



XII International Botanical Congress: Mail Vote and Final Congress Action on Nomenclature Proposals

Author(s): Edward G. Voss

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Feb., 1976), pp. 169-174

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1220431>

Accessed: 13/04/2014 09:50

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Taxon*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

NOMENCLATURE*

XII INTERNATIONAL BOTANICAL CONGRESS: MAIL VOTE AND FINAL CONGRESS ACTION ON NOMENCLATURE PROPOSALS**

Edward G. Voss

Article, etc.	Yes	No	Sp. Comm.	Ed. Comm.	Congress action
<i>Principle II</i>					
A	13	61	0	165	Rejected
<i>Principle III</i>					
A	21	167	2	43	Rejected
<i>Principle IV</i>					
A	69	98	3	54	Rejected
<i>New Principle VII</i>					
A	7	217	1	13	Rejected
<i>Article 3</i>					
A	27	196	9	7	Rejected
B	50	183	5	3	Rejected
C	42	24	157	10	Reworded ¹
<i>Article 4</i>					
A	6	235	0	2	Rejected
B	17	220	1	5	Rejected
C	11	227	2	1	Rejected
D	40	143	2	55	Rejected
<i>Article 6</i>					
A	8	170	1	56	Rejected
B	3	173	3	61	Rejected
C	1	226	1	12	Rejected
D	3	225	2	10	Rejected
<i>Article 7</i>					
A	79	21	3	130	Accepted
B	152	53	2	26	Accepted
C	21	34	2	180	Ed. Comm.
D	42	166	3	27	Rejected
<i>Article 9</i>					
A	115	82	8	26	Rejected

* Edited by R. H. Petersen, Knoxville, Tenn., U.S.A.

** Tabulation of 254 ballots received as of June 9, 1975. For proposals, see Taxon 24: 201-254 (February 1975). Proposals and amendments not published are noted here only if *accepted*; a full account will be presented in the Report of the Nomenclature Section.

¹ The section accepted a new wording for Article 3, Note 1, as proposed by the Committee for Fossil Plants:

“Note 1. Since the names of species, and consequently of many higher taxa, of fossil plants are based on fragmentary specimens, and since the connection between these specimens can only rarely be proved, form-genera are distinguished as taxa within which species may be recognized and given names according to the Code.

“A form-genus may be unassignable to a family, but may be referable to a taxon of higher rank (see Art. 59).” [Examples to be in a single list with no reference to form- and organ-genera.]

Article, etc.	Yes	No	Sp. Comm.	Ed. Comm.	Congress action
<i>Article 10</i>					
A	79	18		137	Accepted
B	15	207		12	Rejected
C	12	217		5	Withdrawn
D	12	217		5	Withdrawn
<i>Article 11</i>					
A	55	20	0	159	Accepted
<i>Article 13</i>					
A	19	9	193	4	Accepted
B	8	23	197	5	Rejected
<i>Article 14</i>					
A	33	33	2	171	Ed. Comm.
B	131	52	1	53	Accepted
C	53	171	5	6	Rejected
D	65	161	4	6	Withdrawn ²
E	91	137	4	6	Accepted
F	7	199	1	32	Rejected
<i>Article 16</i>					
A	196	25	5	9	Accepted
B	75	27	118	8	Accepted
<i>Recommendation 16A</i>					
A	209	15	3	8	Accepted
B	210	13	3	7	Accepted
C	7	219	1	8	Rejected
D	30	133	5	65	Rejected
<i>New Recommendation 16B</i>					
A	190	31	5	7	Accepted
<i>Article 17³</i>					
<i>Article 18</i>					
A	9	209	2	12	Rejected
B	88	60	61	24	Accepted
C	17	85	118	11	Withdrawn
<i>Article 19</i>					
A	10	193	2	28	Rejected
B	127	52	13	39	Accepted
C	24	88	103	14	Withdrawn
D	93	107	6	22	Rejected
E	22	30	2	179	Ed. Comm.
F	96	94	5	19	Tabled
<i>Article 20</i>					
A	16	213	0	3	Rejected
<i>Recommendation 20A</i>					
A	23	206	2	4	Rejected
<i>Article 23</i>					
A	14	21	189	10	Accepted
B	102	92	2	34	Rejected
C	12	41	1	177	Ed. Comm.
D	28	173	1	32	Rejected
<i>Recommendation 23B</i>					
A	24	197	0	13	Rejected
<i>Article 24</i>					
A	12	212	1	13	Rejected

² A substitute proposal from the floor was rejected.

³ Proposal from floor (Zabinkova & Kaden) to refer consistently to "termination" rather than "suffix" or "ending" accepted (applies also to Arts. 18, 19, etc.).

