. Buchheim: "From my experience as secretary of the subcommittee for family names I think it is impossible to draw up a list of names of taxa of higher ranks in the period of 5 years. A complete list for the Plant Kingdom would at least need 15 years to be prepared."

Dr. Heywood: "By all means let us investigate these problems widely but do not formally charge the Committee with making a list with all the bibliographic work involved. Is it the best use of our limited resources? May we have the views of the Rapporteur-Général?"

Dr. Stafleu: "I am in full sympathy with the feelings of Papenfuss that a survey is necessary. If we had such a list it would be enormously useful. Dr. Buchheim has said what I wanted to say also: it will be practically impossible. In these last nineteen years in which I was involved in Nomenclature it has become increasingly difficult to find volunteers for nomenclatural work. It is difficult now already to deal with nomina generica conservanda. For families we had the devotion of Mr. Bullock; he had to restrict himself to the Spermatophytes. Family names are more easily recognized in the literature; for higher taxa usage is inconsistent. We could not do anything of the kind as suggested by Dr. Schopf even though it would be extremely useful. Our Committee must investigate the general nature of the problem but we cannot ask the Committee to produce a published list."

Dr. Silva: "It seems futile to appoint a committee to consider the desirability of extending priority and typification to names of taxa above the rank of family until a catalogue of such names has been compiled which
would serve as a basis for judgment. Until the nature and extent of the problem has been ascertained, it is useless to seek a solution. I do not see why we are worried about a 5-year period. If the task were to require 15 years it would still be worthwhile."

Dr. Stafleu remarked that we have some people working in this field. Let those specialists publish the lists for their special groups. This would be a good beginning. For some other groups, however, the work is much more difficult.

Dr. Papenfuss said that maybe we cannot have the whole list ready for the next Congress but the more we know the better.

Dr. Stafleu: "Could we not ask the Algae people then to produce such a list for the benefit of the Committee as an example?"

Dr. Langman observed that the ING project also requires much information and that much of it is received by delegation. "Let us delegate the compilation of these various lists."

The motion to charge the committee with compilation of a list of names above the rank of family was put to a vote and defeated.

Dr. McVaugh's new proposal for Article 8 was opened for discussion:

Article 8, New Proposal

It is suggested that Art. 8 be reworded to read as follows [new material in brackets]:

"The author who first designates a lectotype or a neotype must be followed, but his choice is superseded if the holotype or, in the case of a neotype, any of the original material is rediscovered; [it may also be superseded if it can be shown that the choice was based upon a misinterpretation of the protologue, or was made arbitrarily without sufficient
understanding of the taxon to which the name was applied]."

Argument: The language of present Art. 8 ("The author who first designates a lectotype or a neotype must be followed [unless] it can be shown that the choice was based upon a misinterpretation of the original description") is quite at variance with current practice as set forth in the "Guide for the Determination of Types" (1966 Code, pp. 71 - 72), and is moreover impossible to follow consistently. The proposed wording is intended to correct this situation.

This matter was brought emphatically to the attention of the Committee for Spermatophyta in 1968 by proposals recommending for conservation the well known Linnaean names Asperula and Delphinium. Under present Art. 8 both names have to be conserved if they are to be applied to the taxa for which they have become familiar. Asperula was lectotypified in 1913 by Britton and Brown; the lectotype chosen was A. odorata L., now commonly considered to belong to the related genus Galium. Delphinium was lectotypified (also by Britton and Brown in 1913) on the basis of D. consolida L., a species now often treated as a member of another genus, Consolida S. F. Gray. In neither case can it be said that Britton & Brown "misinterpreted the original description"; their typifications were based upon priority of position, i.e. following American practice of the period, they chose as type of each Linnaean genus the first species listed in Species Plantarum. The system followed by Britton and Brown is explained in the introduction to their Illustrated Flora of the Northern United States, etc., ed. 2., pp. ix - x. 1913. In effect it is a "mechanical system", proscribed in the Guide for the Determination of Types as "unscientific and productive of possible future confusion and further change". As all Linnaean genera represented by species in eastern temperate North America (and many genera of other early authors) were typified in this manner in the Illustrated
... and in other American floras from 1913 on, and as these were often the earliest lectotypifications of such genera, the matter is of some nomenclatural importance. Under present Art. 8 these early lectotypifications cannot be disregarded, and only rarely can they be set aside on the grounds of "misinterpretation of the original description." even if they are patently absurd "in the light of an understanding of the group concerned" (Guide for the Determination of Types, par. 4, p. 71).

It is thought the proposed addition to Art. 8 will contribute to stability of nomenclature by permitting a more realistic treatment of arbitrary lectotypifications made in the past, without excluding such early typifications if they prove to be acceptable ones.

Dr. Lellinger proposed to add the word "or" after "arbitrarily".

Dr. Donk: "I completely agree with the general sense of the proposal. The wording, however, is such that a lot of speculation will be introduced. First choices made under the 'first-species-type' rule which are anyhow acceptable may now be abandoned. As it stands, if a type has been accepted, and is in agreement with the article as it reads now, this should not be changed as it might under the new wording."

Dr. Hargadant: "I should like to oppose this proposal since it opens the possibility of changing lectotypification for anyone who thinks the name has been misapplied and I think we should go the other way and make any lectotypification impossible. However this is not feasible and the change based on the description should remain. To open up other ways for changing should be prevented and it would be better to conserve special generic names."

Dr. McVaugh: "The rule now says 'based upon a misinterpretation of the original description'. This is too wide a statement that at any time a botanist can argue for a change."
Dr. Proskauer moved an amendment: to strike the words after the word 'arbitrarily.' "I agree that an arbitrary system is undesirable." Motion seconded by Reeder.

Dr. Weresub: "As the rule now stands it would surely cover any arbitrary decision which would not coincide with the description. You accept that and it is not necessary for you to propose conservation if you agree with the lectotypification."

Dr. Rollins: "I rather object to using the name Sisymbrium for the water cress. If we follow Britton and Brown we should have to do this. The other Sisymbriums would then have to be known by another name. We ought to vote on Proskauer's amendment."

Dr. McVaugh: "I accept that amendment."

Mr. Meikle pointed out that as Art. 8 now stands it leads to different interpretations among the members of the Committee for Spermatophyta. He was strongly in favor of McVaugh's proposal.

Proposed rewording of Art. 8 was then accepted as amended (omitting the last 12 words of the proposal).

Art. 10 Prop. F, which had been dealt with at the previous session by establishment of a committee, was brought up for an official vote and rejected.

Article II

Prop. A (54:54:1:77) Rejected. It was pointed out by Mr. Ross that acceptance would mean introducing an inconsistency with Art. 68.
Dr. Rollins asked Dr. Sayre whether the Committee for Bryophyta was ready to report.

Dr. Sayre: "We should like to take up this proposal when we discuss the report of our Committee."

