

RECUEIL SYNOPTIQUE

DES PROPOSITIONS CONCERNANT

LE CODE INTERNATIONAL DE LA NOMENCLATURE BOTANIQUE

SOUMISES A LA SECTION DE NOMENCLATURE
DU

HUITIÈME CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DE BOTANIQUE
PARIS — 1954

présenté par

J. LANJOUW
Rapporteur général



1954

UTRECHT — PAYS BAS

EDITÉ PAR LE COMITÉ D'ORGANISATION DU CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DE PARIS — 1954
ET PAR LE BUREAU INTERNATIONAL POUR LA TAXINOMIE ET LA NOMENCLATURE VÉGÉTALES

THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR PLANT TAXONOMY AND NOMENCLATURE
106 LANGE NIEUWSTRAAT - UTRECHT - NETHERLANDS

March 1954



Printed in the Netherlands by Kemink en Zoon N.V.
Domplein 2 - Utrecht

INTRODUCTION

Il y a environ quatre ans que j'écrivis mon introduction au Recueil Synoptique de Stockholm, introduction d'un livre assez gros. Le Septième Congrès International de Botanique devrait alors se réunir à Stockholm en juillet 1950. Un vrai torrent de propositions venait de se ruer sur moi et mon Institut, chose peu étonnante étant donné que quinze ans s'étaient écoulés depuis le Congrès d'Amsterdam. Le comité éditorial réussit à publier en deux années environ après le Congrès le nouveau Code International de la Nomenclature Botanique.

Aujourd'hui, seulement dix-huit mois plus tard, la tâche nous incombe d'étudier de nouveau de nombreuses propositions, cette fois soumises au Congrès de Paris. En quelque sorte cela nous désappointe: on ne peut pas changer continuellement. Il faut qu'on donne le temps au Code de faire preuve de son efficacité. Le Code doit être simple mais surtout: il doit rester simple; ce précepte se trouve dans les principes. Cela signifie qu'on doit s'abstenir de prévoir chaque cas spécial. Au fond on ne devrait admettre que les propositions envisageant la suppression de tel ou tel passage.

Toutefois, on peut, après tout, comprendre ce grand nombre de propositions. Les modifications très importantes approuvées par les Congrès de Cambridge (1930) et de Stockholm (1950) nous ont empêchés de remarquer les autres défauts relativement moins importants mais en dernier lieu également des défauts. J'ai fini par accepter la situation et mon point de vue a été: s'il nous faut modifier de nouveau notre Code, il faut que nous le fassions à fond tout au moins là où il paraît être nécessaire. D'autre part, il faut en finir après Paris, du moins pour l'avenir le plus proche. En ce moment on acceptera encore que nous le fassions pour le bien scientifique, mais si nous continuons de cette façon nous risquons de perdre la confiance.

On verra dans ce Recueil Synoptique que moi-même j'ai proposé un assez grand nombre de modifications. Quelques-unes, seulement, de ces propositions sont là grâce à mon initiative personnelle: la plupart constituent vraiment des commentaires aux autres propositions. Pour le Congrès de Stockholm mes commentaires étaient incluses dans mes observations mais alors il était impossible de les mettre aux voix.

La Section de Botanique de l'Union Internationale des Sciences Biologiques convoqua à Genève du 25-30 janvier 1954 un colloque international consacré, entre autres, à une discussion des propositions de nomenclature. Ce Pré-congrès est donc comparable au conférence d'Utrecht de 1948. Les participants furent Ch. Baehni, H. Humbert, D. Keck, J. Lanjouw, J. A. Nannfeldt, R. E. G. Pichi-Sermolli, W. Robyns, R. C. Rollins, K. Suessenguth, G. Taylor; M. B. P. G. Hochreutiner fut l'invité du Pré-congrès et par sa connaissance profonde il stimula et enricha les discussions. Le vice-rapporteur, M. F. A. Stafleu — qui en

plus m'a rendu des services inestimables en préparant ce Recueil Synoptique — assista également au Pré-congrès.

Un certain nombre de propositions ou de modifications de propositions sont encore incorporées dans ce Recueil et çà et là on trouvera même les préavis de la conférence. D'ailleurs on publiera sous peu un rapport détaillé des discussions et des décisions, rapport qui sera distribué aux intéressés afin qu'ils puissent encore le consulter en jugeant les propositions.

Les argumentations des auteurs de propositions ont été publiées complètement dans la revue *Taxon* et c'est par cela que tout le monde peut les consulter. On n'a pas encore pu publier les arguments concernant quelques nomina conservanda, la plupart seront encore publiées ou seront envoyées aux comités spéciaux. Ce sont en premier lieu les comités spéciaux qui devront étudier ces nomina conservanda proposita, le Congrès ne pouvant juger qu'après.

D'abord, — tout comme pour le Congrès de Stockholm — on mettra aux voix les propositions au moyen d'un vote préliminaire par bulletins où tout ceux ayant droit de vote au Congrès participeront. On est prié de nous retourner le bulletin de vote ci-inclus avant le 15^{me} mai 1954. On peut voter: oui, non ou comité éditorial, parce qu'un grand nombre de propositions pourra être renvoyé à ce comité sans plus.

La liste électorale a été dressée par le comité organisateur. La possibilité d'appel sera réservée aux cas exceptionnels.

Je conclus en remerciant le comité organisateur du Congrès de Paris de sa confiance et de sa coopération ainsi que les nombreux amis et collègues, dont je ne peux citer les noms, qui m'ont donné tant d'avis importants !

Février 1954.

J. Lanjouw.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE DES PROPOSITIONS *

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. <i>Committee to deal with Urgent Nomenclatural Needs, British Members</i>,
in Taxon 1 : 78 . 1952</p> <p>2. <i>Benson, L.</i> in Taxon 1 : 113 . 1952</p> <p>3. <i>Huttleston, D. G.</i>
in Taxon 2 : 33 . 1953</p> <p>4. <i>Baehni, Ch.</i> in Taxon 2 : 90 . 1953</p> <p>5. <i>Buchanan, R. E.</i>
in Taxon 2 : 93 . 1953</p> <p>6. <i>Ponce de León, A. and Alvarez, M. T.</i>
in Taxon 2 : 96 . 1953</p> <p>7. ——— in Taxon 2 : 98 . 1953</p> <p>8. <i>Fosberg, F. R.</i> in Taxon 2 : 99 . 1953</p> <p>9. <i>Bisby, G. R.</i> in Taxon 2 : 101 . 1953</p> <p>10. <i>Corner, E. J. H.</i> in Taxon 2 : 101 . 1953</p> <p>11. <i>Fosberg, F. R.</i> in Taxon 2 : 107 . 1953</p> <p>12. <i>Pichon, M.</i> in Taxon 2 : 110 . 1953</p> <p>13. ——— in Taxon 2 : 110 . 1953</p> <p>14. ——— in Taxon 2 : 110 . 1953</p> <p>15. ——— in Taxon 2 : 111 . 1953</p> <p>16. ——— in Taxon 2 : 111 . 1953</p> <p>17. ——— in Taxon 2 : 111 . 1953</p> <p>18. ——— in Taxon 2 : 112 . 1953</p> <p>19. <i>Lam, H. J. and Royen, P. van</i>
in Taxon 2 : 112 . 1953</p> <p>20. <i>Blake, S. T.</i> in Taxon 2 : 113 . 1953</p> <p>21. <i>Willis, J. H.</i> in Taxon 2 : 113 . 1953</p> <p>22. <i>Sandwith, N. Y.</i> in Taxon 2 : 113 . 1953</p> <p>23. <i>Sprague, Mrs M. L.</i>
in Taxon 2 : 113 . 1953</p> <p>24. <i>Steenis, C. G. G. J. van</i>
in Taxon 2 : 114 . 1953</p> <p>25. ——— in Taxon 2 : 115 . 1953</p> <p>26. ——— in Taxon 2 : 115 . 1953</p> <p>27. <i>Pichi Sermolli, R. E. G.</i>
in Taxon 2 : 136 . 1953</p> <p>28. <i>Pichon, M.</i> in Taxon 2 : 139 . 1953</p> <p>29. ——— in Taxon 2 : 139 . 1953</p> <p>30. <i>Lourteig, A.</i> in Taxon 2 : 140 . 1953</p> <p>31. <i>Bruce, E. A.</i> in Taxon 2 : 140 . 1953</p> <p>32. <i>Elliott, Ch. G.</i> in Taxon 2 : 141 . 1953</p> <p>33. <i>Paclt, J.</i> in Taxon 2 : 162 . 1953</p> <p>34. <i>Ponce de León, A. and Alvarez, M. T.</i>
in Taxon 2 : 167 . 1953</p> <p>35. ——— in Taxon 2 : 167 . 1953</p> <p>36. ——— in Taxon 2 : 168 . 1953</p> <p>37. ——— in Taxon 2 : 171 . 1953</p> | <p>38. <i>Ponce de León, A. and Alvarez, M. T.</i>
in Taxon 2 : 172 . 1953</p> <p>39. <i>Steenis, C. G. G. J. van</i>
in Taxon 2 : 177 . 1953</p> <p>40. <i>Sprague, T. A.</i> in Taxon 2 : 177 . 1953</p> <p>41. ——— in Taxon 2 : 178 . 1953</p> <p>42. <i>Dyer, R. A.</i> in Taxon 2 : 178 . 1953</p> <p>43. <i>Keay, R. W.</i> in Taxon 2 : 178 . 1953</p> <p>44. <i>Raizada, M. B.</i> in Taxon 2 : 179 . 1953</p> <p>45. <i>La Société Mycologique de France</i>
in Taxon 2 : 193 . 1953</p> <p>46. <i>Ciferri, R. and Tomaselli, R.</i>
in Taxon 2 : 194 . 1953</p> <p>47. <i>Ponce de León, A. and Alvarez, M. T.</i>
in Taxon 2 : 197 . 1953</p> <p>48. ——— in Taxon 2 : 202 . 1953</p> <p>49. ——— in Taxon 2 : 203 . 1953</p> <p>50. ——— in Taxon 2 : 204 . 1953</p> <p>51. ——— in Taxon 2 : 206 . 1953</p> <p>52. ——— in Taxon 2 : 207 . 1953</p> <p>53. ——— in Taxon 2 : 207 . 1953</p> <p>54. ——— in Taxon 2 : 207 . 1953</p> <p>55. <i>Janchen, E.</i> in Taxon 2 : 208 . 1953</p> <p>56. ——— in Taxon 2 : 208 . 1953</p> <p>57. ——— in Taxon 2 : 208 . 1953</p> <p>58. ——— in Taxon 2 : 209 . 1953</p> <p>59. ——— in Taxon 2 : 209 . 1953</p> <p>60. ——— in Taxon 2 : 209 . 1953</p> <p>61. ——— in Taxon 2 : 209 . 1953</p> <p>62. ——— in Taxon 2 : 209 . 1953</p> <p>63. ——— in Taxon 2 : 210 . 1953</p> <p>64. ——— in Taxon 2 : 210 . 1953</p> <p>65. ——— in Taxon 2 : 210 . 1953</p> <p>66. ——— in Taxon 2 : 210 . 1953</p> <p>67. ——— in Taxon 2 : 210 . 1953</p> <p>68. ——— in Taxon 2 : 210 . 1953</p> <p>69. ——— in Taxon 2 : 210 . 1953</p> <p>70. ——— in Taxon 2 : 211 . 1953</p> <p>71. ——— in Taxon 2 : 211 . 1953</p> <p>72. ——— in Taxon 2 : 211 . 1953</p> <p>73. ——— in Taxon 2 : 211 . 1953</p> <p>74. <i>Rickett, H. W.</i> in Taxon 2 : 211 . 1953</p> <p>75. ——— in Taxon 2 : 213 . 1953</p> <p>76. <i>Fritsch, F. E., Hustedt, F., Aleem, A.</i>
<i>A., Margalef, R., Bourrelly, P., Oye,</i>
<i>P. van</i> in Taxon 2 : 213 . 1953</p> <p>77. <i>St John, H.</i> in Taxon 3 : 6 . 1954</p> |
|--|---|

* Note: Toutes les propositions ont été publiées dans *Taxon* avec l'argumentation des auteurs. Cependant, pour des raisons techniques, les propositions suivantes n'ont pas été imprimées dans *Taxon* avant la publication du Recueil Synoptique: a) les propositions de Herter, b) les propositions du Pré-congrès de Genève, c) les propositions du rapporteur.

78. *St John, H.* in Taxon 3: 14.1954
79. — in Taxon 3: 15.1954
80. *Doty, M. S.* in Taxon 3: 16.1954
81. *St John, H.* and *Newhouse, W. J.*
in Taxon 3: 19.1954
82. *Woolford, H. A.* in Taxon 3: 19.1954
83. *Hannam Bell, M.* in Taxon 3: 19.1954
84. *Lamoureux, Ch. H.*
in Taxon 3: 19.1954
85. — in Taxon 3: 19.1954
86. *Lamberton, A. R. H.*
in Taxon 3: 19.1954
87. *La Société Mycologique de France*
in Taxon 3: 19.1954
88. *Morton, C. V.* in Taxon 3: 21.1954
89. — in Taxon 3: 22.1954
90. *Hara, H.* in Taxon 3: 23.1954
91. *Paclt, J.* in Taxon 3: 24.1954
92. — in Taxon 3: 24.1954
93. — in Taxon 3: 24.1954
94. *Baehni, Ch.* in Taxon 3: 25.1954
95. *Léonard, J.* in Taxon 3: 25.1954
96. *Donk, M. A.* in Taxon 3: 25.1954
97. *Ponce de León, A.* and *Mencia y*
García, M. in Taxon 3: 26.1954
98. — in Taxon 3: 27.1954
99. *Ross, R.* in Taxon 3: 29.1954
100. *Brenan, J. P. M.* in Taxon 3: 29.1954
101. *Balfour-Browne, F. L.*
in Taxon 3: 30.1954
102. *Ross, R.* in Taxon 3: 30.1954
103. — in Taxon 3: 30.1954
104. *Stearn, W. T.* in Taxon 3: 30.1954
105. *Dandy, J. E.* in Taxon 3: 31.1954
106. *Stearn, W. T.* in Taxon 3: 31.1954
107. *Ross, R.* in Taxon 3: 31.1954
108. *Dandy, J. E.* in Taxon 3: 31.1954
109. *Ross, R.* in Taxon 3: 32.1954
110. *Bullock, A. A.* in Taxon 3: 32.1954
111. *Stearn, W. T.* in Taxon 3: 32.1954
112. *Meikle, R. D.* in Taxon 3: 32.1954
113. *Ross, R.* in Taxon 3: 32.1954
114. — in Taxon 3: 33.1954
115. *Hubbard, C. E.* in Taxon 3: 33.1954
116. *Exel, A. W.* in Taxon 3: 33.1954
117. *Stearn, W. T.* in Taxon 3: 34.1954
118. — in Taxon 3: 34.1954
119. — in Taxon 3: 34.1954
120. *Janchen, E.* in Taxon 3: 34.1954
121. *Rousseau, J.* in Taxon 3: 40.1954
122. *Litardière, R. de* in Taxon 3: 41.1954
123. *Pinto da Silva, A. R.*
in Taxon 3: 43.1954
124. *Ponce de León, A.* and *Alvarez, M. T.*
in Taxon 3: 45.1954
125. — in Taxon 3: 46.1954
126. — in Taxon 3: 48.1954
127. — in Taxon 3: 48.1954
128. *Ponce de León, A.* and *Alvarez, M. T.*
in Taxon 3: 49.1954
129. — in Taxon 3: 49.1954
130. — in Taxon 3: 50.1954
131. — in Taxon 3: 51.1954
132. — in Taxon 3: 51.1954
133. — in Taxon 3: 51.1954
134. — in Taxon 3: 52.1954
135. — in Taxon 3: 53.1954
136. — in Taxon 3: 53.1954
137. — in Taxon 3: 53.1954
138. — in Taxon 3: 55.1954
139. *Boivin, B.* in Taxon 3: 56.1954
140. *Wheeler, L. C.* in Taxon 3: 57.1954
141. *Rousseau, J.* in Taxon 3: 58.1954
142. *Benson, L.* in Taxon 3: 60.1954
143. *Mattick, F.* in Taxon 3: 61.1954
144. *Florschütz, P.* in Taxon 3: 61.1954
145. *Diehl, W. W.* in Taxon 3: 61.1954
146. *Rogers, D. P.* in Taxon 3: 62.1954
147. *Connors, I. L.* in Taxon 3: 62.1954
148. *Cortés Latorre, C.*
in Taxon 3: 62.1954
149. *Rogers, D. P.* in Taxon 3: 62.1954
150. *Ainsworth, G. C.* in Taxon 3: 63.1954
151. *Ehrendorfer, F.* in Taxon 3: 63.1954
152. *Lamberton, A. R. H.*
in Taxon 3: 64.1954
153. *Connors, I. L.* in Taxon 3: 64.1954
154. *Gleason, H. A.* and *Rogers, D. P.*
in Taxon 3: 64.1954
155. *Rogers, D. P.* in Taxon 3: 64.1954
156. *Kopp, L. E.* in Taxon 3: 64.1954
157. *Brenan, J. P. M.* in Taxon 3: 65.1954
158. — in Taxon 3: 65.1954
159. *Keay, R. W. J.* in Taxon 3: 65.1954
160. *Sealy, J. R.* in Taxon 3: 66.1954
161. *Bullock, A. A.* in Taxon 3: 67.1954
162. *Donk, M. A.* in Taxon 3: 68.1954
163. *Margadant, W. D.* in Taxon 3: 74.1954
164. — in Taxon 3: 74.1954
165. *Donk, M. A.* in Taxon 3: 75.1954
166. *Margadant, W. D.* in Taxon 3: 75.1954
167. — in Taxon 3: 75.1954
168. — in Taxon 3: 75.1954
— in Taxon 3: 75.1954
— in Taxon 3: 75.1954
170. — in Taxon 3: 75.1954
171. — in Taxon 3: 76.1954
172. *Fuchs, H. P.* in Taxon 3: 76.1954
173. — in Taxon 3: 76.1954
174. *Herter, H.* in Taxon 3: —.1954
175. *Moore, E. Jr* in Taxon 3: —.1954
176. *Potonié, R.* non publiée
177. *Herter, H.* non publiée
178. *Crovetto, R. M.* in Taxon 3: —.1954
179. *Fuchs, H. P.* in Taxon 3: —.1954

International Code of Botanical Nomenclature

Prop. A (34 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2:167)

Substitute the present name by: “International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature”.

