

Dr. Rollins assumed that the General Committee would judge what kind of report they wished to present.

Dr. Proskauer: "Do we not have a Code of good practice?!"

Dr. Donk: "We have a guide already for the selection of types."

Dr. Rollins called for a vote on Stearn's motion and it was carried. The matter will be placed on the agenda of the General Committee to do it-
self or to appoint a separate committee.

Art. 32, Prop. D was then rejected.

Prop. E (123:45:0:14)

Dr. Buchheim: "The proposal by Brummitt is badly worded; there are no provisions on endings in Arts. 16 and 20-27, and furthermore only the Note in Art. 18 is proposed to be deleted, but not in Arts. 17 and 19 where the same provision is made."

Dr. Stafleu: "He tries to bring about an editorial correction but he does not do it completely."

Dr. Fosberg: "What is to be accomplished by this proposal? What is not already there?"

Mr. Ross explained that the proposal was to place this provision in a more logical place, under valid publication, rather than under form of names.

Dr. Rollins asked if it would be possible to refer this to the Editorial Committee. Prop. E, upon vote, referred to Editorial Committee.

Article 33

Prop. A (75:2:1:112) Referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. B (109:56:0:23)

Dr. Lellinger suggested that "unambiguous" might be better than "unmistakable".

Dr. Silva: "The purpose of the second part of Article 33 is to require a clear connection between the new combination and its basionym, not to legislate bibliographic precision. Here, as in comparable parts of the Code, to attempt to be too specific leads to legalism in disregard for the spirit or purpose of the rule. Let me cite an example. A legalistic worker in the algae has rejected a new combination because the exact page where the basionym appeared was not cited, even though the place of publication was listed in the bibliography with inclusive pagination. The fact that this worker proceeded to remake the new combination is proof that the original author furnished a clear connection between the new combination and its basionym. The only justification for rejecting a new combination should be the inability to ascertain its basionym. Bibliographic precision is a matter of good taxonomic procedure. Similarly, we can require a description but can scarcely legislate the degree of its meaningfulness."

Dr. Rogers: "'Unmistakable' means that no one can make a mistake. 'Ambiguous' refers to the reference."

Dr. Fosberg: "'Unmistakable' is rather an absolute term. 'Unmistakable and unambiguous' goes in the same direction. I would favor either 'unambiguous' or 'clear'."

Dr. Stafleu: "Why not: 'a full and direct reference' as we have it?"

Dr. Heywood: "The word 'explicit' of Prop. D seems to meet it in fact."

Dr. Voss said that "explicit" citation of a basionym could be required, but the question was defining what constituted an explicit reference.

Dr. Stafleu: "I would favor the text as it stands. I think that 'full

and direct reference' resulting from long sessions of the Editorial Committee is the best we can do. What is 'clear'?"

Mr. Meikle moved to refer Prop. B along with Prop. C to the General Committee. Seconded by Dunn and carried. Prop. B referred to General Committee.

Prop. C (72:91:2:16) [Rejected earlier in the session, with General Committee to consider the issue.]

Prop. D (98:68:2:12)

Mr. Meikle moved that this, too, be referred to the General Committee; seconded by Dunn.

Dr. Margadant said that means "accepting" it, but Dr. Stafleu pointed out that the motion was to refer to the General Committee, not the Editorial Committee.

Dr. McVaugh: "This is not as complicated as the others. It is the question whether or not 'explicit' mention is to be stated. This is not a matter of difficult wording. Let us vote on it."

Dr. Heywood: "This has caused many problems. I cannot see why anyone can object to a perfectly clear unambiguous proposal."

Dr. Stafleu: "But now we shall have two dates: 1953 and 1971 in that one paragraph."

Dr. Cronquist: "Can you tell me how that affects cases of basionyms with the wrong dates?"

Dr. Fosberg: "In the second paragraph this is already stated."

Dr. Voss: "This is an addition to the second paragraph. After 1973 you must be clear and explicit."

Mr. Ross explained that the difference between the present wording and

the proposal was that basionyms can now be "indicated" but what this means is not effectively spelled out.

Dr. Rollins asked for a vote and Prop. D was rejected.

Prop. E (108:58:2:11) Rejected

Article 34

Prop. A (32:128:1:13) Rejected

Prop. B (72:91:1:22)

Mr. Meikle pointed out that there are really two proposals; and that Dr. Brummitt withdraws his second example [Oenothera].

Mr. Ross: "I have never been able to find a name that is mentioned 'incidentally' and has at the same time fulfilled all other requirements. These words were put into the Code in 1950 on the motion of Dr. Fosberg. I ask Dr. Fosberg what he meant by 'incidental mention' and still fulfilled the other requirements of valid publication."

Dr. Stafleu: "I must differ with Mr. Ross. In older literature we very frequently come across such incidental mention. We found several such cases in I. N. G. In some of the travel books there are often cases that can be covered by this rule. We have in such cases dealt with them because of our rule. I would like to keep this rule; it is very useful."

Dr. Buchheim: "I would like to show Mr. Ross Pflanzenwelt von Afrika and the examples in it."

Dr. Fosberg: "There is one publication before 1953 which has such cases in it. Actually that was the publication I had in mind when I proposed this."

Mr. Ross: "If this does in fact rule out some names which otherwise would not be ruled out it should stay."

Dr. Stearn suggested that some examples be sent to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. B was voted upon and rejected.

Article 35

Prop. A (134:52:0:9)

Dr. Weresub asked if we wanted to sanction in the Code names which have no priority.

Dr. Wood said this would be a very useful proposal at the present time.

Mr. Meikle moved that in the third line "except for homonymy" be added after "priority". Seconded by Stearn.

Dr. Cronquist thought the proposal might raise very difficult problems. Between 1809 and 1935, under the American Code, when people used trinomials in such cases, they intended them as subspecies. But the question is: How can we find out where they represent subspecies? With the Brummitt amendment we would have even more problems.

Dr. Fosberg asked, in regard to the Meikle amendment, how there could be a homonym if there were no rank.

Mr. Ross pointed out that names based on the same type are not homonyms.

Dr. Tryon cited an example and observed that in his introduction an author may state what he means but this may not be evident from the text alone.

Dr. Donk questioned the Triticum example. In his introduction Per-

soon explains that an asterisk means he is not sure where to place a species. This example would thus create confusion for mycologists.

Dr. Boivin stated that asterisks in Persoon have two meanings: (1) a new species or (2) a subspecies.

Dr. McVaugh supported Cronquist's statement. Names published without indication of rank do not have any priority. Many of them have been taken up as from the date they were published as a trinomial.

Dr. Rollins called for votes. The Meikle amendment was rejected and Prop. A was rejected.

FIFTH SESSION

Saturday, 23 August 1969, 2:00-5:15 p.m.

(Chairman: R. C. Rollins)

Article 35

Prop. B (4:176:2:3) Rejected

Prop. C

Note 1 (9:141:22:16) Rejected

Note 2 (75:59:23:30) Rejected

Prop. D (67:87:21:9) Rejected

Prop. E (116:35:23:13) Rejected

Prop. F (37:115:2:29) Rejected

Prop. G (7:117:3:57) Rejected

Article 36

Prop. A (63:69:28:15) Referred to the Committee for Hybrids [and later
to the Editorial Committee]

Prop. B (91:59:3:23) Rejected

Article 37

Prop. A Withdrawn

Prop. B (77:62:1:37)

Dr. Fosberg asked for a clear answer to the question: "Can there be a holotype to names of all ranks? The holotype is a specimen, it is opposed to isotype. What are the types for generic names?"

Dr. Stafleu: "On the whole we have used 'holotype' only for names of species or of taxa of lower rank. In addition there can be syntypes. We have never spoken of the holotype of a genus or of an order. We speak for instance of the type family of an order. It would be desirable to continue this usage. I would rather keep 'the nomenclatural type'. The majority of the Editorial Committee has accepted this."

Dr. Weresub: "Is there a difference between a type chosen by the author and a lectotype?"

Dr. Stafleu: "There may be a 'holotype species' or a 'lectotype species'. I think, apart from such informal statement, that such designations should not be used too much."

Dr. Rollins: "In that case 'holotype' does not apply. It simply indicates how the type is chosen."

Dr. Stafleu: "In this Code we use T for type and LT for a type specimen that was chosen. I prefer to have a vote yes or no, not to the Editorial Committee."

Prop. B was rejected by vote.

Prop. C (100:58:3:18)

Dr. Burkhart thought this a good suggestion because if only one specimen is cited the conclusion is unavoidable.

Dr. Rollins suggested voting on the two parts separately.

Dr. Weresub suggested a Recommendation rather than an Article; Dr. Stafleu suggested that the statements did not belong here; Dr. Stearn pointed out that "type of the name" must be used; Dr. McVaugh thought that this was an editorial matter.

Dr. Cronquist feared that we were leading toward an interpretation of what an author might have said.

Note 1 of Prop. C was rejected.

Dr. Cronquist expressed the same objection in principle to Note 2.

Note 2 was rejected.

Prop. D (99:64:2:18)

Mr. Meikle: "Acceptance would be of help for us. If authors have got these additional regulations we shall be free from a great deal of speculation."

Mr. Ross: "There is one thing in this paragraph that is mandatory. People should not be able to retain type specimens in their private herbaria. This is a good element in the proposal."

Dr. Rogers: "I do not know. One can designate an institution. I have sent specimens to the Missouri Botanical Garden. If I had listed them in a publication where would they be now? They are no longer there."

Dr. Stearn moved to eliminate "and permanently" as well as "other".
Seconded by Dunn.

Dr. Heywood asked if "deposited" were not better.

Dr. Fosberg: "This is another indication of a detail which is not appropriate. Let them write a text-book or convey this in a paper. Must such things be spelled out in the Code? It makes our Code more and more complicated!"

The Stearn amendment was accepted, but Prop. C as amended was then rejected.

Prop. E (80:72:2:20) Rejected

Recommendation 37B

Prop. A (20:166:0:0) Rejected

Prop. B Withdrawn

Article 40

Prop. A (37:79:46:12)

Prop. B (29:75:48:18)

Prop. C (69:35:17:45)

All three proposals were referred to the Committee for Hybrids [and later to the Editorial Committee].

