

SYNOPSIS OF PROPOSALS

CONCERNING THE

INTERNATIONAL CODE OF BOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE

SUBMITTED TO THE

NINTH INTERNATIONAL BOTANICAL CONGRESS
MONTREAL - 1959

presented by

J. LANJOUW

Rapporteur général



January 1959

UTRECHT — NETHERLANDS

Edited by the Organizing Committee of the Ninth Int. Bot. Congress and
by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature of
the International Association for Plant Taxonomy.

Published with the financial assistance of I.U.B.S.—U.N.E.S.C.O.

Obtainable from

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



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

PREFACE

For the third time in less than 10 years it is my duty to present a Synopsis of Proposals on Botanical Nomenclature. A few days before writing this preface I heard about the death of my predecessor as Rapporteur-général, Dr. Th. A. Sprague. An expression of gratitude towards Sprague for the important work he did on botanical nomenclature should find its place here. At three international botanical congresses, Cambridge 1930, Amsterdam 1935, Stockholm 1950, Sprague was among the most important participants in the nomenclature section, each time in a different office. The results of his work will always remain discernible in many places in our Code of Nomenclature.

Although there is again a relatively high number of proposals, I think that I am right in stating that they aim at less far-reaching effects than those made at Stockholm and Paris. The proposals are often concerned with mere details or are logical consequences of decisions of principle taken at previous Congresses: e.g. the proposals that try to bring the rules into a closer agreement with the type-method. Of prime importance remains the question of *nomina specifica conservanda c.q. rejicienda* and the proposals connected with this principle. It is highly desirable that the Congress at Montreal should reach a satisfactory decision on this for we cannot go on having this controversy. In order to make it clear without the slightest doubt that I want to give no grounds for the charge that I have influenced those who are perhaps not in a favourable position to form a considered opinion on this question, I have refrained from commenting on this matter of principle. I want it to be understood that this does not mean that I myself have no opinion on the subject. On the contrary, at the meeting at Montreal I shall clearly indicate what I think is the best solution.

I am particularly grateful towards the Canadian Congress Committee for the extremely liberal way in which it has left me complete liberty in the preparation of this Synopsis and the organisation so far of the work for the Nomenclature Section. The circumstance that our colleagues Rousseau and Boivin will cooperate with us at Montreal certainly warrants our expectations of successful deliberations.

The linguistic problems involved in compiling this Synopsis have been solved by Dr. W. Robyns and Mr. R. Ross, who have critically examined the French and English text. It is a pleasure to thank them for this collaboration, especially also because they very often do the same for Taxon, a help which cannot always be publicly acknowledged at the time.

A traditional but certainly not less important acknowledgment is due to Miss Keuken and Dr. F. A. Stafleu for their help in compiling this Synopsis. Thanks to the co-operation of the Canadian Congress Committee and the help of I.U.B.S. we shall be able to count on their presence at Montreal.

I should like to conclude with the wish that everyone carefully considers his decisions before voting and that the discussion at Montreal will be both pleasant and successful.

J. Lanjouw

Utrecht, 11 November 1958.

LIST OF PROPOSALS *

1—3.	<i>E. L. Little, Jr.</i>	Taxon 6: 191. 1957	120—145.	<i>G. M. Schulze et G. Buchheim</i>	Taxon 7: 253. 1958
4.	<i>M. Buchinger</i>	Taxon 6: 197. 1957	145a—150.	<i>L. Holm</i>	Taxon 7: 256. 1958
5—9.	<i>H. St. John</i>	Taxon 6: 197. 1957	151—152.	<i>A. A. Bullock</i>	Taxon 7: 257. 1958
10.	<i>H. W. Rickett et W. H. Camp</i>	Taxon 4: 37. 1955	153—164.	<i>A. A. Bullock et R. Ross</i>	Taxon 7: 257. 1958
11.	<i>A. A. Bullock</i>	Taxon 6: 215. 1957	165—178.	<i>R. Ross</i>	Taxon 7: 259. 1958
12—13.	<i>G. Buchheim</i>	Taxon 6: 226. 1957	179.	<i>J. E. Dandy et R. Ross</i>	Taxon 7: 261. 1958
14.	<i>F. A. McClure</i>	Taxon 6: 239. 1957	180—182.	<i>R. Ross</i>	Taxon 7: 262. 1958
15.	<i>H. P. Traub</i>	Taxon 6: 239. 1957	183—186.	<i>R. Ross</i>	Taxon 7: 262. 1958
16—17.	<i>H. C. D. de Wit</i>	Taxon 5: 6. 1956	187—188.	<i>F. C. Deighton</i>	Taxon 7: 263. 1958
18—19.	<i>M. A. Donk</i>	Taxon 6: 255. 1957	189.	<i>A. A. Bullock</i>	Taxon 7: 264. 1958
20.	<i>H. W. Rickett</i>	Taxon 7: 39. 1958	190—191.	<i>F. C. Deighton</i>	Taxon 7: 264. 1958
21.	<i>H. W. Rickett</i>	Taxon 4: 188. 1955	192—193.	<i>R. Ross</i>	Taxon 7: 267. 1958
22.	<i>G. P. DeWolf</i>	Taxon 5: 52. 1956	194.	<i>A. A. Bullock</i>	Taxon 7: 267. 1958
23—37.	<i>F. R. Fosberg</i>	Taxon 7: 149. 1958	195—200.	<i>F. C. Deighton</i>	Taxon 7: 268. 1958
38—39.	<i>H. W. Rickett et A. C. Smith</i>	Taxon 7: 151. 1958	201.	<i>A. A. Bullock</i>	Taxon 7: 270. 1958
40—41.	<i>F. T. Wherry</i>	Taxon 7: 152. 1958	202.	<i>T. Christensen</i>	Taxon 7: 270. 1958
42—43.	<i>H. W. Rickett et F. A. Stafleu</i>	Taxon 7: 153. 1958	203—211.	<i>Y. Prokhanov</i>	Taxon 7: 270. 1958
44—48.	<i>G. Rowley</i>	Taxon 7: 153. 1958	212.	<i>T. van der Hammen</i>	Taxon 7: 274. 1958
49—50.	<i>H. St. John</i>	Taxon 7: 155. 1958	213—242.	<i>Czechoslovak Botanists</i>	Taxon 7: 274. 1958
51.	<i>R. Mansfeld</i>	Taxon 7: 155. 1958	243—258.	<i>J. Dostál</i>	Taxon 7: 283. 1958
52—57.	<i>C. A. Arnold</i>	Taxon 7: 156. 1958	259—262.	<i>J. Dostál</i>	Taxon 7: 285. 1958
58.	<i>P. C. Silva</i>	Taxon 7: 184. 1958	263—280.	<i>P. C. Silva</i>	Taxon 8: 3. 1959
59—65.	<i>J. Proskauer</i>	Taxon 7: 215. 1958	281—301.	<i>C. V. Morton</i>	Taxon 8: 11. 1959
66—88.	<i>H. P. Fuchs</i>	Taxon 7: 218. 1958	302—304.	<i>J. E. Dandy et R. Ross</i>	Taxon 8: 16. 1959
89—92.	<i>A. A. Bullock</i>	Taxon 7: 223. 1958	305—306.	<i>Committee for Bryophytes</i>	Taxon 8: 17. 1959
94—96.	<i>S. H. Mamay</i>	Taxon 7: 224. 1958	307.	<i>R. Potonié</i>	Taxon 8: 18. 1959
97—100.	<i>A. T. Cross et al.</i>	Taxon 7: 225. 1958	308.	<i>F. R. Fosberg</i>	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
101.	<i>F. L. Staplin</i>	Taxon 7: 226. 1958	309.	<i>N. Y. Sandwith</i>	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
102—108.	<i>H. Tate Ames et al.</i>	Taxon 7: 226. 1958	310.	<i>H. W. Rickett</i>	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
109—115.	<i>A. Traverse</i>	Taxon 7: 229. 1958	311.	<i>J. Proskauer</i>	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
116.	<i>E. Boureau</i>	Taxon 7: 230. 1958	312.	<i>F. R. Fosberg</i>	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
117—119.	<i>J. W. Funkhouser</i>	Taxon 7: 231. 1958	313.	<i>R. Potonié</i>	Taxon 8: 19. 1959
			314—317.	<i>Committee for Stabilization</i>	Taxon 8: 21. 1959

* All proposals have been published in *Taxon* together with the comments of the authors — Toutes les propositions ont été publiées dans *Taxon* avec l'argumentation des auteurs.

For technical reasons, however, the following proposals have not been published in *Taxon*: a) the proposal by Rickett and Stafleu on the list of *nomina conservanda*. b) the proposals by the rapporteur.

Cependant, pour des raisons techniques, les propositions suivantes n'ont pas été imprimées dans *Taxon*: a) la proposition de Rickett et Stafleu concernant la liste des *nomina conservanda*, b) les propositions du rapporteur.

For the proposals concerning *Nomina conservanda proposita* see p. 80 — Les propositions concernant les *nomina conservanda proposita* sont énumérées à la p. 80.

International Code of Botanical Nomenclature

PREAMBLE

Prop. A (120 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 253)

Proposed rewording of paragraph 6: “The provisions regulating the method of modification of this Code form its last division.”

Comments Rapporteur

The proposal should be referred to the Editorial Committee for special consideration by the English-speaking members.

Division I. Principles

Principle I

Prop. A (264 – Silva, Taxon 8: 5)

To read: “The Code applies equally to taxonomic groups of plants whether or not they were originally assigned to the plant kingdom.”