Prop. B (Ponce de León & Alvarez; not published)

It is proposed to use the following subdivision of the Code:

Preliminary chapter	Basis of the Code: Definitions and Guiding Principles.
Chapter I	Of the taxonomic units and the ranks in which they are situated (Present Arts 8, 12, 13, 14, 15).
Chapter II	Of the legitimacy, nature and application of names given to taxa. Sections 1 and 2 (present sections 1 and 2 of Ch. III).
Chapter III	Nomenclature of the taxa in accordance with their categories (present section 4 of Ch. III). Sections 1-6 (present subsections 1-6).
Chapter IV	Of the priority and validity of the names of taxa. Sections 1-4 (present sections 3, 5, 6 & 7 of Ch. III).
Chapter V	Retention, choice and rejection of names. Sections 1-6 (present sections 8-13 of Ch. III).
Chapter VI	Orthography and gender of names. Sections 1-2 (present sections 14 and 15 of Ch. III).
Chapter VII	Names given to definite taxa of a biosystematic character. Sections 1-3 (present section 4, subsection 7 of Ch. III, present Appendix II).
Chapter VIII	Popular names and system of measures. Sections 1-2 (present section 16 of Ch. III).
Supplement I	Special provisions concerning fossil plants (present Appendix IV).
Supplement II	Proposed Nomenclature for cultivated plants (present Appendix III).
Appendix I	Nomina generica conservanda (present Appendix V B).
Appendix II	Nomina familiarum conservanda (present Appendix V A).

Title

Prop. C (Rapporteur, partly modified by the Genève conference)

Division I	General considerations and principles (for detailed contents see Chapter I, prop. B).
Division II	Rules and recommendations.
Chapter I	Categories of taxa, and the terms denoting them (Art. 8 last paragraph, Arts 12-15).
Chapter II	Names of taxa (General provisions). (for detailed contents see Chapter III, prop. B; 4 sections corresponding to the present Art. 10, and the present sections 1-3 of Ch. III).
Chapter III	Nomenclature of taxa according to their categories (present section 4 of Ch. III). Sections 1-7 (present subsections 1-7).
Chapter IV	Effective and valid publication. Sections 1-3 (present sections 5, 6 and 7 of Ch. III).
Chapter V	Retention, choice and rejection of names. Sections 1-6 (present sections 8-13 of Ch. III).
Chapter VI	Orthography and gender of names. Sections 1-2 (present sections 14 and 15 of Ch. III).
Division III	Provisions for the modification of the Code (for detailed contents see former Chapter IV, prop. C).
Division IV	Appendices
Appendix I	(present Appendix II).
— II	(— — III).
— III	(— — IV).
— IV	(— — V).
— V	(— — VI together with some provisions from the present section 16 of Ch. III).

Observations du Rapporteur

L'ensemble des propositions soumises par Drs Ponce de León et Alvarez mérite d'être pris en sérieuse considération. Le rapporteur est d'avis que ces propositions servent à stimuler la discussion de quelques défauts du Code et pour cela il tient à exprimer son appréciation sincère des dites propositions. On a pu étudier la conception entière des auteurs cubains dans Taxon; les conditions techniques et le caractère général du Recueil Synoptique ne permettent pas de la reproduire dans son état original. Si le rapporteur ne peut pas toujours donner un préavis favorable il faut se réaliser d'abord que la forme sous laquelle quelques-unes des propositions sont données n'est pas toujours très heureuse et que quelques propositions sont basées sur une interprétation inorthodoxe du texte anglais.

Cependant l'importance stimulatrice des propositions de Ponce de León et Alvarez est reconnu, et un certain nombre des propositions du rapporteur surtout en ce qui concerne le Chapitre préliminaire, ne sont que des amendements textuels des propositions cubanes.

Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition A d'ajouter le mot "taxinomique" au titre. La nomenclature concerne toute la botanie, les autres "nomenclatures botaniques" devraient être intitulées "terminologie".

La proposition B contient de nombreuses suggestions très utiles. Dans la proposition C le rapporteur a cherché d'intégrer les modifications jugées désirables par lui-même et la proposition des auteurs cubans. Il va de soi que la proposition B a servi de base pour la proposition C. En conseillant l'adoption de la proposition C le rapporteur admet en même temps l'importance stimulatrice de la proposition D.

Le Pré-congrès de Genève a recommandé d'utiliser le terme "Division" pour les quatre parties principales.

*

The set of proposals submitted by Drs Ponce de León and Alvarez deserve serious consideration. These proposals are well-appointed to stimulate a discussion on some of the short-comings in the Code, and the rapporteur, therefore, is eager to express his sincere gratitude for this contribution. Technical difficulties dependent on the general structure of this Synopsis make it impossible to reproduce the scheme set forth by the Cuban authors in its original form, but it has been printed in full in "Taxon", to which the reader is referred. The rapporteur cannot recommend the adoption of all their proposals; the wording, in fact is not always felicitous, and some of the proposals seem to have arisen from a somewhat strained interpretation of the English text. However, the stimulating effect of the contribution of Ponce de León and Alvarez is fully recognized, and some of the proposals made by the rapporteur himself are no more than a rewording of the Cuban ones.

The rapporteur is not in favour of adding the word "taxonomic" to the title. Although the designation "nomenclature" might be applied to the proper use of terms in all parts of botany, it is customary to restrict its application to the proper use of plant names, and to use for all other purposes the word "terminology".

Proposal B contains many extremely useful suggestions. In proposal C the rapporteur has tried to combine some modifications thought to be desirable by himself and the proposal of the Cuban authors. It goes without saying that proposal C is based on proposal B. When the rapporteur recommends the adoption of proposal C he fully recognises the important stimulus provided by proposal D.

The Genève conference recommended the introduction of the term "Division" for the four main parts.

Chapter I. General Considerations, Guiding Principles, and Definitions

Prop. A (35 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2:168)

That the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature begins with a Preliminary Chapter or base, where the principles on which it is founded are stated and which should bear the following name: "Base of the Code: Definitions and Guiding Principles."

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Replace the present Chapter I by Division I, entitled "General considerations and Principles" and consisting of the following fundamental statements designated by Roman numerals.

- I = present Article 1 as modified by the Genève conference (Art. 1, prop. C) (combination of present Arts 1 & 3).
- II = present Article 2 as modified by the Rapporteur (Art. 2, prop. B).
- III = present Article 4 as modified by the Rapporteur (Art. 4, prop. B).
- IV = present Article 6 as modified by Boivin (Art. 6, prop. A).
- V = present Article 7 as modified by the Rapporteur (Art. 7, prop. B).
- VI = present Article 8 with the exception of the last paragraph (Art. 8, prop. C; the last paragraph should be removed to Division II as Art. 1 of the new Chapter 1).
- VII = present Article 9 as amended by the proposals C & D to that Article.
- VIII = present Article 11 as amended by the Rapporteur (Art. 11, prop. B).
- IX = New text (see also Principle IX following Art. 11 in this Rec. Syn.) to read as follows: "The application of names of taxonomic groups is determined by means of *nomenclatural types*".
- X = New text to read as follows (see also Principle X following Art. 11 in this Rec. Syn.): "The correct use of names under this Code is based on priority of publication".

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve la proposition de Ponce de León et Alvarez de constituer un chapitre préliminaire dans lequel seront données les considérations générales et les principes sur lesquelles le Code est fondé. Une situation analogue se trouve dans le Code International de la Nomenclature Bactériologique. Le rapporteur préfère le titre "Considérations générales et principes" à celui de la proposition A et c'est pour cela qu'il conseille l'adoption de la proposition B.

*

The rapporteur is in favour of the proposal made by Ponce de León and Alvarez to frame an Introductory Chapter containing general considerations and outlining the principles on which the Code is based. A similar arrangement is found in the International Code of Bacteriological Nomenclature. For the name of this chapter he would prefer "General Considerations and Principles", and he recommends therefore the adoption of proposal B.

Article 1

Prop. A (36 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 168)

Substitute Art. 1 by paragraph I of the preliminary Chapter (prop. 35) and read:

Of the necessity of the Code.

Systematic Taxonomy in Botany requires for its development a system of nomenclature which should be in accordance with the process by which the successive taxonomical units are formed, when the innumerable and various forms that compose the vegetable world, are arranged.

Therefore there is a necessity for a real Code which will force botanists in all countries to follow the same nomenclatural rules, avoiding in this way the difficulties that would arise in the absence of such common guiding precepts.

Prop. B (121 — Rousseau; Taxon 3 : 40)

L'article devrait se lire: "Botany cannot make satisfactory progress without a precise *and simple* system of nomenclature which is used by *the botanists* in all countries".

Prop. C (Pré-congrès de Genève)

Read: "Botany requires a precise and simple system of nomenclature which is used by botanists in all countries".

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve les remarques de M. Rickett dans Taxon 2 : 117. 1953 et il propose d'adopter la nouvelle rédaction basée sur ces remarques et donnée dans la proposition C. La proposition A lui paraît trop verbeuse, la

Art. 2

proposition B se rapporte plus ou moins à la proposition C mais le Pré-congrès de Genève a préféré la dernière rédaction.

*

The Rapporteur agrees with the comments made by Rickett in Taxon 2: 117. 1953, and proposes therefore adoption of the version formulated in proposal C in which these comments are taken into account. Proposal A seems to him somewhat prolix. Proposal B expresses the same idea but it was modified by the Genève Conference as indicated under proposal C.

Article 2

Prop. A (36 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2: 169)

Replace Art. 2 by the following paragraph IV of the preliminary chapter (prop. 35):

Kinds of Maxims.

The maxims of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature may be *principles, rules, recommendations, notes* and *regulations*.

The principles should not be included in the Articles: they are the basic concepts on which the Code rests and are the foundation for the rules and recommendations. Therefore they form the fundamental Preliminary Chapter of the Code.

The rules are the concrete final precepts that govern nomenclature. In order to put the nomenclature of the past into order, they have a retroactive effect, unless expressly limited. From now on no name or form of nomenclature contrary to a rule can be maintained. They form the essential part of the set of precepts.

The recommendations deal generally with subsidiary subjects and have the purpose of giving a greater uniformity and clarity to the nomenclature of the future. Names or forms contrary to a recommendation cannot on that account be rejected, but are not examples to be followed.

The notes are explanations added to the rules for their better comprehension or application.

The regulations are norms that must be followed for the correct application of certain rules.

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Read: "The precepts of the precise system of botanical nomenclature are divided into *rules* (notes included) and *recommendations*. The general *considerations* and *principles* form the basis of the Code.

The object of the rules (see the present Art. 2) followed".

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur préfère la modification peu importante de la proposition B à la rédaction donnée dans la proposition A, qui a plus ou moins le caractère d'un commentaire.

*

The rapporteur prefers the redaction of proposal B, because proposal A is not so much a statement as a commentary.

Article 3

Prop. A (36 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 168)

Replace Art. 3 by the following paragraph II of the preliminary chapter (prop. 35):

Essential characteristics.

The International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature should be clear and simple for its easier comprehension and application; in addition it should be accurate and its rules should be suitable arranged for a more easy and correct interpretation.

Prop. B (121 — Rousseau; Taxon 3 : 40)

Supprimer l'Article.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur est d'avis que l'Article est superflu, surtout quand l'amendement des Articles précédents est accepté [voyez l'Art. 1, prop. C].

*

The rapporteur is of opinion that the Article is superfluous, especially when the changes in the preceding Articles are accepted [see Art. 1, prop. C].

Article 4

Prop. A (36 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 169)

Replace Art. 4 by the following paragraph III of the preliminary chapter (prop. 35):

Purposes of the Code.

Besides the basic aim previously stated, and in relation with it, we consider the following principles, on which the Code concepts are based fundamental:

1. To aim at fixity of adequate names.
2. To avoid or to reject the use of improper names and forms which may cause error or ambiguity or throw science into confusion.
3. To avoid the useless creation of names.
4. To aim at grammatical correctness, regularity and euphony of names.

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

The essential points in nomenclature are:

- (1) to provide a stable method of naming taxonomic groups
- (2) to avoid (see the present Art. 4) accessory.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le premier précepte devrait être modifié: le Code n'envisage pas la stabilité des noms mais son premier but est de donner une méthode stable pour imposer des noms. La stabilité des noms serait contraire au progrès taxinomique. Pour cela on conseille d'adopter la proposition B. La proposition A est trop verbeuse.

*

The first precept of proposal A will have to be altered: the Code does not aim at fixity of names; its primary object is to provide fixed rules for naming. Fixity of names would be an impediment to the progress of taxonomy. For this reason adoption of proposal B is recommended. Proposal A is too wordy.

Article 5

Prop. A (36 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 170)

Insert Art. 5 as a circumstantial note (paragraph VII) of the preliminary chapter (prop. 35).

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Delete the Article.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur propose de supprimer l'Art. 5 (prop. B). L'Article est superflu et le rapporteur ne connaît aucun cas où on l'a appliqué. Il serait possible de l'appliquer au "nomina dubia". Pour le Code de Paris on a proposé, cependant, de réintroduire une prescription concernant de tels noms et par cela l'Article perd son dernier raison d'être.

*

The rapporteur proposes to delete Art. 5 (prop. B). The Article is superfluous, and the rapporteur is not aware that it has ever been applied. It might be possible to apply it to "nomina dubia". For the Paris Code the re-establishment of a precept with regard to such names has been proposed, and if the latter is adopted the Article loses its last hold.

Article 6

Prop. A (139 — Boivin; Taxon 3 : 56)

Change the second sentence to read as follows:

"If however an organism is transferred from the animal to the plant kingdom, its name or names shall be automatically accepted as validly published under the botanical code, provided they were validly published under the zoological code. However the choice of the correct name and of its correct form shall be made in accordance with the rules of botanical nomenclature. If an

organism is transferred from the plant to the animal kingdom, its names retain their status in botanical nomenclature for purposes of homonymy.”

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve la rédaction modifiée par M. Boivin.

Note. La proposition 36 de Ponce de León et Alvarez ne sert qu'à changer le numéro de l'Article.

*

The rapporteur agrees with Boivin's proposal to change the wording.

Note. Proposal 36 of Ponce de León and Alvarez merely concerns the number of the Article.

Article 7

Prop. A (99 — Ross; Taxon 3 : 29)

Delete the last sentence of the Article and insert it as Rec. 7A.

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Read: (first sentence): “Latin or Greek *treated as Latin*.” and (last sentence): “Latin terminations *are used* . . .”

Observations du Rapporteur

L'intention des auteurs des propositions A et B est la même mais le rapporteur préfère modifier la dernière phrase afin qu'elle soit formulée d'une façon plus définitive (prop. B).

