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FIRST SESSION

Monday, 30 June 1975, 10:15 a. m.—11:30 a. m.

Chairman: I. A. Linczevski

The chairman welcomed the delegates (over 130 were in attendance) and introduced the President of the Congress, A. L. Takh-tajan, who delivered remarks of welcome in a historical context. The chairman next introduced the rapporteur-général, F. A. Stafleu, who in accord with tradition asked the delegates to stand for a moment of silence in memory of those of our number whose death had been noted since the 1969 Congress:

P. Aellen (Switzerland)  S. T. Blake (Australia)
E. Asplund (Sweden)      R. E. Buchanan (USA)

* This official account of actions taken, with summary of discussions, is based on (1) notes made at the sessions, (2) written documents submitted by the participants, and (3) review of the excellent tape recording of the entire proceedings.
The rapporteur also welcomed the delegates and expressed thanks to President Takhtajan for his thoughtful words. He then made a statement on the general procedures for handling the proposals: a resolution on the decisions taken by this section will be presented to the final plenary session of the Congress; final ratification of the actions will be necessary from IUBS because not all botanists who wished to attend were in a position to do so. He then drew attention to two general questions: (1) We should think about whether an entire new edition of the Code is necessary, or a summary of the changes made at this Congress. (2) We should consider a change in the charge made at the Paris Congress (1954) to publish in Taxon all comments—short or long—with nomenclature proposals; this is becoming very expensive, and IAPT has already spent some S 10 000 on this Congress.

Stafleu then requested formal ratification of the Seattle Code as printed, so that the document might be the basis for our discussions. Cronquist moved that the Nomenclature Section accept the Seattle Code as such a basis. The motion was seconded and carried without dissent.

The chairman called on the vice-rapporteur to explain voting procedures. Results of the preliminary mail vote are available at the registration desk. It is suggested that, as previously, proposals rejected by at least a 75% mail vote not be considered unless they are explicitly brought up from the floor. This suggestion was approved without objection. Voss then described the voting cards: white indicating one vote, pink indicating two votes, and gray indicating five votes. If a simple show of hands does not appear decisive, a show of voting cards, in sequence by colors, may be taken; and at any time it is called for by a delegate or by the chair, an actual counted card vote can be taken by submission of the appropriate numbered ticked from the voting card to the “yes” or “no” collection.
Linczevski announced that the tellers would be Zhilin and Hiepko. He then announced appointment of the Nominating Committee, with Faegri as chairman and members as follows: Fulford, Hammer, Johnson, and Kolakovsky. Stafleu explained the duties of this committee — to produce a list of candidates for committees and positions — and stressed that in presenting nominations it should be kept in mind that these are working and not honorary committees. All delegates to the Nomenclature Section are welcome to make suggestions to any member of the nominating committee.

The chairman asked the vice-rapporteur to present a motion empowering the Editorial Committee to attend to necessary details. Similar to those at Edinburgh and Seattle, a motion as follows was suggested:

I. That the Editorial Committee be empowered:
   1. To change, if necessary, the wording of any article or recommendation, and to avoid duplication.
   2. To add or remove examples.
   3. To place articles and chapters of the Code in the most convenient places, but to retain the present numbering insofar as possible.
   4. And, in general, to make any editorial modification not affecting the meanings of the provisions concerned.

II. All delegates are invited to submit their recommendations concerning editorial aspects, sending them in writing to the Committee before 1 January 1976.

Cronquist stated that naturally the Editorial Committee needs to have these powers, but it should be the sense of the Section that the committee act with great caution and make no changes that are not absolutely necessary. Stafleu assured the Section of his full agreement with this sentiment, but pointed out that there are problems, for example, when the Section adopts conflicting proposals. Fosberg observed that discussion of Editorial Committee action practically always follows publication of each edition of the Code, despite the best of intentions, and pointed out that the mail vote appears to delegate an extraordinary number of proposals to the Editorial Committee; he urged that proposals which are not understood be clarified or rejected — not merely referred to the Editorial Committee to render into usable form. McNeill moved to accept the motion as read, and the motion was seconded and carried with only a single objection.

The rapporteur then remarked on certain technicalities. Miss Keuken, who has been recording these actions since 1954, is not here. All proceedings are instead being tape-recorded. Every speaker must therefore use the microphones as they are connected to the recorder as well as to the loud-speakers. There will also be numbered papers available for writing the substance of comments and these will be distributed by the tellers. Delegates are urged to use them
in order that their statements may be noted concisely and accurately. The rapporteur further remarked that in 1950 at the Stockholm Congress the Nomenclature Section convened for the first time after World War II, and one result was the founding of IAPT. So 1975 is the 25th anniversary; attention to this will be given at the Nomenclature/IAPT dinner on July 2, which will be preceded by a cocktail party offered by the Congress. He complimented the organizing Committee for selecting this beautiful building, the “House of the Scientists” owned by the Academy, which is so adequate for all our meetings — including the cafe downstairs where lunch is available.

The session adjourned for lunch and meetings of the Special Committees.

SECOND SESSION

Monday, 30 June 1975, 2:30 p.m.—6:20 p.m.

Chairman: R. C. Rollins

Several announcements were made by Stafleu: He has not complied with the formality of signing the voting cards, but they are nevertheless valid; it is suggested that the delegates sign them, for identification in case of loss. He explained the mail vote as a preliminary guiding expression of opinion from many people not able to participate in these meetings; only two ballots were received since the results were tabulated and duplicated, so we will not announce a revised total. The Bureau has decided to begin consideration with Article 73 in order to give fair treatment to orthography, which in the past has been treated in a great rush at the end.

Greuter moved that as usual a 60% majority be required to accept a proposal except that when there are competing proposals, 60% be first required to make a change, then a simple majority to choose the change. Johnson moved an amendment to require a simple majority for any change. Both motions being seconded, discussion followed. Schopf endorsed 60% as we should have clear support for any change in the Code. Brummitt favored simple majority, observing that a 59% vs. 41% vote would be frustrating. Cronquist was for a large majority, especially since attendance is not fully representative. Bonner agreed with Cronquist, in the interests of a stable if not stabilized Code; a high majority will make change more difficult and promote stability. The rapporteur noted that changes made with only a very small majority are often regretted, and supported Greuter’s motion to retain the procedure used at previous Congresses. The chairman then called for a vote on the amendment, which was clearly rejected. The main motion then carried.
ACTION ON PROPOSALS
(Mail vote is indicated in parentheses for each proposal.)

Article 73

Prop. A (139: 57: 1: 20)

Meikle thought the present wording preferable for botanists who are not experts in language. Nicolson explained why "compounding form" is better than "connecting vowel"; errors prohibited by the Code are not those of compounding vowels. Cronquist expressed himself not in favour of complicated rules to correct spellings; it is easier to spell names the way they were originally spelled, and he also does not like recommendations converted into rules. Traverse felt the proposed change would simplify things; it is limited to epithets and this would promote stability of generic names. Voss pointed out that Prop. A only deals with what we call the changes, and restricts them to epithets; it does not deal with the option of making or not making corrections.

Fosberg asked whether Props. A and C are competing, and whether Cronquist meant that we should no longer be authorized to correct orthographic errors. The chair ruled that Props. A and C were not competing. Cronquist stated that he wanted provisions for correction restricted as much as possible, but that does not mean getting rid of them entirely. Ross pointed out that there are three proposals bearing on paragraph 6; he agrees that they are not competing but suggests consideration of Prop. C first. The chair accepted this suggestion.

Prop. C (44: 159: 2: 20)

Nicolson said that Jansonius was prepared to support his proposal since generic names were not included. Prop. C, to delete paragraph 6, was then decisively rejected, and discussion returned to Prop. A.

Johnson stated that botanists capable of following the intricacies of systematics should be able to follow Nicolson’s clear exposition of linguistic matters and he strongly urged acceptance of his proposals.

McNeill was concerned about the restriction to epithets. Subgeneric and sectional names would not be open to correction and conservation seems a cumbersome way of handling corrections even of generic orthography. He would support the proposal if amended to say “names and epithets.”

Fosberg pointed out that the word “epithet” is not qualified in the proposal and that subgeneric and sectional epithets would therefore be covered. Nicolson noted that work on the Index Nominum Genericorum has revealed many cases of names where we would
be impelled to conserve a preferred orthography if we retained coverage of generic names in this paragraph. McNeill urged the Editorial Committee to make clear what was included in "epithet".

Prop. A was then voted on and accepted.


Demoulin supported the proposal, citing the example of *Lycoperdon atropurpureum*, which was published with a hyphen (*atro-purpureum*), an orthography almost never used until recently re-discovered.

Ross pointed out that the proposal does not deal with hyphens in such epithets as *pecten-veneris*, authorized in Arts. 20 and 23, but only to compounded adjectives. Nicolson and Demoulin concurred, noting that a connecting vowel is not involved, and Voss called attention to the Comments Rapporteurs in the Synopsis, stating that the Editorial Committee would harmonize this proposal, if accepted, with Prop. A — we are not repealing Art. 20!

Prop. D was accepted by a clear majority.


Ross stated that in view of the close mail vote, some remarks were called for. It is wrong in principle for the Code to regulate typography in this way, and the statement is out of place in an Article. One may, because of typographic style, print a whole name in capitals, but this would be contrary to the proposal. Raven replied that he did not intend to deal with such typography as names all in capitals (this would not be "misuse"), and pointed out that this proposal should be considered in conjunction with Rec. 73F.

Cronquist said that even if one approved of the change, it was unfortunate to call the matter a "typographic error". Grubov pointed out that acceptance of the change would violate Russian grammar. Botschantzev said that it is not respectful to the memory of botanists to write the epithets which are derived from their personal names with a small initial letter.

Meikle said that most botanists do use a small initial letter, but why insist on a rule which restricts them unnecessarily. Raven responded that the change was desirable precisely because of that kind of ambiguity. We would reduce error, ambiguity, and confusion to require typographic uniformity — which in no way dishonors persons commemorated. In plants, we are dealing with about 10% of the world's organisms, and perhaps 10% of the botanists still capitalize specific epithets occasionally. In the appearance of such capitalized epithets, we cause persistent confusion to those who have occasion to use the names for other than strict scientific purposes. There is no advantage to this.
Others argued for retention of the present options, making neither capitals nor the contrary obligatory. Meyen asked how botanists would be able to distinguish between epithets based on names of persons and those based on names of cities or villages — e. g., Komarov and Komarovo. It is nearly impossible for editors to determine which source. Zabinkova affirmed that adjectival epithets are not capitalized and are preferred for geographic names; epithets based on names of persons should preferably be genitive and capitalized.

Zhilin proposed to leave Rec. 73F as it is.

Prop. E was apparently rejected on a show of hands. A show of cards was called for, the results being 119 yes and 156 no. Prop. E was rejected, meaning that the present provision is retained, as it has been since 1950 (Stockholm).

Prop. F (131 : 67 : 10 : 16)

Demoulin supported the proposal with the example of Neuropteris vs. Neuropteris Brongniart; the author’s native language was French and an arbitrary decision is required since, from the Code as it stands, one cannot tell whether the letter is a consonant or a vowel.

As the person responsible for the present paragraph, Ross spoke in support of Nicolson’s wording and stressed that we must have some coverage. We should consider Props. F and G together. The chair ruled that the section would do so.

Nicolson proposed an amendment to treat as an orthographic error the transliteration of the Greek diphthong eu- as ev- when it precedes a consonant, but subsequently withdrew it. Meikle agreed that Nicolson’s proposals were considerable better than what was now in the Code, but questioned whether we had sufficient knowledge; he suggested a special committee on orthography to seek expert advice. He moved that such a committee be established and that Proposals F, G, and H be referred to it. Fosberg opposed the motion, stating that Nicolson had gone into the matter exhaustively and that a committee working by mail would not be likely to do any better. Greuter observed that ev- was correct in modern Greek; he supported the motion for the present proposal and moved to amend it to provide a special working group at this Congress for Props. F and G. Christensen spoke of the difficulty with committees and suggested that we let Nicolson make minor corrections in his own proposals after he has heard from specialists. Zabinkova, speaking as a classical philologist, reminded the delegates that botanical Latin is not classical Latin — as pointed out by Stearn, and she favoured Props. F and G. A vote was taken on Greuter’s amendment, and it failed.

Raven spoke against the main motion, pointing out that the proposals had been published long enough ago that there had been ample opportunity for comments from specialists. Nicolson noted that in the year gone by he had received numerous requests for rep-
rints, with many expressions of support. Vote on proposal to refer Props. F, G and H to committee: failed.

Panigrahi supported Nicolson but said he was not clear why the date 1800 was selected instead of a specific publication. Nicolson replied that the date was arbitrary; after that time, usage settled down and before that time, authors were indifferent as to the distinctions between *v* and *u* and *i* and *j*. Buchheim inquired whether any right was reserved for the original author to choose between his own conflicting usage. Nicolson replied “yes, if the author explicitly states that he has erred; no, if he does not”.

Props. F and G (160 : 42 : 9 : 13) were voted upon and accepted by clear majorities.