Dr. Stafleu: "If we defer too many important questions to the end we shall have insufficient time for them. Can we perhaps discuss the proposal and report now?"

Dr. Sayre: "Discussion must take place together with pages 114, 115, and 116 of the Synopsis where Proskauer's statement is reproduced. The Committee sees the two Proskauer proposals as alternative statements of the same idea. Our Committee wants to accept the proposal of the Committee on later starting points and rejects Prop. A of Art. 13."

Mr. Meikle proposed for the consideration of the Editorial Committee the following amendment to the proposed new Note to Art. 13 (see p. 115 of Synopsis): "In respect of Art. 13, the group to which a taxon belongs is determined by the accepted classification of its nomenclatural type and not necessarily by the original classification of the type."

Dr. Faegri: "Could we not vote on the main idea and leave the rest to the Editorial Committee?"

Dr. Cronquist: "Is this not already implicit in the rules anyway?"

Dr. Ross: "The need for a proposal to cover the point is shown by such cases as Lycopodium, published before 1801 (by Linnaeus in 1753) but then included in the Musci although actually a Pteridophyte."

Dr. Sayre: "In the Bryophyte Committee we think it is an editorial matter and frankly we chose the wording of the Committee on later start-
ing points after having asked one by one the opinion of the non-English speaking members."

Dr. Rollins: "I propose to vote on whether we agree with the sense of these various proposals but that we leave the exact wording to the Editorial Committee."

Dr. Proskauer: "The proposal from the chair is acceptable to me."

Prop. A was then accepted as to its sense and referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. B (22:103:51:9)

Dr. Sayre reported that there had been a very close vote on this in the Committee for Bryophyta.

Mr. Ross: "The problem is the typification of generic names the species of which belong to groups with different starting points. This is set out in the committee's report, with an analysis of the possible ways of solving it. I favor the committee's solution, not Proskauer's."

Dr. Proskauer spoke in favor of his proposal: "The majority of you may think this is something which concerns only workers on later starting point groups. I want to be sure that the Code is to be interpreted in such a way that the special privileges granted to these people when granted do not interfere, or interfere only to the absolute minimum, with the work in other groups.

"I am pleading - and this is the difference with the proposal of Mr. Ross - for the type method versus circumscription [reads from p. 115, Synopsis, last paragraph].

"The introduction of these idiotic starting point groups was to introduce taxonomy into the Code. We must now ask our plants: to which
group do you belong? We answer this on the basis of the protologue. We are dealing with a generic name and must interpret it on that basis. Several species are included which thus lead us to specimens or something that would serve as type. We then exclude those specimens which belong to a group with a starting point later than the protologue. We are left with the specimens that do belong to groups of the earlier starting point and we should accordingly choose our lectotype from among them. The Committee's proposal makes the article apply to material of taxa prior to their starting point. This we should not do."

Dr. Voss read a communication from Dr. L. Holm (Uppsala) remarking on the report of the Committee on later starting points. In addition to making the rules still more complicated, he maintained that the Committee's proposal would "introduce a new idea into nomenclature, as it evidently implies typification of names considered to be non-validly published. All the provisions for typification apply to validly published names (cf. Art. 6, Note 1). If even names without any status can be typified, this ought to be clearly pointed out ...." Dr. Holm listed the four names which so far as he knew were concerned: Mnium, Clathrus, Lycoperdon, and Mucor -- of which Mnium was already conserved. Would it not be simpler to conserve the other three than to make alterations in the Code for the sake of a handful of names?

Dr. Margadant said that if we accept Proskauer's conservation proposal we need take no further action.

Dr. Donk offered a reminder that we have special rules for typification by means of non-validly published taxa.

Art. 13, Prop. B, was put to a vote and rejected.

Art. 13, new note proposed by Committee on later starting points (Synopsis, p. 116), was next under consideration.
Dr. Stafleu pointed out that this was a different proposal.

Mr. Ross: "Holm may have discovered only four names but there may be quite a number of further names in Algae."

Dr. Donk: "Among the fungi there are several names that fall in this category."

Dr. Stafleu: "We have not heard the opinion of the Committee for Fungi."

Dr. Margadant: "I am opposed to this additional note. It has another consequence. Sphagnum would become an invalid name."

Dr. Silva: "I should like to make four brief comments. First, Dr. Proskauer is trying to apply logic to an illogical situation. The Special Committee's solution is admittedly illogical, but it seems a practical solution to the illogicality of later starting points. Second, I should like to point out that it is not true that only four generic names are concerned: in the Algae there are numerous names at the specific and generic level that were originally applied to taxa encompassing plants with different starting points. Third, I should like to report the results of a canvass I made of the Committee for Algae. Of 11 members who responded, 3 voted in favor of Proskauer's proposal, 8 in favor of the Special Committee's proposal. Fourth, it is not just Art. 13 which treats various groups of plants differentially, but also Arts. 36, 39, 58, and 59. It seems to me that when dealing with those parts of Code that treat various groups of plants differentially, the taxonomic opinion of the user of the Code rather than of the original author should be followed, and that this principle should be stated in the Code."

Dr. Little: "The solution is nomina conservanda; that is the solution."

Dr. Sayre: "A further possible solution to the problem of the alternative proposals on Art. 13 is to abolish later starting points. The Commit-
Bryophytes yesterday expressed its opinion unanimously that they would favor this solution. However, this was an expression made in desperation over the present problem and might not hold on further reflection. Therefore I do not now bring forward a proposal to that effect, but suggest that all committees dealing with groups with later starting points poll themselves to see if such a proposal has a chance of passage at this Congress.

Dr. Stafleu: "This is an important point. Is your committee ready to make a proposal to abolish later starting points?"

Dr. Sayre: "We should come back to this after a further meeting of the Committee. None of us really agreed with the proposals that have been brought up. It is an illogicality added to an illogicality. We must reflect on it. That is why I suggest to all committees with later starting points that they might do this."

Dr. Fosberg: "I should like to point out that what Silva said about introducing taxonomic opinions by later workers is already introduced in the Committee's proposals."

Dr. Faegri: "I had a feeling that this note is rather rambling. I cannot propose a rewording. It cannot be done from the floor. If it is carried we should instruct the Editorial Committee to give it sense."

Dr. Rollins termed this an excellent suggestion and called for a card vote on the proposal (new note to Art. 13). The proposal was rejected under the 60% rule (158 "yes"; 120 "no").

While the votes were being counted, the second proposal of the Committee on later starting points -- an addition to Art. 43 -- was considered.

Mr. Ross: "This is only needed if the addition to Art. 13 is approved. If that is accepted, then this provision is needed for reasons analogous to those which make Art. 68 necessary."

Dr. Tryon: "These names are invalid and should not be recognized
under the Code. I support Donk's point of view on this."

Dr. Cronquist: "We are setting up again a set of exceptions to Article 13."