*

The last sentence of the Article is indeed a recommendation, and if it is to be maintained in this form, it should be treated as a recommendation (prop. A). The rapporteur would prefer to leave it in its present place, but to alter the wording in so far that it becomes a definite statement (prop. B).

Article 8

Prop. A (36 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 171)

Delete the first part of Art. 8 [paragraphs (1) & (2)].

Prop. B (38 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 172)

Change the third paragraph of Art. 8 to Art. 1 of Chapter I (vide prop. 37) and read: “Any group of plants that, as a result of systematic classification, has been given the character of a taxonomic unit, receive the name of *taxon* (plural: *taxa*).”

Art. 9

Prop. C (Rapporteur)

Remove the last paragraph to the (new) Chapter I as Art. 1 of the Code.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur ne voit aucun motif sérieux pour supprimer la première partie de cette considération générale et il déconseille l'adoption de la proposition A.

La définition du terme "taxon" devrait en effet constituer l'Article premier du Code sensu stricto étant admis que le rapporteur préfère garder le texte actuel; c'est pour cela qu'il propose d'adopter la proposition C.

*

The rapporteur is not aware of any serious objection against the first part of this statement, and dissuades therefore the adoption of proposal A. The definition of the term "taxon" should indeed form the first Article of the main body of the Code, but the rapporteur prefers to retain it in its present form; he recommends therefore the adoption of proposal C.

Article 9

Prop. A (36 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 171)

Delete the Article.

Prop. B (80 – Doty; Taxon 3 : 16)

It is proposed that the following be added as a note: "Nomenclature is considered to be distinct from other phases of systematic botany and this Code is a guide just to nomenclatural procedure. The Code and nomenclature itself are not intended or expected to affect taxonomy (the circumscription of taxa) or phyletic arrangements."

Prop. C (81 – St John & Newhouse; Taxon 3 : 18)

Delete the words: "not to indicate its characters or history, but.."

Prop. D (Rapporteur)

Add: "..., and to indicate its general taxonomic position" [To be combined with prop. C]

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition A. Le principe contenu dans cet Article a vraiment droit d'existence et son préavis est plutôt en faveur des propositions C et D qui précisent d'une façon nette que le nom d'un taxon sert simplement à le désigner et à indiquer la position taxinomique.

La proposition B est au fond un commentaire. M. Doty a sans doute raison, mais une telle note n'appartient pas au Code même.

*

The rapporteur is not in favour of proposal A. The idea that finds expression in this Article is right, and he would therefore prefer to adopt the proposals C and D, which clearly indicate that the name of a taxon merely serves as a means of reference. Proposal D moreover indicates that it also gives some information with regard to the taxonomic position of the plant.

Proposal B is in reality a comment. Doty is doubtless right, but the Code is hardly the right place for such a comment.

Article 10

Prop. A (36 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 171)

Delete the Article and insert it as Section 1 of the new Chapter II.

Prop. B (80 – Doty; Taxon 3 : 16)

Emend paragraph one to read: “A legitimate name or epithet is one that is *being used* in accordance with the rules”.

Emend paragraph two to read: “An illegitimate name or epithet is one that is *being used* contrary to the rules”.

Prop. C (139 – Boivin; Taxon 3 : 56)

Paragraph 3. Add: “See Art. 16”.

Prop. D (139 – Boivin; Taxon 3 : 56)

Paragraph 4. Change to read: “*Effective* publication is publication in accordance with Arts 39 & 41”.

Prop. E (139 – Boivin; Taxon 3 : 56)

Paragraph 5. Change to read: “Valid publication is publication in accordance with Arts 6, 42-54 & C. 24.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve la proposition A.

Les propositions B-E sont à renvoyer au Comité Editorial.

*

The rapporteur is in favour of the adoption of proposal A.

Proposals B to E might be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 11

Prop. A (80 – Doty; Taxon 3 : 16)

It is suggested that the exceptions to Article 11 be listed here or that a reference to them be added.

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Add the following note: "Note. In general the I.C.B.N. applies also to Bacteria. However, many special provisions are needed for this group and for this reason a special International Code of Bacteriological Nomenclature has been provided by the International Microbiological Congress (Journ. Gen. Microbiology 3(3) : 444. 1949)."

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve la proposition A; la précision désirée se trouve dans la proposition B.

*

The rapporteur agrees with the suggestion made in proposal A, and he has accordingly tried to supply the desired precision by adding a note to the Article (prop. B).

(New) Principle IX

Prop. A (Rapporteur)

The application of names of taxonomic groups is determined by means of nomenclatural types.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur est d'avis que le principe de la méthode des types devrait être inséré dans cette division du Code.

*

The rapporteur is of the opinion that a statement on the principle of the type-method should be inserted in this part of the Code.

(New) Principle X

Prop. A (Rapporteur)

The correct use of names under this Code is based on priority of publication.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le principe de la priorité devrait également être mentionné dans cette division du Code.

*

The principle of priority should also be included in this part of the Code.

Chapter II. Categories of Taxa, and the terms denoting them

Prop. A (37a – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 172)

That Chapter II be made up of the last part of Art. 8 (Chap. I) and Articles 12, 13, 14 and 15 (Chap. II) of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, with the pertinent modifications and amplifications, and that this Chapter be given the following name: "Of the taxonomic units and the ranks to which they belong."

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Rearrange the chapter as proposed by Ponce de León and Alvarez but retain its original title. Insert as first Article of this Chapter (I) the last paragraph of Art. 8 and retain its original wording.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve le nouvel arrangement des Articles proposé par Ponce de León et Alvarez; toutefois il déconseille l'adoption du nouveau titre. La proposition B exprime l'opinion du rapporteur.

*

The rapporteur is in favour of the new arrangement of the Articles according to the proposal of Ponce de León and Alvarez, but he dissuades the adoption of the new title. His recommendation is formulated in proposal B.

Article 12

Prop. A (38 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 173, 174)

Replace the present Art. 12 by the following Arts (vide prop. 37a):

Art. 2. The ranks to which the taxa or taxonomic units belong and which arise as a result of the progressive systematic classification of plants are called *taxonomic categories*.

Art. 3. The names of the principal categories, which are considered indispensable in Systematic Botanical Taxonomy, are the following:

Species (The species).

This is the basic category for the taxa or taxonomic units consisting of plants so similar to each other that they commonly are designated by the same name.

Ch. II

Genus (Genus).

This is the category for the taxa formed by the union of related species. The genera are usually the best defined of all taxonomic units.

Familia (Family).

This is the category or rank for the taxa formed by the genera. The families are usually very natural forms of taxonomic units.

Ordo (Order).

This is the rank for the taxa formed by related families.

Classis (Class).

This is the category for the taxa formed by the union of a number of orders. The classes are extensive taxa.

Divisio (Division).

This is the category for the extensive taxonomic units made up of classes. As the name implies, they are considered to be the main divisions of the vegetable kingdom.

Regnum (Kingdom).

This is the uppermost category, represented in Botany by a single large taxon and comprising all the organisms considered to be plants.

Art. 4. Other categories are also accepted as important, though it is not indispensable to find taxa belonging to them, viz. the tribe (*tribus*), intermediary between the family and the genus, and the section (*sectio*) subordinate to the genus, that is, between the genus and the species.

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Divide the present Article into two separate ones: Chapter I, Art. 2: consisting of the first paragraph of the present Art. 12 and Chapter I, Art. 3: reading: "The principal categories in ascending sequence are: species (*species*), genus . . . (second paragraph of present Art. 12) . . . , etc."

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur déconseille l'introduction d'arguments plutôt philosophiques que nomenclaturaux dans le Code de Nomenclature. Une telle discussion serait peut-être désirable dans un manuel taxinomique, mais elle ne doit certainement pas être insérée dans un ensemble de règles de Nomenclature. Pour cela il déconseille l'adoption de la proposition A.

La rédaction actuelle des Arts 12 et 13 est verbeuse et peu claire. Le rapporteur propose une rédaction nouvelle; la modification est purement textuelle et n'a pour but qu'une formulation plus précise.

*

The rapporteur dissuades the introduction of explanations that are more of philosophic than of nomenclatural importance. An exposition such as that given by Ponce de León and Alvarez might be suitable for a handbook of taxonomy,

but it should not be inserted in a Code of Nomenclature. For this reason he dissuades adoption of proposal A.

The redaction of the present Arts 12 and 13 is somewhat lengthy and not quite clear. The changes proposed by the rapporteur merely concern the redaction; their sole aim is a clearer formulation.

Article 13

Prop. A (4 – Baehni; Taxon 2 : 90)

The second sentence, to read as follows: “Thus subfamily (*subfamilia*) denotes a category between the family and the tribe, subtribe (*subtribus*) a category between the tribe and the genus, etc.”

Prop. B (4a – Sprague; Taxon 2 : 131)

The second sentence, to read as follows: “Thus subfamily (*subfamilia*) denotes a category between family and tribe, subtribe (*subtribus*) a category between tribe and genus, etc.”

Prop. C (38 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 174, 175)

Replace the present Art. 13 by the new Arts 5, 7 & 8 and the note to Art. 3 of the new Chapter I (prop. 37) and read:

Art. 3 (Note). Since the sequence of the above-mentioned categories has once and for all been fixed, in accordance with the subordinacy that implies the progressive formation of the taxa, we may say: every individual plant must belong to a species (*species*), every species to a genus (*genus*), every genus to a family (*familia*), every family to an order (*ordo*), every order to a class (*classis*), every class to a division (*divisio*) and every division must be a part of the Kingdom (*Regnum*).

Art. 5. For taxa resulting when subdividing taxa of higher rank, categories whose names will be formed by adding the prefix (*sub*) to the name of the higher category, are also admitted. Thus Sub-Kingdom (*Sub-Regnum*); sub-division (*sub-divisio*); sub-class (*sub-classis*); sub-order (*sub-ordo*); sub-family (*sub-familia*); sub-tribe (*sub-tribus*) and sub-section (*sub-sectio*).

Art. 7. Apart from the classical conception of the species, viz. the Linnean species, there is the conception of taxa based on biosystematic orientation but which do not correspond precisely to subdivisions of the classical species. Thus: the *ecospecies* for those taxa in which the influence of the environment is evident, and the *cenospecies*, a union of ecospecies whose limits seem to be defined mainly by genetic barriers.

In the parasitic species we recognize moreover the special form (*forma specialis*) of biotaxonomic character. Finally we can regard as categories, specially in cultivated plants, the *line* (*linea*) and the *clone*, which represent the lowest categories.

Art. 8. The number of categories may be increased when necessary; but

Art. 14

then we must try to assign them names which will not lead to confusion or error. For example: we can recognize an intermediate category between subclass and order, for a group of orders, which may be called *cohort* (cohors). Similarly series and sub-series are intercalated between subsections and species.

Prop. D (120 – Janchen; Taxon 3 : 35)

Als wichtiges Beispiel einer einzuschubenden Kategorie sei genannt: Phylum (Stamm), zwischen Regnum vegetabile und Divisio. Sehr viele neuere Pflanzensysteme können ohne diesen Begriff nicht auskommen.

Prop. E (Rapporteur)

Read: "If a greater number of categories is required, the terms of these subdivisions are made either by adding the prefix *sub* (*sub*) to the terms denoting the categories or by the introduction of supplementary categories. A plant may therefore be classified in subordinate categories in the following order: Regnum Vegetabile, Divisio, Subdivisio, Classis, Subclassis, Ordo, Subordo, Familia, Subfamilia, Tribus, Subtribus, Genus, Subgenus, Sectio, Subsectio, Series, Subseries, Species, Subspecies, Varietas, Subvarietas, Forma, Subforma.

If this list (present Art. 13, second paragraph).

For special categories (present Art. 13, fourth paragraph)".

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve la rédaction donnée par M. Sprague (prop. B) de la proposition de M. Baehni. Toutefois il est d'avis qu'une nouvelle rédaction (prop. E) servirait à simplifier, préciser et raccourcir les Arts 12, 13 et 14. Il déconseille de modifier les articles ainsi que Ponce de León et Alvarez l'ont proposé [voyez le commentaire à l'Art. 12 (prop. C)] et d'insérer la catégorie spéciale de "phylum", catégorie fréquemment considérée comme équivalente à celle de divisio (prop. D).

*

The Rapporteur agrees with the redaction given by Sprague to Art. 13 in order to meet Baehni's criticism of the present wording, but it seems to him that the Arts 12, 13 and 14 may be formulated in a more simple, precise and shorter way (prop. E). He dissuades adoption of the changes proposed by Ponce de León and Alvarez (see his comments on proposal C regarding Art. 12) and also of the insertion of a special category named "phylum"; phylum is often regarded as synonymous with divisio (prop. D).

Article 14

Prop. A (38 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 174)

Replace the present Art. 14 by the following Art. 6 of the new Chapter I (prop. 37):

The taxa considered as species, on the other hand, may be subdivided into

new taxa of lower rank, of which, in descending sequence, the following are admitted: subspecies (sub-species), variety (varietas) and form (forma).

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Supprimer l'Article quand la proposition E de l'Art. 13 est acceptée.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur préfère une nouvelle rédaction des Arts 13 et 14 comme indiqué sous l'Art. 13 prop. E.

*

As indicated under Art. 13 in his comment on proposal E, the rapporteur prefers a rewording of the Arts 13 and 14.

Article 15

Prop. A (38 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 175)

Replace the present Art. 15 by the following Arts 9 & 10 of the new Chapter I (prop. 37).

Art. 9. The order in which the specified categories are used can not be altered. They retain the following order:

Regnum (Kingdom).

Subregnum.

Divisio (Division).

Subdivisio.

Classis (Class).

Subclassis.

Cohors.

Subcohors.

Ordo (Order).

Subordo.

Familia (Family).

Subfamilia.

Tribus (Tribe).

Subtribus.

Genus (Genus).

Subgenus.

Sectio (Section).

Subsectio

Species (Species).

Subspecies. Cenospecies.

Varietas (Variety). Ecospecies.

Subvarietas.

Forma. Forma specialis.

Linea.

Clone.

Art. 15

Art. 10. If a name of a category is used in contravention to the legitimate gradation it will be considered an inadmissible error and, consequently, the publication of the names given to such taxa will be considered as non-valid. Examples: It is not allowed to divide a genus into families or a species into orders. Only one exception is admitted: In Dr Fries' "Systema Mycologicum" the genera are divided into tribes.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur ne voit aucun motif sérieux pour modifier la rédaction de cet Article.

*

The rapporteur sees no reason whatever to change the redaction of this Article.

Chapter III. Names of Taxa

Prop. A (37b — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2:172)

That Chapter II of the International Code of Taxonomic Botanical Nomenclature be made up by the precepts formulated in Art. 10 of Chap. I, those stated in Sections 1 and 2 of Chap. II, with the convenient modifications and additions, and the incorporation of Appendix I of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature and that this chapter be given the following name:

“Of the legitimacy, nature and application of the names given to the taxa.”

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Restrict the provisions of this Chapter to those contained in the sections 1, 2 and 3 together with a first section entitled “Definitions” consisting of the present Art. 10:

- Chapter II Names of taxa (General provisions)
- Section 1 Definitions (present Art. 10)
- Section 2 Priority (present Art. 16)
- Section 3 The Type Method (present section 2, to be amended)
- Section 4 Limitation of the principle . . . (present section 3)

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve la proposition de Ponce de León et Alvarez de combiner les sections 1 et 2 dans un chapitre à part, cependant il est d'avis que la section 3 y devrait être insérée aussi et il déconseille l'adoption d'un titre modifié. Ce titre serait plutôt: “Noms des Taxa (Provisions générales)”. La proposition B exprime les opinions du rapporteur.

*

The rapporteur is in favour of the proposal made by Ponce de León and Alvarez to refer sections 1 and 2 to a separate chapter, but in his opinion section 3 should also be included in the latter, and he dissuades the adoption of a new title. He recommends the addition of (General provisions). His views are summarized in proposal B.

Section 1. Priority

Prop. A (47 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2:197)

Section 1. — *Legitimacy and nature of names.*

Section 1 of the new Chapter II includes the contents of Arts 10, 16 and 17 of the former Code together with some new prescriptions.

Art. 16

Observations du Rapporteur

Le préavis du rapporteur est de créer une nouvelle section 1 (Définitions) contenant l'Art. 10. Il déconseille la combinaison des Arts 10, 16 et 17 dans une seule section.

*

The rapporteur recommends the creation of a new section 1 (Definitions), to which the contents of the present Art. 10 are referred. He dissuades the creation of a section that would contain also Arts 16 and 17.

Article 16

Prop. A (47 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 197, 198)

Replace the present text by the following series of Articles:

Art. 11. Under the prescriptions of this Code each taxon of any rank or category must have one *correct name*.