A proposal from the floor by Samoilovich, of which copies had been distributed, was brought up for discussion. It would add “and grammatical” to the first paragraph of Art. 73, and provide an example. Ross pointed out that the articles dealing with names of taxa below the rank of genus state that epithets must agree in gender with generic names and the only effect here would be to make clear that corrections must be made in the same way as for typographic and orthographic errors; he supported the proposal. McVaugh observed than since the matter was already covered in Art. 23 we did not need anything additional here and the example would be superfluous. Demoulin suggested that the Editorial Committee place a note in Art. 73 referring to Art. 23. Brummitt agreed with McVaugh and called attention to Art. 32 Note 1, which covers the proposal before us.

The proposal was voted upon and rejected.

Recommendation 73C

Prop. A. (182 : 26 : 10 : 12)

The vice-rapporteur called attention to the strong support for this proposal expressed by W. T. Stearn, who was not present at the Congress.

Brummitt stated that while he was in favour of nearly all of Nicolson’s proposals there was one point at which botanists from Kew would take issue with him — the matter of adjectival epithets derived from personal names ending in -er. The combination of Art. 73 paragraph 7 and Rec. 73C (d) at present makes it obligatory to spell such names in the form “hasslerana” and not “hassleriana”, etc. This has been the policy in all Kew publications for at least 10 years. “We have been telling horticulturists that they must make this change. We have made out new labels in the Gardens for all such names. If the Code now changes to recommend “hassleriana” again we are going to look very silly and a lot of people will be
upset". Brummitt moved an amendment to the proposal, that the old text be retained and reference to "hassleriana" be deleted.

Moore supported the amendment, having tried to bring Hortus III into accord with the existing Code. Fosberg pointed out that this is only a Recommendation; Kew and Hortus III need not change. Meikle said that Kew does try to follow Recommendations, and that we would expose ourselves to ridicule to turn around and now say that we must use "-ianus".

Stafleu called attention to the existence in the Code since 1905 of the -anus ending, and pointed out that Brummitt's proposal is to instruct the Editorial Committee to retain the provision of paragraph (d) whatever action is otherwise taken on Prop. A. Cronquist urged Nicolson to withdraw paragraph (e) of his proposal; Nicolson stressed that his reasons for supporting -ianus were historical, not grammatical.

The chair called for a vote by cards on the Brummitt amendment, and ruled that a simple majority would decide on the amendment. It was accepted, 201 yes, 135 no.

Demoulin moved to broaden the coverage of paragraph (f) of Prop. A by saying "... already in Greek or Latin or possess a well known latinized form (old European given names) ...". He asserted that since Alexander in French is written Alexandre, if one follows the proposal as it stands one must say alexandri for a name given by a German author and alexandrii for a name given by a French author. The amendment was voted upon and defeated.

The chair called for a vote on Rec. 73C, Prop. A and it was accepted as amended by the Brummitt motion.


THIRD SESSION
Tuesday, 1 July 1975, 10 : 00 a. m.—12 : 00 m.

Chairman: R. Ross

Recommendation 73F

Recommendation 73G
Prop. A (177 : 25 : 10 : 17)

The chairman noted the very heavy mail vote in favour. Meikle asked, in view of the kannae-folius example of a pseudocompound, if we are to treat, for example, salviae-folius as a "pseudocompound".
Nicolson pointed out that the last sentence of the paragraph covered this: "The latter use of genitive singular of First Declension for pseudocompounding is an error to be corrected unless it makes an etymological distinction". Thus, "cannaefolius" is to be corrected. Demoulin questioned whether cannaefolius is a pseudocompound and suggested deletion of this example. Zabinkova admitted that Rec. 73G is rather complex, and supported the improved proposal by Nicolson.

The proposal was accepted by a large majority.

Cronquist moved on behalf of himself and McVaugh that in Art. 73 corrections in spelling be made permissive instead of mandatory, by saying "may be" rather than "are to be" and "is". Recommendations have been converted to rules by indirection, he declared: "permissiveness is preferable to a straightjacket". Stafleu spoke on the history of these provisions; "may" was in the Code from 1905 until 1959, when the change was made at Montréal.

Johnson spoke on behalf of botanists, especially many younger ones, who want a definite procedure, not freedom, despite the complications in orthography. Freedom is necessary in taxonomy, but clear rules of procedure are desirable for uniformity in nomenclature. It is not difficult in most cases to apply Art. 73 and the Recommendations, especially now that we have Nicolson's clear and understandable exposition.

Botschantzev favoured making the Code more categorical with less ambiguity, and supported Nicolson's proposals. Brummitt opposed the motion, pointing out that one of its practical effects would be a neat reversal of the previous day's decision on hasslerianus vs. hassleranus. Nicolson proclaimed: "One taxonomic concept — one name" and he would add "one spelling", not two or three as Cronquist would have.

Traverse defended the distinction between Articles and Recommendations, and objected to any further level of permissiveness. He also objected strenuously to speakers addressing the audience in a demagogic manner rather than addressing themselves to the chair. McVaugh — addressing the chair as well as the audience — said that it increases the number of "names" to require that so many corrections be mandatory. The proposal is general, providing a means of separating Recommendations from mandatory rules, and is not relevant to support for Nicolson's proposals. Demoulin protested procedures which would reverse requirements that have been in the Code for many years and which have been followed. He has not had a chance to discuss with colleagues proposals which have not been published in Taxon, and would be uneasy about casting the institutional votes which he carries.

Stafleu, after suggesting that speakers in the front of the room stand to one side so as not to turn their backs on the chair, observed that every meeting of the Section must allow proposals from the floor, as the Section is autonomous, but we must avoid
too sweeping changes. The Cronquist — McVaugh proposal may not be a satisfactory solution for what is desired. The vote on the motion defeated it overwhelmingly.

Recommendation 75A

Prop. A (28 : 26 : 159 : 15)

Traverse reported that the paleobotanical committee supported the proposal, with further ballots since publication of the report in Taxon bringing the total to 12 : 0. The proposal should be adopted without delay. Accepted.

Prop. B (31 : 72 : 17 : 103)

The chair said it was clear that the mail vote preferred the Editorial Committee to consider the examples. Cronquist said we should be sure that only the examples are referred to the Committee. Greuter proposed to reject the proposal, since the Editorial Committee already has authority to select any examples it wishes. Rejected.

Consideration of proposals relating to orthography having been completed, as planned by the Bureau of Nomenclature, action turned to the beginning of the Synopsis.

Principles

Margadant moved that we vote first not to change the Principles at all, since they should be stable. Brummitt thought the proposal on Principle IV was a very minor matter of rewording which might be desirable after consideration of the question of autonyms under Art. 19 and consideration should be deferred; Stafleu assured him that the Editorial Committee would handle the matter in accord with action taken regarding autonyms. McNeill was disturbed by the suggestion that the Principles are in some way inviolate and should not be open for change — although in this case he supported the motion for these amendments, not as a principle about Principles.


Demoulin agreed that the proposed New Principle VII was unsatisfactory as a Principle, but thought greater stress on the matter was needed, perhaps in the Preamble. Rollins said it was important that we not enter teaching too much in the Code. The proposal fell in the realm of instruction. Demoulin thought expansion of the Preamble would be useful, for example, for self-taught taxonomists. Stafleu stressed that the Code is a technical instrument and it is not good to
preach to the taxonomist in it; in any event a specific proposal would be needed for action now. Fosberg pointed out that the proposal was almost unanimously rejected by the mail vote and we should not waste any more time on it.

**Article 3**


Prop. B. (50: 183 : 5 : 3)

Raven requested that the question be considered, despite the mail vote, because of its specialized nature, and reiterated the undesirability of having different terms for a taxon of the same rank, especially at the higher levels. He asked that those who are relatively unconcerned with usage at these levels allow those who are to accept the older and better established term “phylum” for all organisms; he referred especially to students of unicellular organisms, students of phylogeny, and those who are concerned with education in botany.

Fosberg indicated that he had changed his position on this matter, for both terms are useful. We should not lock ourselves into equating the two. “I suggest that we allow ourselves to use both categories and give ourselves 5 years more to produce a well-formulated proposal to permit the use of both”. Cronquist supported Raven and declared that we had nothing to lose; the proposal would promote detente with zoologists. Schopf strongly supported the proposal; the term “phylum” is much more distinctive than “division”. More and more is modern paleobotany the relation of animal and plant kingdoms is coming into consideration and it would be most helpful to end the unnecessary difference in terms.

Demoulin said that as a mycologist he often confronts these problems, but we should try to persuade zoologists to adopt “division” because “phylum” is an ambiguous term, also used as a general word for phylogenetically uniform groups even as small as a subgenus. Johnson supported the proposal on the grounds that “phylum” is in familiar use for a major taxonomic category and it is confusing to students to use the very general-sounding term “division” in plants. “Phylum” need not imply phylogenetic relationship, any more than “family” necessarily does. Stafleu said he had for a long time been convinced of the necessity of the proposal.

The vote being apparently close, a card vote was called for, and the proposal was rejected (199 no, 172 yes).

Prop. C (42: 24 : 157 : 10)

Referred to the Committee for Fossil Plants along with a proposal from the floor by Zhilin (and subsequently reworded — see Ninth Session).
Article 4

Prop. B (17: 220: 1: 5). Rejected. The chair ruled that other proposals consequential to this have likewise been rejected by the same decision.

Article 6


A proposal by Yeo, overlooked in publication, was read by the vice-rapporteur, to substitute the following for paragraph 4 of Art. 6: "An illegitimate name or epithet is one that is to be rejected for the reasons given in Arts. 63—67, and H--". Fosberg was concerned about limiting application to the articles mentioned. What about other parts of the Code? Cronquist agreed that the Code is clear and simple on this matter, and the proposal should be voted down, not referred to the Editorial Committee.

Brummitt thought the proposal highly desirable, as the present text is too broad. Names not in accord with certain rules are in fact not illegitimate, e.g., names published with a wrong termination. Margadant opposed the change since it does not cover Art. 21. Stafleu called attention to Art. 32; illegitimacy is applicable only to validly published names. Buchheim noted that the proposal was incomplete, since there is, e.g., a reference to illegitimate names in Art. 18. If the proposal is accepted, the Editorial Committee should be very careful to examine the Code for any other references. Margadant did not agree that Art. 32 made the endings -oides and -opsis in subgeneric epithets invalid; he thought they were illegitimate. Nicolson asked if a name published with the wrong gender is contrary to Art. 20 and under Art. 32 would be invalidly published. Stafleu said we should reject the proposal and call the attention of the Editorial Committee to the possibility of providing some references in parentheses.

The proposal was voted upon and rejected.

A second unpublished proposal by Yeo was read, to make Note 2 of Art. 6 a paragraph, to read: "The name of a taxon below the rank of genus, consisting of the name of a genus or species combined with an epithet, is termed a combination". The purpose would be to
remove an inconsistency arising from a change to Art. 24 adopted at Edinburgh in 1964, regarding the definition of a combination. Fosberg suggested that if the proposal is accepted it should say "a name plus one or more epithets"; if the point is to limit combinations to two elements, we should reject it.

The proposal was rejected.

FOURTH SESSION

Tuesday, 1 July 1975, 2:15 p. m.—6:10 p. m.

Chairman: R. C. Rollins

Article 7

Prop. A (79: 21: 3: 130)

Cronquist noted that this proposal is part of the package presented by a special committee on priority and typification of taxa above the rank of family. The heart of the package comes in Art. 16, and consideration of Art. 7, Prop. A, as well as Art. 10, Prop. A and Art. 11, Prop. A, should be postponed until action has been taken on Art. 16.

The chair ruled that consideration should be deferred (and Prop. A was later accepted).


A proposal from the floor by Zhilin pertaining to fossil plants, and of which copies had been distributed, was referred to the Committee for Fossils.

A proposal from the floor by Lipschitz, of which copies had been distributed, was presented, to introduce the term paradigmatotypus (specimen exsiccatum, quod typum praebet) for the type of a new taxon the original description of which was printed on the label. Ahti did not think such types required a special designation; one of the many syntypes of exsiccatae should be selected as the lectotype and the rest would be isolectotypes. Botschantzev spoke on behalf of Lipschitz, who was ill, stating that a special term is needed in view of the wide usage of exsiccatae. Fosberg agreed with Ahti except that true duplicates would be isotypes, not syntypes; but there is no need whatsoever for a special term just because the labels are printed.

The proposal was rejected.
Article 8

Another unpublished proposal by Yeo was read, to reword Art. 8 as follows: "The author who first designates a lectotype or neotype must be followed unless it can be shown that the choice was based upon a misinterpretation of the protologue, or a misinterpretation of the specimen or other element chosen or designated, or that the choice was made arbitrarily. In such cases the element first designated may be superseded by another". The vice-rapporteur thought the matter editorial, to avoid saying a neotype is superseded when in fact it is merely superfluous if a type is discovered.

Stafleu apologized for omission of Yeo's proposals form Taxon, and stated that he was not certain this matter was purely editorial. He read Yeo's argument in full. Margadant was strongly opposed to the words "misinterpretation of the specimen" since this opened the possibility of misuse.

The proposal was rejected.