Article 42

Prop. A (105:40:1:27)

Dr. Buchheim: "I speak against this proposal as a member of the Committee for Spermatophyta. We should not confuse this with other publications of generic names. The species has to be new. How can it be new when there is a reference to something that exists?"

Mr. Ross: "In cases where the species had a name that would apply. If there is a description in the literature and the author says it is a new species, it is different. I do not know how many cases there are but they do exist."

Dr. Stafleu: "There are two ways of speaking of new species. The question is: can a species be new when it has already been described without a name?"

Mr. Ross: "If there is a description in DeCandolle under the name of a Linnaean species and it turns out not to apply to that Linnaean species, how does one proceed to make it a new species?"

Dr. Stafleu: "This is then a reference to a misapplication."

Dr. Buchheim: "In that case it would be preferable, I think, not to apply this particular proposal. We should not stress this possibility too much. For historical purposes we need item (1), but I am opposed to the amendment."

Prop. A was rejected.

Article 43

Prop. A (157:24:1:12)

Dr. Nicolson: "We should also deal with infrageneric names."

Dr. Stafleu: "The sentiment of the proposal is correct but it is unnecessary. The specific epithet in such cases is admissible because we have a rule that the illegitimacy of the generic name does not necessarily make the epithet illegitimate. Since 1905 there are nomina conservanda, but this does not mean that the rejected names are invalid."

Dr. Tryon: "I wonder about Art. 68. Why does not this apply here?"

Dr. Stafleu: "There is a point about 68: Burtt says here, in this proposal, 'inadmissible', and not 'illegitimate'."

Mr. Ross: "The situation arises when one conserves a name in a later usage. The type species may then antedate the conserved generic name. This point should be solved."

Dr. Stafleu: "If there is a division of opinion it would be better to accept this proposal in order to make the situation absolutely clear."

Dr. Weresub: "Prop. B is the same. The Editorial Committee can perhaps consider the combination of the two."

Dr. Rollins: "Prop. A is under consideration now. We have a proposal by Nicolson. We shall deal first with this."

Dr. Nicolson formally moved to insert "infrageneric or" before "specific names". Seconded and carried.

Prop. A as amended by Nicolson was put to a vote and accepted.

Prop. B (120:42:3:27)

Dr. Proskauer: "I am lost about our logic. As far as I can see it is as utterly illogical as possible to have a name validly published and

legitimate as of a date which precedes that of the generic name. The only way we can take care of this problem is to assign to these earlier combinations the date of the genus as conserved."

Dr. Stafleu replied that basically conservation was against logic, but once we accepted conservation we had to accept illogical consequences.

Dr. Silva: "When a genus is conserved from an author later than the original one, a specific name published prior to the date of conservation is considered to belong to two genera of the same name: the original genus and the conserved genus. Transfer from the first genus to the second does not involve a change of authorship, nor are the two names homonyms, inasmuch as they are based on the same type. Thus, Alpinia languas dates from Gmelin 1791 even though it is placed in Alpinia Roxb. 1810 (nom. cons.). This procedure, it seems to me, is in accordance with the present Code and therefore Proposal A seems unnecessary."

Prop. B was accepted, to be brought into accord with Prop. A by the Editorial Committee.

Dr. Stafleu: "We should reword this so as to avoid the possibility of declaring such names "legitimate" if in other respects they are in conflict with the Code."

Article 44

Prop. A (9:16:2:153) Referred to the Editorial Committee

Article 45

Prop. A (9:83:1:86) Rejected [by rejection of Art. 7, Prop. D]

Prop. B (6:169:2:6)

Dr. Cronquist: "This is closely connected with another proposal which we have already rejected. It is logical to reject it."

Mr. Ross: "I think that this proposal is completely independent of the one we rejected. We refused to introduce the 'direct and unambiguous reference' but what Brummitt does is to propose to write in the Code the necessity of a full compliance with all rules for validation. Since 1953 there are various new requirements. At a given moment someone has to validate a name in all respects."

Prop. B was put to a card vote and accepted (186 "yes"; 96 "no").

Article 46

Prop. A (5:169:2:4) Rejected

Prop. B (6:169:2:6) Rejected

Recommendation 46C

Prop. A (17:138:3:26) Rejected

Prop. B (79:24:5:70) Referred to the Editorial Committee

Prop. C (64:95:3:27)

Dr. Donk moved to amend the proposal by deleting the parenthetical phrase "(with or without justification)". Motion seconded and carried.

Dr. Howard moved that the last sentence be deleted from the proposal.

Dr. Stafleu pointed out that the last sentence is the same as in the existing Code.

Dr. Stearn opposed deletion of this sentence. "It is very useful to have this indication."

Dr. Moore concurred with Dr. Stearn.

The motion by Howard was defeated.

Dr. Voss stated that since he had worked with Dr. Yeo on this proposal he should put in a good word for it. The point was to lay even greater stress on the publishing author, citation of which was already required by Article 46.

Dr. Cronquist: "Before we vote let us look at the existing Recommendation, which most people do not follow."

Mr. Ross: "It is because of this that we try to amend it."

Prop. C accepted (as amended by Donk).

Prop. D (54:100:3:21)

Mr. Ross: "This is extremely difficult in cases of new combinations. Strictly speaking the publishing author decides whether one should use ex or in."

Dr. Reeder supported Ross.

Dr. Staffeu: "In Stockholm this was 'apud' which you find in the literature."

Mr. Ross: "This was used to avoid the double 'in'."

Dr. Stearn: "The examples make it clear. We must retain the recommendation as it is."

Prop. D rejected.

Dr. Donk spoke of a previous mistake of the Editorial Committee: "Before you go on, Recommendation 46E has been edited by the Editorial Committee in such a way that it is now a source of error for the mycolo-

gists. In Montreal we accepted that pre-Linnaean names would be placed between square brackets. Mycologists used in these cases the word 'ex'. That has now been suppressed without any communication. It was suppressed by the Editorial Committee. The mycologists want the 'ex'. Look at the 3 versions in the 3 editions: they are all different."

Dr. Voss: "The Editorial Committee should be instructed to restore the 'ex' here."

Dr. Stafleu pointed out that failure to do this after Montreal was an editorial error.

Dr. Rollins assured Dr. Donk that the Editorial Committee would take this discussion to indicate that original usage should be restored.

Recommendation 46D

Prop. A (4:155:3:13) Rejected

New Recommendation 46G

Prop. A (74:103:1:8)

Dr. Langman: "These names should be retained in the interest of history. These authors made a contribution after all and if possible the citation of their names should be retained."

Dr. Burkart: "I am against this proposal and agree with Mrs. Langman."

Dr. Cronquist: "I have a practical problem. Occasionally, I have published in floristic works and I ascribed a name to another author who had not validly published it. I then used 'ex'."

Dr. Lellinger: "In the citation of the publishing author, when you have a description, you should use in, otherwise ex."

Dr. Schopf: "I agree with Lellinger. This serves to indicate the type. This is the meaning of this citation, not that of 'honoring' a man."

Dr. Fuchs: "If somebody transfers a species but does not make the combination, and another author picks it up, makes the new combinations, adds nothing further, credit is found for the original author in the 'ex-citation'. I am entirely against this proposal which aims at doing away with this normal and established procedure."

Dr. Seeder: "I should like to speak in favor of the proposal because it seems to me that this is purely a matter of honoring the original author who failed to make the combination."

New Rec. 46G rejected.

Article 50

Prop. A (37:76:47:13)

Prop. B (15:38:33:91)

Prop. C (25:74:48:20)

Prop. D (23:74:47:24)

All four proposals were referred to the Committee for Hybrids [and later to the Editorial Committee].

New Recommendation 50A bis

Prop. A (34:150:2:6) Rejected

Dr. Sayre and Dr. Margadant moved a new proposal regarding Recommendation 46D, replacing the first sentence as follows: "When a name with a description or diagnosis (or a reference to a description or diagnosis) is supplied by one author and this fact is explicitly stated by the publishing author, the name of the author of the description should be followed by the name of the publishing author, connected by the word in."

Dr. Margadant: "I would like to explain this. In the compilation of the Index Muscorum there was a difference of opinion on the use of ex and in. I want to clarify the situation by making the instruction more explicit."

Dr. Cronquist: "The explanation is contrary to what it means. There are many names of Nuttall published in Torrey and Gray and there are descriptions in quotation marks. There is no real explanation; it is not explicitly stated by Torrey and Gray that these names are by Nuttall."

Dr. Stafleu: "It is stated on the covers, see Taxon 18: 716 [Dec. 1969]; these covers are reproduced in the Hafner facsimile edition."

Dr. Cronquist: "I still think that the wording of the proposal is wrong and I am opposed to it."

Dr. Buchheim: "I am in favor of this because many people have used in for descriptions. Margadant wants to restrict it to those cases where it is explicit."

Dr. Cronquist: "There are a number of names published by de Candolle in 1837 and by Hooker in 1844. The descriptions are so similar that they must have been written by Lindley. There are some small differences but it is clear that they stem from the same source. It is very useful for bibliographical usage to ascribe them to Lindley; under the new proposal we could not do this."

Dr. Lellinger asked if this were not a recommendation for future use.

Dr. Margadant: "I have studied Hooker's Flora and there are very different things there. In several cases they sign the description and you have to make some decision."

Dr. Fuchs: "The new proposal by Margadant would rule out authors of which it is clear from sources other than the publication in which the new name and description is attributed to the author that this author is really the originator of the new taxon. For example, R. Brown in W. T. Aiton, Hort. Kew., ed. 2."

Dr. Stearn: "There is a statement. We need not bring it in."

The proposal was put to a vote and rejected.

Article 55

Prop. A (37:30:107:13)

Dr. Sayre: "This was referred to the committees for fungi and bryophytes. The Bryophyte Committee is unanimously in favor of this."

Dr. Donk: "As secretary of the Committee on Fungi and Lichens I must report that in the mail vote of the Committee (which is not yet complete) the majority is against this proposal."

Dr. Silva: "I was not able to interpret the written proposal. I asked for some help but they gave me none. We decided in the Committee for Algae that the proposal is more or less superfluous."

Proposal A was rejected.