To be correct the name of a taxon:

- a) should have a particular circumscription, position and rank.
- b) should be *legitimate*.

The name of a taxon is legitimate if it fulfils the following conditions:

- 1) It must have been *validly published*.
- 2) It must have *priority* in accordance with this Code.

A publication is *valid* if it is *effective* and conforms in form and scope with the precepts of this Code.

A publication is *effective* if it has been duly distributed by sale, by exchange or as gift.

Art. 12. Taxonomic Botanical Nomenclature generally uses generic names as a base for the denomination of taxa.

For this reason generic names have a basic character, no matter what their structure and origin may be.

Art. 13. Every generic name and the names of taxa belonging to a category higher than the genus must consist of a single word, simple or compound, and must be in each category of analogous structure.

Art. 14. The correct name of any taxon from genus to order inclusive is that which, following in its structure the precepts of the Code, was the first one validly published in its rank.

Art. 15. The correct name of every taxon below the rank of genus consists of the generic name and the epithet or epithets first validly published in its rank.

Prop. B (80 – Doty; Taxon 3 : 16)

It is to be noted here that only a *single* specific epithet (Art. 33) can be used with a generic name in binomial nomenclature.

Emend in second paragraph to read "...*legitimate name validly*..." and the third paragraph excluding "...or epithets..." to read "...*legitimate epithet validly published with the same rank*."

Add a note referring to Art. 26.

Prop. C (101 – Balfour Browne; Taxon 3 : 30)

At the end of the first paragraph add: "and for certain fungi (see Art. 69)".

Prop. D (102 – Ross; Taxon 3 : 30)

In the third line, for "9 families in which" read "9 families for which".

Prop. E (122 – Litardière; Taxon 3 : 41)

Supprimer: "Une exception est faite en faveur de 9 familles pour lesquelles des noms dits alternatifs sont autorisés".

Prop. F (123 – Pinto da Silva; Taxon 3 : 43)

Add to paragraph 2: "except in those cases of limitation of priority by conservation dealt with in Arts 24 and 25".

Prop. G (139 – Boivin; Taxon 3 : 56)

Paragraph 3. Delete the words: "below the rank of genus" and substitute: "of specific or lower rank".

Observations du Rapporteur

Les propositions B, C, D, et F sont à renvoyer au comité éditorial. On déconseille l'adoption de la proposition A. Le rapporteur ne voit aucun motif sérieux pour modifier le texte actuel d'une façon si rigoureuse. La définition d'un nom correct donnée dans l'Art. 10 lui paraît plus concise que celle de la proposition A. Les conditions de publication effective et valable doivent être concentrées dans un chapitre à part suivant le chapitre concernant les noms des taxa d'après leurs catégories.

Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition E (voyez l'Art. 23, prop. I); il désapprouve la rédaction mise au point dans la proposition G. On ne peut pas faire exception aux règles de la priorité pour les noms de taxa d'un rang quelconque.

*

Proposals B, C, D and F should be referred to the Editorial Committee. The adoption of proposal A is dissuaded; there is apparently no sufficient reason for such a drastic change in the present text. The definition of a correct name given in Art. 10 is in his opinion preferable to that of proposal A because it is shorter. The conditions for effective and valid publication should be brought together in a separate chapter following on that dealing with the nomenclature of taxa according to their categories.

Art. 17

The rapporteur recommends adoption of proposal E. He is not in favour of the change in the redaction put forward in proposal G. No exception to the rule of priority is admissible for the name of a taxon whatever the rank of the latter may be.

Article 17

Prop. A (45 – Société Mycologique de France; Taxon 2 : 193, 194)

Nouveau texte: "Un nom ou une combinaison de noms ne peuvent être changés valablement sans motifs fondés sur une connaissance plus exacte des faits, doublée d'une étude taxinomique probante, ou sur la nécessité d'abandonner une nomenclature contraire aux Règles.

Exemples: Une étude taxinomique sera en particulier considérée comme probante lorsqu'elle aura établi de façon évidente des erreurs descriptives ou d'interprétation, notamment après examen d'un type ou découverte d'affinités jusque là insoupçonnées; des études précises, portant par exemple sur la structure des tissus ou des éléments hyméniens, floraux, etc. . . . ou sur des particularités cytologiques, chimiques, etc. . . . , amèneront souvent à de telles découvertes."

Prop. B (121 – Rousseau; Taxon 3 : 40)

Devrait se lire: "No one can change a name (or combination of names) without serious motives based either on some adequate taxonomic study or on the necessity of giving up a nomenclature that is contrary to the rules of this Code".

Prop. C (Rapporteur)

Supprimer l'Article.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur propose de supprimer l'Article (prop. C). Il est superflu et son intention réelle est déjà exprimée par l'Art. 2.

*

The rapporteur proposes to delete this Article (prop. C). It is superfluous as its real meaning is already expressed in Art. 2.

Recommendation 17 A

Prop. A (45 – Société Mycologique de France; Taxon 2 : 193)

Supprimer la recommandation devenue inutile quand le nouvel Art. 17 sera adopté.

Prop. B (121 – Rousseau; Taxon 3 : 40)

Supprimer la recommandation.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur conseille de supprimer cette recommandation. Elle est parfaitement superflue.

*

The rapporteur is in favour of the deletion of this recommendation. It is superfluous.

Section 2. The type method

Prop. A (47 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2: 198)

The title to read as follows: "The application of names: *The Type Method*."

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur déconseille l'adoption d'un nouveau titre.

*

The rapporteur is of opinion that there is no reason to change the present title.

Article 18

Prop. A (11 – Fosberg; Taxon 2: 108)

On line 2, note 3 substitute "may" for "must", and add to this sentence: "unless the name or epithet is a *nomen dubium* [see (new) Art. 75]."

Prop. B (47 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2: 198)

Modify as follows:

Names of orders or taxa belonging to categories of lower rank are given in Botany in accordance to the *Nomenclatural Type Method*.

A nomenclatural type (typus) is that constituent element of a taxon to which the name of the taxon is permanently attached. It is evident that the name of the taxon must be changed when the type with the basic name is excluded.

Note 1. The Type Method in Taxonomy represents the manner in which a taxon is conceived, since the taxonomic units are not formed by definition but by appraisal of common characters, that is, by the proximity of the different forms to one considered as a type. The nomenclatural types constitute in this way a link between Taxonomy and Nomenclature.

Note 2. The primary types are material elements: samples adequately preserved so that their characteristics may always be recognized. The other nomenclatural types must always be well characterized taxa. But only the principal taxa can be nomenclatural types.

Prop. C (77 – St John; Taxon 3:6)

Delete the last sentence of the first paragraph, reading: "It follows that the name of a taxon must be changed if the type of the name is excluded".

Prop. D (Rapporteur)

Note 3 to read: "... chosen, unless its name must already be rejected under this Code".

Prop. E (Rapporteur)

Insert Appendix I provision no. 2 as note no. 4 to this Article.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve la partie de la proposition de Ponce de León et Alvarez d'incorporer l'Appendice I dans cette section. L'adoption de la proposition E (rapp.) réaliserait cette incorporation en ce qui concerne l'Art. 18 mais éviterait la modification du texte envisagée par la proposition B. Le rapporteur désapprouve entièrement cette modification.

Le rapporteur approuve la proposition C. La proposition D exprime d'une manière plus large l'intention de la proposition A.

Le Pré-congrès de Genève a accepté en principe l'incorporation de l'App. I dans cette section.

*

The rapporteur agrees with that part of the proposal of Ponce de León and Alvarez which argues that Appendix I should be incorporated in this section. This can be effected by adoption of proposal E; in this way the changes in the text proposed by Ponce de León and Alvarez could be avoided. The rapporteur is strongly opposed against these changes.

Proposal C is recommended for adoption.

The proposal D has the same intent as proposal A but it leaves a greater amount of liberty: it is certainly not necessary to typify names that have to be rejected already for other reasons!

The Genève conference accepted in principle the proposal to incorporate App. I in this section.

New Recommendation 18 A

Prop. A (Rapporteur)

Insérer la provision n. 7 de l'Appendice I.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur est en faveur d'une incorporation de l'Appendice I dans cette section. Ici il propose d'insérer la provision n. 7.

*

The rapporteur is in favour of incorporating Appendix I in this section. Provision no. 7 should be inserted in the way indicated in proposal A.

Article 19

Prop. A (47 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 201)

Incorporate the present Article in the text of Art. 21 (Ponce de León no. 22).

Prop. B (140 – Wheeler; Taxon 3 : 57)

Add: “misunderstanding of the nomenclature, or other definite error. A species assigned, either by direct statement, or by inclusion of subordinate categories, by the author of a taxon must be taken as type”.

Prop. C (Rapporteur)

Add: “A lectotype must not be cancelled if it is the nomenclatural type of a conserved name”.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur déconseille l'adoption des propositions A et B. La proposition de M. Wheeler donne une affirmation qui va de soi mais si la Section désire l'adoption de cette provision le Comité Editorial devrait la donner sa place et sa forme appropriée.

*

The rapporteur dissuades adoption of the proposals A and B. Wheeler's proposal recommends an addition that obviously is understood in the Article itself. If the Section wishes to adopt this addition, the Editorial Committee should find a suitable form and place for it.

Recommendation 19 A

Prop. A (47 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 199, 200)

Incorporate the Recommendation in the text of Art. 21 (Ponce de León no. 20).

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur ne voit aucun motif pour donner à cette recommandation le statut d'un Article.

*

The rapporteur sees no reason whatever for giving this recommendation the status of an Article.

Recommendation 19 B

Prop. A (47 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 200)

Modify as follows: "It is recommended that the original material, especially the holotype, of a taxon be deposited in a responsible institution and that it be scrupulously conserved. When living material has been designated as a type, appropriate parts of it should be immediately preserved."

Prop. B (144. — Florschütz; Taxon 3 : 61)

Delete Rec. 19 B and insert a *new Article* 19 bis:

"On and from 1 Jan. 1955 the original material, especially the holotype must be scrupulously conserved and be deposited in a permanent responsible institution. Living material cannot be designated as a type".

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve les propositions A et B; toutefois il est d'avis que cette recommandation pourrait être supprimée si le nouvel Art. 44 bis (prop. C) est accepté. Le Pré-congrès de Genève a donné un préavis semblable.

*

Adoption of these proposals is recommended but the rapporteur is of opinion that the entire recommendation can be deleted if the new Art. 44 bis (prop. C) is accepted. The Genève conference shared this opinion.

New Recommendation 19 C

Prop. A (Rapporteur)

Insert here the following part of Appendix I, 4d: "Whenever the type material of a taxon is heterogeneous, the lectotype should be selected so as to preserve current usage unless another element agrees better with the original description and (or) figure."

Observations du Rapporteur

La création de cette nouvelle recommandation est nécessaire quand l'Appendice I est incorporée dans cette section comme proposé sous l'Art. 18.

*

When Appendix I is incorporated in this section (see the proposal under Art. 18) the insertion of this new recommendation becomes necessary.

Recommendation 19 D

Prop. A (Rapporteur)

Insert here the present provision no. 6 of Appendix I.

Observations du Rapporteur

Voyez ci-dessus sous 19 C. — See above under 19 C.

Article 20

Prop. A (4 — Baehni; Taxon 2 : 90)

Ajouter la phrase suivante: "Sauf exceptions figurant dans la liste des nomina conservanda, le type nominal d'un ordre est la famille dont le nom est fondé sur le même nom générique".

Prop. B (4a — Sprague; Taxon 2 : 131)

To read as follows, the words italicized being inserted: "The nomenclatural type of an order or of any taxon of a rank between order and family is the family whose name or *alternative* name etc."

Prop. C (47 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 198, 199)

Divide the Article into 2 separate Articles and read:

Art. 18. The nomenclatural type of a genus is the species to which the name of a genus is permanently attached.

In the same manner, the type of any taxon between genus and species in rank is also a species; in the formation of the name of such taxa the name of the genus is retained unchanged.

Art. 19. The nomenclatural type of a family is a genus, and therefore the denomination of the families is based on their generic types.

Similarly, the type of any taxon between family and genus is a genus, and the latter's name will be used for the formation of the name of the taxon to which it belongs.

Likewise, the nomenclatural type of an order, or of any taxon of a rank between order and family, is the constituent family of this order; the latter is based in its turn on a generic type in accordance with the rules.

Note 1. As we see, the type method presents two variations. In its ascending form, from genus upwards the name of the type is the foundation of the name of the taxon that includes it. In its descending form, from genus downwards the type carries the name of the taxon to which it belongs.

Prop. D (80 — Doty; Taxon 3 : 16)

Add to the note "see Art. 26".

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition C, les propositions A, B and D sont à renvoyer au Comité Editorial.

*

The rapporteur disagrees with proposal C, the proposals A, B and D may be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 21

Prop. A (47 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2: 199-201)

Replace the present Article by the following series of Articles and incorporate the present Art. 19 & Rec. 17 A in this series:

Art. 20. When applying specific or infraspecific names certain concepts should be noted since the types are, in these cases, definite specimens and not taxa. The following terms should therefore be noted:

A **HOLOTYPE** (Typus) is the specimen or other element used by the author or designated by him as the nomenclatural type. For so long as a holotype is extant it automatically fixes the application of the name concerned.

An *Isotype* is a duplicate of the holotype.

A *Paratype* or *Cotype* is a specimen other than the holotype cited with the original description.

A *Syntype* is one of two or more specimens or elements used by the author when no holotype was designated, or one of two or more specimens simultaneously designated as type.

A *Topotype* is a specimen collected at the same locality as the type.

A **LECTOTYPE** is a specimen or other element selected from the original material to serve as nomenclatural type when the holotype was not designated at the time of publication or for so long as it is missing.

When two or more specimens have been designated as types by the author of a name (e.g. male and female, flowering and fruiting, etc.) one of them must be chosen as lectotype.

A **NEOTYPE** is a specimen selected to serve as nomenclatural type for so long as all of the material on which the name of the taxon was based is missing.

Art. 21. The nomenclatural type (holotype, lectotype, or neotype) of a species or of any taxon below the rank of species is a single specimen or other single element except in the following cases:

For small herbaceous plants and for most non-vascular plants the type may consist of more than one individual, which ought to be conserved permanently and assembled on one herbarium sheet or preparation.

Note 1. If it is later proved that such a type herbarium sheet or preparation contains parts belonging to more than one taxon, the name must remain attached to that part (lectotype) which corresponds most nearly with the original description.

Note 2. For plants of which it is impossible to preserve a type specimen, the type may be a figure and/or a description.

Note 3. For a species without a type specimen, the type may be a description or figure.

Art. 22. If no holotype has been indicated by the author who described a taxon, or when the holotype is lost or destroyed, a substitute must be chosen. This substitute must be a lectotype or a neotype, preferably a lectotype.

The choice of a lectotype or a neotype must be cancelled if the original material is rediscovered, or if it can be shown that the choice was based on a misinterpretation of the original description.

Prop. B (144 – Florschütz; Taxon 3: 63)

Add: "Up to and including 31 Dec. 1954 the type may be a figure and/or a description for plants of which no type specimen was preserved".

Delete notes 1 and 2.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve la rédaction modifiée proposée sous A. Il approuve la proposition B sous condition que les comités spéciaux pour les cryptogames soient consultés.

*

The rapporteur disagrees with the altered redaction proposed under A. He recommends adoption of proposal B but at the same time he wants to submit this proposal to the committees for cryptogams.

New Article 21 bis

Prop. A (27 – Pichi Sermolli; Taxon 2: 137) retirée par l'auteur.

Section 3. Limitation of the principle of priority; publication, starting points, conservation of names

Article 23

Prop. A (4 – Baehni; Taxon 2: 91)

Read: "The validity of publication is treated as beginning .. at the following dates".

Ou le texte adopté pour la version française: "Une publication est tenue pour valide à partir des dates suivantes"; et "Pour tous les groupes de plantes fossiles, la validité de la nomenclature commence avec l'année 1820".

Prop. B (11 – Fosberg; Taxon 2: 108)

After the last paragraph and before the example insert a paragraph as follows: "For purposes of homonymy only, valid publication of names of genera in all groups of plants, recent and fossil, begins with May 1, 1753".

Prop. C (4a – Sprague; Taxon 2: 131)

The following new version is proposed (after "h"): "For fossil plants of all groups, valid publication is treated as beginning with the year 1820".

Prop. D (45 – Société Mycologique de France; Taxon 2:194)

1ère proposition: “f) pour les *Fungi caeteri* la date de 1836, Fries *Epicrisis*.”