Dr. Donk: "I am glad Dr. Cronquist pointed this out. Why should we conserve certain specific epithets? Cannot we defer the vote on it until we have the vote on Art. 13, note?"

At this point the vote rejecting the proposed note to Art. 13 was announced. On behalf of the Committee on later starting points, Mr. Ross withdrew the proposed addition to Art. 13.

Dr. Proskauer asked for a reconsideration of the vote on Art. 13, Prop. B. "There is no introduction of a change of principle. It follows the Code as closely as possible."

The chair asked the Section to vote on whether they would reconsider, and reconsideration was defeated. Dr. Rollins then asked Mr. Ross to take the chair for the remainder of the session.


Mr. Ross: "I would suggest this is a matter for the Editorial Committee."

Dr. Cronquist: "I would suggest it is not. The name Schizomycetes implies that we are dealing with a group of fungi. I believe that most people who have any knowledge of the fungi and bacteria do not believe that the bacteria are fungi. In fact, one of the major discontinuities in the biological world is that between the eukaryotic organisms, to which the fungi belong, and the prokaryotic organisms, to which the bacteria belong."

Dr. Rogers: "Let we have a vote on it."
Mr. Poss: "I ask for a vote on the proposal itself."

Prop. C was rejected by unanimous vote.

Prop. D (102:61:16:5)

Dr. Demaret: "D'accord avec le principe de choisir arbitrairement le date du 1er janvier 1805. Mais que faire s'il y a conflit entre Persoon et Lamarck? Il serait plus simple de choisir un point de départ unique pour les subdivisions du genre: Persoon considéré comme publié le 1er janv. 1805.

Dr. Wood: "This proposal by Dr. Brizicky was prepared before his death and is documented by a long paper to appear in Taxon. The chosen date will facilitate the search for correct names of subgeneric taxa. Persoon introduced the subgenus in 1805 and DeCandolle the section in the same year. Neither author used the other category. There are a few authors who used terms similar to these during the preceding 50 years, but these works are obscure and the terms used are not in Latin form. The literature of subgeneric ranks is formidable and is largely a no-man's land. A later starting point is desirable."

Dr. Proskauer: "We already discussed later starting points this morning. I think all of you agree that the introduction of them was a great error. I plead with you not to make any further errors of that sort."

Dr. Johnson: "There is little profit to botanists in general in applying the principle of priority to categories between the levels of genus and species. Names of taxa in these ranks are mainly used only in specialized literature and the emphasis in them not on priority but on circumscription, which may vary greatly according to the monographer whose work is being followed. I therefore foreshadow a proposition to eliminate prior-
ity in these ranks, and in the meantime urge rejection of Prop. D., Art. 13."

Dr. McVaugh: "Is there somebody to speak in favor of the proposal especially with regard to this priority question?"

Dr. Wood: "It is meant to eliminate obscure literature of the second half of the 18th century. This is a very serious problem. If we could begin with these two works this would greatly facilitate nomenclature at these levels."

Dr. Voss: "Those names are unindexed. Dr. Wood's point is to give us a starting point which facilitates research."

Dr. Nicolson: "Later starting points have a serious consequences at the specific level. This proposal affects only higher ranks and I am in favor of a later starting date for subgenera and sections."

Mr. Ross commented that a single starting point for a particular rank for all plants is new.

Dr. D'Arcy: "In support of the remarks of Mr. Johnson (Sydney), I think it would be useful to abandon the concept of typification of these categories as well as priority."

Dr. Fosberg: "We do not know the consequences. I agree with Dr. Proskauer. These problems are not so enormous. Let us start indexing. Thirty years ago this proposal might have been appropriate. Now we cannot push these names under the table. Much work has already been done."

Dr. McVaugh: "I support Dr. Fosberg's position. This is against the spirit of the Code. We introduce one more exception because we simply do not take the trouble of looking at the literature such as for instance Mr. Dandy did. This weakens respect for the Code."

Prop. D was voted upon and rejected.

In connection with Art. 13, Dr. Schopf observed that of all starting point dates the distinction of "Fossil Plants" is the only one that is not taxonomic. He continued: 'There is one point of ambiguity in note 3, however,
since 'Recent' is also used in the geologic sense as equivalent to Holocene. I would suggest that the Editorial Committee be instructed to substitute the term 'modern' where 'Recent' is now stated. I feel this was the original intention and this source of uncertainty should be removed."

Mr. Ross stated that this suggestion was in accordance with the original instructions to distinguish between fossil and contemporary plants. The possibility exists that "Recent" is misunderstood as including plants of the last few thousand years. He referred Dr. Schopf's remarks to the Editorial Committee to make the intention clear.

Article 14

Prop. A (137:49:0:7)

Dr. Cronquist: "I suggest that all four of Mr. Bullock's proposals be rejected as unnecessary. Nothing is gained by putting in unnecessary phrases."

Dr. Fosberg: "I support Cronquist's suggestion for another reason. Every time we introduce a new wording, necessary or unnecessary, we may introduce unanticipated side-effects. I see nothing gained in the new wording."

Dr. Stafleu: "There was an ambiguity. I am in general agreement with Fosberg and Cronquist but an occasional ambiguity can be deleted. Prop. A is clearer to the users."

Prop. A was voted upon and accepted.

Prop. B (40:138:0:8) Rejected
Prop. C (57:105:0:16)

Dr. Weresub thought this proposal was connected to Art. 53.

Dr. Stafleu: "In my opinion this proposal is unnecessary. One can of course spell out this procedure but the committees have the authority to do this anyhow. It is impossible to spell out all reasons for conservation."

Prop. C was voted upon and rejected.


Dr. Fosberg: "This complicated statement would not improve the situation at all, but would be disregarded when convenient, invoked when convenient, just as is the present sentence. Further, the sentence is so complicated that it could be used to justify anything and might introduce ambiguity into the code. I propose to reject it."

Dr. McVaugh preferred not to make the wording any more complicated and supported Dr. Fosberg's point of view.

Dr. Voss pointed out that the details of the last sentence in the existing Art. 14 seemed largely irrelevant to present practice, but that the last sentence of Mr. Bullock's proposal presented a new idea which did in fact reflect much current practice.

Mr. Meikle: "Bullock's proposal is an improvement. The last sentence of paragraph 1 has frequently been disregarded by the Committee for Spermatophyta."

Dr. Stafleu asked if the Section would be prepared to delete the last sentence of the first paragraph of the main article. "This would be a great improvement. The sentence has been disregarded by several committees. It is an admonition that contains nothing constructive. However, I leave it to the section to propose such a deletion."

Dr. McVaugh: "In the second sentence it is stated that conservation
has to serve stability in nomenclature. We should perhaps insert here something stating whether long-term stability is meant."

Dr. Cronquist moved that Art. 14, Prop. D be amended to read that the third [final] sentence of the first paragraph of the Article be deleted. Motion to amend the proposal seconded and carried. Prop. D as amended accepted.