Article 9

Prop. A (115: 82: 8: 26)

Brummitt gave a resumé of his published arguments, citing an example of a widely used nomen nudum requiring validation and for which no specimen was available to serve as type; a colleague proposed designating a description as type. McNeill stated that his mycological colleagues had advised him of support for the present wording for groups such as yeasts in which there are no morphological characters — as least in the dried state. He called attention to the unpublished report of the Committee for Fungi (Appendix A: Reports) which voted on this proposal: 4 yes, 3 no, 2 editorial committee.

Fosberg understood the proposal to be designed to prevent abuse of the privilege of designating descriptions as types; however, it is just as easy and far more frequent to abuse the privilege of designating neotypes. "The description by an early author is a better indication of what he had in mind than a neotype selected by an author 200 years later of a specimen that he thought the early author should have meant". Meikle thought the present wording of Note 1 was wholly unsatisfactory and suggested omission of "or if such a name is without a type specimen"; a specimen should always supersede a description or illustration if discovered.

Brummitt declared that this omission would not cure the cases he was concerned about when it is said to be impossible to preserve a specimen. He asked Demoulin if introduction of a time limit would solve the problem regarding such organisms as yeasts — he thought not. Demoulin agreed that such a limit, e. g. January 1958, would be good for macromycetes but he was not familiar with yeasts. McNeill stressed that there are very important implications to our
decision on this proposal; there is current discussion on the desirability of designating living specimens as types for certain groups of fungi, and adoption of the proposal might well lead mycologists to adopt their own code for fungi.

Faegri asked what “such a name” meant in the Article, pointed out that flagellates are virtually impossible to preserve, and called for a distinction between real impossibility of preservation and lack of preserved specimens.

Prop. A was voted upon and rejected.

Article 10


Prop. B (15:207:3:12)

Greuter declared that his proposal was to change the Code and not a misunderstanding of it as stated by the rapporteurs, who unduly influenced the mail vote. Since it is only names, and not taxa, which have types, the taxa cannot be “themselves appropriately typified”. Typification of a name can be either by a specimen (or illustration) or by a name which in turn is typified by a specimen (or illustration). If we want the Code to be taken seriously, we are bound to eliminate the statement that we consider species, i.e. taxa, as suitable standards on which names can be based.

Stafleu stated that the “Comments” were intended to state the present provisions and to call attention to differences. Brummitt supported Greuter and urged a special committee on the subject. He asked which species is the type of a generic name when an author quotes one name but has a plant actually referable to a different species in front of him.

Fosberg differed, stating that if a genus is a group of names, then one name must be the type, but if a genus is a group of species, then a species must be the type. A name has no characteristics pertinent to the typification of a genus; it merely designates a taxon, which must be defined. The name may even be a later homonym which should not be forever retained as a type. Demoulin strongly supported Fosberg, stating that if the proposal is adopted we would be led to absurdities when the material used for defining a genus was misnamed and we would have to use the generic name for something absolutely foreign to the concept of the original author.

McNeill said that Fosberg’s comments can only mean that he is recommending a return to the circumscription method instead of the type method. It is true that the situation described by Demoulin can arise if the author of a genus has misidentified his type species, but in the few cases where this affects a very widely used name of an important genus, conservation would be a solution. He reminded the
Section that the General Committee was instructed at Seattle to bring in a proposal, following deadlocked discussions there on proposals by McVaugh and Weresub. He strongly supported Greuter’s proposal, but if it should fail, he hoped a special committee would be set up as suggested by Brummitt. And he asked Greuter if Props. C and D did not refer to names published before 1 January 1958, after which designation of a type is obligatory. Greuter responded that ultimately the type of a genus ought to be a specimen — the original material which an author examined. Types ought to be standards — whether names or specimens; no one knows what a species is. If the proposal is adopted, it gives a clear opportunity to conserve names where consequences would be undesirable.

Prop. B was voted upon and rejected.


Article 11


Article 13


Prop. B (8 : 23 : 197 : 5)

The unpublished report of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens showed 1 yes and 7 no votes. Margadant spoke in strong opposition to introducing a new starting point in the Code. Prop. B was overwhelmingly rejected.

Article 14


Prop. B (131 : 52 : 1 : 53)

Ross observed that the proposal makes explicit what has been implicit and normal practice, and we ought definitely to accept it. Accepted.

Props. C (53 : 171 : 5 : 6), D (65 : 161 : 4 : 6), and E (91 : 137 : 4 : 6) were deferred upon request of Brummitt and Meikle until consideration of Art. 69 (at which point Prop. C was rejected, Prop. D withdrawn, and Prop. E accepted; see Seventh Session).

Cronquist pointed out that this and associated proposals are the unanimous report of a special committee appointed at the Seattle Congress. They try to bring the phraseology of the rules into accord with the developing practice of using names based on generic names for higher taxa. It does not make the use of such names mandatory.

Upon vote, Prop. A was overwhelmingly accepted, and the chair noted that this indicated acceptance of the related deferred proposals: Art. 7, Prop. A; Art. 10, Prop. A, and Art. 11, Prop. A.

Prop. B (75 : 27 : 118 : 8). Deferred until the report of the Committee for Algae (and subsequently accepted).

Recommendation 16A

Prop. A (209 : 15 : 3 : 8)

Demoulin expressed opposition to the termination -mycota; the rapporteur pointed out that this would require a new proposal, since the ending is already in the Code. Prop. A was accepted.


Recommendation 16B


Article 17, etc.

Proposals from the floor by Zabinkova and Kaden, and which had been circulated, were presented, to the effect that in Arts. 17, 18, 19, and Rec. 21B, the word “termination” be consistently used instead of “suffix” and “ending”, as has been done in Rec. 73D. Yeo noted that Art. H. 4, Prop. A includes the same change.

Ross said that “suffix” and “ending” are linguistic terms with different meanings; “termination” covers both and would be a welcome improvement. Nicolson agreed that “suffix” carries a meaning while in inflected languages like Russian, “ending” refers to a case ending, so “termination” is a better term and removes all ambiguity. Fosberg did not think the proposal objectionable, but as it seemed
to be a matter of change for the sake of change and we were already making too many changes in the Code, he would oppose it. Traverse called the attention of the Editorial Committee to the fact that the English text should refer to “stem of a family name” and not “stem of a family”.

The proposals were overwhelmingly accepted.

**Article 18**


Buchheim reported that the Subcommittee for Family Names was split on this proposal, 2:2, with different reasons (see Synopsis, p. 250). Accepted.


**Article 19**


Buchheim noted that since the similar proposal under Art. 18 was accepted, this proposal should be accepted to conform. Accepted.


Brummitt distributed mimeographed “Supplementary Notes on Autonyms” to those who had not already obtained a copy. Being strongly opposed to any unnecessary alterations in the Code, he regretted having to make this presentation. There are two principal proposals, which should not be confused. We are dealing with Prop. D first: Do autonyms have priority? Only two ranks are involved. (The second issue, resulting from the Wood and Webster proposals, involves three ranks). He explained with the aid of practical blackboard diagrams involving *Heracleum* (subspecies) and *Verbascum* (sections).

Fosberg noted the confusion engendered by the question of autonyms and their priorability, and moved an amendment to the proposal, to the effect that autonyms are only mandatory (therefore not subject to priority) for the sequences leading from a family name to its type genus, from a generic name to its type species, and from a species name to the lowest subdivision including its type specimen. The subdivisions of other subordinate taxa under these three prime categories would be named as are any other taxa (therefore subject to priority).
Greuter recognized the problems to which Brummitt called attention, but thought a better proposal could be developed and suggested a special working committee to report later in this Congress. The rapporteur commented that the same sort of confusion as we had at Seattle could arise here. Would an ad hoc committee—presumably of Brummitt, Fosberg, Greuter, and Ross—be willing to meet tonight?

Fosberg called for discussion on his amendment, which had been seconded, before committing himself to serve on such a committee. Margadant suggested that the committee come up with two clear alternatives. Brummitt thought the issue was clear and desired a vote. Raven endorsed the remarks of Brummitt, who had presented his case very clearly, and urged that we vote on it; therefore, he moved that Fosberg’s amendment be tabled.

The motion to table was seconded and carried.

Raven then reiterated his opinion that Brummitt had stated his position with extreme clarity, that the matter is one of opinion, and that we should move to the question on Prop. D as rapidly as possible.

Greuter moved that Prop. D and others relating to autonyms be referred to a working committee to report the next day. This motion was seconded and carried, and the chair appointed Brummitt, Greuter, Fosberg, and Ross to the committee.

(Prop. D was subsequently rejected; Prop. E (22 : 30 : 2 : 179), referred to the Editorial Committee; and Prop. F (96 : 94 : 5 : 19) tabled—(see Eighth and Ninth Sessions).

**Article 20**


**Recommendation 20A**


**Article 23**

Prop. A (14 : 21 : 189 : 10)

The vice-rapporteur noted that the Committee for Fungi and Lichens strongly favoured this proposal (7 : 2), which is an example of a mycological work. Demoulin added that the example was probably the latest example of a work in which the Linnaean system was not consistently used. Greuter called the Editorial Committee’s attention to the word “epithet” which was not the best.

Prop. A was accepted.

Prop. B (102 : 92 : 2 : 34)

McVaugh said that the point was taken care of adequately in the present positive wording. Rejected.

Recommendation 23B

Article 24

Article 26

Recommendation 26A

Article 28
Yeo stated that too few members of the Committee for Hybrids were here to have discussed the proposal. He summarized what the revised wording intends to do: refer simply to the Code for Cultivated Plants and the kinds of names it covers. Little supported the proposal as an improvement in wording.

Fosberg said he has no objection, but offered an amendment to add: “This does not prevent the use of ordinary botanical names for such taxa of convenient or desired”. Yeo said both Codes allow what Fosberg proposes; the question is whether it should be explicitly mentioned in our Code. The Fosberg amendment having been seconded, it was voted upon and accepted. McVaugh asked what advantage the proposed substitute had over the present wording. Yeo responded that the present wording covers things not the business of our Code; the proposal eliminates this and adds something (Latin cultivar epithet). He suggested altering the next to the last line of the Note by saying “regulated” instead of “recognized”. Voss said it was important to have a summary of the Code for Cultivated Plants in our Code, as many persons are not aware of it or its provisions; the proposal also removes a false statement about graft-chimaeras. Gandilian called attention to the fact that some names are covered in one code and some in another, but some in both — there is no conflict.

Prop. A was accepted as amended.

Article 32

Prop. A (6:86:1:137)
Ross asserted that since Arts. 2—5 do not deal with the forms of names, the proposal proposes nonsense. Rejected.


Recommendation 32B

Article 33

Prop. D (9:156:0:65)
Demoulin believed that the heavy “no” vote resulted from two contradictory opinions: the proposal is superfluous as stated by the rapporteurs because it only states things present elsewhere in the Code; or it would introduce a dangerous innovation by ruling out names otherwise correct but erroneously introduced as “nomina nova”. He preferred to replace his proposal with a request to the Editorial Committee to place a new Note in this Article defining “nomen novum” and reminding people that the renaming of a taxon known under a misapplied name is equivalent to the description of a new taxon, not the introduction of a new name. Nothing new was intended in the proposal.

Cronquist did not think it wise to leave the definition of “nomen novum” to the Editorial Committee. Fosberg did not care whether it was done by the Committee or by a specific proposal, but he strongly supported the introduction of a statement into the Code since some very good botanists do not seem to know the difference between misapplied names and nomina nova. Brummitt agreed, noting that the situation arises frequently in compilation of Index Kewensis.

Prop. D was referred to the Editorial Committee, to provide a Note defining a nomen novum.
Prop. E (180: 45: 0: 13)
Ross opposed the restrictive wording offered, saying that the examples make the scope perfectly clear. Cronquist admitted confusion about the reason for a change and its consequences; Linnaeus did not “use” the binomials that he “indicated” were to be used.
Brummitt declared that the present wording was so blatantly contrary to current practice that he could see no possible argument against the proposal. The paragraph is opposed to its own examples. Frequently people argue that Bentham and Hooker published a new name by making a statement such as “Bellis perennis is to be transferred to the genus Taraxacum”, when nobody familiar with actual practice would accept these names. It is a practical matter.
Fosberg agreed with Cronquist for the same and other reasons, but could support the proposal if it were not retroactive. Meikle agreed with his colleague Brummitt. There is no doubt as to what combination is intended in the Species Plantarum. The proposal should be retroactive — it is needed precisely for past situations.
Stafleu said the present Code is clearer to a larger group; the question involves English usage which is more clear to some people than to others.
The vote by show of hands being indecisive, a card vote was taken and Prop. E was rejected (146 yes, 184 no).

FIFTH SESSION
Wednesday, 2 July 1975, 10: 10 a.m.—12: 10 p.m.
Chairman: R. Ross

Article 34
Prop. A (6: 21: 201: 9)
The Committee for Fungi and Lichens voted 2 : 7 to recommend rejection of this proposal, and it was rejected.

Prop. B (8: 203: 2: 18)
Demoulin said his proposal was aimed at making the system of later starting-points workable; he now believes nothing can make later starting-points workable and hence no longer cares about the proposal. Withdrawn.