Comments Rapporteur

The wording as proposed in *proposal A* could certainly supplement the present wording; it should not replace it. It seems furthermore necessary to incorporate in the code a definite provision for this purpose, illustrated by one or more examples (e.g. in Art. 45 with additional examples). If this view is accepted it would be best to refer this proposal to the Committee for Algae with the instruction to retain also the present wording of Principle I. In the preliminary vote, a vote “yes” will be considered as in favour of proposal A replacing the present text and a vote “Comm. Alg.” will be counted as in agreement with the view expressed by the Rapporteur.

Principle III

Prop. A (151 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 257)

To read: “The correct name of a taxonomic group is determined by priority of publication.”

Comments Rapporteur

The proposed rewording does not seem to be an improvement. In questions of, e.g., homonymy priority is also a determining factor although there may be no question of correct names.

Principle IV

Principle IV

Prop. A (268 – Silva, Taxon 8: 7)

To be divided into three new Principles of which the first to read as follows:

“Each taxonomic group with a given circumscription, position, and rank can bear only one correct name.”

Prop. B (269 – Silva, Taxon 8: 7)

The second:

“The correct name of a taxonomic group is the earliest name or combination of the earliest epithet that is in accordance with the Code.”

Prop. C (270 – Silva, Taxon 8: 7)

The third:

“In the selection of correct names, the principle of priority of valid publication may be superseded by special legislation (conservation).”

Comments Rapporteur

The present text of Principle IV seems to be quite clear, whereas the three proposals reproduce the same contents in a more complicated way besides adding definitions which are better placed elsewhere.

Principle V

Prop. A (5 – St. John, Taxon 6: 197)

To read: “Scientific names of plants are commonly Latin or Greek, or if from other languages, they are often latinized.”

Prop. B (265 – Silva, Taxon 8: 6)

To read: “Names of taxonomic groups are treated as Latin irrespective of their derivation.”

Prop. C (152 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 257)

To read: “Scientific names of plants are treated as Latin even if they are taken wholly or partly from other languages or are without meaning.”

Comments Rapporteur

The wording as proposed in proposal B seems to be a real improvement which is preferable to the more involved rewordings of proposals A and C.

New Principle VII

Prop. A (263 – Silva, Taxon 8: 4)

“Every plant is treated as belonging to a number of taxonomic groups of consecutively subordinate rank, among which the rank of species is basic.”

Comments Rapporteur

The original Art. 2 in which this statement was embodied is in fact not a ‘rule’, and the rapporteur therefore favours adoption of this proposal.

New Principle VIII

Prop. A (266 – Silva, Taxon 8: 6)

“Names of taxonomic groups of the rank of genus and above are monomial; names of taxonomic groups of the rank of subgenus down to and including species are binomial; names of taxonomic groups of the rank of subspecies and below are trinomial.”

Prop. B (Rapporteur)

Amendment to prop. A: Insert this text as a new Article in Chapter III, in a new section preceding the present section 1.

Comments Rapporteur

The statement as presented by *proposal A* is correct, but it is not a principle. It is a basic rule determining the formation of names of taxa and as such it would be better placed in Chapter III. Adoption of *proposal A* with the amendment sub *proposal B* is suggested.

New Principle IX

Prop. A (267 – Silva, Taxon 8: 6)

“Names of taxonomic groups have no status under the Code unless they are validly published.”

Comments Rapporteur

This is indeed a principle, since it implies the association of names with descriptions. If this principle is accepted the Editorial Committee could perhaps be instructed to consider whether the addition of the word “valid” before “publication” in Principle III would not have the same result. The adoption of proposal A is recommended.

Article 1

Division II. Rules and Recommendations

(1-5) Chapter I. RANKS OF TAXA, AND THE TERMS DENOTING THEM

Article 1

Prop. A (66 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 218)

To read: “Any group of individuals joined together by their morphological, anatomical, or other similarity will, in this Code, be referred to as *taxon* (plural *taxa*).”

Comments Rapporteur

It is not clear that the proposed rewording constitutes a real improvement; the adoption of this proposal is not recommended.

Article 2

Prop. A (67 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 218)

Replace the word ‘taxa’ by ‘taxonomic groups’.

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of *proposal A* is not recommended. The difference between “taxa” and “taxonomic groups” as suggested by the author is not clear and would perhaps be confusing.

Article 3

Prop. A (68 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 218)

Replace the word ‘taxa’ by ‘taxonomic groups’.

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of *proposal A* is not recommended for the reasons given above

Article 4

Prop. A (23 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 149)

Add “*Subregnum*” after *Regnum Vegetabile*.

Prop. B (69 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 218)

To read: “If a greater number of ranks of taxonomic groups is required, the terms for these are made either by adding the prefix sub (*sub*) to the terms denoting the ranks or by the introduction of supplementary terms. A *taxon* may be assigned to taxonomic groups of the following subordinate rank:”

Prop. C (202 – Christensen, Taxon 7: 270)

Remove “*Regnum Vegetabile*” from the enumeration of systematic ranks.

Prop. D (215 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 275)

Insert the word “*Phylum*” between “*Regnum Vegetabile*” and “*Divisio*”

Prop. E (226 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 277)

Add: “Taxa whose rank has not been precisely designated by means of a term according to this Article and published on and after are invalid. If they were published before this date, it is necessary to designate them subsequently by means of one of the terms admissible under this Article, which will be considered a change of rank of the taxon (Art. 60). If, however, the original author himself has explained in his publication, which admissible term he had in mind when using an inadmissible symbol or term for the category of the taxon, the use of this admissible term is not considered a change of rank of the taxon.”

Comments Rapporteur

The Rapporteur is not in favour of any of the present proposals. *Proposal D* was rejected by a large majority at the previous Congress. *Proposal E* would involve a great many changes in author-designation (it is really an amendment to Art. 44).

Recommendation 4A

Prop. A (24 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 149)

In line 3 change “should” to “may”.

Comments Rapporteur

The suggested change would be a real improvement.

Article 5

Prop. A (25 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 149)

Give the modern status of the Friesian “tribes”.

Prop. B (51 – Mansfeld, Taxon 7: 155)

The last paragraph to read: “An exception is made for names of the infra-generic taxa termed tribes (*tribus*) in Fries’ *Systema Mycologicum* and the generic taxa termed natural species (*species naturales*) in Necker’s *Elementa Botanica*, which are treated as validly published.”

Article 5

Prop. C (70 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 218)

Insert after the second paragraph: “This does not apply to cases in which an author referred to a taxonomic group by a term used for a different rank today.”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A should be referred to the Committee for Fungi.

The rapporteur is in favour of *proposal B* (see also prop. C to Art. 20 and prop. A to Art. 68). It is advisable to clarify the status of the names in Necker's *Elementa Botanica* and *proposal B* would serve this purpose.

The implications of *proposal C* are far too wide to warrant acceptance.

(6-15) Chapter II. NAMES OF TAXA (GENERAL PROVISIONS)

(6) Section 1. DEFINITIONS

Article 6

Prop. A (281 – Morton, Taxon 8: 11)

It is suggested that the example of *Leptostachya* and *Dianthera* be deleted and the following substituted:

Example: The generic name *Cashalis* Standley (Journ. Washington Acad. Sci. 13: 440. 1923), based on the single species *C. cuscatlanica*, is legitimate because it is in accordance with the rules. The same is true of the generic name *Dussia* Krug & Urban (ex Taubert in Engl. & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. III, Abt. 3: 193. 1894), based on the single species *D. martinicensis*. Both generic names are correct when the genera are thought to be separate. Steyermark (Fieldiana: Botany 24, pt. 5: 248. 1946) however, reduced *Cashalia* Standley to *Dussia* Krug & Urban; when this concept is accepted the latter name is the only correct one for the genus with this particular circumscription. The legitimate name *Cashalia* may therefore be correct or incorrect according to different concepts of taxa.

Comments Rapporteur

The present *Leptostachya* example is certainly not a happy one and Dr. Morton's *Cashalia* example could very well replace it; the proposal is recommended for acceptance.

(7-10) Section 2. TYPIFICATION

Article 7

Prop. A (26 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 149)

From Note 3 delete: "unless its name must already be rejected under this Code".

Prop. B (71 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 219)

The Notes to be changed as follows:

Note 1: (remains unchanged).

Note 2: (new). A *descriptotype* is that constituent element which can be proved to have served an author as a basis for the description of a taxon, or which has been designated as the nomenclatural type.

Note 3: (new). An *interpretotype* is that constituent element not clearly proved to have served as a basis for a description, but designated by the author of a taxon by the name in question.

Article 7

Note 4: (formerly note 2). A *holotype* ("type") is that single specimen or other element either used as a basis for the description by the author and/or designated by him as the nomenclatural type (*descriptotype*) or a specimen interpreted by the author as belonging to the taxon described by himself (*interpretotype*). If a holotype is extant, it has precedence over all other kinds of types.

Note 5: (new). A *merotype* is a fragment of the original *holotype*, which has been divided into two or more pieces after having been used as a basis for the description.

Note 6: (new). If more than one specimen of either the *descriptotype* or *interpretotype* exist, one specimen must be chosen as *lectotype*.

Note 7: (new). Once a specimen has been chosen as a *lectotype*, this choice must be taken as binding, unless it can be proved that this choice arises from a misinterpretation.

Note 8: (new). A *synonymotype* is that constituent element of a taxon quoted by the author as being identical with his newly described taxon.

A *synonymotype* can be used as a substitute for a *descriptotype* or an *interpretotype* if such are missing. The choice of a *synonymotype*, once made, is permanent and cannot be later changed, even if a *descriptotype* or an *interpretotype* should be found.

Note 9: (formerly 4).

Note 10: (formerly 5).