2ème proposition (à présenter si la première est rejetée): “f) pour les *Fungi caeteri* le 31 décembre 1821 (Fries, *Systema Mycologicum*, vol I). On est convenu que le vol. I du *Systema Mycologicum* doit être traité comme s’il avait paru le 31 décembre 1821.”

Prop. E (145 – American mycologists; Taxon 3:61)

Delete paragraph f; in paragraph e for the enumeration of groups substitute “*Fungi caeteri*”. The provision concerning the starting-point for the *Fungi* other than *Myxomycetes* will then read: “e. *Fungi caeteri*, 31 Dec. 1801 (Persoon, *Synopsis Methodica Fungorum*)”.

Prop. F (164 – Margadant; Taxon 3:74)

Add: “When a taxon is transferred to another group with a different starting-point seriously, its name is treated as valid from the date of the first effective publication after or on the earlier of the two starting-points, except in the following cases: 1) names published in an invalid combination; 2) fossil plants; 3) names for incomplete states of the life-cycle of the plant regarded as separate taxa.

Examples: *Porella* L. and *Lycopodium* L. were published in *Musci* in 1753; these names are valid because they have been transferred to *Hepaticae* and *Pteridophyta* respectively. Lichenes, if considered *Fungi*, retain Linnaeus 1753 as starting-point. Exceptions: *Mnium trichomanis* L. 1753, now in *Hepaticae*, cannot be treated as a valid name, because the type-species of *Mnium* has always been grouped in *Musci*. The name of a taxon based on a moss-protonema and published in *Algae* before 1802, cannot invalidate a name in *Musci*, as it represents an incomplete state of the life-cycle.”

Alternative: “If it be preferred to choose another solution, this could be reached by few alterations in the wording of this proposal “. . . transferred to a group with an earlier starting-point . . .” and replacing the exception of fossil plants by one of Lichens.”

Prop. G (Herter, non-publiée)

Abzuändern wie folgt: “Für alle Pflanzengruppen gilt als Ausgangspunkt der legitimen Nomenklatur: Linné, *Species Plantarum*, ed. 1, 1753.”

Prop. H (Pré-congrès de Genève)

The first sentence to read as follows: “Valid publication of names is treated as beginning for plants of the different groups at the following dates”

Prop. I (Pré-congrès de Genève)

- 1) A separate starting-point for the valid publication of family names should be fixed.

- 2) The Nomenclature Section of the Paris Congress should establish a small committee to publish a provisional list of names and types in Taxon.
- 3) Remarks and criticism should be submitted and published before the next (ninth) International Botanical Congress.
- 4) The ninth International Botanical Congress should take an official decision to accept the final list as the starting-point.

Observations du Rapporteur

La partie paléobotanique des propositions A et C est à renvoyer à la commission paléobotanique. Le rapporteur désapprouve la modification de la première phrase de l'Article (prop. A) en se référant au commentaire de M. Sprague (Taxon 2 : 131). Les propositions D et E sont à renvoyer à la commission spéciale pour les fungi. Le rapporteur désapprouve l'adoption de la proposition F, la modification de la première phrase comme indiquée dans la proposition H donne une solution plus élégante.

On déconseille nettement l'adoption des propositions B et G qui sont très dangereuses! La proposition I a été adoptée à Genève par la plus grande majorité possible (9/1).

*

Proposal C and that part of proposal A which deals with names of fossil plants should be referred to the committee for palaeobotany. The alteration in the first sentence of the Article does not seem necessary (see the comment made by Sprague in Taxon 2 : 131). Proposals D and E should be referred to the committee for fungi. The rapporteur disagrees with the proposal F, the alteration of the first phrase given in proposal H constitutes a better solution.

The adoption of the proposals B and G is not recommended: they are extremely dangerous! Proposal I was accepted at the Genève conference by a considerable majority (9/1).

Article 24

Prop. A (77 — St John; Taxon 3 : 6)

Change: "Committee, who will refer them . . ." to read: "Committee, which will refer them . . ."

Prop. B (89 — Morton; Taxon 3 : 22)

For "up to the year 1890" substitute: "up to the year 1907".

Prop. C (98 — Ponce de León & Mencia y Garcia; Taxon 3 : 27)

De substituer à l'Art. 24 du Code International de la Nomenclature Botanique les Arts 41 et 42 du Code International de la Nomenclature Taxonomique Botanique, dont voici les textes.

Art. 41. Pour éviter de changements sans avantages dans la Nomencla-

Art. 24

ture, malgré le caractère des prescriptions de ce Code, le principe de priorité ne s'appliquera pas dans le cas de certains noms génériques qui, employés constamment, doivent s'estimer comme consacrés par l'usage.

A tel effet, à ce Code présentera une liste de noms génériques devant être conservés comme exceptions, intitulés "*Nomina Generica Conservanda*".

Ces noms sont de préférence ceux dont l'emploi est devenu général dans les cinquante ans après leur publication, ou, qui ont été employés dans d'importants travaux floristiques d'avant l'an 1890.

Observation.

Les notes 1, 2, 3, 4, avec tous les exemples de l'Art. 24 précédent, seront transférés intégralement au nouvel Art. 41.

Art. 42. Afin d'adopter de plus en plus les noms des familles aux prescriptions du Code, remplaçant ceux qui ne suivent pas les règles établies, ce Code présentera une liste des noms de familles qui sont acceptés de préférence à d'autres, intitulés "*Nomina Familiarum Conservanda*".

Prop. D (120 – Janchen; Taxon 3 : 35)

Ich beantrage, dass hier die grundsätzliche Möglichkeit ausgesprochen werde, auch für Arten (Species) eine Liste von nomina conservanda aufzustellen.

Prop. E (121 – Rousseau; Taxon 3 : 40)

Remplacer la note I telle que rédigée actuellement, par la suivante: "La liste des nomina conservanda est définitivement close depuis le Congrès international de botanique en 1954".

Prop. F (121 – Rousseau; Taxon 3 : 40)

Ajouter la note suivante: "In the event of the division of a genus in two or more genera, the nomen rejiciendum can be restored as a legitimate name for one of the new genera, provided the author who restores the name is considered as the creator of the generic name".

Prop. G (123 – Pinto da Silva; Taxon 3 : 43)

Read as follows: "A conserved name is conserved against all its earlier validly published homonyms".

Prop. H (Pré-congrès de Genève)

The Genève conference recommends unanimously a modification of Art. 24 along the following lines.

1) References should be inserted to the proposed new Arts 24 bis (B; generic and specific names not used since 1900) and 78 bis (nomina specifica rejicienda).

2) The list of conserved generic names should be closed after the Paris Congress; various closing-dates should be established for the different groups of plants.

3) Immediately after the closing of the lists of conserved names, lists of rejected generic names should be established.

4) The regulations governing the lists of rejected names should, in principle, be the same as those given for names that are to be conserved.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur est d'avis que les propositions A et G devraient être renvoyées au Comité Editorial.

Il approuve les propositions E et H.

Il désapprouve les propositions B, C, D et F.

Le rapporteur déconseille l'adoption de la proposition B parce qu'il approuve la proposition H.

Aucune différence principielle existe entre les nomina generica conservanda et les nomina familiarum conservanda; la différence actuelle n'est que temporaire et d'un caractère technique et elle ne devrait pas être codifiée. Pour cela l'adoption de la proposition C est déconseillée.

Prop. H. Le rapporteur était d'avis qu'on devrait faire quelque chose afin de pouvoir rejeter des noms spécifiques légitimes remplaçant des noms bien connus. D'abord il préférerait chercher la solution dans l'introduction des nomina specifica conservanda proprement typifiés. Toutefois, les arguments avancés au Pré-congrès de Genève l'ont convaincu que la solution présentée par la proposition H est encore meilleure.

*

Proposals A and G may be referred to the Editorial Committee. Proposals E and H are recommended for adoption; proposals B, C, D and F for rejection. Adoption of proposal B is dissuaded, because it seems preferable to accept proposal H.

There is no fundamental difference between nomina generica conservanda and nomina familiarum conservanda; the difference that so far has been made is of a technical character only, and should not be overemphasized by dealing with the two groups in two different Articles. For this reason adoption of proposal C is dissuaded.

Acceptation of proposal F would lead to numerous difficulties in the choice of the types, and is therefore dissuaded.

Prop. H. Recommended for acceptance. The rapporteur is of the opinion that something should be done with regard to the numerous difficulties that arise when well-known specific names have to be replaced by legitimate but obscure other ones. In first instance he favoured the introduction of the principle of nomina specifica conservanda. However, the arguments put forward at the Genève conference were such that he now agrees that the present proposal H is preferable.

New Article 24 bis

Prop. A (45 – Société Mycologique de France; Taxon 2 : 194)

“Lorsque cinquante ans se sont écoulés après la publication d’un nom générique par un auteur, sans que ce nom ait été repris ou admis dans aucun ouvrage ou article valablement publié, on sera en droit de le considérer comme tombé en *désuétude* et sa reprise au détriment d’un nom générique plus récent n’est pas obligatoire.”

Prop. B (Pré-congrès de Genève)

“A specific or generic name not taken up in a botanical paper published since 1900 in accordance with Art. 39 may not be used to replace a currently accepted name.”

Observations du Rapporteur

Le Pré-congrès de Genève a accepté à l’unanimité la proposition B sous condition qu’elle soit accompagnée par l’introduction du principe du *nomina specifica (et generica) rejicienda*.

*

Proposal B was accepted unanimously by the Genève conference on the understanding that the principle of *nomina specifica (et generica) rejicienda* will be introduced at the same time.

Article 25

Prop. A (Pré-congrès de Genève)

Read: “. . . . provisionally approved by the General Committee, botanists are” (vide former Chapter IV, prop. C).

Observations du Rapporteur

Cette modification est la conséquence logique de la proposition de supprimer l’“Advisory Board” (voyez la nouvelle Division III).

*

This alteration results from the proposal to abolish the Advisory Board (see new Division III).

Section 4. Nomenclature of taxa according to their categories

Prop. A (49 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 203, 204)

Modify as follows:

Section 1. Names of taxa above the rank of order.

Section 2. Names of orders and suborders.

Section 3. Names of families and subfamilies, tribes and subtribes.

Section 4. Names of genera and subdivisions of genera.

Section 5. Names of species (Binary names).

Section 6. Names of taxa below the rank of species (Ternary names).

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Adopt proposal A but retain subsection 7 as section 7 of this new Chapter.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve la proposition de Ponce de León et Alvarez d'élever la section 4 au rang d'un chapitre; et d'élever les sous-sections au rang de sections. Toutefois il conseille de garder la (sous)section 7 et pour cela il propose d'adopter les propositions A et B.

*

The rapporteur is in favour of proposal A to raise section 4 to the rank of a chapter, and to raise its subsections to sections, but he dissuades the suppression of the present subsection 7 (prop. B).

Subsection 1. NAMES OF TAXA ABOVE THE RANK OF ORDER

Article 26

Prop. A (50 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 204)

Read: "The rules of priority and typification can not be applied to names of taxa above the rank of order."

Add the following recommendations:

A. The term *Phytæ* must be kept for the highest taxon which, as it includes all plants, is the only one of the category of Kingdom (Regnum).

B. Names of subkingdoms are preferably formed by adding a prefix to the name of the kingdom indicating a dominant quality of all the plants included in this subkingdom. E.g.: Subkingdom *Cormophytæ*.

Note. If the greek term *phyta* is to be used as a suffix to form the names of taxa belonging to higher categories, such as division, no other word than *Phytæ* can be used to designate the only taxon of the highest category; this term is preferable above *Plantæ* and *Regnum Vegetabile* which are latin terms.

Prop. B (Pré-congrès de Genève)

Read: "The Rules of priority and typification do not apply to names of taxa above the rank of family".

Observations du Rapporteur

La proposition B a été adoptée à Genève par une majorité considérable (9/1). Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition A.

*

Rec. 26 A

Proposal B was adopted at the Genève conference by a considerable majority (9/1). The rapporteur disagrees with the proposal A.

Recommendation 26 A

Prop. A (50 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 205)

Replace the present Rec. 26 A by the following Arts and Rec.:

Art. 25. Names of divisions are generally taken from characters indicating the nature of the division as closely as possible, using the greek terminology, they should end in the suffix *phyta*. E.g. *Spermaphyta*.

The name of one of the taxa included in the division can also be taken as a root if it has a marked preponderance above the others and is provided with the suffix *phyta*. E.g. *Pteridophyta*.

Names of subdivisions will be formed by adding to those of the respective division an appropriate prefix. E.g. *Angiospermaphyta*.

Note. Being important taxa, the names must indicate that they are important groups of plants: hence the need of the ending *phyta*, in preference to all others as e.g. *mycota* for Fungi. Furthermore, this ending must not be altered in the names of subdivisions.

Art. 26. Names of classes and subclasses are formed in a similar manner as the names of divisions. Their endings must be:

For cellular autotrophic plants, e.g. Algae:

Classes in *phyceae*.

Subclasses in *phycideae*.

For cellular heterotrophic plants, e.g. Fungi:

Classes in *mycetes*.

Subclasses in *mycetidae*.

For vascular plants e.g. Cormophytae:

Classes in *opsida*.

Subclasses in *idae*.

Rec. 26 A. If the category cohort is accepted the name of these taxa could be formed by using the name of one of its characteristics and adding the suffix *atae*. E.g.: *Paracarpicatae*.

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Delete the recommendation.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur est d'avis que la recommandation 26 A devrait être supprimée. Les règles de la nomenclature ne peuvent pas être appliquées aux taxa de rang supérieur à l'ordre (famille) et la conséquence logique de cette situation est la suppression des recommandations à ce sujet.

*

It seems better to delete recommendation 26 A. The rules of nomenclature are not applicable to taxa above the rank of order (family), and it is therefore illogical to make recommendations with regard to them.

Subsection 2. NAMES OF ORDERS AND SUBORDERS

Article 27

Prop. A (4a — Sprague; Taxon 2 : 131)

To read as follows:

“The name of an order is taken from that of its type family with the ending *-ales*. If a conserved name of the type family is not formed from that of a genus, or if it does not end in *-aceae*, the name of the order is taken from the alternative name of the type family (see Art. 28).

Suborders are designated in a similar manner, with the ending *-ineae*.”

“Examples of names of orders: *Fucales* (from *Fucaceae*); *Polygonales* (from *Polygonaceae*); *Urticales* (from *Urticaceae*); *Apiales* (from the alternative name *Apiaceae*), not *Umbellales* (from the conserved name *Umbelliferae*); *Brassicales* (from the alternative name *Brassicaceae*), not *Cruciales* (from the conserved name *Cruciferae*); *Arecales* (from the alternative name *Arecaceae*), not *Palmales* (from the conserved name *Palmae*).

Suborders: *Bromeliineae*, *Malvineae*.

Prop. B (Pré-congrès de Genève)

Delete the entire Article.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur conseille de supprimer l'Article (prop. B), ceci étant la conséquence logique de la proposition B de l'Art. 26.

*

The Article should be deleted as a result of proposal B, Art. 26.

Subsection 3. NAMES OF FAMILIES AND SUBFAMILIES, TRIBES AND SUBTRIBES

Article 28

Prop. A (6 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 96)

Cette proposition a été retirée par les auteurs.

Prop. B (28 — Pichon; Taxon 2 : 138)

Transformer ainsi le premier paragraphe: “Un nom de famille est un adjectif au pluriel, utilisé comme substantif, formé par adjonction du suffixe *-aceae* au radical du nom du genre-type ou d'un synonyme au génitif.”

Prop. C (74 — Rickett; Taxon 2: 211)

I propose that Art. 28 be changed to read as follows: "The name of a family is a plural adjective used as a substantive, formed by adding the suffix *-aceae* to the stem of the name of its type genus or of a synonym of this name."

Prop. D (137 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 3: 53)

The name of a family is a plural adjective used as a substantive, and is derived from the name of the type genus by adding the suffix *aceae* to the stem (as shown in the genitive).

Note 1. When the name belongs to the 1st, 2nd, 4th, or 5th latin declination there will be no difference between the stem of the genus name and the stem of the family name. Examples:

- From Malv-a Malv-ae
Malv-aceae
- From Ros-a Ros-ae
Ros-aceae
- From Solan-um Solan-i
Solan-aceae
- From Chenopodi-um Chenopodi-i
Chenopodi-aceae
- From Mor-us Mor-i
Mor-aceae

When the generic name belongs to the 3rd latin declination (in which the genitive ends in *is*) we must bear in mind that many of these names are of Greek origin and retain the original form of genitive and that this may lead to variations in the composition of the family name. Examples:

- From Cyc-as Cycad-is
Cycad-aceae
- From Jugl-ans Jugland-is
Jugland-aceae
- From Ir-is Irid-is
Irid-aceae
- From Hamamel-is Hamamelid-is
Hamamelid-aceae
- From Saccharomyc-es Saccharomycet-is
Saccharomycet-aceae
- From Papav-er Papaver-is
Papaver-aceae
- From Borag-o Boragin-is
Boragin-aceae
- From Melastom-a Melastomat-is
Melastomat-aceae

Note 2. If the name of the genus that is accepted as type of a family becomes a synonym, the name of the family derived from it also becomes a synonym.