Prop. B (2:9:4:169) Referred to the Editorial Committee

Article 56

Prop. A (28:5:1:149) Referred to the Editorial Committee

Article 62

Prop. A (114:78:0:0)

Dr. Proskauer: "I have previously opposed this at length. The crux of the issue is that by removing validity from these names the workings of the homonym rule are no longer applied to them. This would involve a considerable amount of change. Further, it would require additional change in the Code to preserve a considerable number of currently conserved names. We should reject this proposal as we have done before."

Dr. Donk: "The last phrase of the proposal is difficult to understand. Can we no longer correct epithets? Art. 73 deals only with a few exceptional cases."

Dr. Tryon: "'Valid' could be inserted between 'published' and 'name' and deleted prior to 'publication'."

Dr. McVaugh explained his position on the points raised by Dr. Proskauer.

Dr. Stafleu: "When you say that a correction is not a name (not validly published) it also does not count for purposes of homonymy."

Dr. Cronquist: "I favor what I believe to be the intent of the proposers. The objection by Donk is significant, however. An example should be given. If it is as difficult as that I would prefer to postpone a decision on this until at least I can understand it."

Dr. McVaugh: "Dr. Proskauer says that we are legislating, but these so-called 'orthographic variants' do not exist. One of the main points is that nomina nuda do not exist. They are not names although printed in fact in papers. I do not see the relevance of the argument of the homonym rule. The examples given are simply statements of facts. They are covered under the rules for orthography."

Dr. Buchheim asked how one knows that these names are not in existence. "How can we possibly consult them?"

Dr. McVaugh asked whether the Section did or did not want to retain such corrections. If so, we must conserve names which are orthographic variants which are against the rules.

Dr. Buchheim: "Then you must change the general rule!"

Dr. Staffeu: "Although I am really in sympathy with the idea of McVaugh and Bullock to deal with this matter, I must admit that after an extensive exchange of letters with them we have not reached a consensus of opinion. We deal in the Code with validly published names. These are the only ones the Code recognizes. As Dr. McVaugh correctly said, there are invalid ones that do not exist for our purposes. I do not want to conserve something that does not exist. Buchheim has also made this point: it would then be necessary to change another rule. Dr. McVaugh is correct: we should change the Code. We can change it that way. The question is: do we want to change it this way? If these names are invalid they are indeed not considered for purposes of homonymy. This has certain effects as we know from the I.N.G. In our work we have based ourselves on the present Code and we have accepted these corrections as published. If these were now thrown out - apart from other consequences which I cannot oversee with respect to homonyms - we would come into serious trouble. Cronquist is correct in saying that we have not reached the right solution

yet. It is not an ideal proposal. The concept of invalidity of publication is involved."

Prop. A was voted upon and rejected.

Article 63

Dr. Rollins stated that this was a very involved and controversial matter. Since it was late in the afternoon and discussion could not be finished, he proposed taking up Article 63 early on the next day.

Article 64

Prop. A (7:5:2:170) Referred to the Editorial Committee

Article 69

Prop. A (30:48:1:111) Referred to the Editorial Committee

The following report on behalf of the Special Committee for Nomina Ambigua had been distributed. A dissenting opinion by Dr. Fosberg was also distributed.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR NOMINA AMBIGUA

Preamble.

Article 69, concerning nomina ambigua, has been the subject of discussion at all recent International Congresses. Not only has its wording been in debate, but also its very existence. At times its deletion has been suggested, usually by botanists working far from Europe, whose attitude can readily be understood because they are rarely affected by this Article and see in it a loophole by which the workings of strict priority and the type-method may be evaded. Those who work on European botany, however, tend to take a very different view, since they have become accustomed to the rejection under the Article of a number of names which are so ambiguous as to be almost meaningless; and to delete the Article now, and thus force the adoption of these names, often in strange and unfamiliar senses (as a result of typification), would have a serious and highly undesirable effect on the presently accepted nomenclature of many well-known European species.

I myself have for many years been concerned with working out the nomenclature for lists of Flowering Plants not only from Europe but also from Tropical Africa, the West Indies, the Himalaya and other regions. Out of the thousands of names investigated for these areas I estimate that I have rejected fewer than 50 under Art. 69; all except one of them are old names based on European plants (some cultivated), and nearly all of them Linnaean names published in the Species Plantarum of 1753. (I attach a provisional list of 36 names: it will be seen that all except 3 are Linnaean names; all except 4 were published in 1753, and all before 1800; the only one not based on a European plant is Plantago cynops, but this name was later applied to a European plant.) The reason why Linnaeus's European names dominate this list is historical. Most well-known European plants were included in the Species Plantarum, and Linnaeus's species often included two or more of those recognized by later authors. In the

absence of the type-method these Linnaean names were liable to be interpreted differently by different authors, so that they were used concurrently with different meanings. Linnaeus himself made the situation worse by changing the application of some of his names between the first edition (1753) of the Species Plantarum and the second edition (1762-63), and as later botanists mostly used the second edition rather than the first these names came to be applied in the second (erroneous) sense instead of the original sense (e.g. Plantago psyllium and P. cynops, Cerastium viscosum and C. vulgatum).

Unfortunately I have no information about the extent to which Art. 69 is invoked by authors in regions on which I have not worked, such as North America, Malaysia, and Australasia; nor do I know to what extent it is used by workers on cryptogamous groups. In the absence of this information I cannot estimate how large a list would be required if it were decided to append one to Art. 69. In view of the size of my own provisional list (which covers the most-affected area) it might be quite small.

Although I believe that Art. 69, in one form or another, is essential, I consider its present wording to be unsatisfactory, quite apart from the question of providing a list. The loose phrase 'long-persistent source of error' can be interpreted differently by different authors, and can be used as an excuse for rejecting names on what I would regard as too frivolous grounds, there being no stipulation as to the length of time meant by 'long' in 'long-persistent'. In my opinion it should be made clear that this 'long' veritably means a long period of time. My own provisional list shows that, so far as Flowering Plants are concerned, I would not reject a name published later than 1794; but this may not hold for other people's lists. Nevertheless it seems clear that only really old names should be involved, and I have come to the conclusion that the Article would be much strengthened if it were limited to such names. I thought of adding a

sentence to the Article: 'This Article applies only to names published before 1800' (i.e. within a period of roughly 50 years since 1753). But then it occurred to me that such a wording would not cater for names in groups with later starting-dates. I now therefore would suggest as an alternative: 'This Article applies only to names published not later than 50 years after the starting-point for nomenclature of the group concerned'. Such an addition, in either form, would cover all the important cases known to me, and cut out the more frivolous ones concerned with more recent names.

Terms of reference of the Committee.

The Committee was asked to report on two matters:

- (i) Should Article 69 be extended to apply to potential nomina ambigua, i.e. to names that have been consistently applied in one sense since shortly after their original publication but are found when typified to apply to a different taxon?
 - (ii) Should there be, as an appendix to the Code, a list of the names to which this article applies? If the committee decides that such a list is desirable, it would be well if it compiled a draft list.
- i. Should Article 69 be extended to apply to potential nomina ambigua?

The Article at present simply states that a name must be rejected if it is used in different senses and so has become a long-persistent source of error.

Under this definition there are two main categories of names: (1) names which throughout all or most of their history have been used in two or more senses so that their meaning is no longer clear, even if typification shows that they are applicable in one of the senses concerned; and (2) names which have been consistently applied in one sense since shortly after their original publication but are found when typified to apply to a different taxon.

In fact there is no clear distinction between these two categories, there being names which come under (1) but which almost qualify for (2). Furthermore, as I see it, a name in category (2) is already implicitly covered by the Article, because it has already been used in two senses (by the original author on the one hand, and by subsequent authors on the other), and its long use in the wrong sense makes it a long-persistent source of error.

At the Edinburgh Congress in 1964 I drew attention to these names in category (2), and suggested that the Article be reworded so as to include them explicitly. In the subsequent discussion it seemed to me that not all those present really understood the point, and in the end it was proposed to add to the Article the words 'or if by transfer to a taxon to which it had not previously applied except by the original author it may become such a source of error'. The proposal was defeated. I was not surprised, for though in desperation I accepted the wording at the time I did not consider it good. The fault lay in the words 'it may become such a source of error', which were misleading, suggesting a doubt or some sort of threat. In fact, when a name is found to belong to a category (2) the fait is accompli: the name is automatically a long-persistent source of error - there is no 'may become' about it!

As I still think it desirable to make the Article explicit in this respect I suggest the following rewording:

'A name must be rejected if it is used in different senses, or has been consistently used in a sense different from that of the original author, and so has become a long-persistent source of error.'

As already indicated above, I would make the further (separate) suggestion that the following sentence be added:

'This Article applies only to names published not later than 50 years after the starting-point for nomenclature of the group concerned.'

- ii. Should there be, as an appendix to the Code, a list of the names to which this article applies?

In the 1935 edition of the International Rules the Article (then numbered 62) was followed by the sentence 'A list of names to be abandoned for this reason (Nomina ambigua) will form Appendix IV'. A similar sentence followed Art. 64 (now 70) concerning Nomina confusa. No such lists were prepared, and after debate at Stockholm in 1950 these sentences concerning lists were omitted.

Art. 69 as it stands now, without provision for a definite list, can go a long way towards achieving what I believe it was originally intended to do, i.e. to eliminate names which have become so ambiguous as to be practically meaningless; but it is unlikely to achieve stability, since not all authors will agree about the names to be rejected. For this second purpose (stability) a definite list of rejected names would be the answer, and I am therefore in favor of it in principle. There are, however, some points which I would like to bring to the attention of the Committee.

- 1) Size of the list. If my own investigations (based chiefly on the floras

of Europe, tropical Africa, the West Indies, and the Himalaya) are any guide, the number of Flowering Plant names to be listed would be quite small - though others may disagree with me and put forward larger lists. I have no idea, however, how many names would be put forward for the rest of the World, or for the various groups of cryptogams. It may be well to request the Special Committees for these groups to draw up lists of suggested names, whether or not the provision of a list is accepted at the coming Congress. With that information we should know where we stand.