Prop. E (26:61:1:113) First sentence referred to Editorial Committee; second sentence referred to Special Committee on superfluous names.
Prop. F (110:61:1:4)

Mr. Ross pointed out that the proposal was an alternative to the problem dealt with in Mr. Bullock's proposal B.

Dr. Voss observed that the mail vote was very clear.

Mr. Ross stated that this applies only when dealing with homonym cases when the two names are conserved because of the change of type for instance. "The argument is written out on p. 58 of the Synopsis. One has to deal with it one way or another. I suggest to follow the mail vote."

Dr. Stafleu: "It could be confusing if this possibility of restoring a rejected name would be introduced."

Dr. Reeder: "It seems to me that it is contrary to the rules to change back again in such cases. This is no stability."

Dr. Cronquist: "The only effect would be to change author and date. Is there a real significant advantage for so doing? I doubt it."

Dr. Proskauer: "I feel sorry about it. One only repeals a superfluous and ridiculous conservation."

Dr. Stafleu: "What is ridiculous to one man is admirable to another."

Prop. F voted upon and rejected.

Prop. G (14:95:7:26) Referred to Special Committee on names of higher taxa.
The session opened with the following remarks by Dr. H.P.R. Seeliger on behalf of the Committee for the Nomenclature of Bacteria:

The International Committee on Nomenclature of Bacteria (ICNB) (formerly of Bacteria and Viruses) was established in the early thirties. This Committee is a section of the International Association of Microbiological Societies (IAMS). Its scope and organization are governed by the International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria (formerly Bacteria and Viruses) which was finally adopted at the VIII International Microbiological Congress in Stockholm in 1958. The latest version of this Code was adopted by the XI International Microbiological Congress in Moscow 1966 and published in the International Journal of Systematic Bacteriology in the English language early in 1967. (Authorized translations in French, German, Spanish, Russian and Japanese). Since the IX Int. Microbiological Congress in Moscow the true viruses are no longer governed by the Bacteriological Code, and an independent International Committee of Nomenclature of Viruses (ICNV) was established. More than 50 member societies of IAMS are represented in the ICNB. At the present time about 23 Taxonomic Sub-committees deal with special groups of bacteria. The Subcommittee on the taxonomy of yeasts was dissolved in 1962 because it was felt that these organisms should be dealt with by the botanists. The Judicial Commission, consisting of 16 members has the status of a Subcommittee.

Between the Int. Microbiological Congresses the work of the ICNB is carried on by an Executive Committee of 6 members. The Judicial Commission is supposed to meet at least every two years. The last meeting was held during October 1968 in Leicester, England, under the direction of its present chairman Dr. P. Sneath. The Opinions prepared by the J.C. are published in the Int. J. Syst. Bacteriology and may be challenged there. They are finally submitted to the ICNB during the next Int. Microbiological Congress for approval, reconsideration or rejection. All official business matters of ICNB and its Sub-committees, minutes of meetings during International Microbiological Congresses etc. are published in the Int. J. Syst. Bacteriology which in 1966 replaced the Int. Bull. on Nomenclature and Taxonomy of Bacteria.
Mr. Meikle pointed out that many species names published in horticultural and ephemeral literature (nursery catalogues, seedsmen lists, garden journals, etc.) had not been included in the *Index Kewensis* or the supplements, and many such works have not even been examined by the compilers of the *Index Kewensis*. If all such names were to be brought to light, many names well known in horticulture and economic botany would have to be rejected. To prevent such a situation arising it would be advisable to accept Bullock's Proposal A, which technically replaces Art. 69 of the Code, an article which has never been satisfactory, and which is in itself a source of considerable confusion.

Dr. Little spoke on Art. 14 bis and Art. 29, Prop. B: "Names are tools as a means to an end. There are only about 1,000 plant taxonomists working with nomenclature and more than 100,000 plant scientists working with names. Name changes are serious, for example, in seed laws. The Standing Committee on Stabilization is checking names. The number of specific names to be rejected would be negligible. Art. 29, Prop. B, by Cronquist and Gleason, is a simpler way of rejecting unlisted names not in *Index Kewensis* and Supplements as ineffectively published."

Dr. Fosberg: "A long time ago certain classes of publications were outlawed from the process of valid publication. If necessary one could expressly exclude now also the types of publications mentioned by Meikle. This would be a less objectionable procedure than introducing nomina specifica rejicienda."

Dr. Voss: "I am afraid that when eliminating only the unindexed
names in those classes of publications we run into trouble about which to accept and which not."

Mr. Meikle: "With respect to Cronquist's proposal on Art. 29 I would like to draw the attention to the fact that the names left out from Index Kewensis were often left out for obvious reasons."

Dr. McVaugh: "If we accept this for seed plants what about the other groups? Are there any nomina rejicienda of those kinds in the other groups? What is the documentation in fields not covered by Index Kewensis and what are the problems there?"

Dr. Stafleu: There are a number of catalogues such as Index Muscorum which have picked up all names. For fungi the situation is more involved; Silva's index of names of algae is not yet published. We have no overall picture. However, should we not keep the discussion restricted to Art. 14bis? We should now hear from you what you want to do with this proposal."

Dr. Fidalgo: 'If I understand the proposal it aims at maintaining well known names through rejection. Most of the cases are a question of interest only to very few people. I shall vote against the proposal."

Dr. Fosberg: "I have not heard anything which changes my opinion on this proposal. I have asked some people, botanists but not interested in nomenclature, whether they found this necessary. On the whole the response is in the vein of: we have a simple Code, let us use it."

Dr. Johnson moved that Art. 29, Prop. B be discussed first because of the close connection between the proposals. Motion seconded by Lanjouw and carried.

Mr. Ross asked to hear from the cryptogamists what they thought about Art. 29, Prop. B.

Dr. Sayre: "I see no great problems in our group. Maybe in the higher cryptogams?"
Dr. Tryon: "Problems in Pteridophyta are largely due to typification, not to names lacking in our indices."

Dr. Fosberg: "I point out that the Index Kewensis does not include infraspecific names. A considerable number of problems involving those names cannot be traced through Index Kewensis."

Dr. Stafleu: "The proposal speaks about 'specific or generic'. The difficulty with the proposal lies in first instance in the generic names. The I.N.O. will in a few years be completed and most overlooked generic names should then be known. For specific names we have the Index Kewensis: this is a different case. Whatever is happening we shall always have to link up the generic names with the specific names listed in Index Kewensis. We cannot expect that by the time the 15th supplement appears we shall have full information."

Dr. Cronquist: "There is a greater objection to this proposal as regards generic than specific names. I withdraw the words 'or generic' from the proposal. It would still accomplish the principal objective."

Dr. Proskauer: "I believe that the proposal is one that goes in the direction into which we ultimately have to go. It might have some merits as a guide to our successors if we included it in our Code, but my feeling is that the earliest possible date would be let us say the year 2000."