Prop. C (307 – Potonié, Taxon 8: 18)

In Note 5 emphasize that genera of *sporaе diversae* are organ genera and form genera.

Prop. D (276 – Silva, Taxon 8: 9)

Note 4 to read: "A new name or epithet published as an avowed substitute (*nomen novum*) for an older name is typified by the type of the older name."

Prop. E (145 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 256)

Note 5 and Appendix IV, 7. to read: "The typification of both organ-genera and form-genera based either on plant microfossils or plant microfossils, of genera of imperfect fungi"

Prop. F (153 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 257)

Add to Note 1: "It is the element or one of the elements upon which the description (and/or illustration) giving the name valid publication (see Art. 32-45) is based."

Prop. G (154 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 257)

Note 3 to read: "If no holotype was indicated by the author who described a taxon, a lectotype as a substitute for it may be designated. When a syntype or paratype exists the lectotype must be chosen from one of these. If the holo-

type is lost or destroyed, an isotype, if such exists, must be chosen, or failing this, a paratype.

“A lectotype (*lectotypus*) is either (a) a specimen or other element selected from the original material available to the describer of a taxon (whether cited in the protologue¹) or not) up to the time of publication of the name concerned, when no holotype was designated, or (b) a duplicate²) of the holotype when the latter is lost or destroyed. When two or more specimens have been designated as “types” by the author of a specific or infra-specific name (e.g. male and female, flowering and fruiting, etc.) one of them must be chosen as lectotype.”

Prop. H (155 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)

Delete in Note 3 the paragraph beginning “A *neotype* is a”

Prop. I (156 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)

Add further to Note 3, the definitions of isotype, paratype and syntype, at present incorporated in Rec. 8A, with modifications as follows:

“An isotype (*isotypus*) is a duplicate of the holotype; it is always a specimen, and may become a lectotype when the holotype is lost or destroyed.”

“A syntype (*syntypus*) is any one of the two or more specimens or other elements cited or indicated in the protologue when the author failed to designate a holotype, or when two or more specimens or other elements were simultaneously designated as types.

“The choice of a lectotype may be superseded only if it can be shown that it was based upon a misinterpretation of the protologue, or if the holotype is rediscovered.”

Prop. K (157 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)

Add to Note 4: “The type of a name or epithet which was nomenclaturally superfluous when published (see Art. 64, 1) is the type of the name or epithet which ought to have been adopted under the Code.”

Prop. L (158 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)

Add: “Note 6. For those groups with nomenclatural starting-points later than 1753 (see Art. 13) the type is to be determined by the protologue given by the author validly publishing (see Art. 32-45) the name, or when valid publication is by reference to a pre-starting-point protologue, the latter must be used as though newly published.”

¹ Protologue (from *πρωτος*, first, *λογος*, discourse) “the printed matter accompanying the first publication of the name [for epithet] (Wilmott MS.); this term was proposed by A. J. Wilmott (1888-1950) to cover everything associated with a name at its first publication, i.e. diagnosis, description, references, synonymy, geographical data, citation of specimens, discussion, comments, illustration. — See Stearn, *Intr. Linn. Sp. Pl. Facs. Ed. Ray Soc.* 126, *adnot.* 1957.

² The word duplicate is here given its usual meaning in herbarium curatorial practice. It is part of a single gathering made by a collector at one time.

Article 7

Prop. M (213 – Dostál et al., Taxon 7: 274)

Paragraph 1 to read as follows:

“The application of names of taxa of the rank of order or below but above that of species is determined by means of standards (typifying taxa), the application of names for taxa of the rank of species or below by means of nomenclatural types (plants and their parts). Thus a standard or nomenclatural type is that constituent element of a taxon to which the name of the taxon is permanently attached, whether as an accepted name or as a synonym.”

Prop. N (Rapporteur)

Amendment to *proposal K*: add “unless the original author of the superfluous name has indicated a definite holotype”.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. The rapporteur shares Dr. Fosberg’s opinion that this sentence is unnecessary and confusing; the adoption of this proposal is recommended.

Proposal B. The proposed terms can very well be used in special taxonomic treatments when it is necessary to give more precise indications of certain specimens. It is not advisable, however, to incorporate all this material in the Code.

Proposal C should be referred to the Palaeobotanical Committee.

Proposal D and *E* should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

The adoption of *proposal F* is not recommended. Where for instance Linnaeus validates a name by reference to a pre-linnean description and supplies no description of his own, but at the same time had a type specimen himself, this type specimen will always prevail over the pre-linnean description and even over the type-specimen of that description if it exists. The wording of the proposal is, therefore, too ample.

Proposal G aims at a preciser wording or Note 3 with the exception of the last paragraph. This rewording is recommended. It should be pointed out, however, that it is of importance to retain the provision on neotypes, and that is why the adoption of *proposal H* is not recommended. Our present code aims at a precise typification: for all taxa of specific or lower rank we need a specimen and not a description or a figure except in the cases specified in Art. 10.

Proposal I is again a welcome improvement and is recommended for acceptance. The last paragraph should be kept as a separate Article 8, however, in order to give this important provision more prominence. This could be achieved by adopting proposal I and rejecting proposal B to Art. 8 (q.v.).

Proposal K should be restricted to those cases in which there is no definite indication of a holotype. Adoption of this proposal together with the amendment proposed sub *proposal N* is recommended.

Proposal L reflects actual practice and is recommended for acceptance.

Proposal M is not recommended. The present system is well established and it is not advisable to change over to a new terminology at this late date in the development of our ideas on typification.

Article 8

Prop. A (72 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220)

Delete the Article.

Prop. B (156 – Bullock and Ross, Taxon 7: 258)

Proposal I on Art. 7 implies that the text of Art. 8 be inserted in Art. 7.

Comments Rapporteur

The present Art. 8 should be maintained separately. The provision is of great importance and deserves a prominent place. The adoption of neither proposals is recommended.

Recommendation 8A

Prop. A (72 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220)

To become Rec. 7A.

Comments Rapporteur

Adoption not recommended, see above.

Recommendation 8B

Prop. A (72 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220; 159 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)

To become Rec. 7B.

Comments Rapporteur

Adoption not recommended, see above.

Recommendation 8C

Prop. A (160 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 259)

In line 1 for “type material” read “original material”.

Prop. B (72 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220; 160 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 259)

To become Rec. 7C.

Comments Rapporteur

Adoption of *proposal A* is recommended because it is a more precise wording. Adoption of *proposal B* is not recommended for the reasons given above.

Recommendation 8D

Recommendation 8D

Prop. A (72 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220; 161 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)

To become Rec. 7D.

Comments Rapporteur

Adoption not recommended, see above.

Recommendation 8E

Prop. A (72 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220)

To become Rec. 7E.

Prop. B (162 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258)

It is proposed, that Rec. 8E should become Note 7 to Art. 7, and amended to read:

“The listed type-species of a conserved generic name (see Art. 14 and App. III) may be changed only by a procedure similar to that adopted for the conservation of generic names.”

“Example: In the interests of stability and taxonomic accuracy Bullock and Killick (Taxon 6: 239, 1957) proposed that the type species of *Plectranthus* L'Hér. should be changed from the listed *P. punctatus* (L.f.) L'Hér. to *P. fruticosus* L'Hér. This was approved by a majority vote of the appropriate Committees, and sanctioned by an International Botanical Congress.”

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of *proposal A* is not recommended for the reasons given above under Art. 8.

Proposal B is recommended for acceptance because it is in agreement with current practice. The Editorial Committee may perhaps consider whether the word ‘only’ is really necessary.

Article 9

Prop. A (163 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 259)

To read: “The nomenclatural type of a genus or of any taxon between genus and species is a species, that of a family or of any taxon between family and genus is the genus on whose present or former (legitimate or illegitimate) name that of the taxon concerned is based (see also Art. 18); and that of an order or of any taxon between order and family is the family whose name is based on the same generic name.

Note 1. The types of the names of families not based upon generic names are the types of their alternative names (see Art. 18).

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A is purely editorial, it is suggested that it be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 10

Prop. A (101 – Staplin, Taxon 7: 226)

The Note to read: “For recent plants of which it is impossible to preserve a type specimen, or for a species of this kind without a type specimen, the type may be a description or figure.”

Prop. B (277 – Silva, Taxon 8: 10)

In the first sentence, delete: “or other element.” Delete the Note.

Prop. C (120a – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 253)

The Note to read: “For plants of which it is impossible to preserve a type specimen, or for a species or a taxon below the rank of species without a type specimen, the type may be a description or figure.”

Prop. D (164 – Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 259)

The Article should precede the present Art. 9.

Comments Rapporteur

The *proposals A* and *B* clearly aim at discouraging the practice of indicating descriptions or figures as types of species or of taxa of lower rank. The Rapporteur is of the opinion that the solution can be found only by clearly indicating in Art. 10 for which groups such an exception should be allowed. It is open to doubt whether there are really any groups for which this is absolutely necessary except Bacteria which have a code of their own. It is significant in this respect that proposal *B* is made by an algologist. For these reasons the acceptance of proposal *B* is recommended and also the rejection of *proposal C*. The aims set by proposal *A* will be better reached by proposal *B*.

Proposal D should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Article 10bis

Prop. A (317 – Baehni, Taxon 8: 21)

“Beginning on 1 January 1961, a specific name accepted as correct can only be replaced by an older legitimate name if the latter is typified by a holotype in the form of an authentic herbarium specimen.

Article 10bis

Comments Rapporteur

Since this is a proposal made to the Special Committee on Stabilization for its consideration with respect to the stabilization of specific names, reference is made to the Committee's report, published in *Taxon* 8: (1959). See also comments under Art. 62bis.