- 2) There is one class of name that is difficult to cater for in a list. This includes the names of so-called aggregate species which are commonly divided into numerous 'microspecies'. Examples are Rubus fruticosus L. and Alchemilla vulgaris L. These names are widely and correctly used for the species when treated as aggregates; but when the aggregates are divided into microspecies they are dropped on the grounds that they are ambiguous at microspecific level. If a list were accepted, and these names placed on it to justify rejection at microspecific level, then the names would be barred from use at aggregate level also, so that each aggregate would have to take the oldest name from among the names of microspecies. The situation then would be absurd. This is a point which would require special legislation if a list were accepted.
- 3) If a list were accepted for Art. 69, then one would equally be required for Art. 70, as originally provided for in the Rules of 1935. This is not an insuperable difficulty; indeed the two lists could be combined into one.
- 4) If my suggestion about limiting Art. 69 to names published within 50 years of the starting-point were accepted the field would be so narrowed down that a list might not be so necessary.

I append a list of 36 names which I would recommend for inclusion in a list if the provision of one is accepted.

Examples to Art. 69.

The first example (Rosa villosa L.) is a bad one and should be replaced. Other examples can be provided according to the wording of the Article as accepted at the Congress.

J. E. Dandy.

Dr. Proskauer moved to delete Article 69.

Mr. Ross said there was a committee report before us which contains two proposals dealing with Art. 69.

Dr. Rollins set as a goal for the day to deal with one of the controversial matters: superfluous names, hybrids, or Art. 69; and he declared that Dr. Proskauer's motion was open for discussion.

Dr. Proskauer: "My objection is that the Article as it stands is in great conflict with the type method and that it has no business in our Code."

Dr. Donk: "This proposal comes up at every Congress. The argument that makes the Article stay in the Code is that it provides us with an escape clause. When we really object to a name we can still refer it to Art. 69. I should be happy to keep it in the Code."

Mr. Meikle: "I am opposed to the proposal to delete Article 69, but I agree that the Article is in many ways a very unsatisfactory one. The correct alternative to Art. 69 is the acceptance of a principle of Nomina Spec-

ifica Rejicienda; a proposal to this effect should be made at the next Congress."

Mr. Ross: "If we remove Art. 69 there will be many cases where our nomenclature will no longer be precise."

Dr. Stearn: "There is an amended version introduced by Mr. Dandy. All of the cases deal with the European flora; most of them are cases of Linnaean names. There was a certain amount of conflicting usage proposed by Linnaeus. This was got rid of by a consensus of European botanists as nomina ambigua. Mr. Dandy has introduced a list. I can tell that this cites a number of Linnaean names, e.g. one in Ulmus. I propose modification of this article in Dandy's sense."

Dr. Rollins: "There is a motion before the house."

Dr. Buchheim: "As a member of Committee for Stabilization I might point out that this committee has used Art. 69 in compiling its list. To delete Art. 69 certainly would upset the stabilization of many important plants and thus work against the general sense of the Section of Nomenclature as expressed at Edinburgh."

Dr. Fuchs: "A name can become ambiguous, but has to be used when the wording of Art. 69 is kept as it is; one has then to wait until the name has become ambiguous in order to delete the ambiguous name. Art. 69 as reworded and amended by Dandy will still leave open ambiguous names after the deadline. A better wording may be to extend the Article to apply also for future names becoming ambiguous. 'If a name has or will be a source of ambiguity'."

Dr. D'Arcy: "There are good examples of names which would fit perfectly into the category of nomina ambigua which have become clarified through the close study of many people, e.g. Solanum nigrum L. and Cap-sicum annuum L. This principle of nomina ambigua in the code closes

the door on the historical types and names which will perhaps yield to future workers."

Dr. Wood: "The committee on ambiguous names is divided. I agree with the opinion expressed by Dr. Fosberg but before voting on Dr. Proskauer's proposal we should consider Mr. Dandy's proposals, carefully, including that of limiting the effect of Art. 69 to 50 years after the starting point. Certainly if Art. 69 is retained a list of ambiguous names should be appended, for as it stands all names are subject to personal interpretation and even a committee will have great difficulty in reaching decisions."

Dr. Heywood: "This subject comes up regularly at nomenclature sessions and all the arguments have already been rehearsed. It is a form of intercontinental warfare! Has anything changed since Edinburgh? The onus is on those who oppose Art. 69 to give new reasons for rejecting it. One thing that has changed is that we have a list prepared by Dandy, vol. 2 of *Flora Europaea* has been published, and vols. 3, 4, and 5 are in active preparation -- all based on acceptance of Art. 69. Typification studies will not, as has been suggested, solve the problem. The names are used in different senses and ambiguous and fail to serve as a means of communication."

Dr. Rollins: "I should like to limit the debate. U. S. botanists never act as a body. We consider each case individually and on its merits."

Dr. Johnson: "The purpose of the Code is not to uphold principle and logic, but to provide a stable nomenclature. The problem presented by the European botanists is a very real one, and is not solved merely by typification. The well-documented proposals of Dandy provide a clarification and restriction of Article 69, which is what we need. The intercontinental dispute should not be allowed to interfere with this."

Dr. Rollins: "I still insist there is a motion to delete Art. 69 before the Section."

Dr. Fuchs: "To introduce a time limit as proposed by Dandy may solve the problem. After that deadline we may rephrase Art. 69, not only with the past but also with the future in mind. We should not close the door entirely."

Dr. Tryon: "The new element in Dandy's Proposal - 'persistently used . . . etc.' would prevent reapplication of a name by correct typification."

Dr. Faegri: "It should be taken into consideration that there is no proper committee report. Mr. Dandy's letter - to which I large subscribe - is chiefly an expression of his personal views. The present wording of Art. 69 is not fortunate, Mr. Dandy's proposal is an improvement, but even now the article is not good enough, and the matter should be left for future study by a reconstituted committee."

Dr. Rogers: "The usefulness of the article concerning nomina ambigua is not a matter of geography. At the Stockholm Congress we were told that the problems previously solved by Art. 70, concerning nomina confusa, had better be solved by typification. The problems now solved by Art. 69 can be solved in the same way."

The motion of Proskauer to delete Art. 69 was voted upon and defeated.

Dr. Stafleu: "We are ready to vote on the proposals made by this committee on ambiguous names. I confirm what Dr. Faegri said: this report is more a proposal by Dr. Dandy."

Dr. Faegri moved that the matter be deferred for further study. Motion seconded by Lanjouw and carried. Dr. Rollins declared that a committee would be established to report to the next Congress.

Dr. Proskauer moved that study of Articles 70 and 71 be added to the charge of the committee. Motion seconded by Heywood and carried.

The proposals regarding Articles 69 and 71 were thus dealt with. Dr. Lanjouw asked whether matters were referred to the existing committee

or to a new committee, and Dr. Rollins replied that a new committee will be appointed to work over this material and report by 1975.

Mr. Ross asked whether the appropriate committee might be the present Committee for Stabilization.

Dr. Stafleu: "I would not do that. I am chairman of that committee but that committee is charged with the specific task to study certain cases. I would rather try to find people for that committee. I must give a word of warning. This committee was difficult for me as rapporteur because I could not get it working. At the last minute Dr. Dandy has indeed taken much trouble in writing this but only after five years. There were no others. If some of you might feel capable but still reluctant to give time we shall have the same result."

New Article 69 bis

Prop. A (6:176:3:4) Rejected

Article 71

Prop. A (8:30:146:6) [Previously referred (see above) to a new special committee.]

SIXTH SESSION

Sunday, 24 August 1969, 9:00-11:30 a. m.

(Chairman: R. C. Rollins)

Dr. Rollins opened the session by calling for discussion on Dr. Weresub's amended proposal on Article 10, as follows:

The nomenclatural type of genus is a species* ...

*This type species is the one indicated by name in accordance with Art. 37 or, in pre-1958 literature, indicated by name as (holo) type or as "the one element" in accordance with Art. 7, or selected as lectotype from among the species indicated by name by the author of the genus, unless this author explicitly excludes the type specimen of the species named, or declares that he questions its inclusion in his type species.

Post-validation publication of a "corrected" determination of the material the author had at hand may not be used retroactively to change the typification of a generic name.

Dr. Rollins: "This proposal is in direct conflict with Prop. C of Dr. McVaugh, which puts the emphasis in another direction. We ought to consider both these proposals for discussion at the same time."

Dr. McVaugh discussed Prop. C and suggested deferral of action on Props. A and C for consideration by interested persons, through the General Committee, so that a new proposal might be worked out before the next Congress.

Dr. Weresub: "Prof. Nannfeldt pointed out to me that the second paragraph could better be a note preceding the example rather than a statement in itself. I agree to have it as a note." [Dr. Weresub then illustrated her proposal on the blackboard, with discussion.]

Dr. Fosberg: "If the protologue of such a generic name as Pseudo-larix is regarded as composed of two elements, even though one had not been named, any lectotypification must be considered in light of what the de-

scription says and will ultimately stand or fall on this basis."

Dr. Margadant: "I should like to have a decision at this Congress and not by a later Congress. We should vote on Weresub's proposal."

Dr. Lellinger: "Dr. McVaugh's motion has precedence and we have to decide on that first."

Dr. Margadant: "I spoke against that motion."

Dr. Proskauer: "We are facing here a situation where a man said 'what I have in hand is called by this name'. He said so in error, he should not have said so, but he meant what he said. We are not here to discuss what our little brains want the man to do. All we have to consider is what he actually did."

Dr. Weresub: "I fully agree. It is lectotypification coming into the matter. You must take a decision on the species which best satisfies the protologue. Nobody else's taxonomy can come into the picture. The question is to fix the type of the original author. Why you would like to accept a later typification I cannot understand."

Mr. Ross: "Dr. Weresub's proposal takes no account of the names of genera published without mention of included species. This case needs to be covered. Furthermore, the principle of the type method is that names should be applied in the sense of the original author, and Weresub's proposal is contrary to this."

Dr. Moore **said** that as he was heavily involved he would like to comment. He quite agreed with Mr. Ross, but contended that here there is no opportunity to lectotypify. In the Chrysolarix case, by mentioning a specific name Gordon holotypified his genus [Pseudolarix]. He may have erroneously done so but we must have a legalistic approach: he did mention the name and we cannot escape it. Mr. Bullock has recommended looking at Gordon's synonymy: he wants to accept the implicit statement not the explicit.