Mr. Ross asked for a vote on Art. 29, Prop. B and it was rejected. The discussion returned to Art. 14 bis.

Dr. Dunn asked what proportion of seed catalogues have descriptions and contain validly published new names. He personally was against rejection on a nomina rejicienda basis.

Dr. Stearn stated that there are a large number of species with valid descriptions in the seed lists. They really exist: the number is very great.
Dr. Fosberg: "These horticultural publications give usually new information and the names are effectively published but they do not tell us what they are. These names are often impossible to typify. They should simply be called *nomina dubia* as they are called in the monographs."

Dr. Moore: "I agree with Dr. Fosberg. Many of these names can indeed be considered *nomina dubia*. They are validly published but there is no type, they cannot be pinned down, it is impossible to do anything with them."

Mr. Ross asked whether any future monographer of the groups to which these names refer would not check whether they can be typified.

Dr. Voss agreed that there are indeed *nomina dubia*. What do we do with names which cannot be typified? The proposal would in effect provide for a list of *nomina dubia*.

Proposed new Article 14 bis was voted upon and rejected.

**Recommendation 16A**

Prop. A (17:113;33:14) Rejected

Prop. B (33:88;35:17)

Dr. Cronquist: "Props. B, C, D, and E make a package. I do not believe that there is any conflict between B and the others. The proposals on these endings do not really fall under the charge of the special committee. We are moving away from descriptive names towards names based on generic names. The main point is to get rid of the *-opsida* endings for classes which have not been taken up anyhow by the reference books."

Dr. Stafleu remarked on the history of the article. "The *-opsida* ending came from Lam. It was dealt with at Stockholm, but I was not there."

Dr. Lanjouw: "It really came up in the 1948 Utrecht conference before
Stockholm. Lam was in the group and then proposed -opsida. We may not all have been in agreement but we were not very much opposed either.

Stockholm accepted the Utrecht recommendation. Another proposal by Lam, a very good one, on that occasion was to use the word 'taxon'.

Dr. Rogers: "Dr. Patenfuss, Dr. Lam, and I were members of the Stockholm committee on these higher categories. We presented a report and the section adopted it. I would be very happy to go along with Dr. Cronquist as to the ending -opsida. However, it is a very distinctive ending and makes it perfectly clear that a class is meant. Dr. Cronquist does not like it, I like it. We hear a lot about stability. Let us leave the Code alone in this respect."

Dr. Reeder: "Prop. D suggests an ending for superorders. Arts. 3 and 4 deal with the principal ranks. Superorder does not appear in Art. 4, however. I suggested at Montreal myself to have superorders. It seems to me wrong that the proposals on 16A provide for endings of ranks not mentioned in the Code."

Dr. Cronquist: "Art. 4 the second part!"

Mr. Ross: "This is something for the Editorial Committee in case Prop. B is approved."

Prop. B was then rejected.

Prop. C (53:76:40:13) Rejected

**Article 19**

Prop. A (135:36:2:8) Accepted
Prop. B (41:28:2:108) Referred to the Editorial Committee
Prop. C (115:23:3:45) Accepted

Dr. Wood noted that the wording will have to be changed by the Editorial Committee to accord with Prop. A.

Prop. D (49:106:3:17)

Dr. Fosberg: "I am very dubious about this paragraph. It was put in on the supposition that an author's name behind the Latin name implies credit. To leave it out in the cases under discussion here, however, is not a very good thing. It would be more precise to have the author's name here."

Dr. Cronquist: "Here is another reason why we find ourselves in difficulties. We allow the citation for subsections ..."

Mr. Ross: "We are dealing with the level of subfamilies."

Dr. Cronquist: "That is the same situation. You might have subfamilies for which you do want to indicate the author."

Dr. Buchheim: "This provision was introduced into the last Code. Several subfamily names had to be changed to be in accordance with the Code. We have to repeat the subfamily name based on the family name. It makes no difference to cite the author."

Prop. D was rejected.

Prop. E (26:126:3:23) Rejected
Prop. F (80:75:3:20) Accepted
Prop. G (92:41:2:43)
Dr. Lellinger: "This proposal makes tautonyms priorable and this results in two sets of competing correct names. If one adopts a certain set of subfamilies, then one would adopt certain tautonyms and reject certain regularly formed names. But if other subfamilies are adopted, then a different set of tautonyms and regularly formed names would have to be adopted."

Dr. Tryon stated that recognition of the name and taxon proposed must come from the time it was formally recognized in a classification, not only when the first subdivision name was published.

Dr. Weresub also said that surely the date of publication of the name of the typical subtaxon is retrospectively that of the valid publication of the higher taxon, whether or not the subtaxon appeared as such at that time.

Mr. Ross: "When a family which had been divided into subfamilies is sunk what is the status with respect to priority of the subfamily names? The proposal tells you exactly how the priority competition works in such a case. Similar proposals at lower levels are Art. 25 Prop. C and Art. 26 Prop. C."

Dr. Cronquist: "This is more important at the variety level. The problems come up frequently: they are an awful nuisance. Too many changes in epithets are now possible."

Mr. Meikle pointed out that Art. 19 Prop. G, Art. 22Prop. B and Art. 25 Prop. C should be considered as a package.

Dr. Weresub said that Art. 19Prop. C also falls in this group.

Mr. Ross: "We are covering all levels between family and genus. The same principle should apply to all levels. The number of cases at the different levels may vary but I would propose that we take a vote on all these three propositions together and regard them as being really one proposal."
Dr. Stafleu: "Would it not be clearer, since it is evident that the principle is the same, that we take a vote on Prop. G taking into account the acceptance of proposals A and C to Art. 19? We have already taken some action which should not be revised. Let us not shift too many proposals but follow the order of the Synopsis."

Art. 19, Prop. G was voted upon and accepted [but see reconsideration later in the session].

Dr. Rollins resumed the chair.

Prop. A (136:30:2:11) Accepted

Prop. A (42:13:5:135) Referred to Committee for Hybrids [and later to the Editorial Committee].

Prop. A (141:34:1:11) Referred to Committee for Hybrids [and later accepted].

Prop. A (141:34:1:11) Referred to Committee for Hybrids [and later accepted].
Prop. A (112:55:2:14)  Accepted
Prop. B (85:35:2:59)

Dr. Stafleu pointed out that since Prop. A was accepted, Prop. B which is additional to it would have to be revised to accord with Prop. A; but the general sense can be voted upon.

Mr. Ross said the main point of substance was the sentence "Its type is the same as that of the generic name."

Dr. Margadant: "We make a fundamental change. We are here changing the rule that an epithet has priority in its own rank only."

Dr. Stafleu: "We did that already in Montreal when we accepted the rule of the automatic repetition of the epithet."

Dr. Fosberg: "The fundamental change here is giving these things priority."