(11) Section 3. PRIORITY

Article 11

Prop. A (282 – Morton, Taxon 8: 12)

Add the examples: *Mouriri* subg. *Pericrene* and *Arytera* sect. *Mischarytera*.

Prop. B (145a – Holm, Taxon 7: 256)

In lines 6 and 9, delete "validly published".

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of both proposals is recommended; they aim at a technical improvement of the Article.

(12-15) Section 4. LIMITATION OF THE PRINCIPLE OF PRIORITY: PUBLICATION, STARTING-POINTS, CONSERVATION OF NAMES

Article 13

Prop. A (18 – Donk, Taxon 6: 255)

Add: "Note 5. The starting-points for Fungi later than 1 May 1753 merely affect the dates of publication of names that would have been validly published if no later starting-points had been introduced: they do not change the type of these names, except when it can be shown that the type was definitely excluded on purpose by the author who validly published a name dating from before its starting-point in accordance to the present Article."

Prop. B (58 – Silva, Taxon 7: 184)

Delete the exceptions to paragraph g.

Prop. C (305 – Committee for Bryophytes, Taxon 8: 17)

Paragraph *b* to read as follows:

"b. *Musci* (the *Sphagnaceae* excepted), 1 Jan. 1801 (Hedwig, *Species Muscorum*).

Prop. D (306 – Committee for Bryophytes, Taxon 8: 17)

Alternative proposal to prop. C:

“b. *Musci* (the *Sphagnaceae* excepted), 19 Apr. 1801 (Hedwig, *Species Muscorum*).

Prop. E (283 – Morton, Taxon 8: 12)

Remove Note 4 to Chapter III, Section 4.

Prop. F (228 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 278)

Add: “Note 5. In the case of taxa whose names were published before the date of the “starting-point” and that were used in the “starting-point” publication or later, it is necessary to choose lectotypes from the material that was at the disposal of the author who gave the name valid publication in the “starting-point” work or later (in the case of taxa of higher rank than species according to Article 9). Only if there is no material available that was at the disposal of the author giving the name valid publication, and there is no contradiction between his concept and that of the original author, may the material of the original author be chosen as lectotype.

Example: The species *Clavaria abietina* Persoon 1794 was revalidated by Fries 1821. Fries, however, described under this name a species different from the one described by Persoon. It is necessary to use this name in the sense in which it was used by Fries and to cite it as *Clavaria abietina* Fries.”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. The principle involved in this proposal is put to the vote under Art. 7, proposal L and proposal F to this Article. In order to know whether the mycologists themselves want a special ruling, they should have the opportunity of a separate vote. All mycologists are invited to vote on this proposal in this *preliminary* vote; others are requested to abstain.

Proposal B. It has become clear that the later starting-points in Algae have hardly been applied and that actual application is rather difficult. This is a question for the algologists to decide: they are requested to vote here, others are asked to abstain in this *preliminary* vote.

Proposal C and D. All Bryologists are requested to vote here in the preliminary vote. It should be pointed out that the acceptance of 19 April would constitute a breach with the Stockholm decision to have arbitrary dates for the later starting-points, which are either 1 January or 31 December.

Proposal E should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal F should be referred to the Editorial Committee since the principle involved is put to a general vote under proposal L to Art. 7.

Article 14

Prop. A (1 – Little, Taxon 6: 191)

Amend the Article to provide for *nomina specifica conservanda* (*epitheta specifica conservanda*) or conserved specific epithets by inserting the word

Article 14

“species,” before “genera” in the first sentence to read as follows: “However, in order to avoid disadvantageous changes in the nomenclature of species, genera, families, orders, and intermediate taxa entailed by the strict application of the rules, and especially of the principle of priority in starting from the dates given in Art. 13, this Code provides, in Appendix III, lists of names that are conserved (*nomina conservanda*) and must be retained as exceptions.”

Prop. B (1 – Little, Taxon 6: 191)

After the second sentence of Art. 14, insert the following sentence: “Also, these specific names will be restricted to a limited number of species of outstanding economic importance and species otherwise widely known.”

Prop. C (1 – Little, Taxon 6: 191)

After Art. 14, Note 2, add the following sentence: “Any proposal of a name must cite the holotype, lectotype, or neotype and must be accompanied by ten copies of a photograph of this specimen for study and distribution.”

Prop. D (1 – Little, Taxon 6: 191)

After Art. 14, Note 6, add the following note: “Note 7. In *nomina specifica conservanda* (*epitheta specifica conservanda*) the specific epithet is conserved against other specific epithets for the same species. The binary combination and generic name are not conserved, but the generic name and specific epithet may be conserved independently.”

Prop. E (1 – Little, Taxon 6: 191)

The following examples, subject to later formal proposal and acceptance, are suggested as additions to Art. 14 and meanwhile as illustrations: “The specific epithet of *Picea excelsa* (Lam.) Link (1841; otherwise illegitimate under Art. 64 as nomenclaturally superfluous when published) is conserved against *Picea abies* (L.) Karst. (1881) and against the basionym *Pinus abies* L. (1753). If *Picea* were reunited with *Pinus*, the binary name would be *Pinus excelsa* Lam. (1778; also nomenclaturally superfluous when published). — *Eucalyptus rostrata* Schlecht. (1847) is conserved against *E. camaldulensis* Dehnh. (1832) and against the earlier homonym *E. rostrata* Cav. (1797). — *Sequoia gigantea* (Lindl.) Decne. (1854) is conserved against the earlier homonym *E. rostrata* Cav. (1797). — *Sequoia gigantea* (Lindl.) Decne. (1854) is conserved against the earlier homonym *Sequoia gigantea* Endl. (1847). If the genus *Sequoia* Endl., *nom. conserv.*, is divided, the binary name for this species becomes *Sequoia-dendron giganteum* (Lindl.) Buchholz. — *Pseudotsuga taxifolia* (Lamb.) Britton (1889) through its basionym *Pinus taxifolia* Lamb. (1803) is conserved against *Pinus taxifolia* Salisb. (1796).”

Prop. F (15 – Traub, Taxon 6: 239)

Add: “Note 7. When a controversy has arisen about any particular proposal, safeguards shall be observed to insure impartial procedure so that the proposal will be considered strictly on its merits: The General Committee shall refer the proposal for examination to a committee of the customary number of members who are not involved in the controversy either directly or indirectly, and who according to their solemn affirmations have no preconceived mental reservations on the subject. This rule shall apply to all controversial proposals under this Article not finally approved by a Congress up to and including 1954.”

Prop. G (27 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 150)

In Note 3 substitute the words “of corresponding rank based on the same type” for “for the same taxon.”

Prop. H (42 – Rickett et Stafleu, Taxon 7: 153)

Reword Note 3 as follows: “A conserved name is conserved against all other names in the same rank for the same type (nomenclatural synonyms) whether these are cited in the corresponding list of rejected names or not, and against those names based on different types that are cited in that list.

When a conserved name competes with one or more other names based on different types and against which it is not explicitly conserved, the earliest of the competing names is adopted in accordance with Art. 57.”

Prop. I (43 – Rickett et Stafleu, Taxon 7: 153)

Reword Note 4 as follows: “When a name has been conserved against an earlier name based on a different type, the latter”

Comments Rapporteur

In principle, *proposal A* is the only important one here; proposals B, C, D and E are of secondary importance. Acceptance of *proposal A* means the introduction of *nomina specifica conservanda*. At the Paris Congress a Special Committee on Stabilization was appointed to study the problems with regard to nomenclatural stability of specific names. The report by this Committee is published in the January 1959 number of *Taxon*. The present proposal, to introduce *nomina specifica conservanda* was the only proposal that received a majority vote in the committee. Full details on this vote are given in the report and need not be repeated here. The Rapporteur does not want to influence in any way the vote on this very important question. This is the reason why he does not give here either his personal opinion or his general appreciation. A vote “yes” for *proposal A* in the preliminary vote will be counted as a vote *in favour* of the principle of *nomina specifica conservanda*.

If *proposal A* is accepted it is still not necessary to accept *proposal B*. Although correct by itself, this statement is superfluous since this is a question for the Congress and its Committees to decide in each special case, as has been and is done for *nomina generica conservanda*.

Proposals C, D, and E should be referred to the Editorial Committee, if *proposal A* is accepted.

Proposal F. Everyone will agree with the sense of this proposal: each judgment by the nomenclature committees must be impartial. It is the opinion of the Rapporteur that such impartial procedure is ensured by the present organisation and this is why the proposal is thought to be superfluous.

Proposals G, H, and I have the same object of giving a more precise meaning to Note 3. Since *proposals H and I together* cover all cases, the rapporteur recommends their adoption rather than the adoption of *proposal G*.

Article 14bis

New Article 14bis

Prop. A (302 – Dandy et Ross, Taxon 8: 16)

In order to avoid disadvantageous changes in the nomenclature of species entailed by the strict application of the rules this Code provides, in Appendix —, a list of specific names which are to be rejected (*nomina specifica rejicienda*). The object of this list is to further the attainment of stability in the names of species of special horticultural, economic or other importance: the names included in it, if not rejected in this way, would by the provisions of the Code replace widely accepted names well established in botanical literature or in commerce.

Examples: *Lilium lancifolium* Thunb. (Trans. Linn. Soc. 2: 333; 1794) would replace *L. tigrinum* Ker-Gawl. (Bot. Mag. 31: t. 1237; 1810), the well-established name of the widely cultivated tiger lily. *Lassonia heptapeta* Buc'hoz (Pl. Nouvellem. Découv. 21, t. 19, fig. 1; 1779) would prevent the retention of *Magnolia denudata* Desr. (apud Lam. in Encycl. Méth. Bot. 3: 675; 1791), the accepted name of an important cultivated species.