Article, etc.	Yes	No	Sp. Comm.	Ed. Comm.	Congress action
<i>Article 26</i>					
A	5	188	0	47	Rejected
<i>Recommendation 26A</i>					
A	19	183	0	29	Rejected
<i>Article 28</i>					
A	62	71	60	31	Accepted ⁴
B	4	183	3	58	Rejected
C	130	34	32	34	Withdrawn
<i>Article 32</i>					
A	6	86	1	137	Rejected
B	21	145	3	56	Rejected
C	2	33	5	191	Rejected
<i>Recommendation 32B</i>					
A	8	221	2	6	Rejected
<i>Article 33</i>					
A	2	196	2	32	Rejected
B	1	182	2	46	Rejected
C	4	169	1	61	Rejected
D	9	156	0	65	Ed. Comm.
E	180	45	0	13	Rejected
<i>Article 34</i>					
A	6	21	201	9	Rejected
B	8	203	2	18	Withdrawn
C	95	115	2	17	Rejected
D	17	136	2	67	Ed. Comm.
<i>Article 35</i>					
A	140	85	5	8	Accepted
B	152	72	5	5	Accepted ⁵
C	173	53	3	6	Accepted
D	54	161	6	9	Rejected
E	34	186	5	9	Rejected
<i>Article 36</i>					
A	7	228	0	1	Rejected
<i>Article 41</i>					
A	7	28	186	3	Rejected
B	7	206	2	15	Rejected
C	3	82	6	138	Rejected
<i>Article 42</i>					
A	24	15	184	5	Accepted
<i>Article 46⁶</i>					
<i>Recommendation 46E</i>					
A	71	127	28	10	Rejected
<i>New Recommendation 46G</i>					
A	25	176	4	27	Rejected
<i>Recommendation 47A</i>					
A	12	173	0	47	Rejected
<i>Article 48</i>					
A	21	196	1	13	Rejected

⁴ Amendment from the floor (Fosberg) accepted to add "This does not prevent the use of ordinary botanical names for such taxa if convenient or desired."

⁵ Amended to use date of 1 Jan. 1890 instead of 1900.

⁶ A proposal from the floor (Botschantzev) was rejected, but the General Committee is to name a special committee to report to the next Congress on transliteration of authors' names from non-Latin alphabets.

Article, etc.	Yes	No	Sp. Comm.	Ed. Comm.	Congress action
<i>Article 50</i>					
A	1	172	2	60	Rejected
<i>Recommendation 50F</i>					
A	1	178	1	59	Rejected
<i>Article 51</i>					
A	2	220	1	8	Rejected
<i>Article 53</i>					
A	0	188	1	48	Rejected
<i>Article 56</i>					
A	2	178	1	56	Rejected
<i>Article 57</i>					
A	30	19	0	185	Ed. Comm.
<i>Article 59</i>					
A	6	19	204	4	Sp. Comm.
B	6	13	206	4	Sp. Comm.
C	9	11	204	4	Sp. Comm.
<i>Article 60</i>					
A	3	178	3	54	Rejected
<i>Article 63</i>					
A	10	186	14	16	Rejected
B	20	144	18	28	Withdrawn
C	56	109	18	28	Accepted
D	7	69	4	145	Rejected
E	28	30	4	166	Accepted
F	19	27	4	177	Ed. Comm.
<i>Article 64</i>					
A	22	66	1	139	Rejected
B	9	61	0	157	Rejected
C	2	155	1	72	Rejected
<i>Article 69</i>					
A					
1) Reword	137	85	4	4	Accepted
2) List	98	115	4	10	Accepted
3) Note	45	179	5	7	Withdrawn
<i>Article 70</i>					
A	126	101	4	2	Accepted
<i>Article 71</i>					
A	185	44	5	0	Accepted
<i>Article 72</i>					
A	5	25	193	5	Sp. Comm.
<i>Recommendation 72A</i> (Taxon 24: 394. May 1975, not in synopsis)					Tabled
<i>Article 73</i>					
A	139	57	1	20	Accepted
B	70	25	1	129	Accepted
C	44	159	2	20	Rejected
D	84	81	8	42	Accepted
E	106	98	1	22	Rejected
F	131	67	10	16	Accepted
G	160	42	9	13	Accepted
H	47	157	11	10	Rejected
<i>Recommendation 73C</i>					
A	182	26	10	12	Accepted ⁷
B	47	19	10	151	Ed. Comm.

⁷ With amendment from the floor, to retain *-anus* after names ending in *-er* (not *-ianus* as proposed).