Dr. Stafleu: "It is an involved situation but I must say that the Wood and Webster article in Taxon was very clearly written. In a discussion like this it is almost impossible to repeat these complex arguments and examples but the article itself is very well documented and an excellent base for action. It solves the problems of Brummitt and Chater in an elegant way."

Dr. McVaugh proposed to accept Prop. B in principle and to ask the Editorial Committee to look at it further to make it agree with Prop. A.

Dr. Langman asked that when the new Code is published, the many changes be pointed out to the users.

Dr. Stafleu: "There will be a brief report in Taxon. That will be the right place to do this."
Mr. Ross: "I suppose that the Section realizes what it has done in accepting A in removing tautonomy between subgenus and section in cases other than those involving the type of the genus. These two things do not contradict each other. It is merely an extra sentence."

Dr. Rollins called for a vote and Prop. B was accepted, to be brought by the Editorial Committee into accord with Prop. A.

Prop. C (129:36:0:19)  Accepted
Prop. D (18:11:0:121)  Referred to Editorial Committee
Prop. E (94:37:3:44)

Mr. Ross: "It is perfectly possible to read the Code as it was in the past. After our acceptance of proposal A we read it in a different way from that suggested by Tryon. [Reads first part of Art. 22]. It would be correct to read that the priority of the name that is automatically established starts at the moment of the coining of the other name. This statement is present in the Code. It is however ambiguously worded. We can settle it one side or the other."

Dr. Tryon: "My understanding of this is that the automatically created sectional name if placed under another genus will have priority. This is a different thing."

Mr. Ross: "Whether automatically established or not, it is a name."

Dr. Tryon: "Only under the generic name!"

Dr. Fosberg: "There may be rather few sectional and such names that will be transferred from one genus to another, but when we get down to subspecific epithets there will be many and we will have much name changing as a result."

Dr. Wood asked who is the author of the automatically established name.
Dr. Rollins: "There seems to be some sentiment that we are perhaps mistaken in accepting Prop. G to Article 19 because that was the first of these proposals. We should be careful not to have to correct it at another Congress."

Mr. Heikle: "Before we go any further: read the example under Article 25, Prop. C. This will throw more light on this proposal."

Dr. Fosberg: "I move that we reconsider our decision on Prop. G to Article 19." Motion seconded by Margadant.

Dr. Donk: "The explanation given by Brummitt and Chater (see p. 21 Synopsis under Art. 25) includes a statement in which they ascribe to Linnaeus something he never did."

Dr. Nicolson: "The example in Art. 25 prop. C states specifically what is the date of the name. Same in Art. 26."

Dr. Tryon: "We are getting confused. I am afraid that we are going too fast on this without knowing what we are doing. We should slow down. If the section wishes to adopt the Brummitt and Chater proposals we must be familiar with what we are doing."

Dr. Rollins: "I suggest voting on the motion by Fosberg to reconsider Prop. G to Art. 19."

Dr. Proskauer: "The proposals are carefully written down and plentifully documented in Taxon. They are in my opinion eminently sound and carry us along the path that we have chosen to take. I believe it was not wise to accept at the same time the Wood and Webster series of proposals. I urge a 'no' vote on Fosberg's proposal. A further point is that Art. 26 was mentioned: Brummitt and Chater have taken care of it. There is no problem involved."

Dr. Johnson: "I suggest that the Section reject the Brummitt & Chater proposals concerning categories between family and genus, and between genus
and species, since there's a strong case for exempting these categories (used chiefly by specialists) from the operation of priority. This does not apply to the similar proposals concerning infraspecific categories. A decision is needed on these, since names in these ranks are used by botanists in general."

Dr. Webster: "It is true that the Brummitt and Chater proposals are contradictory to ours."

Dr. Lanjouw: "All these problems go back to what we did for the species in Art. 26 at Stockholm. I proposed that new article. The 'priority' is now introduced in a wrong way. In 1950 everyone agreed that the priority of the automatically created name went back to that of the creation of the original epithet in the next higher rank. If you do this for taxa above species, there is no problem at all. The priority date of the 'automatic' epithet is that of the original author. It is thought that the original author of, say, a species described at the same time the type variety. A Linnean species of 1753 for which a variety was published later, would have a type variety epithet dating back to 1753. This is the same practice as for the transfer of epithets."

Dr. Cronquist: "If I understand Dr. Lanjouw well, his interpretation introduces further confusion. A great many varietal names have been established in accordance with the old rules: using the oldest available epithet in the category. If we now go back and reject them because of priority we are just upsetting established practice unnecessarily."

Dr. Lanjouw: "Can you give an example?"

Mr. Ross: "A lot of people have proceeded along the lines stated by Cronquist. If we accept Lanjouw's interpretation we are going to disturb many names. The proper interpretation of the Code requires at the moment the avoidance of too many changes. Both proposals if accepted will entail some changes."
Dr. Buchheim: "I am much astonished that Dr. Lanjouw holds that the date for a varietal epithet repeating the specific epithet unaltered is the date of the specific epithet, not that of another varietal epithet proposed later or even having no date or no priority at all."

Dr. Fosberg: "I moved to reconsider Art. 19, Prop. G, which deals with this problem. I also propose that tautonymous epithets are not transferable."

Dr. Lanjouw: "The epithet needs no status of priority. Take the Lobelia spicata example. As soon as there is a new variety we automatically create var. spicata."

Dr. Buchheim: "You must indicate the date."

Dr. Lanjouw: "The date of var. spicata is then 1805. As soon as you remove this variety to another species you are not removing this variety but the species itself to another species because it includes the type. There is no priority problem with the variety. The date that counts is that of the specific epithet."

Dr. Rogers: "The last sentence of Art. 26 means, I think, the automatically created epithet. This would mean that they are not transferable."

Mr. Ross: "We have three interpretations current of the date of var. spicata in Prof. Lanjouw's example: 1805; 1920; never. We must settle this one way or another. In my view the current Code makes this 1920, as is spelled out by Bruwmitt & Chater."

Dr. Rollins: "I agree with Dr. Rogers. Therefore the date of publication becomes irrelevant. You should do as you wish, as Dr. Lanjouw did, but you can also choose to ignore this and say there is no reason to have a date of publication."

Dr. Lanjouw: "As soon as you remove the variety you remove the species of which it is the type."

Dr. Fosberg: "The problem is that we have just changed this."
Dr. Rollins asked for a vote on the Fosberg motion.

Mr. Weikle observed that several botanists of several nations have in practice accepted the Brummitt and Chater position.

The Fosberg motion to reconsider Art. 19, Prop. G was carried.

Upon reconsideration, Art. 19, Prop. G was rejected.

Dr. Fosberg stated that he had also referred to the last sentence of Art. 26.

Dr. Stafleu said this could be interpreted in different ways. Some have not followed Fosberg's interpretation on the 'non-transferable' status of the automatically created epithet.