Note 1. Names in the list are treated as illegitimate, but any which are earlier homonyms retain their status as such.

Note 2. If the specific epithet has been transferred to another genus it may be legitimate in its new position as from the date of transfer (see Art. 72, Note).

Note 3. A *nomen specificum rejiciendum*, when cited as a synonym, should be followed by the explanatory words (“*nomen rejicienda*” or “*nom. rejic.*”).

Note 4. The list of *nomina specifica rejicienda* will remain permanently open for additions. Any proposal of an additional name must be accompanied by a detailed statement of the cases both for and against its rejection. Such proposals must be submitted to the General Committee (see Division III), which will refer them for examination to the committees for the various taxonomic groups.

Comments Rapporteur

This proposal is also discussed in the report of the Special Committee on Stabilization. This committee studied the principle embodied in this proposal. The Rapporteur again refers to this report for a detailed report on the vote and on the arguments pro and contra.

Article 15

Prop. A (38 – Rickett et Smith, Taxon 7: 152)

To read: “When a name proposed for conservation has been approved by the General Committee after study by the Committee for the taxonomic group concerned, botanists are authorized to retain it pending the decision of a later International Botanical Congress.”

Prop. B (303 – Dandy et Ross, Taxon 8: 17)

Reword as follows: When a proposal for conservation or rejection of a name has been provisionally approved by the General Committee, botanists are authorized to accept it pending the decision of a later International Botanical Congress.

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of *proposal A* is recommended. It reflects actual practice. *Proposal B* should be referred to the Editorial Committee, it is connected with the proposal on *nomina specifica rejicienda*.

New Recommendation 15A

Prop. A (39 – Rickett et Smith, Taxon 7: 152)

“When a name proposed for conservation has been referred to the appropriate Committee for study, botanists should follow existing usage as far as possible pending approval by the General Committee.”

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of this proposal is recommended. It reflects actual practice.

Recommendation 16A

(16-28) Chapter III. NOMENCLATURE OF TAXA ACCORDING TO THEIR RANK

(16) Section 1. NAMES OF TAXA ABOVE THE RANK OF ORDER

Recommendation 16A

Prop. A (23 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 149)

Change (a) to (b), change (b) to (c) and add: “(a). The name of a subkingdom is a substantive with a nominative plural ending.”

Prop. B (216 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 275)

Paragraph (a) to read: “The names of phyla and divisions are preferably taken from characters indicating their nature as closely as possible; the names of *phyla* should end in *-phytae*, the names of divisions should end in *-phyta*, except in the case of *Fungi*, in which case they should end in *-mycota*. Words of Greek origin should be preferred.”

Comments Rapporteur

The Rapporteur is not in favour of the adoption of proposals A and D to Art. 4 (*q.v.*); the present *proposals A* and *B* are connected with those to Art. 4; their adoption is not recommended.

(17) Section 2. NAMES OF ORDERS AND SUBORDERS

Article 17

Prop. A (12 – Buchheim, Taxon 6: 226)

To add: “Names published with a term denoting the rank such as “Cohors”, “Nixus”, “Alliance”, or “Reihe” instead of “Ordo” (order, ordre, Ordnung) are treated as having been published as names of orders and are subject to the same provisions as such names.”

Prop. B (62 – Proskauer, Taxon 7: 216)

Repeal and substitute: “The name of an order is taken from the correct name of its type family and has the ending *-ales*.”

A suborder is designated in a similar manner, with the ending *-inae*.”

The suborder which includes the type family of its order also has this family as its type.

If the name of an order or suborder when first proposed was derived from a synonym of the correct name of its type family it shall be corrected without change of priority. The name of the correcting author shall be appended to that of the original author.”

Prop. C (272 – Silva, Taxon 8: 8)

To read: “The name of an order is based on the stem of any legitimate name of an included family and has the ending *-ales*.”

A suborder is designated in a similar manner, with the ending *-ineae*, except that the name of a suborder which includes the type of the order to which it is assigned must be based on the same stem as the ordinal name, but, contrary to Article 46, without citation of an author’s name.

Note 1. An ordinal or subordinal name based on the stem of an illegitimate name of a family is illegitimate.”

Prop. D (136 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 255)

First para., read: “The name of an order is taken from that of its type family or a synonym of this name, even if illegitimate, and has the ending *-ales*.”

Prop. E (214 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 275)

Add: “Note. When the name of an order or suborder has been published with an improper termination, the ending must be changed to accord with the rule, without change of the author’s name.”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A reflects current practice and is recommended for acceptance.

Proposal B in its present form hinges on the use of the word “correct” and is therefore unacceptable. The choice of names of higher categories must not be made dependent upon the *taxonomic (subjective)* choice of a *correct* name.

Proposal C has the same intent as proposal B but it takes *legitimate* rather than *correct* names as a basis for names of orders. This is a sound procedure because it does away with the undesirable possibility to have illegitimate names as the basis for names of orders. The adoption of this proposal is recommended.

Proposal D leaves open the possibility of having illegitimate names as a basis for names of orders and for that reason its adoption is not recommended.

Proposal E is the logical counterpart of a procedure adopted for names of families, subfamilies and tribes. Its adoption is recommended.

(18-19) Section 3. NAMES OF FAMILIES AND SUBFAMILIES,
TRIBES AND SUBTRIBES

Article 18

Prop. A (59 – Proskauer, Taxon 7: 215)

Delete the first sentence and substitute: “The name of a family is a plural adjective used as a substantive; it is formed by adding the suffix *-aceae* to the stem of the correct name of its type genus. Exceptions to this rule, besides those listed in Note 2 below, may be maintained only by conservation.”

Add a new Note:

“If the name of a family when first proposed was derived from a synonym

Article 18

of the correct name of its type genus it shall be corrected without change of priority. The name of the correcting author shall be appended to that of the original author.”

Prop. B (73 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220)

Add to Note 1: “If one wishes to take into consideration the author who corrected the improper termination, one can add the connecting author joining him with the original author by the word corr. (= *corrigit*).”

Prop. C (93 – Rickett, Taxon 7: 224)

The Congress is asked to authorize the insertion of the present Note 1 without change of wording.

Prop. D (273 – Silva, Taxon 8: 8)

Delete the first sentence and substitute the following:

“The name of a family is a plural adjective used as a substantive; it is formed by adding the suffix *-aceae* to the stem of any legitimate name of an included genus.”

Add a new Note and renumber existing notes:

“Note 1. A name of a family based on the stem of an illegitimate generic name is illegitimate.”

Prop. E (13 – Buchheim, Taxon 6: 227)

To add: “Names published with the term denoting the rank “Ordo” (order, ordre, Ordnung) instead of “Familia” (family, famille, Familie) are treated as having been published as names of families and are subject to the same provisions as such names.”

Prop. F (176 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 261)

The alternative names of the families mentioned in Note 2 to be listed as follows:

<i>Palmae</i>	<i>Arecaceae</i> Type: <i>Areca</i> Linn.
<i>Gramineae</i>	<i>Poaceae</i> Type: <i>Poa</i> Linn.
<i>Cruciferae</i>	<i>Brassicaceae</i> Type: <i>Brassica</i> Linn.
<i>Leguminosae</i>	<i>Fabaceae</i> Type: <i>Faba</i> Mill. (= <i>Vicia</i> Linn. p.p.)
<i>Guttiferae</i>	<i>Clusiaceae</i> Type: <i>Clusia</i> Linn.
<i>Umbelliferae</i>	<i>Apiaceae</i> Type: <i>Apium</i> Linn.
<i>Labiatae</i>	<i>Lamiaceae</i> Type: <i>Lamium</i> Linn.
<i>Compositae</i>	<i>Asteraceae</i> Type: <i>Aster</i> Linn.

Prop. G (177 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 262)

The second paragraph of Note 2 to read: “When *Papilionaceae* are regarded as a family distinct from the remainder of the *Leguminosae*, that name is conserved against *Leguminosae*. The alternative name is *Fabaceae*. This is an unique exception to Art. 51.”

Prop. H (217 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 275)

Delete note 2.

Prop. I (259 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 285)

Delete “or of a synonym of this name”.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A is not recommended for the same reasons as given above under Art. 17 on the subject of names of orders.

Proposal B is also not recommended because this is hardly a matter for legislation.

Proposal C is a formal sanctioning of a decision taken by the Editorial Committee when drawing up the Paris Code. It is the logical counterpart of the rule for subfamilies and tribes and it is therefore recommended for acceptance.

Proposal D is recommended for the same reasons as proposal C to Art. 17. If accepted the Editorial Committee should be instructed to add the words “unless conserved” to the proposed Note 1.

Proposal E is acceptable only if “of families” is inserted after the first word. Amended in that way the proposal may be accepted and referred to the E.C. for its final wording.

Proposal F should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal G is recommended for acceptance because it gives a clearer wording.

Proposal H is not recommended. The names *Palmae*, etc. are of long standing and in general use. There seems no need at all to “deconserve” them.

Proposal I has become superfluous because of the better worded proposal C.

New Recommendation 18A

Prop. A (60 – Proskauer, Taxon 7: 215)

“If a family name currently in wide and general use proves to be derived from a synonym of the correct name of its type genus, this shall be a weighty reason for conserving the name-bringing synonym over the otherwise correct name of the type genus, except when such a synonym is a later homonym of the legitimate name of a genus not included in the particular family.”

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of this proposal would depend upon the adoption of proposal A to Art. 18. It is not recommended for the reason given there and under Art. 17 on the subject of names of orders.

Article 19

Prop. A (61 – Proskauer, Taxon 7: 216)

In the first sentence delete: “. . . to the stem of the name of its type genus or of a synonym of this name.” and substitute: “. . . to the stem of the correct name of its type genus.”