Prop. C (95: 115: 2: 17)
Brummitt noted that names proposed to him as examples of incidental mention were all equally or better covered by other provisions.
Most of them were not accepted by their authors. "Incidental mention" can be interpreted too broadly; the Code should say what it means.

Fosberg, who introduced the provision at Stockholm, explained its background. Pickering is full of incidental mention, as are many travel books. Buchheim offered another example: Engler's Pflanzenwelt Ost-Afrikas, where there are many new species mentioned with a few descriptive words, but the formal descriptions were provided later in monographs. Cronquist supported Fosberg and Buchheim; there are many such names, particularly in works by people who are not primarily taxonomists. If it were not for the present provision, we would have to consider each of these names to see if the author gave enough information to validate it.

Rollins cited the example of Roxira, mentioned in one of Clausen's works but not formally described. Demoulin observed that all revalidated names are validated by incidental mention.

Silva said he had combed the literature during the past 25 years for over 135,000 algal names. In perhaps 10% of the cases he faced diffuse rambling accounts in which new names were introduced incidental to travel narratives, geological descriptions, etc. One cannot judge the validity of a name on the basis of the type of publication; we have rules for validity and each case has to be examined on its own. If we take "incidental mention" seriously we would have to reject thousands of names; the provision in the Code serves no useful purpose.

Traverse stated that in paleopalynology he had found this provision extremely useful to dispose of hundreds of names put forward in the 1930's and 1940's in a casual manner.

Brummitt responded to the arguments by stating that all the examples quoted by Buchheim, Cronquist, and Rollins depend on sufficient description; no examples have been given of a name which is invalid only because a name is mentioned incidentally.

The rapporteur observed that there has been great diversity in application of this provision; some taxonomists do not use it, and others do, in different ways. The provision has been largely disobeyed — but rightly used by others. Much hinges on interpretation of words and of books. Our Code does not rule on specific cases, but provides general principles. Not much harm would be done by deleting this provision, or by leaving it in.

The show of hands being inconclusive, a card vote was called for; Prop. C was rejected (153 yes, 188 no).

The chair ruled that since we have competing proposals we should vote first whether to change, and then on Props. A, D, and E. Silva claimed that Prop. D did not entail an emendation of Art. 35 but only maintained the status quo, with an example. Contrary to what was stated by the proposers of Prop. E, he said that interpretation of Art. 35 is not unique as regards either retroactivity or the "first reviser" rule; lectotypification is analogous to retroactive assignment of rank, while the "first reviser" rule is implicit in Art. 34 and explicit in Art. 57. The chair ruled that Prop. D presented an interpretation which is not explicit in the present wording and should be treated as an alternative.

Cronquist said the three Brummitt proposals (A, B, C) must be taken as a package and while he thought them not really necessary, they would do no great harm if the date 1900 were set back to 1890 to accommodate better the names published under the "American Code". Fosberg said that if one looks carefully in a published work, he can find the intention of the author as to the rank used. Silva stated that the proceedings of the nomenclature section of the Montréal Congress make absolutely clear that his example is in accord with the way in which Art. 35 was intendent to apply.

The rapporteur confirmed this, but the Code has not always been interpreted that way; hence, these alternative proposals. Linczevski said that Art. 35 in its present wording is short and not very clear; Brummitt's proposals and examples are a very good solution.

A vote to make some change in Art. 35 was carried. The chair explained the effects of the various competing proposals.

Prop. A (140 : 85 : 5 : 8)

Greuter observed that we cannot clarify the article in a way to make everyone happy; Prop. A combines features which preserve present usage and results from collaboration of himself with Brummitt and Chater following their separate proposals to the Seattle Congress. The mail vote supports this.

Raven moved that we accept Props. A, B, and C as a single package and reject D and E, since E was rejected by more than a 75% mail vote and D does not represent current practice.

McNeill wondered if Props. A, B, and C were really a package. In particular, he had reservations about making Prop. C mandatory; he would prefer it as a recommendation. Demoulin favoured Prop. A and stressed that D or E would give us the same kind of troubles we are suffering with later starting-points. Prop. A is a very elegant way to deal with the problem. Buchheim pointed out that the motion was not the proper procedure for considering competing proposals, which should be individually discussed. The chair ruled the Raven motion out of order.
Brummitt compared the proposals, especially regarding typification. Prop. E back-dates priority, and seems to be generally unpopular; it would be a reversal of the present Code, would lead to more complicated author citations, and would alter typification; in the *Triticum* example, according to Prop. A typification would be according to Persoon, while according to Prop. E it would be according to DeCandolle.

Eichler said the Note in Prop. A needed editorial attention, but he strongly supported the proposal. Margadant strongly opposed Prop. A as it would be an important change from what we have been doing. Nicolson thought that undesignated infrageneric ranks should be recognized as sectional unless the author states otherwise; this is historical usage, and Prop. A could use a procedure similar to Prop. B, which covers infraspecific ranks.

The rapporteur favoured clarifying the article and thought the arguments in favour of Prop. A were very strong. McNeill sought clarification in the light of Nicolson’s comments. Does the proposal cover epithets as well as names; he hoped it did cover infraspecific taxa. Ross noted that an epithet cannot be published except as part of a name, so the proposal refers to all binomials including names of subgenera. McVaugh observed that Prop. A without Prop. B had very different implications from Prop. A with Prop. B and should not be considered separately.

Prop. A was voted upon and accepted.

Prop. B (152 : 72 : 5 : 5)

Cronquist proposed that the date 1900 be replaced by 1 January 1890, and this was accepted by the proposers. Nicolson proposed an amendment to add: “If in a given publication prior to 1 January 1890, only one infrageneric rank is admitted it is considered to be that of section unless this would be contrary to the statements of the author himself in the same publication”.

Margadant opposed the amendment since the date falls in the middle of a period in which the situation in bryology was very confused. Ahti opposed Prop. B because an asterisk was often used by northern European authors for subspecies but the intent was not always stated in the same publication; also, there are many epithets like *abiflora* published without rank, which have been treated later as forms but would become varieties under this proposal and may endanger the status of some established varietal epithets.

Nicolson asked for clarification of the date; he would prefer 1953. Otherwise we have three classes of names: pre-1890, 1890—1953, and post-1953. Greuter responded that we cannot go as far as 1953 to save names published without rank; if we stick to the last century and to infraspecific levels we will have the most simple system. If we are not sure of the effect of Nicolson’s proposal we should reject it. The proposers of Prop. B were unfamiliar with the sectional name problem and did not include it.
Frodin supported Prop. B with the 1890 date, but not the Nicolson amendment, for the effect on infraspecific names was clear. Infrageneric names require much more study by interested persons before the next Congress. The rapporteur pointed out that sectional names are not indexed and are a very big problem; he would advise against including sections in the proposal.

Nicolson's amendment having been seconded, it was voted upon and defeated. Prop. B, with date amended to 1 January 1890, was then voted upon and accepted.

Prop. C (173:53:3:6)

Mennema asked the section to reject this proposal, despite the big majority in the mail vote. It is not exact enough and would be the source of much confusion; Persoon, for example, changed his opinion regarding ranks in the course of publication of some works, and explained himself in some other publications. Greuter noted that there are several cases, such as Nyman, when a designation of rank appeared in a different portion of a work; rejection of Prop. C would not solve Mennema's problem, because the taxa would be left without rank.

Fosberg pointed out that the proposal does not require that the opinion of an author be accepted if he has indicated otherwise at a different date. It merely requires that the different parts of a work be regarded, for this purpose, as of the same date; this would cover Mennema's objection.

Raven asked whether deletion of "in the same publication" from proposal B would accomplish what is desired. If not, why not? Greuter said it would not, because Prop. B is concerned only with the special case of publications containing only one infraspecific rank. Prop. C was voted upon and accepted. Since acceptance of Props. D (54:161:6:9) and E (34:186:5:9) would be quite inconsistent with the acceptance of Prop. A, the chair ruled that they had been rejected and the session adjourned for lunch.

SIXTH SESSION

Wednesday, 2 July 1975, 2:30 p.m.—5:00 p.m.

Chairman: R. C. Rollins

Article 36

Prop. A (7:228:0:1)

McNeill reported that his colleague, B. Baum, was unfortunately unable to be present but feels very strongly on this proposal. There are two aspects to the matter: first of all, Baum believes that the rapporteurs have misinterpreted the proposal in commenting that the
present Code in no way prohibits the procedure suggested; and secondly, if the Section agrees that there was misinterpretation, it must consider whether the provision should be included. Because much of the difficulty lies in the original wording, Baum suggests the following rewording: “A matrix of character-states, discriminant functions, canonical loadings, or the like may be used in lieu of individual Latin descriptions or diagnoses, provided the character-states are listed in Latin”.

The rapporteur was still of the opinion that under the present Code the desired style could be used. McNeill maintained that at least one of the procedures is not evidently in accordance with the Code, and cited a recent paper of Baum’s in which five of seven sections were new; the position of the constituent species, which is what defines the new sections, is presented in terms of axes which are not any of the original characters but are canonical axes derived by summing for each species the products of the original character-state values by the appropriate canonical weightings.

Fosberg said that this appears to be a step in the process of arriving at an author’s conclusions; can not the conclusions reached by this type of analysis then be expressed in Latin or other language that is understandable by ordinary old-fashioned taxonomists? “I hope that the author would not insist on publication in terms that are obscure to others. And I would like to know if types and other specimens can be cited in this method, and how”. Demoulin said that he and his colleagues involved in this kind of canonical analysis agreed that this is only a step in a scientific investigation; if one cannot interpret and transform this into common language the study is not ripe.

McNeill responded that very often it is possible to present the results of a canonical analysis in conventional form; however, Baum feels that in his paper it was not possible. McNeill stressed that we must make clear in our vote whether we feel such a procedure constitutes valid publication; a simple rejection would leave uncertainty as to whether the Comments Rapporteurs stand. The rapporteur concluded that what Baum had done was invalid; the rapporteurs indeed misunderstood the proposal—or they would have recommended against it.

Upon vote, Prop. A was overwhelmingly rejected.

Article 41

Prop. A (7:28:186:3)

Traverse reported that the Committee for Fossils unanimously recommended rejection of this proposal (0:12), as it was the opinion of the committee that fossil plants should have no special treatment. Rejected.

Prop. C (3 : 82 : 6 : 138)
Greuter recommended rejection; the Editorial Committee is still free to use examples if desirable. Ross agreed that the substance of the proposal should be definitely rejected; it does not deal with an example only. Rejected.

Article 42

Article 46
A proposal from the floor by Botschantzev had been distributed. It would add a footnote as follows to Art. 46: "The correct spelling of the name of the author is the spelling by Latin letters which was given by the author himself. When in original spelling of the name of an author diacritic signs were used, the signs are to be suppressed in the same way as prescribed by Art. 73 for Latin plant names".

Holub considered the proposal very important; the name of the author is a constituent part of the name of a plant but no regulations for writing these names are included in the Code. The spelling of the name from the title of the publication should be used, not Latinized spellings, e. g., not C. (Carolus) Koch but K. (Karl) Koch. There are problems of various transliteration schemes from non-Latin alphabets to be solved. Diacritic signs should not be suppressed. Some authors themselves used different spellings of their names. We are not prepared to solve the question now; the proposal of Botschantzev should be discussed more intensively in the future and a solution should be left to the next Congress.

Botschantzev placed examples on the blackboard, declared that various transliteration schemes have been applied, with some incorrect results as in the recent Kew Record, and urged the section to accept the proposal. He has great difficulty recognizing his own taxa except for old ones written in his own form. Nicolson said that suppression of diacritical marks according to Art. 73 would not be satisfactory.

Fosberg expressed himself in sympathy with the intent of the proposal but was worried about diacritic signs. He proposed an amendment to delete the last sentence of the proposed footnote. Botschantzev accepted this amendment.

Brummitt stated that botanists at Kew had taken very seriously the criticisms of transliterations used in the Kew Record and hoped that future parts (after those now in proof) would be better received in the USSR. There are considerable problems involved, and he supported Holub’s proposal to defer a decision to the next Congress.
Cronquist declared that the matter cannot be as simply solved as the proposal suggests, though he sympathizes with his Soviet colleagues. An author does not always give a transliteration in Latin characters. He moved that the matter become a Recommendation rather than part of Art. 46.

Faegri favoured postponement. The proposal also concerns Japanese and other languages; the International Standards Organization system should be studied.

Sachet agreed that a recommendation would be much better, and would provide some protection against over-conscientious editors. Botschantzev said there was a long tradition in Russia regarding transliteration and habits will not change; so he preferred an Article and not a Recommendation.

Stafleu expressed full sympathy with botanists who cannot recognize their own names when transliterated. IUBS as a rule follows the recommendations of the International Organization for Standardization, which the Soviet government has officially ratified. It would be awkward if the Code, issued under the authority of IUBS, stated officially that it would not follow these standards.

The motion to change the proposal to a Recommendation having been seconded, it was voted upon and carried. Botschantzev thought this most unfortunate and threatened to follow the ISO standards in the future to see if names will be recognized!