Dr. Fosberg then moved to reword Art. 26, Prop. A: "However, such automatically created tautonymous names or epithets are not transferable in any rank."

Dr. Stearn said the wording would be for the Editorial Committee. "We should speak of 'automatically created tautonymous epithets'."

Dr. Fosberg was willing to accept this term, pointing out that Art. 26 deals only with infraspecific epithets.

Dr. Cronquist wanted to be sure we all understood what we were doing. A few moments before we were asking whether automatically created tautonyms could be priorable, but now we seem to be convinced there is no priority for them. An author may then be forced to use completely inappropriate epithets.

Dr. Fosberg: "In case there is no appropriate epithet there is no objection to using the automatically created one as new."

Dr. Voss suggested a look at Art. 25, Prop. C.

Considerable additional discussion ensued on the merits, intent, and practical consequences of proposals to deal with automatically established epithets.
Dr. Proskauer: "We have changed our mind and we are now considering a change of the Code pushing it in the other direction. I am very much worried that we will be sorry about this push. I feel that we have been and are in confusion. We should leave the Code alone. I ask you to vote no. I believe the move is in the wrong direction. The fundamental point by Brummitt & Chater is soundly taken."

Dr. Heywood: "I find myself in disagreement with my British colleagues. We must push in one direction or the other. I do agree that Morton's Prop. A to Art. 26 is the correct one to accept."

Dr. Webster: "I do not think the Brummitt & Chater proposals are to the benefit of the rules. They are carefully put forward but have a wrong basis. In fact we have rejected Art. 19, Prop. G. We must go ahead with Art. 22, Prop. E and the additional proposal to Art. 25.

Dr. Schubert: "I think that it will be better to postpone the discussion until tomorrow morning."

FOURTH SESSION

Saturday, 23 August 1969, 9:00-9:45; 11:00-12:15

(Chairman: R. C. Rollins)

Dr. Rollins asked Dr. Staflieu to give a review of the situation with respect to the Wood and Webster and the Brummitt and Chater proposals.

Dr. Staflieu: "We decided to consider the whole problem of automatic repetition of names and epithets together. We are therefore talking about
Arts. 19, 22, 25, and 26 but especially Art. 19. We accepted the Wood and Webster proposal. This proposal simplified the matter before us considerably. It limits the application of the automatic creation of epithets to subdivisions which contain the type of the genus or species. It does not solve all our problems. Art. 19, Prop. C (Brummitt and Chater) was accepted on the understanding that it was to be modified in accordance with proposal A; it is accepted only in so far as it does not conflict with proposal A. Proposal E to Art. 19 was rejected; proposal G, however, was initially accepted but then afterwards met with considerable opposition. This proposal deals with the priority status of such automatically created epithets. This acceptance was due perhaps to the fact that it was late in the evening. For that reason we came back to it and rejected it in a second vote.

"Then we had a discussion how botanists had applied these rules. We asked ourselves whether botanists had indeed taken such epithets in consideration for purposes of priority in transfers.

"It then appeared from the discussion and from examples that quite a few people have acted on the understanding that these automatically created names were not available for transfers. The president supported this and I should also emphasize that this has been my understanding. This is about where we left except that one of our last speakers drew our attention to a proposal on Art. 26: Prop. A by Morton. There it is definitely spelled out, if only for one category. In addition the attention of the section was drawn to the last words of Art. 26. These words are not quite clear and this is why this diversity of opinion has arisen.

"Dr. Fosberg presented a motion which essentially aimed at spelling out that these automatically created epithets or names were not available for transfer. This is where we left off.

"I ask now Dr. Fosberg to hold that motion for a little while until
we have talked about the Morton proposal A to Article 26. This proposal is essentially the same as his proposal although limited to one rank."

Dr. Rollins: "Overnight we have been thinking about it. Dr. Fosberg may perhaps want to propose a slightly different wording. I also want to say that we do not want to speak of 'typical subspecies' as Morton does. We want to speak of the tautonyms."

Dr. Fosberg: "I am willing to withdraw this motion if a satisfactory wording from Morton's proposal can be passed. I do not know the proper time to discuss Morton's proposal."

Dr. Rollins: "We shall do that now and ask you to combine your motion with that of Morton."

Dr. Fosberg withdrew his motion and substituted a new one: to reword proposal A, Art. 26, as follows: "However, such automatically created tautonymous subspecific epithets are not to be taken into consideration for purposes of priority, nor are they transferable. Note: the same principle applies to automatically created tautonymous epithets in any rank."

Dr. Rollins: "This would be excellent."

Mr. Meikle asked if it would be possible for the Editorial Committee to think out a single term for "automatically created tautonymous epithet."

Mr. Ross: "We must take care that whatever we do about this we make it clear that when an epithet or name has been used both in an automatic tautonym and as a validly published non-tautonym it can be transferred; and also that such an epithet can be taken up as a new name."

Dr. Rollins: "The Webster proposal takes care of that."

Dr. Tryon: "New Recommendation 26A, the second example, illustrates Mr. Ross's point. Since the epithet is not automatically created it can be transferred."

Dr. Lanjouw: "I am in agreement with Tryon. Most of the problem is
solved with this new Recommendation 26A. We should adopt this in principle, with Fosberg's remarks. The Editorial Committee can then insert it in the rules."

Dr. Rollins: "We now take a vote on the sense of Fosberg's motion. The Editorial Committee will take care to apply it to the various articles."

Motion carried. "We now resume sequential handling of the proposals."

Art. 22, Prop. E was rejected.

New Recommendation 22A

Prop. A (113:51:2:15) Accepted

Article 23

Prop. A (40:113:1:22) Rejected
Prop. B (3:187:0:2) Rejected
Prop. C (39:76:50:13) Referred to the Committee for Hybrids [and later to the Editorial Committee].
Prop. D (113:8:5:29) Referred to the Committee for Hybrids [and later to the Editorial Committee]
Prop. A (48:70:38:25) Referred to the Committee for Hybrids [and later rejected]

Article 24

Prop. A (43:69:53:13) Referred to the Committee for Hybrids [and later to the Editorial Committee]

Dr. Tryon suggested to the Editorial Committee that the last phrase of the Saxifraga example read: "... by the intercalation of the names of the intermediate taxa the full classification under the species is given."

Dr. Cronquist expressed concern about an apparent conflict between Art. 24 and Art. 32, the latter seeming to declare that the Art. 24 example of Andropogon ternatus subsp. A. macrothrix was not validly published.

Dr. Stafleu: "This would cause trouble with thousands of infraspecific names. There was a decision by the Section about this particular point. The example gives guidance and this practice should be followed."

Article 25

Prop. A (94:82:8:3) Rejected
Prop. B (112:55:2:17) Accepted
Prop. C (95:42:3:35) Rejected

Dr. Rollins: "We have essentially taken care of this by accepting the Fosberg motion. The Editorial Committee is now empowered to provide a simple wording. We still have Mr. Meikle's suggestion that we find a single term for 'automatically created tautonyms.'"