Note 3. The time-honoured but irregular names *Palmae*, *Gramineae*, *Cruciferae*, *Leguminosae*, *Guttiferae*, *Umbelliferae*, *Labiatae* and *Compositae*, should be treated as synonyms. Botanists should prefer the name that in accordance with the rules ends in *aceae*, and add, for a greater clearness, the irregular equivalent in parentheses.

Prop. E (122 – Litardière; Taxon 3: 41)

Supprimer: "Toutefois à la place de ces noms les botanistes ont la faculté d'en utiliser d'autres fondés sur ceux des genres-types et terminés en *-aceae*".

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur donne un préavis favorable aux propositions B, C, et D qui mèneront au fond au même but. Le Comité Editorial trouvera la rédaction finale. Avec M. de Litardière le rapporteur est d'avis qu'un seul nom devrait obligatoirement être employé pour désigner un seul taxon de circonscription précis, mais il préférerait attendre les décisions de la section au sujet de la proposition I de l'Art. 23. Au cas où on établirait une liste de noms de famille comme point de départ, il faudrait sans doute modifier le texte actuel. Le Pré-congrès de Genève a conseillé à l'unanimité de garder les noms *Palmae*, *Gramineae*, etc.

*

The rapporteur is in favour of such a change as is asked in the proposals B, C and D. The final form of this change may be left to the Editorial Committee. He agrees with de Litardière that it would be desirable to have one name only for each taxon, but he should like to await the action of the section with regard to proposal I of Art. 23. When a starting-point for the nomenclature of familynames would be established, it would become necessary to modify the present text. The Genève conference was unanimously in favour of keeping the names *Palmae*, *Gramineae*, etc.

New Recommendation 28 A

Prop. A (Herter – non publiée)

Werden die Endungen *-aceae*, *-oideae*, *-cae*, *-ineae*, *-inae* an einen Gattungsnamen angehängt, der auf einen Vokal ausgeht, so bleibt dieser vort. Man schreibe also *Melastomaceae* und nicht *Melastomataceae*.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le Comité Editorial pourrait étudier cette proposition en même temps que les propositions B, C et D à l'Art. 28.

*

This proposal could be studied by the Editorial Committee together with the proposals B, C and D of Art. 28.

Article 29

Prop. A (28 — Pichon; Taxon 2 : 138)

Transformer ainsi le premier paragraphe: “Un nom de sous-famille est un adjectif pluriel, utilisé comme substantif, formé par adjonction du suffixe *-oideae* au radical du nom du genre-type ou d’un synonyme au génitif; les noms de tribus. . . . etc.” (comme précédemment).

Prop. B (51 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 206)

Delete the words “*or a synonym*” in the second line of this Article.

Prop. C (80 — Doty; Taxon 3 : 16)

In lines four and three of the “note” change the word “authority”, to “author”. Make same change in lines two and four of the “example”.

Prop. D (Herter — non publiée)

Delete: “*Metastelmatinae*”.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur donne un préavis favorable aux propositions A et C. Il s’oppose à la proposition B parce que la suppression des mots “ou une synonyme” mènerait à un grand nombre de changements inutiles; la proposition D est à renvoyer au Comité Editorial.

*

Proposals A and C are recommended for adoption. Acceptation of proposal B would lead to a great number of changes of doubtful value, and is therefore dissuaded; proposal D should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Subsection 4. NAMES OF GENERA AND SUBDIVISIONS OF GENERA

Article 30

Prop. A (52 — Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 206)

Substitute the second paragraph of this Article by the following note:

Note. Generic names being basic in Taxonomic Botanical Nomenclature no rules can be given for their information. Some of the principal sources of generic names are:

- a) Original Latin names. E.g.: Allium, Laurus, Tilia. Many of them came to Latin from Greek, e.g. Cedrus (Kedrus), others were of Celtic origin, e.g. Larix.
- b) Names taken from other languages. E.g. Areca, from Malabar; Gingko, from Chinese; Nelumbo, from Ceylonese; Tulipa, from Persian; Jacaranda which is a vernacular name in Brasil.

- c) Names which indicate a character or quality. They are the most adequate names. Examples of simple names: Bactris, Lagenaria, Aster. Examples of compound names: Anacardium, Helianthus, Nephrolepis, Calophyllum, Theobroma.
- d) Names dedicated to prominent botanists. E.g.: Adansonia, Brittonia, Magnolia, Jacquinia, Thunbergia.
- e) Names dedicated to mythical persons. E.g. Amaryllis, Dionaea, Helenium, Nymphaea, Persea.
- f) Geographic names. E.g.: Araucaria, Eleusine, Iberis, Opuntia.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur ne voit aucun motif plausible pour modifier cet Article. La première partie de la note formule un principe plutôt qu'un précepte. Le fait étant admis qu'un nom de genre peut avoir une origine quelconque, il paraît tout à fait superflue d'essayer de décrire cet origine! Cependant le rapporteur est d'avis que plusieurs exemples de la proposition de Ponce de León et Alvarez pourraient être insérées dans le texte actuel.

*

There seems to be no sufficient ground to change this Article. The first part of the note that should replace the present second paragraph states a principle, but does not give a precept. If it is admitted that a generic name may be taken from any source whatever, it seems useless to enumerate such sources. Some of the examples quoted by the proposers might eventually be added to the present list.

Recommendation 30 A

Prop. A (52 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 206, 207)

Add the following suggestions:

- i) to indicate, if possible, a common characteristic of the plants included in the taxon.
- j) not to form names which are anagrams.
- k) not to use a name similar to or derived from the epithet of one of the species of the taxon.

Prop. B (77 – St John; Taxon 3 : 6)

Delete the word "barbarous", and change the sentence to read: "Not to take names from languages other than Latin or Greek, unless those names are frequently cited in books of travel, etc."

Prop. C (121 – Rousseau; Taxon 3 : 40)

Le paragraphe devrait se lire simplement: "To avoid names not readily adaptable to the Latin tongue".

Art. 31

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve les modifications proposées par MM St John et Rousseau (B et C, le Comité Editorial pourrait faire le choix), il désapprouve celles de la proposition A.

*

The changes proposed by St John and Rousseau are both acceptable; the Section might leave the choice to the Editorial Committee. The suggestions made in proposal A can hardly be recommended.

Article 31

Prop. A (Editorial Committee; Code p. 22)

The note (**) on the use of the term subdivisional epithet was inserted by the Editorial Committee. The Paris meeting should express its approval or disapproval of this procedure.

Prop. B (77 – St John; Taxon 3:7)

Paragraph two and three should be removed from the Article, and made Rec. 31 A. The wording to remain unchanged.

Prop. C (123 – Pinto da Silva; Taxon 3:44)

Add to the second paragraph: “or are the names of the genera themselves (cf. Art. 32).”

Prop. D (Rapporteur)

Delete the words “or their place may be taken by an ordinal number or a letter”.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur donne une préavis favorable à toutes les propositions. La suppression des mots mentionnés dans la proposition D paraît nécessaire afin d'éviter de nombreuses confusions de citation. Une telle nomenclature diffère principalement de celle des autres catégories et devrait être rejetée.

*

All these proposals are recommended for adoption. The deletion of the words mentioned in proposal D seems necessary in order to avoid confusion when such groups are cited. Such a nomenclature differs entirely from that followed in the other categories and should be avoided (it can, in fact, hardly be called nomenclature!).

Article 32

Prop. A (45 – Société Mycologique de France; Taxon 2 : 194)

Remplacer la fin de la phrase par: "... doit porter obligatoirement un nom différent de celui du genre". (Changer l'exemple ou le supprimer).

Prop. B (77 – St John; Taxon 3 : 7)

Line one, after "subgenus", insert: "section, or other subdivision of a genus."
Line two, for "that name", read: "the same unaltered name".

Prop. C (80 – Doty; Taxon 3 : 17)

It is proposed that there be added a sentence to read: "Valid publication of a name for any subordinated taxon which does not include the nomenclatural type of the higher taxon automatically creates a subordinated taxon of the same rank which has as its nomenclatural type the type of the genus and which bears the generic name unaltered."

Prop. D (120 – Janchen; Taxon 3 : 35)

Ich beantrage die Aufhebung und Streichung dieses Artikels.

Prop. E (123 – Pinto da Silva; Taxon 3 : 44)

Insert: "or section" after "The subgenus".

Prop. F (146 – Rogers; Taxon 3 : 64)

For "subgenus" substitute the words "subdivision of a genus".

Prop. G (139 – Boivin; Taxon 3 : 56)

Delete the word "subgenus" and substitute: "subdivision of a genus".

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve les propositions B, C, E, F, et G qui expriment la nécessité de suivre la méthode des types dans toute la nomenclature botanique.

Il tient à préciser qu'il désapprouve entièrement les propositions des mycologues français et de M. Janchen, (A, D). Ces propositions sont contraires au principe fondamental de la méthode des types nomenclaturaux.

*

The proposals B, C, E, F, and G are recommended for adoption. The Rapporteur strongly disapproves of the proposals A and D, which attack the basic principle of the nomenclatural type method.

Art. 33

Subsection 5. NAMES OF SPECIES (BINARY NAMES)

Prop. A (92 – Paclt; Taxon 3 : 24)

Substitute the term “binary name” by “specific name”.

Prop. B (148 – Cortés; Taxon 3 : 64)

Diviser la sous-section:

a. *sous-section 5* Noms de macro-espèces (noms binaires)

b. — — 6 Noms d'espèces (noms ternaires)

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve en principe la proposition A, cependant dans ce cas-ci on pourrait simplement supprimer les mots “binary names”; il désapprouve la proposition B qui est contraire aux principes fondamentaux de la nomenclature actuelle.

*

Proposal A is recommended for adoption, however in this title it would be even better simply to delete the words “binary names”. Proposal B is contrary to the fundamental concepts of our present nomenclature.

Article 33

Prop. A (4 – Baehni; Taxon 2 : 91)

A modifier: “Les épithètes s'accordent en genre et en nombre avec le nom générique.”

Prop. B (4a – Sprague; Taxon 2 : 131, 132)

There seems to be no objection to inserting the words “number and case” after “gender” in the Arts 33 & 34, if this is considered desirable for the benefit of those unacquainted with the Rules of Latin grammar. If it is necessary to include “number”, as suggested by Prof. Baehni, surely it is equally necessary to include “case”, e.g., “*Cinna arundinacea* Gramen magnitudine *Avenae sativae*” L. Sp. Pl. ed. 1, p. 5 (1753).

Prop. C (53 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 207)

A. Omit the parentheses at the end of the first paragraph.

B. Substitute the fourth paragraph by the following note.

Note. The names of species being binary, the generic part of the name should in the first place be correct.

Prop. D (82 – Woolford; Taxon 3 : 19)

In the first paragraph to bring the third sentence and the second sentence into agreement it is proposed that the third sentence be amended to terminate with the words “. . . . must be hyphenated or united.”

Prop. E (83 – Bell; Taxon 3 : 19)

As a second paragraph it is here proposed that there be added: "Specific epithets consisting of more than one word are to be rejected if published after 1955".

Prop. F (147 – Conners; Taxon 3 : 62)

Add the following to the examples after the third paragraph: "*Stagonospora arenaria* Sacc. from the host *Elymus arenarius*, *Cercospora monoica* Ell. & Holw. from *Amphicarpa monoica*, *Peridermium balsameum* Peck from *Abies balsamea*; but also *Gloeosporium balsameae* J. J. Davis, *Phacidium balsameae* J. J. Davis, from *Abies balsamea*, *Taphrina sacchari* Jenkins from *Acer saccharum*."

Prop. G (148 – Cortés; Taxon 3 : 64)

Modifier ainsi: "Un nom de "macro-espèce" est une combinaison binaire etc."

Prop. H (Pré-congrès de Genève)

The second phrase to read as follows: "If an epithet consists of two or more words,"

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur ne voit pas d'inconvénient à adopter les propositions des MM. Baehni et Sprague (A et B); toutefois il préférerait la rédaction suivante: "..... as a substantive, agrees grammatically with the generic name". Il ne voit pas la nécessité de modifier l'Article de la façon de la proposition C. Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition E, les propositions D et F sont à renvoyer au Comité Editorial.

Le rapporteur s'oppose à l'introduction des macro-espèces (prop. G). La proposition G est contraire aux principes fondamentaux de la nomenclature actuelle. La proposition H a été acceptée à l'unanimité par le Pré-congrès de Genève.

*

The rapporteur sees no objection against the proposals made by Baehni and by Sprague (A and B), but he would prefer the following redaction: "..... as a substance, agrees grammatically with the generic name". There seems to be no necessity for the change advocated in proposal C. Adoption of the proposals D and E is recommended; proposal F should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

The rapporteur is against the introduction of macro-species. Proposal G is contrary to the fundamental concept of the present nomenclature. Proposal H was unanimously accepted by the Genève conference.

Art. 33 bis

New Article 33 bis

Prop. A (148 — Cortés; Taxon 3 : 62)

Un nom d'espèce est une combinaison ternaire entre le nom de la macro-espèce et l'épithète formée comme celle des macro-espèces et ajoutée à celle-ci.

Exemples: *Ginkgo biloba biloba* L; *Viscum album album* L; *Viscum album laxum* B. R.

Observations du Rapporteur

Voyez les observations sous l'Art. 33. — See the remarks under Art. 33.

New Article 33 bis A

Prop. A (Herter — non publiée)

Zwecks Uniformierung der Nomenklatur sollten die Artnamen (die binären Namen) den Namen der Unterabteilungen von Arten (den ternären Namen) gegenüber bevorzugt werden, zumal in volkstümlichen Schriften, in Botanischen Gärten, usw.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition A. — The rapporteur disapproves of proposal A.

Recommendation 33 A

Prop. A (77 — St John; Taxon 3 : 7)

Add to the end of the last sentence: "... or a notable botanist or person who is thus honored".

Prop. B (Pré-congrès de Genève)

Delete the recommendation.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le Pré-congrès de Genève a recommandé à l'unanimité la suppression de la recommandation. Elle est superflue et sa dernière phrase n'exprime certainement pas la coutume actuelle.

*

The Genève conference recommended unanimously the deletion of this recommendation. It is superfluous and its last sentence is contrary to actual practice.

Recommendation 33 B

Prop. A (53 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 207)

Amplify the first paragraph as follows:

“Specific epithets should preferably be:

- a) Simple or compound adjectives (rubra, glauca, calocoma, grandifolia, multifida).
- b) Names of persons used in the genitive or in an adjectival form, (clusii, humboldtiana).
- c) Names of the localities where the plants are found used in the genitive or in an adjectival form (japonica, saharae).”

Prop. B (120 – Janchen; Taxon 3 : 35)

Die Verwendung des Genitivs und der adjektivischen Form desselben Personennamens zur Bezeichnung zweier verschiedener Arten derselben Gattung, wie z.B. *Lysimachia Hemsleyana* und *L. Hemsleyi* ist so verwirrend, dass sie nicht nur für die Zukunft vermieden, sondern auch für die Vergangenheit durch eine Regel verboten werden sollte. Siehe meinen Anträge zu Artikel 73 und 82 und zu Empfehlung 82 I.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur ne voit pas la nécessité de modifier cette recommandation comme proposé sous A. La proposition B apporterait de nombreux changements de noms, et c'est pour cela qu'on déconseille également son adoption.

*

It does not seem necessary to alter this recommendation in the way of proposal A. Proposal B would lead to numerous changes and its adoption is therefore not recommended.

Recommendation 33 C

Prop. A (53 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 207)

Add: “Not to make epithets which are anagrams.”

Prop. B (77 – St John; Taxon 3 : 7)

Delete the words: “or more”. Then the recommendation will read: “To avoid specific epithets formed of two hyphenated words.”

Prop. C (80 – Doty; Taxon 3 : 17)

It is proposed as a guide that a paragraph “j” be added to read “The Latin ending is preferably added directly to a word taken from languages other than Latin or Greek with no alteration of the word. Example: *Cyrtandra waianaeensis*”

Rec. 33 D

St John (1950. Occas. Papers B. P. Bishop Mus. 20 : 80) for a *Cyrtandra* from the Waianae Mountains.”

Prop. D (Pré-congrès de Genève)

Delete suggestion (f).