Fosberg pointed out that the comments of Faegri and Stafleu missed the point of the proposal, which is to enable us to locate and identify the authors and places of publication of names. The need is to recognize names published in the past; future authors can be asked to follow possible international standards for transliteration, but these cannot be applied to the past. If we write names according to systems other than those in the publications themselves, we will never be able to find them in indices of authors and publications.

Greuter did not want our Soviet colleagues to think we did not understand their problems — which others have also — but this proposal offers too simple a solution. The Section should not insert even a Recommendation into the Code at this point.

Linczevski thought the discussion demonstrated the importance of the proposal. Other provisions relating to orthography are recommendations and these should remain so. He suggested a special committee on orthography, to include linguists. He supported Fosberg's position, and observed that Stafleu in *Taxonomic Literature* did not follow the international standards. Stafleu noted that the new edition will follow different standards. He added that the proposal as worded does not make possible the distinction desired by Fosberg and agreed that a special committee be charged with study of this problem, considering alphabets other than Cyrillic as well.

The chair observed that the effect of this proposal has been to draw attention to a real problem, and asked whether Botschantzev
would be pleased with the appointment of a special committee. He agreed, on condition that the committee report by the end of the sessions.

Zhilin agreed to the necessity for a special committee which would report to the next Congress, because it is a very complicated matter, involving many other alphabets.

The proposal on Art. 46, as amended (to be a Recommendation, and omitting the second sentence), was then voted upon and rejected. A card vote was requested, and the results confirmed (72 yes, 248 no). The chair stated that this complex matter should be studied and reported upon at the next Congress and asked the nominating committee to propose a special committee. Ross suggested that it would be more productive to instruct the General Committee to establish the special committee, and this suggestion was accepted by the chair, ruling that the matter was referred to the General Committee.

Recommendation 46E

Prop. A (71 : 127 : 28 : 10)

Meikle thought there was something to be said for the proposal since citation of pre-starting-point authors is confusing when they are so often post-Linnaean; we should avoid confusion with post-starting-point non-publishing authors. He would prefer deletion of the Recommendation and no citation of pre-starting-point authors. Demoulin noted that we were again at a point where people with later starting-points have special problems, when so large a percentage of names were published before the starting-point. But square brackets [ ] are undesirable and little used; they are often confused with parentheses ( ). Zoologists use them with a very different meaning. There may have been irregularities in the way the present wording appeared in the Code, but square brackets did not enter the Code by a straightforward process, either. He believed that the reintroduction of square brackets in the Code would be disagreeable to the majority of people who cite pre-starting-point authors and that there was general agreement against brackets in the International Mycological Association.

Fosberg called attention to the fact that Rec. 46E applies only to names actually ascribed to a previous author, not to the earliest author who may have used the name back to Pliny or Dioscorides. The matter is not of interest only to mycologists, as Linnaeus in his Genera Plantarum ascribes many names to Tournefort. We should reject this proposal and leave the Code as it is.

The rapporteur informed the Section that the Committee for Fungi and Lichens recommended accepting the proposal (7 : 2) but that he himself was strongly against changing the Recommendation. Demoulin's arguments are very convincing.

The proposal was overwhelmingly rejected.
New Recommendation 46G

Recommendation 47A

Article 48
Prop. A (21 : 196 : 1 : 13)
Demoulin said that if some clarification is not placed in Art. 48 it is possible to interpret misapplications as later homonyms. Nicolson asked everyone to read Art. 48 and the last paragraph of Art. 55; Art. 48 seems to be a peculiar loophole to Art. 55. What is the difference between this kind of “later homonym” and a simple misapplication of a name? Art. 48 is superfluous.

Cronquist agreed that technically Demoulin was right, but the matter was not serious and the change was not really necessary. The rapporteur thought abuse was not very common and the proposal would still leave a problem. Validation of substitute names by referring to misapplications is very common and ought not be ruled against. Adding the two words proposed does not achieve the desired purpose.

The proposal was rejected.

Article 50

Recommendation 50F

Article 51

Article 53
Prop. A (0 : 188 : 1 : 48). Rejected (by previous action).

Article 56
Article 57

Prop. A (30 : 19 : 0 : 185)

Greuter noted that other Articles, as least Art. 23, are also exceptions and the Editorial Committee should list all exceptions here. Editorial Committee.

Article 59

The voting of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens was posted on the board (yes — no — ed. comm. — abstain): Prop. A (3 : 3 : 3 : 0); Prop. B (3 : 6 : 0 : 0); Prop. C (1 : 8 : 0 : 0). Sutton noted that the committee was deadlocked on Prop. A and rejected B and C. Props. A and B are competing proposals, A extending principles already existing in the Code but not covered in Art. 59 and B removing the teeth from Art. 59. This Article is the subject of discussion by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens and a special IMA committee; consequently the wisest course is to refer these proposals back to the new Special Committee until the next Congress.

Prop. A (6 : 19 : 204 : 4), B (6 : 13 : 206 : 4) and C (9 : 11 : 204 : 4) were referred back to the Special Committee.

Article 60


Article 63


Prop. B (20 : 144 : 18 : 28)

Yeo offered a reminder that Props. B and C are diametrically opposed, and he prefers Prop. C despite an element of logical conflict with Art. H. 3. In Hieracium, epithets published in conflict with Art. H. 3 have been taken up for taxa now considered not to be hybrids and will be superfluous if nothing is done. It is necessary to take action one way or the other. Upon the request of the chair, Yeo withdrew Prop. B.


Brummitt supported the proposal, which means that such names are not superfluous and may be used if they become needed. Accepted.

Prop. D (7 : 69 : 4 : 145). Rejected, with observation by the rapporteur that examples can be examined by the Editorial Committee.

Prop. E (28 : 30 : 4 : 166)

Fosberg averred that this was not an editorial matter. Ross said the main effect of the change would be to make plain that names
involving an illegitimate generic name may provide an epithet on the same footing as the epithets of fully legitimate names. It is something which ought to be in the Code.

Holub opposed Props. E and F, noting that the main change was substitution of the word “name” for “combination”. If generic names are included as proposed, then some unnecessary changes may follow (of which he cited examples). The *Hordelymus* example in Prop. F concerns only a monotypic genus and therefore does not show all problems of the proposed change.

The session was adjourned at 5:00 to allow convening of the general assembly of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) in the same room.

SEVENTH SESSION

Thursday, 3 July 1975, 9:40 a.m.—1:00 p.m.

Chairman: R. Ross

Article 63

Discussion continued on Prop. E with a short summary by Holub of his remarks of the previous day; he stated that if the proposal is accepted, changes in the text on typification would also be necessary. Greuter agreed that this was not purely an editorial matter, but concerns the intent of the Code where generic names are not covered. Holub was correct in proposing a new generic name in his example, but he must be the only one who realized this peculiarity of the Code. However, the Code is clear that the type of a name is the type of its basionym.

Stafleu concurred that the matter was not purely editorial, but we have done what the proposal says for many years; it is sound procedure.

Prop. E was accepted.


Article 64


Stafleu asked for a vote rather than referral to Editorial Committee; he was definitely not in favour of the proposal. Rejected.

Prop. B (9:61:0:157)

Stafleu likewise requested a vote. A good, logical practice was described, but the situation (two homonyms simultaneously published with different types) was extremely rare and not covered by the
Code and hence this was new material. Margadant indicated he was in favour but he wanted an English translation of "gleichlautende Namen". Stafleu said "homonyms" and the chair ruled that this was the English sense. Greuter proposed an amendment, to delete "oder der für diese Taxa... (to the end)". The procedure should cover the situation only if an author explicitly treats both homonyms in the same work. Buchheim thought Greuter was in error — Linnaeus did this several times. Greuter suggested that perhaps we should say "accepts" rather than "takes up" for "anzuschliessen".

Cronquist said the proposal adds nothing new, with the ruling that "homonyms" is the translation, and hence it is unnecessary. Greuter's amendment, however, would actually change the meaning and should be considered as a different proposal. Stafleu claimed that even without the proposal at all, we can do what it wants; it merely spells out procedure, except for the Greuter amendment. As the situation clarified in discussion, Greuter withdrew his amendment and Margadant affirmed that the sense of the proposal (to cover orthographic variants) was useful. The chair called attention to the note in Art. 64. Prop. B was rejected.


The chair observed that we were now at a point where we consider conservation or rejection of specific epithets. It would not be satisfactory to consider the proposals one by one before a general discussion on the subject. Action on Art. 69, Prop. A may depend on action on Art. 14.

Meikle said the matter deserves adequate consideration, but he will be brief as time was precious. He will request a card vote on Art. 14, Props. C, D and E. One school says that the machinery for nomina specifica conservanda couldn't handle all the work, and another says that there is very little left to do. Prunus amygdalus is a recent case which renewed his fervour for conservation. He cannot in all honesty see why there is such entrenched opposition to the proposal; machinery for generic names has worked well and could apply to species names with equally satisfactory results.

Buchheim reminded the Section that at Edinburgh a very important decision was made: to start machinery on stabilization of names. The committee has worked hard and effectively. He further noted that the International Seed Testing Association had empowered him to speak against these proposals; it has stabilized hundreds of names since 1966, names which are generally the correct ones according to present knowledge and which cannot be changed for six years.

Demoulin, affirming that he knew how this issue had always divided botanists, noted that one looks at it differently if one is a taxonomist in a group, who finds it easy to cope with nomenclatural changes, than if one is a user of the names — not only people in applied botany but also taxonomists who work on a different group. (When he collects a fungus on culms of Phragmites communis he is...
very unhappy to be told it is *P. australis*). “The vast silent majority
of users of plant names would welcome nomina specifica conservanda”.

Little agreed that the specialists in nomenclature should do some-
thing to help the users of plant names: agronomists, horticultu-
rists, foresters, and others. He represented the Society of American
Foresters, with more than 18,000 professional members, and had
worked with foresters more than 40 years; he had long supported
nomina specifica conservanda. Changing labels in botanical gardens
and arboreta is costly.

McNeill, as representative of a Department of Agriculture (Ca-
nada), emphasized that this was the one really important decision
before the Nomenclature Section. There is no new principle involved;
the feared flood of proposals would be a myth if the criteria suggested
by Brummitt and Meikle in their comments accompanying the propo-
sal were applied. Lists of approved names as cited by Buchheim are
one of the strongest arguments in favour of conservation; such lists
can rapidly become lists of the “correct” names regardless of the
Code and would mean its destruction. If we reject Art. 14, Prop.
C we will be taking a step to destroy credibility of the Code as a basis
for the application of scientific names among the broad community
of users.

Brickell denied the full relevance of the International Seed Tes-
ting Association list, as it covers not only species but also cultivars.
This is also an important issue with plant patents and plant variety
rights, where names are legally controlled by international
agreement. The present stabilization committee has no legal teeth.
Many members of the Nomenclature Section had emphasized the
need for stability in the Code and yet they consistently oppose stabili-
ization by conservation of specific names.

Fosberg noted that this was his sixth International Botanical
Congress and at all but two this matter was on the floor for formal
consideration and decisively rejected. All of the arguments are old
familiar ones; not a new idea has appeared. The Committee on Stabi-
lization seems to be working, and he suggested rejection of all propo-
sals.

Moore spoke as a member of the Committee on Stabilization
and of an institution that works with over 23,000 ornamental and
economic plants, and urged continued use of the Code, with education
of the using public. He called for the question.

The chair explained the meaning of Moore’s motion and the
import of terminating discussion before proceeding to consider the
proposals seriatim. The motion was seconded and carried.

Art. 14, Prop. C was open for discussion, and Brummitt pointed
out that it was intentionally vague, consisting itself of only the first
two lines in the Synopsis. Meikle called for the question, and his mo-
tion was seconded and carried. However, with the consent of the
Section, the chair asked for the rapporteur’s comments. Stafleu sta-
ted that the main reason he advised against this at the last Congress was not on principle, but from fear that we would not have enough people to do all the work; apparently, from the discussion, we have persons from some large institutions who are willing to do the work, and he is in favour of nomina specifica conservanda.

A card vote resulted in rejection of Prop. C (150 yes, 186 no). While the ballots were being counted, the chair suggested consideration of the General Proposals.

**General Proposals**

Prop. A (23 : 201 : 9 : 2). Withdrawn. Thomas noted there would be insufficient time to discuss it adequately, but he urged delegates to consider the proposal.

Prop. B (69 : 24 : 2 : 134)

Margadant noted that this would require publication of a complete new edition of the Code, a decision not yet made, so he would refer the proposal to the Editorial Committee. The chair stated that acceptance would apply if a new edition is issued. *Accepted.*


Art. 14, Prop. D was open for discussion. Johnson stated that he had voted against Prop. C because of the likelihood of ill-informed proposals; however, he considered Prop. D acceptable since proposals for rejection would generally be better informed and he favoured some means of keeping names of important species. The last sentence of paragraph (a) needs attention to clarify the status of earlier homonyms; does the sentence allow for retention of later homonyms? Meikle explained that earlier homonyms would be rejected and later homonyms *could* be used.