It is a regrettable circumstance that the choice of type is based on a misunderstanding. "I would be most happy to go to Pseudolarix; we must, however, look at what was said."

Dr. Voss: "Article 10 says that the type of a genus is a species, not that it is the name of a species."

Dr. Donk asked Dr. Weresub about the Cyphella example. He had not seen the type of C. goldbachii.

Dr. Rollins said the issue was clear and called for a vote on the McVaugh motion to consider this between now and the next Congress.

Motion carried. Art. 10, Props. A and C deferred for consideration, a new proposal to come through the General Committee.

The report of the Committee for Hybrids was presented by Dr. Stearn, who introduced it with an eloquent discussion of the need to abandon the Victorian idea that hybrids were something not quite decent and had to be kept hidden.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR HYBRIDS

The Committee for Hybrids (inadvertently called the Committee for Cultivated Plants on p. 8 of the Synopsis [and in Div. III of the Code]) has considered all the proposals for the nomenclature of hybrids in the Synopsis. At present most of the regulations for the naming of hybrids are segregated from the main text of the Code as Appendix I. Acceptance of Article 3, Prop. B (Yeo) means the incorporation into the main text of the provisions relating to interspecific hybrids (i.e. hybrids between species of the same genus) but the retention in Appendix I of those relating to intergeneric hybrids (i.e. groups of hybrids between species of different

genera). The Committee discussed this matter thoroughly and consulted other botanists. On grounds of logic, convenience, and clarity it concluded unanimously that all provisions relating to hybrids at present in Appendix I should be inserted at appropriate places, with consequential editorial modification, in the main text, and Appendix I abolished. Accordingly it strongly proposes acceptance of Art. 3, Prop. B in the following modified form, i.e. Art. 3, New Prop. C:

'The principal ranks of hybrid taxa are, in ascending sequence, interspecific hybrid and intergeneric hybrid; their nomenclature is governed by the general provisions of this Code. They have the same ranks as species and genus respectively.

'The Committee suggests that, to avoid any possibility of confusion the following note be added: "The term interspecific hybrid, whenever used in the Code, refers to a hybrid between species of the same genus"'

As stated in the Synopsis (p. 8), this would contribute much to the consistency and clarity of the Code. It could be managed without making any change in the present numbering of articles in the Code. If agreed in principle, the work of integration, along the lines put forward in the first of Yeo's parallel series of proposals, could be left to the Editorial Committee. The Editorial Committee would ensure that cross-references to the present Appendix I were eliminated and others substituted as references to relevant articles. Acceptance of this transfer automatically implies consideration only of Yeo's first series of proposals. The excellent index of the Code would ensure that provisions relating to hybrids could be readily be found, thus removing the only argument for keeping them out of the main text.

The recommendations of the Committee on most of the proposals relating to hybrids are as follows:

Art. 3B; substitute for this new Prop. C above

Art. 3C (above): yes

Art. 4A: yes

Art. 7L: yes

Rec. 20A, Prop. A: yes

Art. 21A: yes

Art. 23C: yes

The Committee proposes that to avoid the anomaly of referring to the epithets of hybrids as 'specific epithets', the term 'collective epithet', already in use in the International Code for Cultivated Plants (e.g. Art. 14), should be adopted here.

In the 3rd paragraph on p. 20 at the end of the 2nd line delete 'or' from 'form or by a'

New Rec. 23C: no.

If Appendix I should be retained separate, the Committee would recommend deletion of Rec. H 5A as proposed by Tryon (Synopsis, p. 39).

Art. 24 A: yes

New Rec. 24C: no

Art. 28 B: yes

Art. 28 New Prop. D. To avoid homonyms in the names of sexual hybrids and graft-chimaeras (dealt with in International Code of Nomenclature

for Cultivated Plants, Art. 20-24, but liable to be overlooked by users of I.C.B.N.) the Committee proposes the following addition to Art. 20:

'The name of a graft-chimaera of any rank must not be the same as the name of a sexual hybrid of the same rank'.

Thus +Crataegomespilus applies only to graft-chimaeras of Crataegus and Mespilus, *Crataemespilus only to sexual hybrids of Crataegus and Mespilus.

In the next to last paragraph, read: 'plants in cultivation, including graft-chimaeras, appear in,' etc.

Art. 32 B: yes

Art. 37. The Editorial Committee should note the need for correlation with Art. 40, possibly by the addition of 'except for the names of a hybrid group, which is a condensed formula or its equivalent (see Art. 40).'

Art. 40 A: yes

Art. 50 A: yes

Art. 50 B: yes

Art. H.1C: yes

Art. H.1D: no

Art. H.3D: yes

Art. H.5C: yes

Art. H.5E: no

This proposal could lead to numerous name changes, particularly in

Mentha, Populus, Salix, Ulmus, etc., and new combinations attendant with unnecessary and difficult bibliographical work. The Committee did not have time to draft and approve the needed alternative proposal. The following provisional version, prepared by the Secretary, is accordingly put forward for consideration:

'An epithet published before 1975 subordinate to the binary name of a recognized hybrid but at a rank other than that of nothomorph is treated as if published at the rank of nothomorph; the name of the original author being cited, followed by an indication of the original status (cf. Art. 50). Example: Carduus × orthocephalus Wallr. nm. mulliganii Boivin (pro forma).'

W. T. Stearn, Secretary

Also distributed with the committee report was the following motion presented by Dr. Demaret on behalf of the botanists of the National Botanical Garden of Belgium:

All particular rules for hybrids and cultivated plants shall be grouped in special appendices with cross references in the general articles concerned, so that these rules are coherently united in one place to avoid treatment in several places.

Examples: 1) Art. 28 should be restricted to a reference to Appendix I and a reference to the International Code of cultivated plants and the particular rules of this article should be treated in an Appendix

2) Art. 40 should be replaced by a short article: "Validity of

publication of the names of plants is treated in Appendix I,
Names of hybrids and of special categories."

Dr. Rollins: "The report is now open for discussion."

Dr. Tryon: "Hybrid articles should definitely be in a separate appendix as much as possible."

Dr. Faegri: "It is not admissible to use the term rank in connection with intergeneric vs. interspecific hybrids. A genus is a higher rank than a species because it includes one or more species. But e.g. a Festuca-Lolium hybrid does not include any interspecific hybrid within Festuca. If we want to differentiate between the two categories, another word than rank must be used. However, a nothomorph is a subordinate rank in relation to the complete concept of the hybrid because the hybrid may comprise a number of nothomorphs."

Dr. McVaugh: "The articles in the appendix have the same worth as those in the body of the Code. We are changing their place only to achieve a more convenient use."

Dr. Donk: "If the new proposal Art. 3, Prop. C is introduced ("The principal ranks of hybrid taxa are ...") I should like to know whether a botanist is obliged to treat a plant as a hybrid if he thinks so."

Dr. Stearn: "If you recognize a thing being a hybrid you do so."

Dr. Donk: "Are we obliged to follow the words for hybrids?"

Dr. Stearn: "If you do not publish a name it does not exist, but otherwise you use the Code."

Dr. Donk: "I was afraid of that."

Dr. Durm said we should encourage the naming of only those hybrids which are established or repeated sufficiently often that they represent entities which require names because the taxa will occur repeatedly in nature or in cultivation.

Dr. Rollins called for a vote on the principal question: to bring the articles relating to hybrids into the body of the Code. This proposal was rejected.

Dr. Rollins: "The next problem is to deal with any other aspects of the report that differ from the present appendix. We should not go through everything and I ask Dr. Gilmour to identify those differences."

Dr. Gilmour: "The main item left as being not connected with the transfer of the appendix is Art. 7, Prop. L."

Dr. Stafleu: "I wonder whether it would be possible to make a shortcut. We should not use our time now on technicalities that can very well be left to the new Committee for Hybrids. The Section has taken a decision on one major item. Apart from that there are four or five questions left. You could approve these on the understanding that the appendix remains intact, leaving the actual wording to the Editorial Committee and the hybrid committee."

Dr. Tryon: "There is a clear understanding which of the new proposals do affect the present appendix. Let us just identify only the things that are new."

Dr. Rollins said other matters would be left to the Editorial Committee and the new Committee for Hybrids.

Dr. Gilmour: "The adoption of the word 'collective epithet' is to be decided upon by this Section. Also perhaps the deletion of Rec. H. 5A should be brought before the Section. The difference is purely that an epithet of a hybrid is different of the epithet of a species. It is a terminological question."

Mr. Ross said it was important for the Editorial Committee to know if such epithets are not counted for purposes of homonymy.

It was voted to accept the term "collective epithet" instead of "specific epithet" for hybrids.

Dr. Tryon urged deletion of Art. H. 5A, as he had proposed.

Deletion of the Article was accepted.

Mr. Meikle proposed that Art. H5, Prop. E and the alternative proposal of the Hybrid Committee should be rejected on the grounds that it would unduly restrict the number of ranks below the level of an interspecific hybrid, a hierarchy of such subordinate categories is particularly needed in such genera as Salix, Populus, Ulmus, Mentha.

Motion seconded by McVaugh.

Dr. Gilmour: "Any subordinate rank to a hybrid must be a nothomorph."

Dr. Stafleu pointed out that it is still possible to have more ranks under more general articles of the Code, but that you cannot use the same infraspecific epithet twice under a specific name--they would be homonyms. This is what Dr. Stearn means; the proposal stabilizes procedure and saves names.

Dr. Rollins called for a vote on the Meikle motion and it was defeated. The last paragraph remains in the report of the Committee for Hybrids.

The report of the Committee was then accepted, with the understanding that the Editorial Committee and the new Committee for Hybrids would refer material to its proper place in light of the decision to retain Appendix I.

Dr. Stafleu then noted that we had to dispose of the Demaret motion and explained that the Brussels proposal wanted to transfer even more hybrid provisions from the Code to the Appendix. He inquired whether the Code for cultivated plants was meant, too.

Dr. Gilmour: "We decided to keep the Appendix. We have done what they asked."

Dr. Demaret: "We should like to transfer the general as well as the

special rules to the Appendix and to restrict the general article to a cross-reference."