The proposal was accepted and referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. B (99:58:3:17) Accepted

Prop. C (46:37:3:92) Accepted and referred to Editorial Committee to accord with Prop. B.

New Recommendation 26A


Dr. Rollins reported that in response to the urging that we simplify if possible the term "automatically created tautonym" he now heard that Dr. Fosberg suggests "autonym."

Following brief discussion, it was voted to accept the term "autonym" and the proposed new Recommendation 26A.

Article 27

Prop. A (89:50:0:40) Accepted and referred to the Editorial Committee to accord with parallel proposals.
Dr. Stafleu: "Greuter wants to make it absolutely clear that Gandoger's names are not admissible. There are different opinions on this but if Gandoger's names were to be taken into account we would add over a hundred thousand names to our synonymy. All authors have ignored them. Greuter wants to legislate this."

Dr. Cronquist: "Is this the place to introduce such legislation? Where should we place it?"

Dr. Stafleu: "There is really a case for considering this a case of doubt with respect to 'effective publication'. However, we could also consider it a question of valid publication. We might also cite Gandoger as an example e.g. under Art. 33, that is, as an example of wrong use of category designations. I must point out that a recent author, Fuchs, wants to take up Gandoger's names."

Dr. Proskauer: "I believe that we should be honest about what we are
doing. If we throw this book out we must say this is an article which does so. Let us not throw upon this case the shade of dishonesty as we did with Necker."

Dr. Stafleu: "In 'Taxonomic Literature' I have explained in some detail the position of Gandoger's microspecies. I proposed that these microspecies are infraspecific taxa with binomial designations. As such they fall outside our Code. Greuter, however, has another opinion and therefore wants to reject them in a different way."

Dr. Harvey: "Can we make it an example?"

Dr. Stafleu: "If you agree that Gandoger should be cited we could indeed insert it as an example in an appropriate place."

Dr. Margadant moved acceptance of the principle, charging the Editorial Committee to do the rest. Motion seconded.

Dr. Johnson: "Gandoger published other works. In one or two of them he did the same as in the _Flora Europae_. The form is, however, often different."

Mr. Ross: "I propose an amendment to Margadant's motion. I suggest that Gandoger's names of microspecies be included in Art. 33 as an example."

Dr. Margadant accepted this amendment and the motion was carried.

Prop. B [acted upon the previous day]
Prop. C (6:169:0:3) Rejected
Prop. D (1%6:33:0:4)

Dr. Voss: "The Synopsis contains an error here. We left out a note: "A seed-exchange list which is issued as part of a publication containing scientific papers is exempted from the provisions of the preceding paragraph."

Dr. Cronquist: "I should like to take exception to this note. Would
we not have a problem in determining this business of what are 'scientific papers'?

Dr. Stafleu: "The proposal as such has a basis in practice. Seed lists published in Linnæa for instance were adequately distributed. The note, however, talks only about a combination of the seed-list and scientific publications. The note might be omitted."

Dr. Donk: "Would you consider Science and Nature newspapers?"

Dr. Stafleu: "This part on newspapers is now new. This provision is already in the Code."

Dr. Fosberg asked if we are to vote with or without the note.

Dr. Heywood supported Cronquist. "We must be careful in the wording since it has to be made clear how much scientific material converts a seed list into a scientific publication. In practice there is a complete transition from simple lists through lists with one or two pages of scientific matter to obvious scientific publications."

Dr. Stafleu: "You propose to leave out the note."

Dr. Papenfuss: "We could also have lists of culture collections."

Dr. Stafleu: "This would be a valid publication."

Dr. Proskauer: "They are very close."

Dr. Stafleu: "Do you think people would interpret culture collections as seed lists?"

Dr. Rogers: "Some seed exchange lists are scientific publications, some not."

Dr. Dunn: "Do we vote on a motion along the lines of what Cronquist and Heywood said? Do we delete that note?"

Mr. Gilmour proposed to distinguish less ambiguously between (a) combined publications and (b) seed lists. The note could be reworded: "Other scientific publications containing seed lists . . ."
Dr. Stafleu: "Even with Mr. Gilmour's words the note is still ambiguous. Is it the sense of the section that publication should be impossible in seed lists?"

Dr. Rollins: "How many wish to get rid of the lists?"

Dr. Rogers moved to consider the proposal with deletion of the note. Motion seconded and carried. Prop. D as printed (without the note) accepted.

**Article 32**

Prop. A (1:35:1:145) Referred to the Editorial Committee

Prop. B (37:67:30:36) Referred to the Committee for Hybrids [and later to the Editorial Committee]

Prop. C (27:74:29:38) Referred to the Committee for Hybrids [and later to the Editorial Committee]

Prop. D (98:60:1:15)

Dr. Stafleu pointed out that Art. 33, Prop. C should also be examined at this point, and Dr. Voss called attention to the inconsistency in the mail vote on these proposals.

Dr. Rollins announced that first consideration would be given to Art. 33, Prop. C.

Mr. Meikle stated that Dr. Brummitt had asked him to have the Section vote separately on the various items, which are actually different subjects.

Dr. Heywood: "This is a very complicated proposal. I wonder what the Section feels about a special committee, although it is very carefully argued. I sympathize with the proposers but it is complicated."

Dr. Fosberg: "This is a set of directions for good practice but it does not belong in the Code."
Dr. Tryon: "I support Dr. Fosberg's remarks. This is the type of proposal which makes the Code far more complex. We must do everything to keep it simple."

Mr. Meikle: "This is simply a note to the Code for the benefit of the reader. Dr. Brummitt has set it out very carefully. I draw your attention to one thing: on line 4 from the bottom 'clear' must be 'cross'."

Dr. Stafleu: "I am in full sympathy with Brummitt's difficulties in compiling the Index to European Taxonomic Literature. He is extremely painstaking but I must say that I have seen him reject publications and names about which I was not too happy, that is to say not too happy about the rejections. I feel somewhat unhappy about some of his interpretations and I should not like to see them written into the Code."

Dr. Fosberg and Dr. Cronquist both agreed with the undesirability of spelling out procedure in such detail.

Mr. Ross: "The problem here is: what is a direct reference? We have 'full and direct reference' to the original publication in the Code since 1953. Brummitt tends to apply this in a legislative way, others literally. I favor a literal interpretation but I favor even more being certain. I do not think that it would be profitable to determine this morning how thus to be certain. This should be studied between now and the next Congress by either the General Committee or a specially appointed one."

Dr. Rollins called for a vote on Art. 33, Prop. C as set out by Brummitt. Prop. C was rejected.

Dr. Stearn proposed a study by the General Committee before the next Congress. This motion was seconded.

Mr. Ross said the General Committee could do it itself or appoint a special committee.

Dr. Heywood supported this. He suggested that the General Committee consider a "Code of Good Practice."