Fosberg declared that even if he were in favour of the proposal, which he was not, he would have to vote against it so long as it contained the incredible statement "or for any other reason in the cause of nomenclatural stability" which means that anyone's opinion goes. He was also opposed because of Meikle's interpretation, which he took to mean that if an epithet is once rejected it is unavailable under any circumstances. If a name is validly published, how can it be rejected against *everything*?

Demoulin suggested using phrasing similar to Art. 13 (f) regarding names used by Fries: "Such names are to be regarded as validly published but cannot affect the nomenclatural status of names published afterward".

Raven agreed with Johnson's argument. The reason these matters are considered every time is because they are important. The
botanical community demands stabilization and we should vote for this eminently reasonable proposal.

Greuter stated that even if he were opposed to the proposal, which he is not, he would not object to the phrasing which affects homonyms because they could be dealt with like rejected generic names.

Cronquist recognized the significance of the difficulties that have led people to propose conservation or rejection of specific names, but the proposed cure is worse than the disease. It is something like taking morphine; anyone can reasonably use it for life-threatening pain, but if one uses it for any old pain, he soon ceases to function. Experience with the conserved list of genera suggests that names to be considered for rejection will not be few.

Faegri quoted the examples given in the preamble to Art. 69, Prop. A and said there is only one cure: rejection.

McVaugh called for the question, and his motion was seconded and carried. The rapporteur noted a procedural difficulty—Johnson’s question is not so easily solved as Meikle has said nor in the way Greuter suggests, because we are dealing with rejected, not conserved names. The way out is to say “not validly published” and get rid of rejected names. The proposers accepted this suggested amendment, but withdrew their proposal after prolonged parliamentary questioning as to the propriety of voting when an amendment was made after discussion.

The rapporteur then offered a new proposal, like Prop. D except that the last sentence of (a) would end “...not validly published”.

Buchheim warned against this proposal. A name rejected against a taxonomic synonym ought to be available if both taxa are recognized; if such a name is declared not validly published, a new name would otherwise have to be proposed. Fosberg added the objection that insertion of a provision affecting validity of publication without full investigation of its possible effects on the section on Conditions and Dates of Valid Publication seems highly undesirable.

Meikle called for the question and his motion was seconded and carried. Upon tabulation, the card vote indicated rejection of the proposal (113 yes, 223 no). While the ballots were being counted, consideration on General Proposals resumed.

General Proposals (cont.)


The vice-rapporteur explained that the alternative to his proposal would mean saying many additional times in our Code “(except for Bacteria)” since we presently call attention to only a very few of the discrepancies between the two codes. The better solution is to remove from our Code any claim to regulate the names of organisms treated as bacteria.

Faegri asked why it was necessary to get into the complicated question of whether bacteria are plants or not. Why not just say the
Code does not refer to the bacteria? Voss replied that if the Editorial Committee is so instructed, it can handle in the simplest way the principle that our Code does not cover the names of organisms when treated taxonomically as bacteria.

Ahti said that if we exclude the bacteria from the Code, some people may interpret it to exclude blue-green algae, which in many books are considered to be bacteria. Greuter asked about homonyms and Voss called attention to Prop. F. Demoulin thought the Committee for Algae should consider whether the last paragraph of Art. 45 needs extending to refer to the bacteriological code. Stafleu said the matter was already covered in our Code.

Raven affirmed that our Code covers blue-green algae when considered as plants. There is nothing we can do to prevent someone who considers them to be bacteria from publishing new species according to the bacteriological code.

Prop. E was voted upon and accepted.

Prop. F (111:36:10:63)

The vice-repporteur said the purpose of the proposal was simply to avoid having the Code make the taxonomic declaration that all plants must be placed in a single kingdom, since some systems recognize more than one kingdom of organisms which should be covered by this Code. The Editorial Committee can adjust the wording in the least awkward way if this principle is accepted. Accepted.

Art. 14, Prop. E was next open for discussion. Meikle, detecting that a certain melancholy had fallen upon the assemblage since rejection of Props. C and D, noted also a degree of death-bed contribution; so that out of charity, he and Brummitt offered some hope of salvation in the world to come — i.e., the XIII International Botanical Congress — by this largely procedural motion. They only ask that a special committee report on the conservation and rejection of specific names. Brummitt added that this committee would have the specific task of collecting actual examples, and should present a hard case to the next Congress rather than personal opinions.

McVaugh asked whether Art. 69, Prop. A should be considered first. Faegri stated that if Prop. E is accepted, he would withdraw Art. 69, Prop. A. Johnson, as a member of Faegri’s committee, did not agree that the proposal on Art. 69 should be withdrawn if Prop. E is accepted; it is to some degree an independent issue. The chair ruled that discussion of Art. 69, Prop. A should come first.

Article 69

Prop. A

Fosberg spoke against the rewording and repeated his long-standing position that the Article was undesirable. He moved an amendment to delete Art. 69 from the Code. Faegri objected that this
was a completely new proposal, not an amendment. The chair ruled that it would be voted on first, with a 60% vote required for passage.

Demoulin declared that if we lose both Arts. 69 and 70, which are our only emergency escapes from some really absurd situations, he would consider taxonomy as a madman’s game and devote himself entirely to biochemistry. This is again an issue that comes up at every Congress, and the proposed deletion of Art. 69 was rejected by the mail vote at the preceeding one.

Stafleu advised against the amendment. We have rejected nomina specifica conservanda et rejicienda and need this escape; it has been often used.

The vote on Fosberg’s amendment failed, returning the discussion to the main proposal.

Faegri noted the three separate parts of the proposal: the first attempts to link Art. 69 more closely to the type method; the other two are procedural. It would be difficult to make the Article work without a list. While the proposed Note is debatable, it creates less ambiguity than without it. The chair observed that the mail ballot divided the three points and we should follow that procedure in the voting.

Cronquist was sympathetic to the proposal but uneasy about how it might be applied in practice. How would the list be set up? A formal procedure would be best. Stafleu declared that the list should be purely formal and go through a committee just like nomina conservanda.

Part 1 (137:85:4:4), the rewording, was voted upon and accepted.

Part 2 (98:115:4:10), the establishment of a list, was voted upon and accepted.

Part 3 (45:179:5:7), the new Note, was withdrawn.

The discussion returned to Art. 14, Prop. E. Cronquist credited Brummitt, Meikle, et al. with tenacity, but feared that a vote to establish a committee might be interpreted as support for ideas that the Section has not favoured. Meikle assured Cronquist and others that there was no intent to plead a particular cause; the committee might report in any way. It is to glean exact information. He suggested a show of hands rather than a card vote.

McVaugh urged an impartial committee including some members who do not necessarily favour conservation or rejection. The chair offered assurances that such a committee would be impartial. Johnson urged that the Section give serious consideration to the needs of the many users of plant names who are concerned about this matter; we have a responsibility which we should recognize by setting up a balanced committee.

Fosberg declared that the proposal was strictly a move to keep alive a proposition that has been decisively rejected by four successive Congresses. He doubted that an impartial committee was possible, since those favouring these ideas will be willing to serve but
those perfectly happy with the status quo will not care to waste their time.

Prop. E was voted upon and accepted.

The rapporteur announced that the Section would reconvene from 2:00 to 3:00, and if the business were not finished, again tomorrow at 10:00. It would not be fair to rush too much.

EIGHTH SESSION

Thursday, 3 July 1975, 2:15 p. m.—3:00 p. m.

Chairman: R. C. Rollins

Article 70

Prop. A (126:101:4:2)

Faegri said that his committee had looked at all previous committee reports on the subject and could find no argument which would justify the existence of Art. 70, which should be deleted. McNeill asked about the question of what one does with names that cannot be typified. Fosberg said the answer was obvious: if a name cannot be typified it cannot be used; it exists but can do no harm. Few monographs do not have lists of ambiguous and excluded names.

Prop. A was voted upon and accepted.

Article 71

Prop. A (185:44:5:0)

Dressier said the Uropedium example shows the problems: Uropedium lindenii was based on a peloric lady-slipper—a very "normal" sort of monstrosity; it is self-pollinating and forms large populations and should have a name. He believed Art. 71 should be deleted and he would then propose to conserve Phragmipedium; if it is not, we should seek a better example of a monstrosity, and define what it is.

Cronquist said that despite difficulties in interpretation, the Article was useful in disposing of names that are based on obvious freaks. Faegri asked for a definition of a monstrosity. Cronquist admitted that they were difficult to define, but you can recognize it when you see it. Fosberg said that these names should have the same status as those covered under Art. 70—if they cannot be typified they cannot be used. Rollins noted that there are often monstrosities in Cruciferae as a result of fungus infections; and they can be easily referred to species.

Prop. A was voted upon and accepted. A card vote was called for, and the results confirmed (232 yes, 60 no).
Article 72

Prop. A (5: 25: 193: 5)

The vice-rapporteur called attention to the favourable vote (6: 1) by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens, but noted that the proposal apparently depends on Art. 59, for which we referred all proposals back to the Special Committee. Referred to Special Committee.

Recommendation 72A

The rapporteur called attention to the proposal by Paclt, published in the May issue of Taxon, to delete Rec. 72A and amend the Note in Art. 72. The vice-rapporteur noted that the effect would be to change Rec. 72A to mandatory status, as an Article. Margadant moved to table the proposal, and this motion was seconded and carried.

Consideration turned to the report of the ad hoc committee on autonyms. Ross presented the first portion of the report (Appendix A: Reports), dealing with Prop. 0, regretting that copies were not available for distribution as it had just been completed during the lunch hour on a bench outside the Hermitage.

Raven stated his belief that the matter was absolutely clear, as it was when first presented, and he called for the question. This motion was seconded and carried. A card vote was taken on Art. 19, Prop. D and the proposal was rejected (133 yes, 152 no).

Art. 19, Prop. E was referred to the Editorial Committee.

The report of the Committee for Algae (Appendix A: Reports) had been distributed and was presented by Silva. Schopf noted that Cyclococcolithus (Prop. 201) was also referred to the Committee for Fossil Plants, which believes the question should be deferred. The vice-rapporteur noted that since the Committee for Algae was not recommending conservation, the name was not going on any list, so the effect was the same.

Ross asked whether acceptance of the report meant acceptance of Art. 13, Prop. A, and Art. 16, Prop. B, as recommended. It was voted to accept the report and the proposals recommended.

Ninth Session

Friday, 4 July 1975, 10: 00 a. m.—12: 45 p. m.

Chairman: R. C. Rollins

The report of the Committee for Fossil Plants consisted of copies of the pre-Leningrad report (Taxon 24 : 387—389) and a supplement (Appendix A: Reports). It was summarized by Traverse, who called
attention to the most important point, deletion of organ-genera from the Code. This automatically takes care of proposals from the floor by Zhilin, pertaining to Arts. 3, 7 and 59, and Meyen’s proposal in the Synopsis (Taxon 24 : 251—254). The thrust of this important departure from the present Code is to remove matters that are purely or almost purely taxonomic.

Zhilin explained that he had not followed Meyen and proposed one term, “artificial”, for fossil genera because it was impossible to distinguish between form- and organ-genera. He was now in favour of the Committee’s proposal. The vice-rapporteur asked whether the type of Glossopteris should not be stated as a species of Glossopteris—or had the combination never been made? Traverse and Schopf pointed out that the type of the rejected name Glossopteris should be given as Asplenium scolopendrium because of doubt as to valid publication in Glossopteris.

Schopf urged acceptance of the report and paid tribute to Faegri, who served to moderate the various views. Traverse moved acceptance of the report and the action recommended. Seconded and carried without dissent.

The chair introduced the question of coordinating the botanical and zoological codes, a matter on which this Section cannot act unilaterally, and introduced L. Jerković, of Sarajevo, Yugoslavia, who summarized a memorandum on the subject. The chair asked for the sense of the group as to whether it favoured entering into discussion with zoologists about a uniform code for all organisms; this could be referred to the next ICSEB.

Ross asked, if the Section approved, whether it would be the duty of the General Committee to take up the matter with the organizers of ICSEB II and the Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. Faegri noted that the matter was under study by ICSU, whose executive committee has asked for study of the question. This was preferable administratively to referring it to congresses. The chair ruled that the matter was then referred to IUBS.

Discussion returned to the report of the ad hoc committee on autonyms. Brummitt stated that it was unfortunate that we had no discussion the previous day and recalled the Seattle action when a reconsideration occurred the next day. However, the group is now small and not representative, so he suggested that decision on Props. D and F be reserved and botanists be urged not to rush into print a lot of new combinations. He did not even know the rapporteur’s position. The rapporteur stated that there had been ample time for discussion, including clear blackboard presentations followed by questions, which resulted in the referral of the proposals to the ad hoc committee. The net result of action thus far is that the Code remains as it is; what is now asked is a request that we not follow the Code.

Ross read the second half of the report of the committee on autonyms, affecting Prop. F. The committee could not function in an
informed way without a botanical library in the short time available. He supported Brummitt’s view that we should leave the Code as it is at the moment. Cronquist agreed that an attenuated group should not take any action on highly controversial matters, and moved to table Prop. F. The motion was seconded and carried.