Dr. Stafleu: "This is editorial."

Dr. Rollins: "The Editorial Committee will take care of this, unless I see some objections."

Dr. Buchheim: "The 'example' in the motion says that Art. 40 should be replaced. This is something we have not decided upon."

Dr. Stafleu: "It speaks about 'validity of publication'. We shall have to check this."

Dr. Faegri: "May I bring to the attention of the Editorial Committee the first sentence in Article 28."

Dr. Margadant: "If we want to keep the Code as it now stands you should reject the proposals by Demaret."

Dr. Rollins: "It does not specifically say so. They are only examples. I shall clarify the issue by asking for a vote on Demaret's examples."

Dr. Rollins proposed to clarify the issue by asking for a vote on the examples in Demaret's motion. It was voted to exclude the examples from the motion, which was then accepted for reference to the Editorial Committee for action in the spirit of the previous motions.

Superfluous Names (Art. 63)

The report of the Committee on Superfluous Names (Appendix C, Synopsis pp. 74-99) was opened for discussion. The only member of the Committee present was Dr. Silva, who noted the complexity of the problem of the Committee. "The correspondence was not simple. The actual result was that each member stayed with his own ideas. Only with great difficulty would someone approve even part of the other ideas. The result

has been a series of independent proposals. It is impossible to give a report in view of this diversity of opinion."

Dr. Stafleu: "This is a most peculiar report. I have encountered many difficulties to make this ad hoc committee work. Some people refused, others simply did nothing. In the end I asked Conrad Morton to take the chairmanship. He tried very hard to get some action. The General Committee suggested a few new names: Burt, Jacobs, and Singer. The group then considered what happened at Edinburgh and sent to Morton their own ideas on the Edinburgh report, including new suggestions and proposals. To Conrad Morton's utter dismay these five individual reports turned out to be almost as different as one could imagine. It did not give him a basis for a report which even had a majority and a minority version in it. He asked me what to do and I advised him to present us the versions of the five members. It is a report consisting of five sets of opinions. I have tried to facilitate the task of the section by incorporating in the preliminary vote the proposals put forward by these five gentlemen. The vote is clear, I am glad to say; this should simplify our procedure. Burt has proposed nomina specifica conservanda with the suggestion, if I understand him correctly, to set up a committee and save all necessary names in the next three years or so. I have already asked him how to find the people, but Burt went to Australia and my letter came back unanswered. We have here a preliminary vote on all these various proposals which will provide guidance. Would it not be best to go through these proposals and eliminate quickly those which were very clearly rejected? We could then have a general discussion such as in Edinburgh because the issue is still important."

Dr. Rollins: "First let me say that although my name appeared in the literature as chairman that was a mistake, I never agreed to serve as such."

Dr. Margadant: "That was a superfluous name!"

Dr. Fosberg: "The simplest solution - this is a motion - to the problem before us is to reject the report of the Committee and to let the articles concerned stand as they are." Motion seconded by Eichler.

Dr. Papenfuss: "It took an enormous amount of time and I do not want to reject. Let us table the report."

Dr. Tryon: "I do not want to speak against tabling or rejecting. The heart of the matter, however, lies in Prop. G by Morton. This amends the article in the correct way. This is also done in my proposal (to Art. 63). In essence we have only these two proposals. I move an amendment to the tabling motion, to consider Prop. G and original Prop. C."

Dr. Cronquist stated that a tabling motion cannot be amended.

Dr. Stafleu pointed out that this was an American peculiarity, which would introduce a new element into the Nomenclature Section -- although it was true that such amending was not done in this country.

Dr. Rollins asked Dr. Fosberg if he were willing to accept a version of his motion which would allow these two proposals still to be discussed.

Dr. Fosberg agreed to these two exceptions, observing that we could spend the rest of the day if we discussed the whole report.

Dr. McVaugh pointed out that Prop. G was favored by more than 50% of the mail vote.

Dr. Donk asked for an explanation of "tabling a motion."

Dr. Rollins: "Put aside and do not consider it. It has nothing to do with the next Congress. You cannot tie the hands of that Congress to this report. The proposal is that the report be tabled, with the exception of the consideration of Prop. G of the committee and the proposals to Art. 63 in the Synopsis."

Dr. Stafleu explained the present status of things: "The chairman asked Dr. Fosberg to modify the motion. The section probably agrees to table the motion with exception of the consideration of those two proposals. This would mean that if the motion is accepted, we would just talk about Prop. G by Morton. After that we come back to the separate and independent proposals in the Synopsis. These may be of minor importance, but they have to be dealt with."

The tabling motion as amended was carried.

Dr. Weresub asked what it meant to do something "by implication."

Dr. Voss suggested that the examples referred to in Prop. G gave guidance on this. Admittedly, "implication" may be difficult to determine.

Mr. Meikle proposed that Prop. G be reworded to read "demonstrably" after "unless the type is at the same time excluded", rejecting Morton's phrase "either explicitly or by implication." Seconded by Proskauer.

Mr. Ross: "In many cases 'sensu' is omitted by old authors but they must be assumed to have intended it."

Dr. Tryon: "Implicit exclusion of the type can be taken as coming from the description, which is not intended or desirable."

Dr. Faegri: "Morton introduced on p. 90 'either explicitly or inferentially' which is not the same thing as implicitly. I do not know who is responsible for the difference."

Mr. Ross said he had urged Morton to do this. "Inferentially" is not really the correct word to indicate the kind of cases that matter, such as Dr. Tryon spoke of.

Dr. Fuchs: "I wonder whether the example mentioned by Dr. Ross (Tryon's cases) can be classified as implicit. Citation of a later author is explicit. The example of Pseudolarix is a case of a generic description not being in agreement with the type species cited by the original author. What is 'implicit' here?"

Dr. Langman: "Mr. Ross said 'inferentially' is not the same as 'by implication'. Mr. Morton took these words as meaning the same thing."

Dr. Lellinger stated that Morton's word ultimately was "implicitly."
"He made that change himself."

Mr. Ross called attention to the Luffa case on p.111 of the Synopsis and said it was necessary to make clear that citations of this kind be taken as binding, as did the Committee for Stabilization.

Dr. Tryon pointed out that a great many of the arguments in favor of Prop. G of the Committee were also in favor of his proposal, which he asked be considered at the same time, explaining the substance of Prop. C.

Dr. Weresub asked if Dr. Tryon would agree to remove "with its original author".

Dr. Donk wondered about lectotypification after publication. After proper lectotypification one should not have superfluity. One should use the type method and not the circumscription method. He observed that the discussion on this subject was rather abruptly stopped at Edinburgh because of lack of time, although nobody was really satisfied that the proceedings had really ended. He concluded: "We have various opinions and a mail vote. There is a lot of discussion about interpretation. I propose that the committee continue its work and that it include in its discussions the possibility that in the future some groups will be exempted from the application of this Article. The phanerogamists have already done a lot of their work. There are a few groups which had the benefit of not understanding or not wanting to apply Art. 63."

Dr. Rollins: "Do you want to bring this as a motion and refer these articles to a new committee together with the proposals?"

Dr. Donk: "Yes, I put this forward as a motion. The committee could continue. They should meet and also take into consideration further suggestions." Motion seconded by Dr. Langman.

Dr. Stafleu explained that the motion by Donk was to continue the Committee and specifically charge it with consideration of the possibility of exempting certain groups from the consequences of Art. 63.

Dr. Rollins said he would refer these proposals to such a committee.

Dr. Lellinger: "It seems to me that when one has five years to propose something one expects that it is well founded and should be taken up now."

Dr. Stafleu: "You state that there were five years. Dr. Donk and his colleagues duly made proposals, published them and put them before the committee. The only difficulty was to get this committee to work."

Dr. Silva: "I should like to speak in favor of Dr. Donk's proposal. Unless one were on the committee, one would be unable to appreciate the great amount of time and thought that went into this report. Although Dr. Stafleu has indicated that the Committee was late in getting started, it in fact operated assiduously for several months. It seems inappropriate for the careful deliberations of the Committee to be considered so hastily on the floor of the Nomenclature Section. I should like to say something about the history of the working of the Committee. It was obvious from the beginning that Mr. Morton believed that the most important charge of the Committee was to consider the addition of such words as "inferentially" or "by implication" to Art. 63 so as to salvage certain names that otherwise would be considered superfluous. Mr. Morton was amazed to learn that three members of his committee - Jacobs, Burt, and I - felt that the problem of superfluous names went much deeper, and indeed we three challenged the idea of legitimacy, preferring to consider the status of names only in terms of validity and correctness. In this connection, I should like to suggest that a study of the zoological code would help to clarify our thinking concerning the concept of legitimacy. Contrary to what has been

suggested on the floor just now, I believe that Prop. C (p. 33) and Prop. G (p. 94) involve nit-picking. If the report of the Committee is a rat's nest, as has been stated, its condition merely reflects the condition of the pertinent parts of the Code."

Dr. Rollins: "This is a complex matter. We must arrive at a consensus. The articles dealing with this should be submitted to a body that would study them further."

Dr. Fosberg: "I propose an amendment to the motion to the effect that Props. G and C still be considered." Seconded by Lellinger.

Dr. Papenfuss: "I hope you vote against what Dr. Fosberg proposed. We should refer this back to the committee and not waste our time."

Dr. Lellinger: "Dr. Tryon's proposal to amend Art. 63 (his proposal C) is in fact quite different from Mr. Morton's (proposal G) in that it would restrict sharply the operation of Art. 63 to cases of obviously superfluous names. Mr. Morton's proposal, on the other hand, preserves the traditional and contemporary use of this article, and therefore should be adopted."

Dr. Fosberg said his proposed amendment in no way affects the action of the committee. It would make the article a little more precise and workable from now until the next Congress.

Dr. Rollins called for a card vote on the amendment to exclude from the tabling motion Proposals G and C. Amendment carried (145 "yes"; 135 "no").

SEVENTH SESSION

Sunday, 24 August 1969, 2:00-4:10 p. m.

(Chairman: R. C. Rollins)

Dr. Rollins called for a vote on the Donk motion, as amended, to refer proposals on Art. 63 to a special committee to report to the next Congress. Motion carried. Discussion then resumed on Props. G and C.