Add a new paragraph:

“The subfamily or tribe including the type genus of the next higher category also has this genus as its type.”

Add a new Note:

“Corrections for synonyms of the type genus are made as in the case of families.”

Prop. B (74 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220)

The Note to read: “When a name of a taxon belonging to one of the above categories has been published with an improper termination, such as *-eae* for a subfamily or *-oideae* for a tribe, the ending must be changed to accord with the rule, without change of the author’s name, unless one wishes to follow the suggestion of Art. 18, Note 1. However, when the rank of the group is changed by a later author, his name is then cited as author for the name with the appropriate ending, citing the former author between brackets in the usual way.”

Prop. C (274 – Silva, Taxon 8: 8)

Delete the first paragraph and substitute the following:

“The name of a subfamily is a plural adjective used as a substantive; it is formed by adding the suffix *-oideae* to the stem of any legitimate name of an included genus.

A tribe is designated in a similar manner, with the ending *-eae*, and a subtribe similarly with the ending *-inae*.

The name of any taxon of a rank below family and above genus which includes the type of the next higher taxon must be based on the same stem as the name of the next higher taxon, but, contrary to Article 46, without citation of an author’s name.”

Prop. D (260 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 285)

Delete “or of a synonym”.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A is not recommended for the same reasons as given above under Art. 17 and 18. The use of the word “correct” is unacceptable here.

Proposal B is a rewording which does not seem to clarify either the present text, or the present procedure. Its adoption is not recommended.

Proposal C is recommended for the same reasons as proposal C to Article 17 and proposal D to Art. 18.

Proposal D is now superfluous because proposal C achieves the same object in a clearer way.

(20-22) Section 4. NAMES OF GENERA AND SUBDIVISIONS OF GENERA

Article 20

Prop. A (146 – Holm, Taxon 7: 256)

To read: The name of a genus is a substantive in the singular number, or a word treated as such. It may be taken arbitrary manner.

Prop. B (165 – Ross, Taxon 7: 260)

Add: “The name of a genus may not coincide with a technical term currently used in morphology unless it was published before 1 Jan. 1912 and was accompanied, when originally published, by specific names published in accordance with the binary method of Linnaeus.

“E x a m p l e s : The generic name *Radicula* . . .

“The name of a genus may not consist of two words, unless these words were from the first combined into one or joined by a hyphen.

“E x a m p l e : The generic name *Uva ursi* . . .

“Note: The following are not to be regarded as generic names: 1) words not intended as names.

“E x a m p l e : *Anonymos* Walt. . . .

“*Schaenoides* and *Scirpoides*, used by Rottböhl, Descr. Pl. Rar. Progr. 14, 27. 1772 to indicate unnamed genera resembling *Schoenus* and *Scirpus* which he stated (op. cit.: 7) he intended to name later are token words and not generic names. *Kyllingia* Rottböhl and *Fuirena* Rottböhl (Descr. Icon. Pl. 13, 70. 1773) are the first legitimate names of these genera.

2) unitary designations of species.

“E x a m p l e : F. Ehrhart . . .”

(The examples are those of the present Art. 68).

Prop. C (179 – Dandy et Ross, Taxon 7: 262)

Add: “Note: The names of the taxa called “species naturales” by Necker, Elem. Bot. 1790 are not to be treated as names of genera.”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A is recommended for acceptance. It is a textual amendment which gives a better picture of actual practice.

Proposal B is also recommended for acceptance. These names which are not really generic names should not be declared illegitimate (as under the present Art. 68) but it should be made clear from the beginning that they are not taken into consideration at all.

Proposal C is not recommended for acceptance, see comment under Art. 5, proposal B.

Article 21

Article 21

Prop. A (284 – Morton, Taxon 8: 12)

Delete the *Banisteria* example and insert: “*Costus* subg. *Metacostus*.”

Prop. B (166 – Ross, Taxon 7: 260)

Add to the second paragraph: “or the prefix Eu-.” Delete the third paragraph and remove to Art. 64(2).

Prop. C (180 – Ross, Taxon 7: 262)

Add to first paragraph: “The epithet is either a substantive of the same form as a generic name, or a plural adjective agreeing in gender with the generic name and written with a capital initial letter.”

Comments Rapporteur

All three proposals are marked improvements and are recommended for acceptance.

Recommendation 21A

Prop. A (182 – Ross, Taxon 7: 262)

To read: The epithet of a subgenus or a section is usually a substantive, that of a subsection or lower subdivision of a genus preferably a plural adjective.

“Botanists, when proposing new epithets for subdivisions of genera, should avoid those in the form of a substantive when other co-ordinate subdivisions of the same genus have those in the form of a plural adjective, and vice versa.

“They should also avoid, when proposing an epithet for a subdivision of a genus, one already used for a subdivision of a closely related genus, or one which is identical with the name of such a genus.

“If it is desired to indicate the resemblance of a subgenus or section (other than the type subgenus or section) of one genus to another genus, the ending *-oides* or *-opsis* may be added to the name of that other genus to form the epithet of the subgenus or section concerned.”

Comments Rapporteur

The proposal aims at a rewording and a combination of the present Recs. 21A and 22A. It should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 22

Prop. A (75 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220)

Delete the last part of the first sentence beginning with “but ..” and insert the following sentence: “., with citation of the author of the genus between brackets.”

Prop. B (285 – Morton, Taxon 8: 12)

Delete paragraph 2 of the text and paragraph 2 of the examples.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A was rejected twice, at Stockholm and Paris. Adoption is not recommended.

Proposal B is also not recommended for acceptance. The present paragraph 2 was a logical addition which was perhaps not formally accepted but which the Editorial Committee felt was implied in the ruling of the Paris Congress.

Recommendation 22B

Prop. A (181 – Ross, Taxon 7: 262)

To become Rec. 21A.

Comments Rapporteur

To be referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Recommendation 22C

Prop. A (40 – Wherry, Taxon 7: 152)

“Authors desiring to distinguish clearly between the name of a genus and that of a type-including subdivision thereof may prefix to the name of the latter the Greek character α ; this is not to be regarded as the creation of a new name.”

Comments Rapporteur

It is not advisable to accept this new Recommendation. The name of a section is a combination of a generic name with an epithet and the use of the epithet with or without a symbol but without the generic name and the term denoting the rank is always confusing.

(23) Section 5. NAMES OF SPECIES

Article 23

Prop. A (49 – St. John, Taxon 7: 155)

After the first sentence, insert: This epithet is of one or two, but not more than two, words.

In the second sentence delete: “or more words.”

Prop. B (286 – Morton, Taxon 8: 13)

In the examples, add after *Rubus amnicola*: “the specific epithet being an invariable Latin substantive.”

Article 23

Prop. C (167 – Ross, Taxon 7: 260)

Add after the third paragraph and its examples:

“The specific epithet may not exactly repeat the generic name with or without the addition of a transcribed symbol (tautonym).

“Examples: *Linaria* ...”

Delete the last paragraph and transfer this to Art. 42 in amended form (see Art. 42 prop. D).

Add the following at the end of the Article:

“Note: The following are not to be regarded as specific epithets: 1) words not intended as names,

“Examples: *Viola* “*qualis*” ...

2) ordinal adjectives used for enumeration,

“Examples: *Boletus* ...

3) those published in works in which the Linnaean system of binary nomenclature for species was not consistently employed.

“Examples: The name *Abutilon album* ...

“Linnaeus is regarded as having used binary nomenclature for species consistently from 1753 onwards, although there are exceptions, e.g. *Apocynum fol. androsaemi* L. (Sp. Pl. 213. 1753).”

(The examples are those of the present Art. 70).

Prop. D (199 – Deighton, Taxon 7: 270)

Add to paragraph 2: “(But see also Rec. 73E).”

Comments Rapporteur

It is of importance for names of parasitic fungi, for instance, to have the possibility of three word epithets. See Genève Conference Report, Regnum Vegetabile 5: 28. *Proposal A* is therefore not recommended.

Proposal B gives a valuable addition to the wording of the examples.

Proposal C is recommended for acceptance for reasons similar to those given under Art. 20, proposal B.

Proposal D should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Recommendation 23B

Prop. A (231 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 279)

Change paragraph (i) as follows: “(i) not to use names found in any unpublished sources, as e.g. handwritten notes, correspondence, or on herbarium labels and to attribute them to their authors.”

Comments Rapporteur

To be referred to the Editorial Committee.

(24-27) Section 6. NAMES OF TAXA BELOW THE RANK OF SPECIES

Article 24

Prop. A (308 – Fosberg, Taxon 8: 19)

Add: “. . . . and must be rejected” to the first sentence of paragraph 4.

Prop. B (168 – Ross, Taxon 7: 260)

For the third paragraph substitute the present Art. 71.

Prop. C (218 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 275)

Delete the words “which receive either epithets or numbers or letters to facilitate their arrangement” in paragraph 2.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposals B and *C* are recommended for acceptance since both tend to clarify actual procedure.

Article 26

Prop. A (76 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 220)

Delete the last part of the first sentence beginning with “but . . .” and insert the following sentence: “. with citation of the author of the next higher taxon between brackets.”

Prop. B (309 – Sandwith, Taxon 8: 19)

Treat the spelling ‘*siphilitica*’ of Linnaeus in his *Lobelia siphilitica*, (in the examples) as an orthographic linguistic error and use the correct spelling ‘*syphilitica*’.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A is not recommended for acceptance; it was twice rejected, at Stockholm and Paris.

Proposal B is recommended for acceptance.