Brummitt was concerned that the Section make some statement that the matter is still open. The rapporteur noted that the vote on Prop. D was very decisive; the only question is whether there was adequate discussion. Nicolson moved that the matter of autonyms be referred to the General Committee for appointment of a special committee to report to the next Congress. Meikle wondered if Brummitt could be allowed to explain the example on the blackboard; the chair reiterated that discussion was closed, the matter tabled, and remaining business must be completed. The motion to set up a special committee was seconded and carried.

APPENDIX I

Little noted that the Committee for Hybrids had no quorum nor report; he suggested that only those proposals with a large mail vote in favour be considered. The chair saw no way to speed up consideration.


The vice-rapporteur read comments from Yeo explaining the misunderstanding of this proposal (also of New Rec. H. 4A and Art. H. 8, Prop. B) as discussed by the rapporteurs in the Synopsis. Under the old Code, the examples given in Prop. B would be names; under Prop. C they would be condensed formulae. Upon vote, Prop. C was rejected.


McNeill noted that since Art. H. 4, Prop. C, had been rejected it would be wise to accept this one. The rapporteur agreed that it was desirable. Accepted.


Meikle noted that the proposal was controversial, as was Art. H. 9, Prop. A, and might have very undesirable consequences, so he recommended rejection. Rejected.


Little stated that since we had combined Arts. H. 8 and H. 9 by accepting Art. H. 8, Prop. A, this proposal should be accepted to be consistent. The vice-rapporteur noted that only editorial adjustments were accepted under Art. H. 8, not a matter of substance; this proposal should be considered on its merits. The rapporteur recommended rejection of the proposal. Brummitt suggested referral back to the Committee for Hybrids. Upon vote, the proposal was rejected (thus rejecting Art. 32, Prop. C).


In the absence of any official committee report or expert guidance from anyone present, the proposal was rejected.

APPENDIX II

Buchheim summarized the report of the Subcommittee for Family Names (Taxon 24 : 249—251). The Section confirmed the recommendations of the Subcommittee, resulting in the following action:


APPENDIX III

The rapporteur clarified the procedures relating to nomina conservanda, which must first be studied by the Special Committees and then the General Committee. He called for ratification of such names as had been recommended by the General Committee as indicated in the Synopsis. Motion to accept these was seconded and carried.
The vice-rapporteur stated that so far as he knew, action had been taken on all proposals.

Greuter moved on behalf of himself, Brummitt, and McNeill to keep the matter of Art. 10 open since the General Committee has not yet reported and should do so. Cronquist wanted assurance that a committee would not review Art. 10, Prop. A, which was adopted overwhelmingly by the Section. The rapporteur assured him that the committee would consider only the business left over from the Seattle Congress (to which only Art. 10, Props. B, C, and D of the Synopsis are relevant). The motion to refer these matters again to the General Committee for investigation by a special committee was seconded and carried.

Nicolson called the attention of the Editorial Committee to Tryon's proposal to modify Rec. 7B, which was accepted at Seattle but did not get into the Code. A protologue includes all elements of a taxon and the issue is what to do when the elements are discordant with each other, not with the protologue.

Margadant and Demoulin stressed that the Editorial Committee should not change the numbering of the Articles in the Code to accommodate the deletion of Arts. 70 and 71. The rapporteurs assured them that the Editorial Committee would act in accord with the motion of the first session.

Faegri presented the report of the Nominating Committee (see Taxon 24: 689—690. Nov. 1975), of which copies were distributed, and noted a few corrections. Motion by the chair to accept the report and to declare the nominees elected was carried. Stafleu commented that many people on committees are not members of IAPT; he urged all secretaries to ask members of their committees to join IAPT, for all persons interested in nomenclature should be members.

Stafleu then spoke regarding the production of a new Code, for he had some reservations. A new edition would unavoidably be rather expensive, and he sought the opinion of the Section.

Thomas suggested a new edition, because for many works which have addenda and supplements these are often ignored and do not find their way into libraries. Stafleu said that if we did not have a new edition, he would publish the changes in Taxon, and reprints would be sent with copies of the Code.

Margadant moved to empower the Editorial Committee to look into the possibilities of publishing a new edition; if this were not possible, to produce the text of the changed Articles in full; and finally, if that not be possible, to publish the changes only. Greuter supported the motion but thought the Editorial Committee already had that power. Faegri said it would be preposterous to bind the Editorial Committee; he could not promise that IUBS would be able to support publication of another Code so soon after the previous edition. Margadant's motion was seconded and carried, and further comments were solicited by the chair.
McVaugh urged strong effort to publish the Code as a unit, because of the likelihood of confusion and error among potential inept users. Students and others need the material in one volume. Nicolson suggested two things to save money: (1) cut, paste, and use offset printing to produce; (2) make soft-cover one-language editions available.

Meikle said there seemed to be agreement to prefer a separate new volume, but as a document of only temporary importance it need not be printed on such good paper. It might be possible, in view of the importance of the Code to taxonomy, to raise funds from various institutions. Stafleu noted that the problem is labor; paper is not significant. Sachet urged exploration of other printing techniques.

Voss thought it is important that the Code be available to students at low cost so that they might be induced to pay some attention to it; perhaps a paperback edition including the glossary would be a “best-seller”, without the Appendixes. McNeill said that very few changes had been made at Leningrad, so if ever there is an occasion on which a new edition could be omitted, this is it, and use of the Seattle Code was not likely to lead to error.

Little declared that we must stop issuing a new Code every few years. It is not stabilization to change the rules. He would like discussion on his informal suggestion to omit nomenclature at the next Congress, as was done at Ithaca in 1926; this would save money, too. Brummitt recommended a new colour for the binding so that a new edition could be easily recognized.

Stafleu expressed his gratitude for the suggestions and mentioned another problem — the report of these meetings. Perhaps our Soviet colleagues can publish the report, in view of the fact that money may not be sent out of the country to support publication elsewhere. He also noted that IAPT had discussed the matter of arguments associated with proposals published in Taxon. As editor, he is obliged to publish only the proposals; he will have to request summaries of arguments, and is prepared to distribute xerox copies of typewritten documents. (Of course there is no problem if an author is able to cover page charges, but IAPT cannot be asked to support long arguments).

The rapporteur asked the Section if it wished the Bureau of Nomenclature to prepare a motion for presentation at the final Plenary Session of the Congress, accepting the decisions of the Nomenclature Section. Motion to authorize the Bureau to draw up a resolution was seconded and carried.

Faegri presented a “lifeboat action” motion as follows: “In case there shall not be another International Botanical Congress, the authority over the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature must be transferred to the International Union of Biological Sciences through its Division of Botany, or an organization at that time corresponding to it. The Bureau is asked to present to the next Inter-
national Botanical Congress a proposal for the machinery to do this". The intent is to avoid the hectic problem Zoology faced unprepared. Staflieu explained that such machinery could take effect when and if needed, once it was a part of our record and ratified. The motion was seconded and carried.

Fosberg suggested that the Nomenclature Section should go on record with a hearty vote of thanks to the interpreters and recorders for doing such an efficient and patient job of making it possible for us to communicate *. (Ratified by applause). Little added that the Section also go on record as thanking our hosts for the other fine arrangements made. (Further applause). The president of the Section, Linzevski, thanked the rapporteurs for attention to the details of organizing the Section and to vice-presidents Rollins and Ross for aid in chairing the sessions. He appreciated the patience of the Section in listening to the Russian translations. The close cooperation of the delegates and those on the podium has produced results. Not everyone will be pleased with the decisions made. He hoped that the time for nomina specifica conservanda had arrived. He also hoped that at the next Congress the proposal to amend Art. 14 will be accepted without any card vote. He concluded with great thanks to all colleagues who took part. (Applause).

A P P E N D I X A:

COMMITTEE REPORTS PRESENTED TO THE SECTION

Report of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens

The last report of the Committee was published in Taxon 23 : 647 (1974). Since that time, the Secretary has been informed of the list of nomina conservanda proposita for fungi, and the Synopsis of Proposals for changes in the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature for action at the Leningrad Congress has appeared.

After examination of the Synopsis, the Secretary submitted to the Committee a list of proposals which were considered as having unusual import for nomenclature of fungi and lichens. The Committee members were asked to submit their votes on these issues, so that the Committee as a whole could make recommendations to the nomenclature sessions of the Congress. A majority of the Committee has voted, and the results of this tally are given below. In each case, the Committee offers its opinion via its vote, and especially where strongly negative, vigorously objects to the proposal. In each case, the sequence of votes is: yes — no — editorial committee — abstain.

* Translation service was provided throughout the Nomenclature sessions by Rebecca Sorkina and Alexander Zhuravlev.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art.</th>
<th>prop.</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>2-4-3-0</td>
<td>weakly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>1-8-0-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B:</td>
<td>1-8-0-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>4-3-2-0</td>
<td>recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>B:</td>
<td>1-7-0-1</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>C:</td>
<td>1-8-0-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>D:</td>
<td>1-8-0-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>E:</td>
<td>2-7-0-0</td>
<td>rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>8-0-1-0</td>
<td>strongly recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16A</td>
<td>C:</td>
<td>0-7-1-1</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B:</td>
<td>3-1-4-1</td>
<td>editorial committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>C:</td>
<td>0-4-2-2</td>
<td>rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>7-2-0-0</td>
<td>recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>1-7-1-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>0-7-2-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26A</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>0-7-2-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>B:</td>
<td>1-7-1-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>C:</td>
<td>0-7-2-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>2-7-0-0</td>
<td>rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>B:</td>
<td>1-7-1-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>B:</td>
<td>8-1-0-0</td>
<td>strongly recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46E</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>7-2-0-0</td>
<td>strongly recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Rec. 46G</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>0-9-0-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>3-3-3-0</td>
<td>no decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>B:</td>
<td>3-6-0-0</td>
<td>rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>C:</td>
<td>1-8-0-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>1-8-0-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>4-5-0-0</td>
<td>rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>6-1-1-1</td>
<td>recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Prop.</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>0-8-1-0</td>
<td>strongly rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E:</td>
<td>7-0-1-1</td>
<td>strongly recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these proposals for changes in the Code, the following decisions on *nomina conservanda proposita* for Fungi may be reported (in each case the votes are reported: in favour — opposed — postpone debate).


188. *Cetraria* (Culberson, Taxon 15 : 316) : 7—0—2 (accepted).


A number of Committee members have indicated their indisposition to serve for another term, and the following new members have been co-opted by nominations and election of the present Committee: Dr. T. Ahti (Finland); Dr. H. H. Burdsall (United States); Dr. G. L. Hennebert (Belgium); Dr. Lennart Holm (Sweden); Dr. G. F. Laundon (New Zealand); Dr. Z. Pouzar (Czechoslovakia); Dr. C. V. Subramanian (India); Dr. M. Svrcak (Czechoslovakia); and Dr. K. T. van Warmelo (South Africa).

Dr. Jan Nannfeldt, the present Chairman, has declined to serve for another term, and Dr. L. K. Weresub (Canada) has been elected as the new Committee Chairman. The present Secretary has been elected to another term.

To Dr. Nannfeldt go the thanks of the Committee for his leadership and wisdom over the past years, and from the Secretary, my thanks to all Committee members whose efforts and cooperation have made possible the nomenclatural progress of the past year. Respectfully submitted,


Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Autonyms

Acceptance of Art. 19, Prop. D, would permit an author reducing a species in which subspecies had already been described to the rank of subspecies under another species, to choose as subspecific epithet for it in its new position its specific epithet. At present he is always unable to do so. The same applies in similar cases at all ranks below family. Acceptance of the proposal would not involve any change in a name already published, but it would give the status of validly published name to a name not necessarily effectively published. Its rejection would involve changes in a number of names published before 1969. Your committee is divided on the desirability of this amendment: 2 are for it, 2 are against it.

Under the Code as amended at Seattle in 1969 autonyms were restricted to taxa including the type of the family, genus, or species to which the taxon is subordinate. Previously it applied at all levels of the hierarchy, e.g. to the section including the type of a subgenus that did itself not include the type of the genus. Acceptance of Prop. F would restore this position, which was the one in force from the introduction of autonyms in 1950 until 1969. Both the pre-1969 situation and that now in force have disadvantages and your committee is divided on which has the greater: 2 favour the amendment and 2 are against it, one of them without much conviction.

Report of the Committee for Algae

By a majority mail vote, the Committee has recommended acceptance or rejection of the following proposals for the conservation of generic names:

Acceptance:

Prop. 327 (Taxon 21: 201. 1972) Chloromonas Gobi
Prop. 374 (Taxon 23: 430. 1974) Cystophora J. Agardh

Rejection:

Prop. 201 (Taxon 16: 340. 1967) Cyclococcolithus Kamptner

Note: Prop. 231 (Taxon 17: 442. 1968) Hormidium Klebs has been withdrawn (see Taxon 21: 642. 1969).

Regarding Art. 13, Prop. A, six members of the Committee (two in absentia and four present at this Congress) recommend adoption. A seventh member favours only the last two of the four proposed dates. No other responses have been received.

Regarding Art. 16, Prop. B, only the opinions of the four members present at this Congress are available. All four recommend adoption.