Article, etc.	Yes	No	Sp. Comm.	Ed. Comm.	Congress action
<i>Recommendation 73F</i>					
A	132	96	0	2	Withdrawn
<i>Recommendation 73G</i>					
A	177	25	10	17	Accepted
<i>Recommendation 75A</i>					
A	28	26	159	15	Accepted
B	31	72	17	103	Rejected
<i>Appendix I</i>					
A	19	142	34	14	Rejected
B	1	11	25	173	Ed. Comm.
<i>Article H.4</i>					
A	5	7	18	181	Ed. Comm.
B	6	7	17	177	Ed. Comm.
C	48	68	25	58	Rejected
D	12	6	17	170	Ed. Comm.
<i>New Recommendation H.4A</i>					
A	87	62	18	32	Accepted
<i>Article H.6</i>					
A	132	23	20	25	Accepted
B	26	15	17	148	Ed. Comm.
C	3	109	10	88	Rejected
<i>Article H.7</i>					
A					
1) "legitimate"	76	85	27	10	Rejected
2) "correct"	39	117	27	10	Rejected
B	85	10	10	99	Ed. Comm.
C	133	23	29	20	Accepted
D	137	20	29	18	Accepted
<i>Article H.8</i>					
A	14	31	25	132	Ed. Comm.
B	28	102	21	40	Rejected
<i>Article H.9</i>					
A	62	65	41	31	Rejected
<i>Article H.10</i>					
A	4	149	6	58	Rejected
B	3	40	151	10	Rejected
<i>Appendix II</i>					
A	1	62	146	6	Rejected
B	10	47	143	4	Withdrawn
C	25	15	158	13	Sp. Comm. (no action)
D	26	19	155	10	Accepted
<i>Appendix III</i>					
A	0	5	203	3	Sp. Comm.
<i>General</i>					
A	23	201	9	2	Withdrawn
B	69	24	2	134	Ed. Comm.
C					
1) General	5	231	1	3	Rejected
2) Fundamental	1	233	1	2	Rejected
3) Idiotaxonomical	2	233	1	2	Rejected
D	19	22	3	187	Ed. Comm.
E	141	11	9	62	Accepted
F	111	36	10	63	Accepted

Action regarding committees, etc.:

Nomina conservanda were approved as recommended by the General Committee (see Appendix A in Synopsis and p. 244).

Special Committee reports presented to the Section were approved.

Nomenclature committees as proposed by nominating committee were accepted.

The General Committee was instructed to name special committees to consider transliteration from non-Latin alphabets (Art. 46), the problems of Art. 10 referred by the Seattle Congress, and the question of autonoms.

Proposals on Articles 59 and 72 were referred for further study to the Committee for Fungi.

Acceptance of Art. 14 Prop. E established a committee to report on the matter of nomina specifica conservanda et rejicienda.

The Editorial Committee was given the usual power to alter wording, examples, or location of articles and recommendations insofar as the meaning was not affected, but was requested to retain the present numbering.

The section accepted a motion by Faegri which would transfer authority for the Code to the Division of Botany of IUBS in the event that International Botanical Congresses should no longer meet, and instructing the Bureau of Nomenclature to present to the XIII Congress a proposal for appropriate machinery.

The section approved in principle a resolution to the Plenary Session accepting the decisions on nomenclature.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR SPERMATOPHYTA

Conservation of Generic Names, XIX

The previous report in this series was published in *Taxon* 24: 244-248. Feb. 1975. As of the date of the deliberations reported below, the membership of the Committee was as follows:

Hiroshi Hara, Chairman (Japan)	W. Greuter (Switzerland)
R. C. Bakhuizen van den Brink (Netherlands)	I. A. Linczevski (U.S.S.R.)
R. K. Brummitt (Great Britain)	Rogers McVaugh, Secretary (U.S.A.)
G. Buchheim (U.S.A.)	E. J. Mendes (Portugal)
Hj. Eichler (Australia)	Bo Peterson (Sweden)
F. R. Fosberg (U.S.A.)	G. Wagenitz (B.R.D.)

As in previous reports, the votes for and against each proposal are shown in parentheses immediately after the names involved; the affirmative votes precede the negative. Eight affirmative votes were required for a recommendation by the Committee to accept a proposal.

Proposal 352 [9476] *Rhaponticum* Hill (1762), vs. *Rhaponticum* Ludwig (1757). (4-6, 1 abstaining, one vote withheld). (*Taxon* 22: 314-315. 1973).

Rhaponticum is a genus of about 20-25 species, mostly Eurasian. In this proposal it is stated to be generically distinct from *Centaurea*, although formerly included in that genus by such authors as Bentham and Hoffmann. It is argued that if it is not conserved, it will be necessary to make new combinations under the available names *Stemmacantha* Cass. or *Leuzea* DC.

The Committee was unable to generate strong support for this proposal. First, the name actually published by Hill in 1762 was *Rhapontica*, not *Rhaponticum*. Some committee members feel that *Rhapontica* Hill and *Rhaponticum* Ludwig are not orthographic variants, that the correct name is *Rhapontica* Hill, and that conservation is therefore unnecessary. The Committee as a whole deplores the ambiguity of the Code on this point, and believes that the next Congress should refine the text of Art. 75. At present the Special Committees, increasingly often, are having to invoke conservation merely as a device to insure one particular interpretation of Art. 75. This puts an undue burden on the Committees, and indicates a weakness to be corrected in the Code.