Dr. Rollins turned to Mr. Meikle's suggestion to amend Prop. G by inserting "demonstrably" in the Note to Art. 63 and deleting the proposed phrase "either explicitly or by implication". He urged all speakers to be as brief as possible, and said Props. G and C were very much alike.

Dr. Donk: "I do not agree that Props. C and G are more or less of the same kind. Prop. C, by Tryon, restricts, Prop. G, Morton, modifies the standing Article. If we accept Tryon's proposal we deal with superfluous names only in the strictest sense. If we adopt this we shall have to make further additions. What Dr. Tryon wants is an impossible task. What is Dr. Tryon's intention?"

Dr. Stafleu: "It does not matter what Dr. Tryon thinks. Every text has to be interpreted by the botanical community, and every change entails new difficulties."

Dr. Donk: "Prop. G was agreed upon by three members of the Committee. Dr. Silva's proposal was rejected. The Morton proposal brings about a clarification."

Dr. Rollins: "I propose that we vote as quickly as we can on Prop. G. If you do not approve of Prop. G we discuss C."

Dr. Tryon: "It would be appropriate to explain my proposal. It should be clear that it aims at precision in what is meant by 'inclusion of a type'."

Dr. Cronquist: "I move that we express the policy of this body by voting first in principle on the spirit of these two proposals. If we are in agreement we consider one or the other or refer it to the Editorial Committee".

Motion seconded by Boivin and carried. The spirit of the Section is to adopt one of the proposals.

Mr. Meikle: "I have proposed an amendment to Prop. G."

Dr. Lellinger: "We have not emphasized the strict interpretation of the use of this article as should be made clear by the note to Art. 63. Names not obviously superfluous should not fall under Article 63. Acceptance of Prop. C however, will shift the application of the article in the wrong direction."

Dr. Tryon: "Prop. G should be rejected in order to avoid too many changes in nomenclature because of the different interpretation."

Mr. Ross: "I disagree with both proposals. They both restrict the operation of Art. 63. This is undesirable."

Dr. Staffeu: "In view of the fact that this is an important matter I should state my preference. You want a vote on G and C. The vote will be on the two because the 'spirit' motion shows that you want to make this Article more precise. The more general proposal is to be preferred over the more specific one. Morton's proposal will be helpful for further clarification and I prefer to see this proposal accepted."

Dr. Rollins called for votes on the issues.

The Meikle amendment was defeated.

Prop. G was accepted as printed in the Synopsis (p. 94).

Prop. C was rejected.

Mr. Ross and Dr. McVaugh urged the Editorial Committee to consider the many useful examples in the report of the Committee on Superfluous Names, despite the fact that the proposals themselves have been tabled. Action then resumed on sequential consideration of proposals in the Synopsis.

Article 72

- Prop. A (9:29:2:143) Referred to the Editorial Committee
 Prop. B (122:36:0:27) Accepted
 Prop. C (39:20:1:123) Referred to the Editorial Committee

Article 73

- Prop. A (19:14:2:157) Referred to the Editorial Committee
 Prop. B (12:54:1:120)

Dr. Margadant thought there should be a definite vote on this.

Dr. Faegri called attention to the work on this matter in the ICSU Abstracting Board.

Dr. Buchheim spoke against the examples, and Dr. Stafleu reported that the example of Saurauja had been withdrawn.

Prop. B was rejected.

Mr. Meikle asked what happens to a name such as Guava, which would have to become Guaua.

- Prop. C (12:118:13:28) Rejected
 Prop. D (14:9:2:160) Referred to the Editorial Committee
 Prop. E (3:28:3:148) Referred to the Editorial Committee
 Prop. F (63:9:2:200) Referred to the Editorial Committee

Recommendation 73C

Prop. A (54:101:2:28)

Dr. Stearn explained that he had made this proposal because he was asked so many questions on these matters.

Prop. A accepted.

Recommendation 73D

Prop. A. (7:162:1:14) Rejected

Article 74

Prop. A (8:128:11:26) Rejected

Appendix I

Almost all proposals had been covered by the previous motions to retain Appendix I and otherwise to accept the report of the Committee for Hybrids -- or were obviously to be referred to the Editorial Committee in the light of those motions. In regard to the title of the Appendix, Prop. A was referable to the Editorial Committee and Prop. B was rejected as no longer applicable. The proposed deletion of Rec. H. 5A had been approved.

Appendix II

Prop. A (99:44:30:16)

Dr. Voss called attention to a letter from the Subcommittee for Family Names, which unanimously rejected this proposal, arguing (among other things) that the proposers had drawn all their supporting statements from the Greek and not the Latin.

Dr. Wood: "I am a member of that subcommittee. A family name must be derived from the stem. We feel very strongly that every single case should be dealt with separately."

Dr. McVaugh: "Somebody should present the other side of the case. We are conserving family names. We conserve such names so as to conserve current usage. Capparidaceae is in current usage. On the basis of a technicality we have conserved Capparaceae, a form which was not used before, but it is not in the spirit of conservation of family names to do so."

Dr. Cronquist: "Mr. Stearn has shown that Botanical Latin is an independent language. We are then not bound by the rules of classical Latin and we should stick to the more familiar names. This is a reversal of conservation."

Dr. Buchheim: "Since Stearn in his Botanical Latin uses 'Capparaceae' we should follow this. To conserve Batidaceae, etc. in that form would necessitate changing Art. 18 which requires derivation from the stem. Cannabaceae and Capparaceae have been used now in many publications. Takhtajan has also used the names as given in the Code. The Committee is reluctant to invent new names or new forms but in this case we had no choice."

Dr. Fosberg: "Is not conservation essentially a procedure disregarding the rules?"

Dr. Stafleu: "I have great admiration for the work that has been done by the Committee. We have made ourselves unpopular, alas, with quite a few people with the adoption of the new form Capparaceae. From a linguistic point of view both interpretations seem to be possible. In such a case I should have retained Capparidaceae. For the other three names we should follow our committee."

Dr. Stearn: "We cannot escape from this change. There is no evidence in the old literature to support Capparidaceae. On the other hand in the pharmaceutical Latin of the 18th century 'capparidas' was used."

Dr. Cronquist moved to amend the proposal by striking out the names Batidaceae, Cannabinaceae, and Haloragidaceae -- retaining only Cappari-
daceae. Amendment was seconded and defeated.

Dr. McVaugh called for a card vote on the proposal, and it was re-
jected (114 "yes"; 188 "no").

Guide for the Determination of Types

- Prop. A (13:97:4:72) Referred to the Editorial Committee [this had in
effect been done along with Art. 7, Prop. A]
- Prop. A (11:85:1:86) Rejected
- Prop. C (11:152:1:15) Rejected
- Prop. D (45:31:1:103) Referred to the Editorial Committee
- Prop. E (60:79:1:35) Accepted

Guide to the Citation of Botanical Literature

- Prop. A (62:90:1:34)

Dr. Margadant said there is a standard bibliographical practice.

Mr. Ross: "In botany, where we are so much concerned with priority, the actual date is of primary importance. That date should not be in brackets but should be the main one."

Dr. Buchheim: "There are two different methods. The bibliographical way is to indicate the printed date followed by the correct date in square brackets. If you do it different you do it the wrong way and people do not know what you mean."

Dr. Daniels: "I am in favor of this proposal, especially the use of square brackets."

Dr. Langman: "In the Index Nominum Genericorum we do as Mr. Ross says: we put down the correct date first and the title-page date in parenthesis and in quotation marks. This is another way out of the problem."

Dr. Burkhardt: "I use this method in the Flora Argentina: first put the real date and in brackets the date on the title-page in quotation marks."

Dr. Proskauer: "I am very much in favor of following the I.N.G."

Dr. Stafleu: "As soon as the ICSU code on abbreviations in data processing has been accepted we should discuss whether this has implications for our Code."

Prop. A was rejected on a motion to leave this part of the Code as it stands.

Prop. B (19:136:1:27) Rejected

New Appendix IV

Prop. A (8:45:120:6)

Dr. Silva read the report of the Committee for Algae, which was accepted -- thus rejecting Prop. A and referring the matter to the International Association of Microbiological Societies.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ALGAE

The Committee was canvassed for its opinion concerning those proposals of special interest to phycologists. Of these matters, only those not acted upon by the Nomenclature Section are herein reported upon.

I. Article 10. The Committee voted 7 to 4 in favor of the principle of typifying names of monotypic genera by reference to material in hand rather than to the citation of synonyms. It should be noted that the list of conserved names of algae was drawn up following the Paris Congress in accordance with the principle of 'material in hand' after consulting with the Bureau in Utrecht.

II. Article 13. It is the opinion of the Committee that the rejection of both Article 13, Prop. B, and the alternative proposal offered by the Committee on Later Starting Points (Synopsis, p. 116) leaves unclear the situation regarding the typification of the name of a taxon that originally comprised plants of normal (1753) and later starting points. As evidence of the diversity of opinion on how to proceed with typification in such a case, three members voted to accept Proskauer's interpretation while eight members accepted the procedure outlined by the special committee.

Appendix B. The Committee recognizes the desirability of a uniform designation of cultivated algal strains and fully supports Komárek's effort to establish such a system. However, it is their opinion that this

matter is beyond the purpose and scope of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature and recommends that it be referred to the Section on Culture Collections of the International Association of Microbiological Societies. It should be noted that some of the organisms considered algae by one group of workers are considered animals by another group of workers. In order to avoid the same type of unsatisfactory situation that exists in the naming of taxa of these same organisms in which two competing nomenclatures, one botanical and one zoological, have developed, any code for the designation of cultivated strains of algae should be an integral part of a broader consideration encompassing all protozoa and protophyta.

III. Proposals for the Conservation of Familial Names.

The Committee approves the conservation of (249) Cladophoraceae DeToni (6/0/0) and (250) Siphonocladaceae Schmitz (6/0/0).

IV. Proposals for Conservation of Generic Names.

The Committee approves the conservation of

- (159) Porphyridium Nägeli (8/1/0)
- (161) Homoeothrix Kirchner (7/1/1)
- (260) Coleochaete Brebisson (9/0/0)

The Committee withholds action on

- (201) Cyclococcolithus Karptner (4/1/4) and
- (231) Hormidium Klebs (2/4/3) pending further study.