New Recommendation 26A

Prop. A (41 – Wherry, Taxon 7: 152)

“When it is desired to make evident that a given epithet refers to a type-including subdivision rather than to a species, the Greek character *α* may be prefixed to that epithet. This is not to be regarded as the creation of a new

Recommendation 26A

epithet any more than is the change from initial small to capital letters permitted by Rec. 73F.”

Comments Rapporteur

The proposal is not recommended for the reasons given above under Rec. 22C.

Article 27

Prop. A (169 – Ross, Taxon 7: 260)

Delete the Article and reinsert it in Art. 64 in amended form (see Art. 64, prop. D).

Comments Rapporteur

Recommended for acceptance, see Art. 64.

(29-50) Chapter IV. EFFECTIVE AND VALID PUBLICATION

(29-31) Section 1. CONDITIONS AND DATES OF EFFECTIVE PUBLICATION

Article 29

Prop. A (20 – Rickett, Taxon 7: 39)

It is proposed to provide that the availability of printed matter means its delivery by the printer to one of the usual carriers by which it is distributed to the public. The exact wording of the revised Article may be left to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. B (244 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

It is proposed to clarify the situation with regard to publication by indelible autograph and microfilm and to remove the contradiction between the main text and the note in this respect.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. The proposal is certainly correct but it is evident that these matters are difficult to legislate. It is proposed to refer this to the Editorial Committee for further consideration. They may be able to find a practicable solution.

Proposal B should also be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Recommendation 29A

Prop. A (28 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 150)

Change the first line to “Authors are urged to scrupulously avoid publishing”. Another possibly preferable way of saying it might be “. . . . to avoid scrupulously the publishing”

Prop. B (120b – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 253)

Delete: “in ephemeral publications”.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. The Editorial Committee should be advised to study this proposal scrupulously or to scrupulously study it (with due apologies to the Rapporteur’s friend Fosberg).

Proposal B should not be accepted. The last paragraph does not deal with all ‘ephemeral publications’ but mentions only a few of them.

Article 31

Prop. A (245 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 283; 287 – Morton, Taxon 8: 13)
Read “*Exsiccati*” for “*Exsiccatae*”.

Comments Rapporteur

To be referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Article 31bis

Prop. A (2 – Little, Taxon 6: 192)

To read: “In Spermatophyta a generic or specific name more than fifty years old is rejected as not effectively published when it neither has been accepted by a second author nor has been cited in an index of scientific names within fifty years after publication or by 1 Jan. 1960, if published before 1910.”

Comments Rapporteur

This proposal was also studied by the Special Committee on Stabilization. From the report it is clear that there was no support for it. Similar proposals have been rejected again and again by previous Congresses.

New Article 31ter

Prop. A (3 – Little, Taxon 6: 194)

To read: “To be effectively published, a name of a genus or species of Spermatophyta published before 1900 must have been cited in Index Kewensis including Supplementa I to XI.”

Comments Rapporteur

The same comments apply here as given under Art. 31bis.

(32-45) Section 2. CONDITIONS AND DATES OF VALID PUBLICATION

Prop. A (183 – Ross, Taxon 7: 262)

Throughout this section, for “description” read “definition.”

Comments Rapporteur

The Rapporteur is of the opinion that a change from “description” to “definition” would be rather confusing at this late stage. The term “description” is in general use now and the advantage of the more precise “definition” would not outweigh the disadvantage of losing the generally accepted term “description”.

Article 32

Prop. A (65 – Proskauer, Taxon 7: 217)

Add: "A name of taxon above the rank of genus but not higher than an order and formed by the addition of a suffix to the stem of the name of a genus shall be considered validly published even if no diagnosis was supplied, provided that it was effectively published before 1 Jan. 1908."

Prop. B (109 – Traverse, Taxon 7: 229; 147 – Hohn, Taxon 7: 256)

Delete "of recent plants" in the first paragraph.

Prop. C (119 – Funkhouser, Taxon 7: 232)

Change "recent plants" to "recent or fossil plants" in the first paragraph.

Prop. D (246 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 283; 288 – Morton, Taxon 8: 13)

In the examples change the spelling of the epithet "martini" to "martinii".

Prop. E (170 – Ross, Taxon 7: 260)

Delete "both" in second line.

After "(see Art. 29)" read: ", (2) have a form which complies with the provisions of Chapter III, and (3) be accompanied"

Prop. F (185 – Ross, Taxon 7: 263)

Add before the existing notes: "Note. A definition [description] is a statement intended to indicate the character or characters by which a taxon is to be distinguished."

Prop. G (187 – Deighton, Taxon 7: 264)

The third paragraph to read: "A new combination or a new name published on or after 1 Jan. 1953, is not validly published unless its basionym (name-bringing or epithet-bringing synonym) or substituted synonym is clearly indicated and a full and direct reference given to its author and original publication with page, or plate, etc., reference and date."

Prop. H (188 – Deighton, Taxon 7: 264)

Add to the third paragraph as Note 1, present Notes 1 and 3 becoming Notes 3 and 4 respectively: "Mere reference to the "Index Kewensis", the "Index of Fungi", or any work other than that in which the name was validly published, does not constitute a full and direct reference to the original publication of a name."

Prop. I (220 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 275)

Add to paragraph 2 (with retrospective validity): "New transfers and combinations are not considered validly published is published only in synonymy."

Article 32

Prop. K (223 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 276)

Add: “Note 4. An indirect reference is a clear indication, by the citation of the author’s name or in some other way, that the new name is based upon a previously and effectively published diagnosis.”

Examples of indirect indication: *Hypochnus* Fr. ex Fr. 1821 is published in *Systema Mycologicum* 1: (14), 450 (1821) without any diagnosis. The abbreviation “Fr.” after the name indicates a connection with a previously published (before the starting-point) diagnosis of *Hypochnus* Fr. 1818, *Observations* 2: 278 (1818) and therefore the name *Hypochnus* Fr. ex Fr. was validly published in 1821. — *Kratzmannia* Opiz (in Berchtold et Opiz, *Oekon.-techn. Fl. Böhmens* 1/2: 398. 1836) is published with a diagnosis, but not definitely accepted by the author and therefore invalid. It is accepted definitely in Opiz, *Seznam rostlin Květeny České* 56 (1852), but without any diagnosis. The citation of author’s name after *Kratzmannia imbricata* (L.) Opiz is an indirect indication of the previously published diagnosis in 1836. — Opiz published the name of the genus *Hemisphace* (Benth.) Opiz in *Seznam, Květeny České* 50 (1852) without a diagnosis, but as he wrote *Hemisphace* Benth. he indirectly indicated a previously validly published diagnosis by Bentham, *Labiata. Gen. Sp.* 193. 1833.”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. Adoption would mean the validation of *nomina nuda*. This is not acceptable.

Proposals B and C should be referred to the Palaeobotanical Committee, *proposal D* to the Editorial Committee.

Proposals E, F, G and H are all recommended for acceptance because they are all clarifications making the rules more precise and less open to various interpretations.

Proposal I is superfluous, see the present Article 37.

Proposal K is recommended for acceptance because it gives a welcome and precise indication of what is meant by “indirect”.

Article 33

Prop. A (189 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 264)

The last sentence of the second example should read: “The publication of the names under *Brosimum* which were accepted by Ducke and published before 1 Jan. 1953, is valid, whilst that of the names under *Piratinera*, not accepted by Ducke, is invalid. If these names had been published after 1 Jan. 1953, all of them would be regarded as invalidly published.

Prop. B (222 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 275)

The ruling in the last paragraph to be made to conform with that in Art. 32, paragraph 2.

Prop. C (224 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 276)

Add: “The name of a genus is validly published even if the species belonging to that genus are not cited simultaneously.”

Examples: The genus *Lorinsera* Opiz (in Berchtold et Opiz, *Oekonom.-techn. Fl. Böhmens* 2/2: 28. 1839) was validly published in a generic key without mention of any species.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. Ducke did not reject *Piratinera*, he merely stated that, if the methods of the American botanists (1922!) were followed, one had had to accept *Piratinera* instead of *Brosimum* and he therefore also provided the combinations under *Piratinera*. It is clear that he accepted both possibilities and that this is an example of alternative names accepted by the author. If an author supplies two names but does not accept one of them, these names are not alternative names and Art. 33 does not apply. Names not accepted by an author can never be considered validly published by him.

Proposal B should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal C. This addition belongs to Art. 39 but even so it would be contradictory to Art. 35 for names published after 1 Jan. 1958. (For names published before this date it is superfluous because Art. 39 is very clear about what is required, after 1 Jan. 1958 one has to indicate at least the type-species! The note as proposed reflects current practice but it is not necessary to state what is not required for valid publication. It would be of advantage to insert the example in Art. 39.

Article 34

Prop. A (11 – Bullock, Taxon 6: 215)

To read: "In order to be validly published, a new name for a taxon of recent plants, the bacteria and algae excepted, published on or after 1 Jan. 1935 must be accompanied by a Latin description, or by a reference to a previously published description in accordance with Art. 32, provided only that such previously published description must be in Latin if it was published on or after 1 Jan. 1935.

The same considerations apply to new names for recent taxa of Algae, except that the effective date is 1 Jan. 1958."

Prop. B (94 – Mamay, Taxon 7: 224)

Modify the first sentence to read: "In order to be validly published, a name of a new taxon of plants, the bacteria, algae and all fossils excepted, published on or after 1 Jan. 1935, must be accompanied by a Latin diagnosis or by a reference to a previously and effectively published Latin diagnosis."

Prop. C (95 – Mamay, Taxon 7: 225)

Insert "recent" before "algae" in first line of last sentence.