P. C. Silva for P. S. Dixon, Secretary.

Report of the Committee for Fossil Plants

Beyond the results outlined in the pre-Leningrad report (Taxon 24: 387—389. May 1975), the committee has taken the following actions at Leningrad:

1. Recommends that the generic name, Klukia, from the Paclt list (see pre-Leningrad report), be held for more consideration until the next congress. The other names on the Paclt list can be rejected at this congress.

2. a. Recommends that Cyclococcolithus Kamptner, proposed for conservation by W. Hay at Seattle, be held for more consideration at the next congress.

   b. Recommends the same action for Botryopteris Renault, which had not previously been proposed for conservation.

3. Brings the following two proposals before the Nomenclature Section:

   a. Emend the conservation statement for Glossopteris Brongniart on p. 377 of the 1972 ICBN as follows: Correct the type of the rejected generic name to read: T.: Asplenium scolopendrium L.
b. Emend Article 3, Note 1, to read:

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: *Lepidocarpon*... *Dadoxylon*... (same lists as in present Code, but deletes all references to form and organ genera).

A. Traverse, Secretary.

---

**Report of the Committee for Bryophytes**

As indicated in the report published in *Taxon* 24: 248—249 (1975) a large majority of the Committee recommends acceptance of the following nomina conservanda:

- *Muelleriella* Dusén
- *Chiloscyphus* Corda corr. Dum.
- *Bryoxiphium* Mitt.
- *Lejeunea* Libert
- *Scapania* (Dum.) Dum. (emend. typ.)
- *Pleuridium* Rabenh.
- *Porellaceae* Cavers
- *Lejeuneaceae* Casares-Gil.
- *Bryoxiphiaceae* Besch.
- *Eustichiacae* Broth.

The committee members present at the meeting on Monday, June 30, 1975 (Fulford (chairman), Bonner, Demaret, Margadant, Florschiitz), again considered the *Daltonia* problem. It was unanimously agreed that the unofficial (not published) proposal by Margadant (see report Taxon and text below) should be brought before the Section of Nomenclature, i.e. to conserve *Daltonia* Hook. et Tayl. with the lectotype *D. splachnoides* (Sm.) Hook. et Tayl. This proposal is also recommended for acceptance.

P. A. Florschiitz, Secretary.


Comment: The emendation intends to change the date and the author(s) of the name to be conserved to those of its original publication. This is fully in accordance with the conservation practice of making an illegitimate name legitimate by conserving the lectotype to the species traditionally kept under this generic name, as indeed was first done by Bridel.

W. D. Margadant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahti, Teuvo</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Gokhtuni, N. G.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Al-Shehhar, Ihsan Ali</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Gocolskokov, V. P.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aidarova, R. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Golomilizky, N. P.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Ananiev, A. R.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Gorovoi, P. G.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avetisjan, V. E.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Gradstein, S. R.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Balkovsky, B. E.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Greene, S. W.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beljanin, V. N.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Greuter, Werner</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Bhat, P. Keshava</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Grubov, V. I.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaxell, D. F.</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Grudzinskaia, I. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Boltenhagen, E.</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Gviniani, Z. I.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondarenko, O. N.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Hammer, K.</td>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>Bonner, C. E. B.</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Hara, Hiroshi</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botschantzev, V. P.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Hässel de Menéndez, G. G.</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Brickell, C. D.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Hedberg, Olov</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs, B. G.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Hekking, W. H. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Brooker, M. I. H.</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Herrera, Sara</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brogier, H. E.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Hiepko, Paul</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Bradmitt, R. K.</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Holmgren, Noel H.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchheim, Günther</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Holmgren, Patricia</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Budantzev, L. J.</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Holub, Josef</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capote, Salvador</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Ikonnikov, S. S.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Carbonell, Fredes Vind.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Iljinskaja, I. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, Tyge</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Imchanitzkaja, N. N.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Chrshanovski, V. G.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Inoue, Hiroshi</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor, H. E.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Ivanina, L. I.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Cowan, R. S.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Iwatsuki, Z.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronquist, Arthur</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Jakubziner, M. M.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Czerepanov, S. K.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Jalas, Jaakko</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahling, Gerald</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>James, P. W.</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Czukavina, A. P.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Jerković, Lazar</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degener, Isa</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Johnson, L. A. S.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Dahling, Gerald</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Kask, M. K.</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degener, Otto</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Khlonova, A. E.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Demaret, F.</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Kholonova, L. I.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demoulin, Vincent</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Kolakovskaja, V. S.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Dressler, Robert L.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Krassilov, V. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duong, Huu Thai</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Kolakovsky, A. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Ducharsier, J.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Kukkonen, Ilkka</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eichler, Hj.</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Konopska, Lidia</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Emmerich, Margarete</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Kuthatheladze, S. I.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faegri, Knut</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Kossych, V. M.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Faerl, R. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Kuznetsov, L. V.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fataliev', R. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Kostina, L. I.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Filatova, N. S.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Linczevski, I. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florschütz, P. A.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Krassilov, V. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Florschiitz, P. A.</td>
<td>New Guinea</td>
<td>Little, Elbert L., Jr.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosberg, F. R.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Kukkonen, Ilkka</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Frodin, D. G.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Luks, J. A.</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frodin, D. G.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Linczevski, I. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Fulford, Margaret</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Makascheva, R. Kh.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieljan, E. Ts.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Little, Elbert L., Jr.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Galushko, A. I.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Mamatkulov, U. K.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandiljan, P. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Luks, J. A.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Makascheva, R. Kh.</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C:
INSTITUTIONAL VOTES

As directed by the Nomenclature Section of the Seattle Congress, a revised list of institutional votes was drawn up and approved as follows by the Bureau of Nomenclature and the General Committee, in accordance with Division III of the Code. (This replaces the list in the Edinburgh Report (Regn. Veget. 44: 69–74. 1966)). In general, institutions are briefly identified below by the name of the city in which each is located, together with the herbarium symbol from the *Index Herbariorum*, ed. 6. An asterisk (*) indicates that the institution was represented at the Nomenclature Section in Leningrad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aarhus (AAU)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen (ABD)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberystwyth (ABS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abidjan (ABI)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abidjan (UCJ)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide (AD)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide (ADU)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide (ADW)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agana (GUAM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany (NYS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque (UNM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Springs (NT)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Alma-Ata (AA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ames (ISC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Amherst (MASS)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Amsterdam (AMD)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Amsterdam (AVU)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara (ANK)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ann Arbor (MICH)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcata (HSC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens (ATH), Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens (ATHU), Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Athens (GA), USA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn (AUÅ)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Auckland (AK)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Auckland (AKU)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Austin (TEX)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Baarn (CBS)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangkok (BKF)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Barcelona (BC)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basel (BAS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belém (IAN)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belém (MG)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Beltsville (BARC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Beltsville (BPI)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bergen (BG)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Berkeley (UC)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Berlin (B), West Berlin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin (BHU), DDR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Birmingham (AAS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham (BIRM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Blackburg (VPI)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield Hills (BLH)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington (IND)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bogor (BO)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bogota (COL)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay (BLAT)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boulder (COLO)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratislava (SAV)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Brisbane (BRI)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brno (BRNU)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bruxelles (BR)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruxelles (BRLU)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucuresti (BUCA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Budapest (BP)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Budapest (BPU)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires (BA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires (BAA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires (BAFC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cagliari (CAG)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cairo (CAI)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Calcutta (CAL)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cambridge (CGE), UK</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cambridge (CGG), UK</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cambridge (A), USA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cambridge (AMES), USA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge (FH), USA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge (GH), USA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra (CANB)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton (IBSC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town (BOL)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town (CT)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town (NBG a. SAM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caracas (VEN)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbondale (SIU)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff (NMW)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill (NCU)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charkow (CW)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago (F)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch (CHR)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont (RSA)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont-Ferrand (CLF)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluj (CL)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coimbra (COI)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Park (MARY)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus (OS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepción (CONC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen (C)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen (CP)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordoba (CORD)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrientes (CTES)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvallis (OSC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (DAV)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi (HCIO)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin (TCD)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham (DUKE)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lansing (MSC)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh (E)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton (ALTA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erevan (ERE)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firenze (FI)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins (CS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt (FR)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville (FLAS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatersleben (GAT)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genève (G)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gent (GENT)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow (GL)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborg (GB)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göttingen (GOET)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graz (GZU)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greifswald (GFW)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenoble (GR)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph (OAC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habana (HAJB)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habana (LS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halle (HAL)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg (HBG)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haren (GRO)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki (H)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroshima (HIRO)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu (BISH)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iasi (I)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan (FHI)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innsbruck (IB)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa City (IA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul (ISTF)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca (BH)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca (CUP)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jena (JE)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem (HUJ)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg (J)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karachi (KUH)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent (KE)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kew (IMI)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kew (K)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiew (KW)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston (IJ)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxvile (TENN)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków (KRA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków (KRAM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuala Lumpur (KLU)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto (KYO)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lae (LAE)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Plata (LP)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Plata (LPS)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramie (RM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lausanne (LAU)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds (LDS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legon (GC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester (LTR)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiden (L)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leningrad (LE)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leningrad (WIR)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liège (LG)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima (USM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisboa (LISC)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisboa (LISI)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisboa (LISU)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool (LIVU)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljubljana (LJU)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (BM), UK</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Code(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (UWO), Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles (LA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucknow (LWG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund (LD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison (WIS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid (MA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaus (INPA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester (MANCH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalay (ASM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila (PNH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maracay (MY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marburg (MB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marseille (MARS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayaguez (MAPR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayaguez (ASM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne (MEL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mérida (MER)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México (ENCB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México (MEX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukkee (UWM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula (MONTU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montevideo (MVM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier (MPU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal (MT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal (MTJB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal (MTMG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgantown (WVA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow (MHA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi (EA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi (NAI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoli (NAP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville (VDB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuchatel (NEU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven (YU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans (NO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (NY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichinan (NICH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Lisboa (LUA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novosibirsk (NS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeiras (LISE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olomouc (OL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando (FTU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orono (MAINE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo (O)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa (CAN, CANA, CANL, CANM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa (DAO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa (DAOM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu (OULU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford (FHO), UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford (OXF), UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford (MU), USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palermo (PAL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamá (PMA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris (PC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras (UPA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavia (PAV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peking (PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peradeniya (PDA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth (PERTH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth (UWA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perugia (PERU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar (PES)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia (PH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisa (PI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh (CM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh (Hunt Bot. Inst.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pondicherry (HIFP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moresby (UPNG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto (PO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto Alegre (ICN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznan (POZ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praha (PR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praha (PRC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria (PRE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria (PRU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence (BRU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo (BRY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullman (WS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullman (WSP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec (QUE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quezon City (PUH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabat (RAB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh (NCSC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawalpindi (RAW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading (RING)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recife (URM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennes (REN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio de Janeiro (HB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio de Janeiro (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio de Janeiro (RB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside (UCR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rama (ROPV)
Roma (ROML)
Sacramento (SACT)
Saint Andrews (STA)
Saint Louis (MO)
Saint Paul (MIN)
Salasplis (LATV)
Salisbury (SRGH)
Salt Lake City (UT)
San Francisco (CAS)
San Francisco (SFSU)
San Isidro (SI)
Santa Barbara (SBBG)
Santiago (SGO)
São Paulo (SP)
Saskatoon (SASK)
Sassari (SASSA)
Seattle (WTU)
Singapore (SING)
Sofia (SOM)
Stanford (DS)
Stellenbosch (STE)
Stockholm (S)
Stockholm (SBT)
Storrs (CONN)
Suva (SUVA)
Sydney (NSW)
Taipei (TAI)
Taipei (TAIF)
Tallahassee (FSU)
Tampa (USF)
Tartu (TAA)
Tartu (TU)
Tbilisi (TBI)
Teheran (IRAN)
Teheran (TEH)
Tempe (ASU)
Tokyo (MAK)
Tokyo (TI)
Tomsk (TK)
Turin (TO)
Toronto (TRT)

Toronto (TRTC)
Toulouse (TL)
Toulouse (TLA)
Townsville (JCT)
Trieste (TSB)
Trinidad (TRIN)
Trondheim (TRH)
Trujillo (HUT)
Tucuman (LIL)
Turku (TUR)
Tucson (ARIZ)
Ulan Bator (UBA)
Umeå (UME)
University (UNA)
University Park (PAC)
Uppsala (UPS)
Uppsala (UPSV)
Urbana (ILL)
Urbana (ILLS)
Utrecht (U)
Vancouver (UBC)
Victoria (DAVFP)
Vladivostok (VLA)
Waco (BAYLU)
Wageningen (WAG)
Warszawa (WA)
Washington (NA)
Washington (US)
Washington (U. S. Geol. Surv.)
Wellington (WELT)
Wellington (WELTU)
Wien (W)
Wien (WU)
Winnipeg (WIN)
Woking (Royal Hort. Soc.)
Worcester (CUW)
Wroclaw (WRSL)
Wuchang (WH)
Ypsilanti (EMC)
Zürich (Z)
Zürich (ZT)