Cyclococcolithus is hereby referred to the Committee for Fossil Plants in view of the fact that the proposed nomen rejiciendum applies to a fossil taxon. In the case of Hormidium, the Committee wishes to investigate possi-

ble alternative courses of action before accepting or rejecting the proposal.

The Committee agrees to the addition of Bostrychia Fries ex Fries as a nomen rejiciendum under Bostrychia Montagne (7/0/0).

The Committee wishes to apprise the Committee for Fungi of the existence of Phloeospora Areschoug 1873 in the Striariaceae (Phaeophyta), which should be considered in connection with the proposal to conserve Phloeospora Wallroth 1833 (Deuteromycetes). By a vote of 6 to 2 the Committee expressed the opinion that the possibility of conserving the algal name should be left open.

P. C. Silva, Secretary

General Proposals

Prop. A (73:66:7:35)

Dr. Fosberg was of the opinion that the Editorial Committee could decide whether we need such a committee.

Dr. Cronquist opposed the proposal, as the latter part of it could lead to very radical changes.

Dr. Rollins called for a vote and Prop. A was rejected.

Prop. B (76:77:6:21) Referred to the Special Committee on Names of Higher Taxa.

Nomina Conservanda

Dr. Stafleu reviewed the reports ready to be acted upon. All were accepted by the Section, as follows:

- (1) The reports itemized on p. 107 of the Synopsis, all of which had been approved by the General Committee, and the family names listed on p. 100.
- (2) The reports in Appendix E of the Synopsis (on pp. 117 - 124).
- (3) The reports in the Taxon preprint (18: 477-482) distributed to the Section [Report XI of the Committee for Spermatophyta and Final Pre-Seattle Report of the Committee for Fossil Plants].

Items 2 and 3 still required approval by the General Committee [which was subsequently given]. [The Algae family names on p. 100 of the Synopsis and the names in the Report of the Committee for Algae, which was presented at the Section and accepted, were also subsequently approved by the General Committee.]

Committee Reports

COMMITTEE FOR HYBRIDS: Report has been given (pp. 00-00) and accepted.

Division III of the Code should give the correct name of this committee.

COMMITTEE ON STABILIZATION (Synopsis, pp. 108-114): Dr. Schubert called attention to the report. Mr. Ross suggested that a final corrected list be published in Taxon or Regnum Vegetabile so it will find a permanent place on library shelves. Motion seconded by Stearn and car-

ried, the report accepted with this understanding.

COMMITTEE FOR ALGAE: Report has been given (pp. 00-00) and accepted.

COMMITTEE ON SUPERFLUOUS NAMES (Synopsis, pp. 74-99): Report has been dealt with.

COMMITTEE ON GLOSSARY: The Glossary has been published (Reg. Veg. 56).

Thanks were expressed to the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON LATER STARTING-POINTS (Synopsis, pp. 114-116): Report has been dealt with.

COMMITTEE ON NOMINA AMBIGUA: Report has been given (pp. 00-00) and dealt with.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE: Dr. Papenfuss presented the following report, which was accepted:

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEES

Rapporteur-général: F. A. Stafleu, Netherlands

General Committee

Chairman: R. Ross, U. K.

Secretary: E. C. Voss, U.S.A.

Appointed Members: H. Hara, Japan

J. S. L. Gilmour, U. K.

M. Lange, Denmark

G. F. Papenfuss, U. S.A.

R. C. Rollins, U. S. A.

G. M. Schulze, Germany

M. Mathias, U. S. A.

Ex-officio members: C. Taylor, U. K. (as president of IAPT)

F. A. Stafleu, Netherlands (as rapporteur-général) and
as secretary of IAPT

The secretaries of the regular and standing committees.

Editorial Committee

Chairman: F. A. Stafleu, Netherlands (ex officio, as rapporteur-général of the previous Congress).

Secretary: E. G. Voss, U. S. A.

Appointed members: R. McVaugh, U. S. A.

R. Ross, U. K.

G. M. Schulze, Germany

R. de Vilmorin, France

C. E. B. Bonner, Switzerland

J. M. Schopf, U. S. A.

R. D. Meikle, U. K.

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

Committee for Spermatophyta

Chairman: H. Hara, Japan

Secretary: R. McVaugh, U.S.A.

Members: R. Bakhuizen van den Brink, Netherlands

G. Buchheim, U.S.A.

R. Brummitt, U. K.

Hj. Eichler, Australia

F. R. Fosberg, U.S.A.

W. Greuter, Switzerland

H. Hylander, Sweden

I. Linczevski, Russia

E. Mendes, Spain

G. Wagenitz, Germany

J. Proskauer, U.S.A.
 G. Sayre, U.S.A.
 W. C. Steere, U.S.A.
 R. v.d. Wijk, Netherlands

Committee for Pteridophyta

Chairman: R. E. Holttum, U. K.
Secretary: R. E. G. Pichi-Sermolli, Italy
Members: H. Ito, Japan
 F. Jarrett, U. K.
 K. U. Kramer, Netherlands
 M. L. Tardieu-Blot, France
 M. Tindale, Australia
 R. M. Tryon, Jr., U.S.A.
 E. Schelpe, South Africa

Committee for Algae

Chairman: G. F. Papenfuss, U.S.A.
Secretary: P. S. Dixon, U.S.A.
Members:

P. Bourrelly, France	A. R. Loeblich, Jr., U.S.A.
M. Chihara, Japan	H. Luther, Finland
T. Christensen, Denmark	R. Ross, U. K.
T. Desikachary, India	P. Silva, U.S.A.
M. Doty, U.S.A.	R. Simonson, Germany
J. Gerloff, Germany	H. B. S. Womersley, Australia
C. van den Hoek, Netherlands	A. D. Zinova, Russia
L. Irvine, U. S.	
J. Komárek, Czechoslovakia	

Committee for Fossil Plants

- Chairman: J. M. Schopf, U.S.A.
- Secretary: A. Traverse, U.S.A.
- Members: S. Archangelsky, Argentina
 N. A. Bolkhovitina, Russia
 W. G. Chaloner, U. K.
 W. R. Evitt, U.S.A.
 K. Faegri, Norway
 J. W. Finkhouser, U.S.A.
 L. Grambast, France
 F. P. Jonker, Netherlands
 S. H. Manay, U.S.A.
 S. V. Meyen, Russia
 N. Snigirevskaya, Russia
 R. Potonié, West Germany
 J. Townrow, Australia

Committee for Hybrids

- Chairman: W. T. Stearn, U. K.
- Secretary: P. Yeo, U. K.
- Members: S. Danert, Germany
 J. Gilmour, U. K.
 G. Krüssmann, Germany
 G. H. M. Lawrence, U.S.A.
 E. L. Little, U.S.A.
 F. Meyer, U.S.A.
 E. McClintock, U.S.A.
 F. Schneider, Netherlands

W. H. Wagner, U.S.A.

P. Wendelbo, Norway

Standing Committee on Stabilization

Chairman: F. A. Stafleu, Netherlands

Secretary: B. C. Schubert, U.S.A.

Members: G. Buchheim, U.S.A.

E. L. Little, Jr., U.S.A.

H. E. Moore, Jr., U.S.A.

W. Punt, Netherlands

C. Quartly, U. K.

C. E. Wood, U.S.A.

Special Committee on Typification

and Priority of Taxa above

the Level of Family

Chairman: A. Cronquist, U.S.A.

Members: T. Christensen, Denmark

L. Holm, Sweden

I. Linczevski, Russia

J. M. Schopf, U.S.A.

P. C. Silva, U.S.A.

Special Committee to Report on Articles

69, 70, & 71

Chairman: F. A. Stafleu, Netherlands

Secretary: K. Faegri, Norway

Members: C. R. Benjamin, U.S.A.

B. Boivin, Canada

F. R. Fosberg, U.S.A.

V. Heywood, U. K.

L. A. S. Johnson, Australia

B. C. Schubert, U. S. A.

Final Comments

Dr. Stafleu reported on the way in which the list of institutional votes had been drawn up in the past. Some changes were needed. Dr. Rollins suggested that the General Committee should be instructed to draw up a new list. It was so moved and carried.

Dr. Weresub asked about nomina conservanda prop. 136, listed on p. 102 of the Synopsis. Since Art. 10 had been dealt with, prop. 136 can be taken up. Dr. Stafleu pointed out that General Committee and Congress action must await a report on the matter by the Committee for Fungi.

Dr. Rollins assured the Section that the Editorial Committee would attend to any inadvertently unfinished business. Dr. Tryon moved that it be authorized to do so. Motion carried

Dr. Donk reported that our Russian colleagues wanted to bring out a Russian translation of the Code. Dr. Stafleu said that Dr. Linczewski had written him about this, and he advised him to base the translation on the Seattle Code. The changes will be sent to him as soon as possible.

Dr. Silva called attention to the omission in the Code of Art. 17, Prop. C, which had been accepted at Montreal. Dr. Stafleu assured him that the matter would be placed before the Editorial Committee.

Dr. Stafleu asked that authority be given the Bureau of Nomenclature

to draw up a motion to present before the Plenary Session of the Congress, to accept our decisions. Motion made and carried. [The following resolution was subsequently adopted:

"Be it resolved that the decisions of the Nomenclature Section with respect to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature as well as the appointments of the officers of the Nomenclature Committees made by that Section in its plenary meeting of Sunday August 24th, 1969, be accepted."]

Dr. Stearn: "Before you close this business I should like to say on behalf of our colleagues that we thank the Rapporteur and the Vice-rapporteur who produced such good reports. I admired the reasonable way the great number of proposals was handled and the fairness with which you conducted this business. We are grateful to you for the extraordinary manner in which you handled this. I know from a similar position myself how you have to keep your eyes on everything. To the chairman and to all the members of the Bureau we want to express our thanks."

Dr. Rollins: "I wish to add my words to those of Dr. Stearn, especially to the Rapporteur and the Vice-Rapporteur. I very much appreciate the indication that the meeting has been successful. I hope that it has indeed been a successful session. If there is no more business we can close the session."

The final session was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.