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition A. Dans ce cas on doit admettre les anagrammes ainsi que dans les noms génériques. Il désapprouve également les propositions B et C; dans le dernier cas il faut qu'on laisse le choix à l'auteur pour des raisons pratiques. La proposition D a été acceptée à Genève par une majorité sensible (8/2), la suggestion (f) étant contraire à la coutume actuelle.

*

Adoption of proposal A is dissuaded. There seems to be no serious objection against the use of anagrams either in the names of genera or in those of species. Adoption of proposal B is not recommended. In the case of proposal C the choice should be left to the author. Proposal D was accepted by a considerable majority (8/2) at the Genève conference, the suggested procedure being contrary to present usage.

New Recommendation 33 D

Prop. A (Herter — non publiée)

In Fällen in denen weder der Genitiv noch die adjektivische Form angebracht sind, wähle man den Nominativ: Artigas, Cardunculus, Cristoforo-Colombo, Pater-familias, Pax-vobiscum, Schneewittchen.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition A. — The rapporteur disapproves of the proposal A.

Subsection 6. NAMES OF TAXA BELOW THE RANK OF SPECIES (TERNARY NAMES)

Prop. A (93 — Paclt; Taxon 3 : 24)

Substitute the term “ternary name” by “infraspecific name”.

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Delete “Ternary names”.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition A parce qu'il ne voit pas la

nécessité d'ajouter les mots "infraspecific name" au titre. Les mots "ternary names" devraient être supprimés (prop. B), cette indication étant incorrecte.

*

Adoption of proposal A is dissuaded because there seems to be no necessity for adding the words "infraspecific names" to the title. The words "ternary names" are also superfluous and, moreover, incorrect; they should be deleted (prop. B).

Article 34

Prop. A (29 – Pichon; Taxon 2 : 139)

Transformer ainsi la fin du second alinea: "... et dont le type nominal est alors, sauf inconvénient grave ou impossibilité, celui du taxon supérieur (cf. Art. 35)".

Prop. B (4 – Baehni; Taxon 2 : 91)

vide Prop. A sub Art. 33

Prop. C (4a – Sprague; Taxon 2 : 131, 132)

vide Prop. B sub Art. 33

Prop. D (103 – Ross; Taxon 3 : 30)

Insert as a paragraph between the fourth and fifth paragraphs: "Certain epithets specified in Art. 80 may not be used for infraspecific taxa (except as provided in that Article)".

Prop. E (148 – Cortés; Taxon 3 : 64)

Ajouter au paragraphe final "il est permis de réduire les combinaisons trop compliquées à des combinaisons ternaires, pourvu qu'on exprime le rang des taxa subordonnés."

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur voit les difficultés exprimées par M. Pichon mais il se demande si la proposition A donnerait une solution acceptable, parce que la désignation d'un type est toujours nécessaire et même obligatoire. Dans le premier cas mentionné par M. Pichon l'auteur devrait créer une troisième variété. Cette variété occuperait vraiment une position intermédiaire et pourrait vraisemblablement être considérée d'un point de vue génétique comme adhérent à l'une ou l'autre des extrêmes. Cependant, d'un point de vu nomenclatural, cela n'a aucun intérêt. Le deuxième cas est plus difficile. On peut s'imaginer une situation dans laquelle le type de l'espèce (*dioïque*) est mâle et les variétés ne se distinguent que par les caractères des plantes féminines. L'auteur des variétés devrait alors arbitrairement choisir la variété à laquelle le specimen-type appartient, une décision principielle étant impossible!

Art. 35

Le rapporteur ne voit donc pas la nécessité de créer une provision spéciale comme envisagée par M. Pichon (prop. A).

Le préavis du rapporteur au sujet des propositions B et C et son préavis aux propositions A et B à l'Art. 33 sont les mêmes.

Les propositions D et E sont à renvoyer au Comité Editorial.

*

The rapporteur admits the difficulties to which Pichon refers, but he is not convinced that adoption of proposal A would solve them in an acceptable way, because indication of a type is binding and should remain so. In the first case discussed by Pichon the author should create a third variety, which would occupy an intermediate position; it is true that this might prove to be identical with one of the others, but this is from a nomenclatural point of view of no importance. His second case offers greater difficulties. In the example given by him (varieties differing in the characters of the fruit only) the absence of fruits in the type specimen is more or less accidental, but if the species happens to be dioecious, it will always remain impossible to refer a male plant to one of these varieties, but it will also be impossible to prove that it does not belong to one of them. Would there be any serious harm in referring such an indeterminate type to a definite variety? The provision proposed by Pichon would in that case be superfluous. The proposals B, C, D & E might be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 35

Prop. A (11 – Fosberg; Taxon 2: 108)

Add to the first sentence: "... except that the name of the original author of the epithet may, if desired, be added in parentheses."

Prop. B (120 – Janchen; Taxon 3: 35)

Ich beantrage die Aufhebung und Streichung dieses Artikels.

Prop. C (122 – Litardière; Taxon 3: 41)

Supprimer l'Article.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur donne un préavis nettement défavorable à toutes les propositions, l'Article actuel ayant été approuvé par la grande majorité de la Section de Nomenclature à Stockholm.

*

The rapporteur is strongly opposed against all proposals. The present Article was approved at the Stockholm Congress by the great majority of the Section for Nomenclature.

Recommendation 37 B

Prop. A (54 – Ponce de León & Alvarez; Taxon 2 : 207)

That Recommendation 37 B, duly modified, be considered an Article to be included in a new Chapter (VII), dealing with Biosystematics.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur déconseille l'adoption de la proposition A. – The adoption of proposal A is dissuaded.

Subsection 7. NAMES OF PLANTS IN CULTIVATION

Article 38

Prop. A (104 – Stearn; Taxon 3 : 300)

Replace the last sentence by: "Detailed regulations for the nomenclature of such plants appear in the International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants (London, 1953)."

Observations du Rapporteur

Le texte du nouveau Code de Nomenclature pour les Plantes Cultivées remplacera le texte actuel de l'Appendice III et c'est pour cela qu'une modification du texte actuel paraît superflue.

*

The text of the new I.C.N.C.P. will replace the present text of Appendix III and for this reason it seems superfluous to accept proposal A.

Section 5. Conditions and dates of effective publication

Prop. A (97 – Ponce de León & Mencia y García; Taxon 3 : 26)

De formuler le Chapitre IV des quatre sections indiquées comme suit:

De la priorité et validité des dénominations des taxa

Section 1. – Limitation du principe de priorité: point de départ des publications valides. Conservation des noms.

Section 2. – Conditions et dates des publications effectives.

Section 3. – Conditions et dates des publications valides.

Section 4. – Citations d'auteurs et rapports de précision.

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Adopt the proposal A but leave section 3 in the same Chapter (II) as sections 1 and 2. Chapter IV (to be entitled: "Effective and valid publication") will then consist of the present sections 5, 6 and 7.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve la proposition de Ponce de León et Mencia y García de créer un nouveau Chapitre IV composé des sections 5, 6 et 7 du troisième Chapitre du Code de Stockholm. Cependant il est d'avis que la section 3 devrait être insérée dans le Chapitre II dans lequel les questions de priorité sont traitées. C'est pourquoi il conseille d'adopter la modification de la proposition cubane proposée sous B.

*

The rapporteur is in favour of the proposal of Ponce de León and Mencia y García to create a new Chapter IV, but he would limit this chapter to the sections 5, 6 and 7 of the present Chapter III, and proposes to insert section 3 of that chapter in Chapter II, which deals with questions of priority. This is expressed in proposal B.

Article 39

Prop. A (11 – Fosberg; Taxon 2 : 108)

Add to the second sentence: "typescripts or other unpublished material".

Prop. B (79 – St John; Taxon 3 : 7)

In paragraph three, for "in newspapers", read: "in general and non-scientific newspapers".

Prop. C (79 – St John; Taxon 3 : 7)

In the first paragraph of the note, for the word "holographic", substitute the word "handwritten".

Prop. D (105 – Dandy; Taxon 3 : 30)

Replace first sentence by: "Publication is effected, under this Code, only by sale of printed matter to the general public or by adequate distribution of it (through sale, exchange or gift) among botanical institutions."

Prop. E (140 – Wheeler; Taxon 3 : 57)

Paragraph 1. Delete: "or by the issue of microfilm made from manuscripts."

Prop. F (140 – Wheeler; Taxon 3 : 58)

Delete paragraph 3 prohibiting publication in tradesmen's catalogues or in newspapers.

Observations du Rapporteur

Toutes les propositions ont en vue une précision nette de l'Art. 39. Il faut

qu'une publication soit publiée de telle façon qu'elle soit distribuée effectivement dans le monde botanique. Le rapporteur est d'avis que la rédaction de l'Article devrait être renvoyée à une commission spéciale. Le Pré-congrès de Genève a invité M. Dandy de constituer une telle commission et de soumettre un rapport à la Section à Paris.

*

All these proposals aim at greater precision in the text of Art. 39. It is clear that names should be published in such a way that they reach a representative part of the botanical world. The redaction of the Article should be referred to a special committee. The Genève conference decided to invite Mr Dandy to act as chairman of the committee, to choose his collaborators and to report to the Section in Paris.

Section 6. Conditions and dates of valid publication

Voyez les propositions concernant la section 5 — see the proposals under section 5.

Article 42

Prop. A (44 — Raizada; Taxon 2 : 187)

I propose the following amendments to paragraph 3 of Art. 42:

a. Names published by mentioning the older species to be transferred to a new genus, should be considered valid; such is the case with *Eulophus peucedanoides* of Bentham and Hooker f., or with *Gymnema sylvestris* of R. Brown.

b. Names published by the same method as *Polyalthia* of the *Genera Plantarum*, where the older names have not been mentioned, to be considered as not validly published at all.

c. On and after a certain date to be fixed by the next botanical congress, only combinations actually made, i.e. *typographically expressed*, are to be considered as valid for the future without retroactive effect.

Prop. B (77 — St John; Taxon 3 : 8)

Repeal the next to the last paragraph.

Prop. C (77 — St John; Taxon 3 : 9)

Add the following as the fourth paragraph: "No combination is validly published if the author bases it solely upon a basonym previously published without a Latin diagnosis, subsequent to 1 Jan. 1935."

Prop. D (80 — Doty; Taxon 3 : 17)

The third paragraph should be placed (transposed) between paragraphs one and two for clarity in reference to the application of the date, January 1, 1953.

Prop. E (91 — Paclt; Taxon 3 : 24)

Substitute the term “basonym” by “basionym”.

Prop. F (139 — Boivin; Taxon 3 : 56)

Add: “Note 3. For plant taxa originally published as animals, see Art. 62.”

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve les propositions A et B [voyez le commentaire de M. Pichon dans Taxon 3 (3)]. Le rapporteur ne voit pas qu’une circumvention de l’Art. 44 pourrait être effectuée selon la manière indiquée par MM. St John et Doty. Il est au contraire d’avis que l’Art. 44 restreint l’Art. 42(2) à tel effet qu’après le 1er janvier 1935 aucun nom de taxon puisse être publié valablement par référence à une description antérieurement et effectivement publiée. Si, par exemple, le nom d’un nouveau taxon a été publié conforme aux règles, sauf l’Art. 54, sa publication n’est pas valable. L’Art. 44 actuel ne permettrait pas de valider cette publication par une simple référence bibliographique accompagnée de l’indication du rang du taxon. La restriction de l’Art. 44 est donc trop rigoureuse et il faut chercher la solution des difficultés dans une modification de cet Article (voir Art. 44 prop. F). Le rapporteur conseille donc de rejeter les propositions C et D.

Le rapporteur approuve la proposition E, la proposition F est à renvoyer au Comité Editorial.

*

The adoption of the proposals A and B is dissuaded [see the commentary of M. Pichon in Taxon 3(3)]. The rapporteur does not see that it would be possible to circumvent Art. 44 in the way indicated by St John and Doty. He is, on the contrary, convinced that Art. 44 restricts Art. 42 to such an effect that after the first of January 1935 a name cannot be regarded as validly published when it is based upon a previously and effectively published description. When, for instance, the name of a new taxon has been published in accordance with the rules with the exception of Art. 54, the publication is not valid. The present Art. 44 would not allow the validation of that publication by means of a simple bibliographical reference accompanied by an indication of the rank of the taxon. This restriction is too far-reaching, and it is therefore necessary to solve our difficulties by a modification of Art. 44 (Art. 44, prop. F). Proposals C and D should therefore be rejected. Proposal E should be accepted, as the form “basonym” is grammatically incorrect.

Proposal F might be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Recommendation 42 A

Prop. A (4 — Baehni; Taxon 2 : 91)

Je recommande de supprimer “From 1 Jan. 1953 onward”.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve la proposition de M. Baehni. — Proposal A is recommended for adoption.

Article 43

Prop. A (4 — Baehni; Taxon 2 : 91)

“Synonyme nominal” est une monstruosité tautologique qui doit être remplacée dans le Code par “synonyme” tout court.

Prop. B (140 — Wheeler; Taxon 3 : 60)

(2) Delete: “On and from 1 Jan. 1953”.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur déconseille l'adoption de la proposition A. Avec M. Sprague (Taxon 2 : 132) il est d'avis qu'on doit faire distinction entre deux types de synonymes, les synonymes taxinomiques et les synonymes de nomenclature. Toutefois, il préférerait “synonyme de nomenclature” au “synonyme nominal” dans le texte français.

Le rapporteur approuve la proposition B.

*

Adoption of proposal A is dissuaded. As Sprague (Taxon 2 : 132) has shown, there are two kinds of synonyms, taxonomic ones and nomenclatural ones. The term “synonyme nominal” of the French text might perhaps be replaced by “synonyme de nomenclature”.

The adoption of proposal B is recommended.

Article 44

Prop. A (45 — Société Mycologique de France; Taxon 2 : 194)

Ajouter: “. . . . de deux diagnoses dont l'une sera rédigée dans la langue maternelle de l'auteur et l'autre dans une langue différente de la première.”

*Prop. B (76 — Algologues; Taxon 2 : 213)**

La description d'une nouvelle espèce doit se faire en deux langues dont l'une doit être le latin ou une langue adoptée par les congrès internationaux, l'autre étant laissée au choix de l'auteur.

Prop. C (77 — St John; Taxon 3 : 9)

In the last line read: “. . . . from 1753 to 1934 inclusive with diagnoses in any language.”

* “Algologues”: F. E. Fritsch, Fr. Hustedt, A. A. Aleem, R. Margalef, P. Bourrelly, R. D. Tweed, N. Woodhead.

Prop. D (149 — Rogers; Taxon 3 : 62)

Add the following example:

“*Schidaea Gregoriana* Degener, Fl. Hawaiiensis, fam. 119, 1936 (Apr. 9) and *S. kealiae* Kaum & Hosaka, Bernice P. Bishop Mus. Occas. Papers 11, no. 23 : 3. 1936 (Apr. 10) were proposed for the same plant; and the type of the former is a part of the original material of the latter. Since the name *S. Gregoriana* is not accompanied by a Latin diagnosis, the later *S. kealiae* is the legitimate name.”

Prop. E (Rapporteur)

Delete the Note.

Prop. F (Rapporteur)

To read as follows: “. . . accompanied by a Latin diagnosis or by a reference to a Latin diagnosis effectively published after 1 Jan. 1935.”

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur donne un préavis nettement défavorable aux propositions A et B. La question des descriptions latines a été discutée jusqu'ici par chaque Congrès International de Botanique et l'opinion du rapporteur n'a pas varié sur ce point depuis Stockholm. Briquet, dans le “Recueil Synoptique” de Cambridge dit: “On peut évidemment accepter toutes les langues; les botanistes perdront ainsi l'immense privilège qui est actuellement le leur et entreront dans une voie qui aboutira à une confusion babélique.”

Surtout la première proposition mènerait à des situations parfaitement inadmissibles et vraiment “babéliennes”. Que penser d'un botaniste néerlandais, travaillant dans l'Indonésie et publiant deux diagnoses dont l'une est rédigée dans sa langue maternelle (le néerlandais) et l'autre dans une langue différente, par exemple la langue indonésienne, ou d'un botaniste japonais publiant dans les langues japonaise et chinoise, etc., etc.

La seconde proposition est déjà plus limitée mais qu'est ce qu'une langue de congrès, le français, l'anglais, l'allemand, le russe, l'espagnol, le portugais, etc.? Les deux propositions sont très dangereuses aussi d'un point de vue de l'unité internationale de la taxinomie botanique. Actuellement nous bénéficions en effet de “l'immense privilège” que le monde *entier*, vraiment entier, accepte les descriptions latines. Quand cette description serait supprimée on pourrait en finir avec les règles de nomenclature. Jusqu'ici les descriptions latines ont été la cause principale de l'adhérence aux règles des botanistes russes et chinois.

Les propositions A et B compromettront l'unité de la science taxinomique. Le rapporteur est d'avis que l'Art. 44 est actuellement contradictoire à l'Art. 42 en ce qui concerne la possibilité de publier valablement (à partir d'un certain date) par référence à une description antérieurement et effectivement publiée. (Voyez les observations à l'Art. 42). Pour cela il propose l'adoption de la pro-

position F. La note devrait être supprimée; elle ne peut qu'être comprise dans la lumière d'une connaissance de l'histoire de la nomenclature et actuellement elle ne sert à rien; la proposition C la rendrait plus compréhensible mais le rapporteur est d'avis qu'une suppression serait encore plus utile (prop. E). La proposition D est à renvoyer au Comité Editorial.

*

Adoption of the proposals A and B is strongly dissuaded. The question of the necessity of Latin descriptions has been discussed at every previous International Botanical Congress, lastly at Stockholm and no new points of view are brought forward so that there seems to be no reason to reopen the discussion. Briquet admitted in the "Recueil Synoptique" prepared by him for the Cambridge meeting, that it would be possible to accept all languages, but he pointed out that botanists would in this way lose the very great privilege they enjoy at present, and that they would choose a road that would lead to babylonian confusion. Adoption of the first proposal especially would lead to entirely inadmissible situations and to truly babylonian confusion. How would it be when a Dutch botanist working in Indonesia would publish two diagnoses, one in his mother tongue (Dutch) and the other in the idiom of his adopted country the Indonesian language, or when a Japanese botanist published in Japanese and Chinese, etc. The second proposal does not demand such unlimited freedom of choice, but here we must ask what are congress languages? French perhaps, English, German, Russian, Spanish, Portuguese, others perhaps? Both proposals, moreover, are dangerous for the maintenance of international cooperation in the sphere of taxonomic botany. It is, indeed, an "immense privilège", as Briquet said, a very happy circumstance that the whole world is prepared to accept Latin as the international vehicle for our descriptions. When the precept to use Latin for this purpose is given up, it might well be that this would mean the end of our endeavours to arrive at universally accepted nomenclature rules. So far the use of Latin for our description was the principal reason for the Russian and Chinese botanists to accept the rules.

Art. 44 is in its present redaction contrary to Art. 42 with regard to the validity of a name that is not accompanied by a Latin diagnosis but is published with a reference to a previously and effectively published Latin description. (See the remarks under Art. 42). To eliminate this contradiction the rapporteur proposes adoption of proposal F. This would meet the wishes of St John and Doty expressed in proposals C and D to Art. 42. The note may be deleted (prop. E); it is comprehensible only to those who are well acquainted with the history of nomenclature, and is of no use; proposal C would be an improvement, but deletion of the note would make this superfluous. Proposal D may be referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Article 44 bis

Prop. A (80 — Doty; Taxon 3:17 sous l'Art. 52)

"After January 1, 1955, names for taxa are not validly published unless the type is designated."

Art. 45

Prop. B (84 — Lamoureux; Taxon 3 : 19 sous l'Art. 52)

“On and after 1 Jan. 1955, names for taxa are not validly published unless the type is designated.”

Prop. C (Rapporteur; modification des Prop. A et B)

“On and from 1 Jan. 1955, names of new taxa of recent plants are considered as validly published only when the nomenclatural type is indicated. When this type is a specimen, the place where it is permanently preserved must be indicated.”

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur est d'avis qu'un tel précepte est absolument nécessaire afin de compléter la codification de la méthode des types. Les propositions A, B et C ont le même but mais la dernière phrase de la proposition C constituerait un précepte non envisagé sous A et B. La Rec. 54 A sera alors superflue. Le Comité Editorial trouvera la rédaction finale.

*

Proposals A and B are identical and are incorporated in proposal C. Adoption of such a precept seems absolutely necessary when we wish to complete the codification of the type method. Proposal C goes somewhat farther than the other two in demanding that the place where the type specimen is preserved be indicated (Rec. 54 A will then become superfluous). The final redaction may be left to the Editorial Committee.

Article 45

*Prop. A (76 — Algologues; Taxon 2 : 213) **

Insert a provision stating that descriptions of *Algae* that are not provided with good drawings will not be validly published.

Prop. B (163 — Margadant; Taxon 3 : 74)

Add: “On and from 1 Jan. 1955 names of new taxa of Bryophyta (Musci and Hepaticae) are not considered as validly published unless they are accompanied by illustrations or figures showing the essential characters in addition to the description, or by a reference to a previously and effectively published illustration or figure.”

Observations du Rapporteur

La proposition A est à renvoyer à la commission pour les algues, la proposition B est à renvoyer à la commission pour les bryophytes. Il serait d'avantage de renvoyer le problème également aux autres commissions spéciales pour les cryptogames.

*

* Voyez la note à l'Art. 44 — See the footnote to Art. 44.

Proposal A should be referred to the committee for algae; proposal B to the committee for bryophytes. It is recommended to refer this proposal also to the other committees for cryptogams.

Article 48

Prop. A (77 – St John; Taxon 3 : 10)

Add at the end of the first paragraph:

“An effectively and validly published generic name is not illegitimate because of the lack of any included species.

Examples: *Cladium* P. Br., Civ. & Nat. Hist. Jamaica 114. 1756; *Thelypteris* Schmidel, Icon. Pl. ed. 2. 45. tt. 11, 13. 1762, see *Rhodora* 31 : 21-26. 1929; *Margyricarpus* Ruiz & Pavon, Fl. Peruv. Prodr. 7. pl. 33. 1794.”

Prop. B (80 – Doty; Taxon 3 : 17)

Read: “. . . . (2) by citation of a previously and validly published description of the genus, or (3) by reference to a previously and validly published description”

Prop. C (106 – Stearn; Taxon 3 : 31)

Insert after the words “other subdivision of a genus” the following: – “The description mentioned in (2) and (3) must be in Latin if published on or after 1 Jan. 1935”. Add as note “The citation of a description or diagnosis published on or after 1 Jan. 1935 does not validate the publication of a new generic name unless the description or diagnosis concerned was in Latin.”

Prop. D (123 – Pinto da Silva; Taxon 3 : 44)

Add: “. . . . even if such description is a pre-Linnean one.”

Prop. E (Rapporteur)

Delete the Article (except its last sentence) since it repeats Art. 42. The last sentence should be transferred to Art. 42.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur est d'avis qu'une modification comme prévue par MM. St John et Doty est superflue parce que l'Article entier est, en effet, superflu. Il ne s'agit que d'une simple répétition des préceptes généraux de l'Art. 42 et le rapporteur conseille de supprimer l'Article sauf la dernière phrase qui devrait être ajoutée à l'Art. 42 (prop. E).

Le rapporteur ne voit donc pas la nécessité de modifier l'Article comme indiqué sous C et D. La proposition F de l'Art. 44 est conforme aux intentions de M. Stearn.

*

Modifications as proposed by St John and by Doty seem superfluous as

the Article itself can be missed. It is, in fact, merely a repetition of the general precepts given in Art. 42. The rapporteur therefore proposes to delete the Article with the exception of the last sentence, which should be removed to Art. 42 (prop. E). Modifications as indicated in proposals C and D seem unnecessary. Proposal F for the modification of Art. 44 would meet Stearn's wish.

Article 50

Prop. A (107 — Ross; Taxon 3 : 31)

For "a plate with" read "an illustration with".

Prop. B (108 — Dandy; Taxon 3 : 31)

For "analyses" read "analysis".

Prop. C (109 — Ross; Taxon 3 : 31)

As a footnote to "a plate (or figure) with analyses" or that phrase as amended, insert: "Single figures of microscopic plants showing the details necessary for identification are to be included in this definition."

Observations du Rapporteur

Les propositions A, B et C sont à renvoyer au Comité Editorial. — All proposals may be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 51

Prop. A (110 — Bullock; Taxon 3 : 32)

For "subdivisions of genera . . . and specific names", substitute: "taxa below the rank of genus are not validly published unless the names".

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur approuve la proposition A. — The proposal is recommended for adoption.

Article 52

*Prop. A (76 — Algologues; Taxon 2 : 213)**

Publication of good drawings of new species in well-known international iconographical works, in which for technical reasons no descriptions are given, must be recognised as valid.

Prop. B (80 — Doty; Taxon 3 : 17)

Read ". . . of a previously and validly published description . . ."

* Voyez la note à l'Art. 44 — See the footnote to Art. 44.

Prop. C (80 – Doty; Taxon 3 : 17) [Voyez le nouvel Art. 44 bis]

Prop. D (84 – Lamoureux; Taxon 3 : 19) [Voyez le nouvel Art. 44 bis]

Prop. E (107 – Ross; Taxon 3 : 31)

For “a plate or figure with” read: “an illustration with”.

Prop. F (111 – Stearn; Taxon 3 : 32)

Insert after the words “a previously and effectively published description of it” the following: “which description must be in Latin if published on or after 1 Jan. 1935”. Add as a note: “The citation of a description or diagnosis published on or after 1 Jan. 1935 does not validate the publication of a new specific or infraspecific name unless the description or diagnosis cited was in Latin.”

Prop. G (108 – Dandy; Taxon 3 : 31)

For “analyses” read “analysis”.

Prop. H (109 – Ross; Taxon 3 : 31)

See Art. 50 prop. C.

Prop. I (Rapporteur)

Delete the first part of the Article and modify its second part as follows: “Names of species or of subdivisions of species of recent plants published before 1 Jan. 1908 are treated (contrary to Art. 42) as validly published when they are only accompanied by an illustration with analysis showing essential characters.”

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur est d'avis que la rédaction actuelle de l'Article est inutilement compliquée. Le précepte (1) ne répète que les préceptes de l'Art. 42 et il devrait être supprimé. La rédaction pourrait alors être simplifiée comme indiquée sous la proposition I.

L'adoption de la proposition A (Algologues) n'est pas désirable. Le rapporteur attire l'attention sur le fait que la technique actuelle de reproduction est tellement développée qu'aucun éditeur pourrait excuser une publication incomplète comme envisagée par les algologues. Vraiment, dans le passé, de tels cas étaient parfois inévitables, mais la rédaction actuelle donne déjà la permission demandée pour les publications avant 1908.

La proposition B est superflue, le précepte précis étant déjà donné dans l'Art. 42.

Les propositions E, G et H sont à renvoyer au Comité Editorial.

La proposition F sera superflue quand la proposition F de l'Art. 44 sera acceptée.

*

Arts 53—54 bis

The present wording of the Article is uselessly lengthy. Precept (1) is but a repetition of the precept given in Art. 42, and should for that reason be deleted. The remaining part might be formulated as in proposal I. Adoption of proposal A (Algologues) is undesirable. The printing technique is at present so far advanced that incomplete publications as meant by the algologists are no longer excusable. In the past the issue of such works may indeed often have been unavoidable, but this has already been taken into account in the present text of the Article, which accepts such figures provided that they were published before 1908.

Proposal B is superfluous; the precept is included in Art. 42.

Proposals E, G and H may be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal F becomes superfluous when proposal F for the modification of Art. 44 is adopted.

Article 53

Prop. A (4 – Baehni; Taxon 2:91)

Supprimer: "In the absence of proof to the contrary, the date given in the work must be treated as correct."

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur conseille de renvoyer cette proposition au Comité Editorial.
— This proposal may be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 54

Prop. A (77 – St John; Taxon 3:10)

"A name of a taxon published without a clear indication of its rank is invalid."

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve la modification proposée par M. St John. Il serait très dangereux de donner une force rétroactive à l'Article actuel. Toutefois, le Comité Editorial pourrait trouver une rédaction plus positive (Pré-congrès de Genève).

*

The adoption of proposal A is dissuaded. It would be extremely dangerous to make the present Article retroactive. The Editorial Committee might find, however, a more positive redaction (Genève conference).

New Article 54 bis

Prop. A (77 – St John; Taxon 3:10)

Since the symbol § has been widely used to indicate a section, any name

of a taxon validly published with no other indication of rank than an associated §, is to be accepted as the name of a section.

Example: § *Diplacus* (Nutt.) Gray, Syn. Fl. N. Am. 2(1):275.1878, a section of the genus *Mimulus* L.”

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition A: dans ce cas-là on devrait introduire dans le code des références à de nombreux autres symboles.

*

The proposal is not acceptable: in that case it would be necessary to insert references to many other symbols!

Recommendation 54 A

Prop. A (85 – Lamoureux; Taxon 3:19)

To read: “The name of a new taxon should not be published without indicating the place where the type is preserved.”

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Delete the recommendation.

Observations du Rapporteur

Voyez le commentaire sous le nouvel Art. 44 bis. — See the comments under the new Art. 44 bis.

Recommendation 54 D

Prop. A (120 – Janchen; Taxon 3:35)

Ich beantrage die Streichung dieser Empfehlung.

Prop. B (Pré-congrès de Genève)

Add “. . . . for another taxon”.

Observations du Rapporteur

La modification proposée par le Pré-congrès de Genève précisera la recommandation actuelle en éliminant seulement la procédure inadmissible d'utiliser un *nomen nudum* pour un autre taxon. Il va sans dire qu'aucune objection existe contre l'adoption d'un *nomen nudum* pour le même type!

*

The alteration proposed by the Genève conference is meant to restrict the present recommendation by dissuading the inadmissible procedure to adopt a *nomen nudum* for another taxon. It goes without saying that such a name may always be adopted for the same type!

Recommendation 54 E

Prop. A (121 – Rousseau; Taxon 3 : 41)

Supprimer cette recommandation, qui pour toutes fins pratiques n'est qu'une répétition des Arts 44 et 45.

Prop. B (Herter – non publiée)

Replace the present text by "Beim Beschreiben neuer Gruppen lasse man die Verwandtschaft deutlich erkennen."

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur déconseille la suppression de la recommandation: elle peut être utile; il déconseille également l'adoption de la proposition B. — The adoption of both proposals is dissuaded.

Recommendation 54 F

Prop. A (Herter – non publiée)

Replace the present text by: "Beim Beschreiben neuer Gruppen füge man nach Möglichkeit Abbildungen bei."

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve la proposition A; de telles dispositions sont ou seront données dans l'Art. 45. — The rapporteur dissuades the adoption of proposal A; such provisions are or will be given in Art. 45.

Recommendation 54 I

Prop. A (120 – Janchen; Taxon 3 : 35)

Der französische Text gibt den Sinn des englischen Textes nicht genau wieder. Denn "the last-published sheet of the volume" muss nicht gerade "la dernière feuille de volume" sein, sondern kann auch (und wird wohl häufiger) die Hinterseite des Titelblattes oder eine andere Seite des Titelbogens sein.

Observations du Rapporteur

Renvoyer au Comité Editorial. — May be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Section 7. Citation of authors' names and of literature
for purposes of precision

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur a reçu une communication de M. Rickett au sujet de cette

section. M. Rickett est d'avis que quelques-uns des Articles n'ont pas du tout le caractère de règles qui sont à appliquer à la première publication d'un nom mais qu'ils sont plutôt des recommandations à utiliser en répétant des noms déjà publiés. Dans un seul cas (voyez l'Art. 58) le Pré-congrès de Genève a déjà recommandé un changement de statut. Le rapporteur est d'avis qu'une discussion générale à ce sujet est désirable parce qu'il approuve entièrement les remarques de M. Rickett.

*

The rapporteur received a communication from Dr Rickett with regard to this section. He is of opinion that several of the Articles in this section are not really rules at all; that is they do not apply (or were not meant to apply) to the first publication of a name, but are statements of proper procedure to be used in writing a name which has already been published. In one instance (see Art. 58) the Genève conference recommended already a change of status from recommendation to Article. The rapporteur thinks that a general discussion on this subject might be useful since he is in full agreement with Dr Rickett's remarks.

Article 55

Prop. A (Rapporteur)

Insert a cross-reference to Arts 32 and 35 in which exceptions to this rule are admitted.

Observations du Rapporteur

A renvoyer au Comité Editorial. — To be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 57

Prop. A (80 — Doty; Taxon 3 : 17)

Add: "This does not apply to specific epithets, which cannot be used other than as their application is determined by their type, whether it be a holotype or lectotype."

Prop. B (80 — Doty; Taxon 3 : 17)

It is proposed that the last two words "as authority" be deleted.

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur est d'avis que la proposition A est superflue et que la proposition B est à renvoyer au Comité Editorial.

*

Proposal A seems to be superfluous; proposal B may be referred to the Editorial Committee.