Prop. D (97 – Cross e.a., Taxon 7: 225)

Modify the first sentence as in proposal B above and add as a (new) final paragraph:

"In order to be validly published, a name of a new taxon of fossil plants published on or after 1 Jan. 1960 must be accompanied by a Latin diagnosis or by a reference to a previously and effectively published Latin diagnosis."

Article 34

Prop. E (184 – Ross, Taxon 7: 263)

For “diagnosis” read “definition”.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. It is not advisable to accept this rewording. Art. 34 deals with names of new taxa and not with new names for taxa. But even if thus amended the proposal should still be rejected: It was already a very liberal decision by the Cambridge Congress to postpone the original date of 1908 to 1935 and it is not advisable to give any further opportunity of avoiding Latin diagnoses.

Proposals B, C and D should be referred to the Palaeobotanical Committee. *Proposal E* is not recommended for the reasons given above under ‘section 2’.

New Recommendation 34A

Prop. A (186 – Ross, Taxon 7: 263)

“Authors publishing names of new taxa should give or cite a full description in Latin.”

Comments Rapporteur

This Recommendation is certainly useful and its adoption is recommended.

Article 35

Prop. A (110 – Traverse, Taxon 7: 229)

Delete the word “recent.”

Prop. B (117 – Funkhouser, Taxon 7: 231)

To read: “Publication on or after 1 Jan. 1958 of the name of a new taxon of recent or fossil plants of the rank of order or below is valid only when the nomenclatural type is indicated (see Arts. 7-10).”

Prop. C (190 – Deighton, Taxon 7: 264)

Add: “The nomenclatural type of a name published on or after 1 Jan. 1961 must be indicated by the insertion of the Latin word ‘typus’ (or ‘holotypus’, etc.) immediately before or after the particulars of the type so designated.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposals A and B should be referred to the Palaeobotanical Committee.

Proposal C reflects good practice but the consequences of it as an Article would perhaps be too wide. It would be better to have it as a Recommendation and in that case it could be referred to the Editorial Committee with this advice.

New Recommendation 35B

Prop. A (191 – Deighton, Taxon 7: 265)

“The indication of the type should follow immediately the Latin diagnosis.”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A indicates good practice and is recommended for acceptance.

New Article 35bis

Prop. A (4 – Buchinger, Taxon 6: 197)

“The description of a new taxon must be complete and include the characters of all organs in an adequate state of development, and of both sexes if the plant is dioecious. Should a complete description of a higher or the same rank exist (especially in the case of varieties or forms), it is only necessary to mention in the diagnosis of the taxon the characters in which it differs from that one.”

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of this new Article is not recommended. The provision contained in the first sentence is impossible to impose and the last sentence contradicts the first.

Article 36

Prop. A (96 – Mamay, Taxon 7: 225)

Insert “recent” before “algae” in the second paragraph.

Prop. B (98 – Cross e.a., Taxon 7: 225)

Add: “In order to be validly published, a name of a new taxon of fossil spores or pollen published on or after 1 Jan. 1960 must be accompanied both by drawings to illustrate diagnostic features of the new taxon and by photomicrographs.”

Prop. C (102 – Tate Ames e.a., Taxon 7: 226)

Delete the first paragraph.

Prop. D (142 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 256)

Paragraph 1 (and proposed Art. PB. 5) to read: “A name of a new taxon of fossil plants of *specific or lower rank*”

Comments Rapporteur

All proposals should be referred to the Palaeobotanical Committee.

Article 37

Article 37

Prop. A (221 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 275)

To read: “The names of taxa (whether that of a new taxon, a new combination, or a new transfer) are not validly published if they are cited as synonyms.”

Comments Rapporteur

The proposal has the same as the current text, only in a more complicated way. There is no need to explain in this place what kinds of names of taxa exist.

Article 39

Prop. A (111 – Traverse, Taxon 7: 229)

Delete the word “recent”.

Prop. B (225 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 276)

Insert after “(3) by reference” the words “(direct or indirect)”.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A should be referred to the Palaeobotanical Committee, *proposal B* to the Editorial Committee.

Article 40

Prop. A (120c – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 253)

It is proposed that the Committee for Cultivated Plants should re-examine the definitions in order to supply a suitable wording.

Comments Rapporteur

To be referred to the Committee for Cultivated Plants.

Article 41

Prop. A (121 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 253)

It is proposed that the order of the two examples be reversed, since the *Philgamia* example refers to (2) and the *Strophoblachia* example to (1).

Comments Rapporteur

To be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Recommendation 41A

Prop. A (29-30 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 150)

Change to: “A description of any new taxon should mention the points in which the taxon differs from its allies.”

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of this proposal is strongly recommended. It is obvious that this advice should be given for all descriptions. The amended recommendation would be better placed as 32B.

Article 42

Prop. A (16 – De Wit, Taxon 5: 6)

Add: Note. “A nomen specificum nudum is a binomial occurring in effectively published literature without any accompanying text or accompanied by words considered to be without diagnostic value. Nomina specifica nuda are not recognized by the Code (see Art. 12).”

Prop. B (50 – St. John, Taxon 7: 135)

In line 2, after species, insert: “or infraspecific taxon”.

Prop. C (289 – Morton, Taxon 8: 13)

Abbreviate *Phlyctidia* as “P.” not as “Ph.”

Prop. D (171 – Ross, Taxon 7: 260)

Add: “Note: This Article applies to specific and other epithets published under *Anonymos* and other token words that are not generic names (see Art. 20, Note (1)).

“E x a m p l e s: The binary combination *Anonymos aquatica* Walt. (Fl. Carol. 230. 1778) is not validly published. The correct name for . . .

(This example is from the present Art. 23.)

“The binary combination *Scirpoides paradoxus* Rottböll (Descr. Pl. Rar. Progr. 27. 1772) is not validly published since *Scirpoides* is a token word, not a generic name. The first validly published name for this species is *Fuirena umbellata* Rottböll (Descr. Icon. Pl. 70. 1773).

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A seems to be a useful addition to the Article, defining *nomina nuda*. Its adoption is recommended.

Proposal B is not recommended for acceptance. The citation of the specific name is always necessary in such cases, the citation of an infraspecific name is superfluous since the same epithet can on no account be used twice (for different types) under the same specific name.

Article 42

Proposal C should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal D contains a useful cross reference to Art. 20, note 1. It is not necessary to insert the note itself because it is already clear that under Art. 20 *Anonymos* is not a generic name, but it would be extremely useful to insert here the examples given in the proposal together with a cross reference to Art. 20. The rapporteur proposes that this proposal be referred to the Editorial Committee with this advice.

New Recommendation 42A

Prop. A (17 – De Wit, Taxon 5: 6)

To read: "Once a binomial is designated by name as a nomen specificum nudum in effectively published literature the decision ought to be followed unless an error in judgment can be proved."

Comments Rapporteur

A recommendation like this could be given for each rule and it seems superfluous to stress here only the case of nomina nuda. The proposal is not recommended for acceptance.

Article 43

Prop. A (247 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

Delete the note because it duplicates note 2 to Art. 41.

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of this proposal is not recommended. Art. 41 deals with species and therefore there is no duplication.

Article 44

Prop. A (31 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 150)

Indicate what should be done with names published before 1 Jan. 1953 without clear indication of rank.

Comments Rapporteur

The remark is correct. This case presents an example of the usefulness of the Preamble, and especially of the last paragraph of it. The Editorial Committee could perhaps be empowered to repeat here in a suitably modified way this last paragraph so as to make it clear that established custom must be followed when the rank was not clearly indicated by the original author.

Article 45

Prop. A (32 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 150)

Add to the second paragraph: “However, validly published earlier homonyms, whether legitimate or not shall cause rejection of their later homonyms (unless these are conserved).”

Prop. B (264 – Silva, Taxon 8: 5)

Delete the third paragraph (see also Principle I, prop. A).

Prop. C (148 – Holm, Taxon 7: 257)

In the second paragraph, delete the words: “published in legitimate combinations”.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A certainly clarifies the second paragraph. It is good to repeat here that earlier homonyms, even if illegitimate, always make a later homonym illegitimate.

Proposal B. All algologists are invited to vote on this proposal in order to give the Committee for Algae an indication of their opinion on this subject. Other taxonomists are requested to refrain from voting in the preliminary vote.

Proposal C also clarifies the second paragraph and its adoption is recommended.

Recommendation 45C

Prop. A (290 – Morton, Taxon 8: 13)

The Congress is asked either to reaffirm or to reject the present Recommendation.

Comments Rapporteur

The present Recommendation is a very useful one and it is suggested that it be reaffirmed (in the preliminary vote a vote “yes” will mean “reaffirm”).

Recommendation 45G

Prop. A (6 – St. John, Taxon 6: 197)

To read: “The etymology of new names and epithets should be given.”

Comments Rapporteur

The proposal is not recommended. Why should the etymology be given when this is obvious?

Article 46

(46-50) Section 3. CITATION OF AUTHORS' NAMES AND OF LITERATURE FOR PURPOSES OF PRECISION

Article 46

Prop. A (7 – St. John, Taxon 6: 198)

Add: "If a larger number of persons jointly publish a new taxon, no more than the first three of the group will be cited as the authors of the name of the taxon.

Example: *Streptomyces albo-niger* Hesseltine, J. N. Porter, Deduck, Hauck, Bohonos & J. H. Williams, *Mycologia* 46: 19. 1954, will be cited as *S. albo-niger* Hesseltine, J. N. Porter & Deduck et al."

Prop. B (77 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 221)

Delete the last part of the last sentence.

Prop. C (232 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 280)

Add: "If two (or more) authors were equally concerned with the publication of a name, the names of both (or of the last two) are linked by means of the conjunction "et". If a taxon has been described by more than three authors, the first three authors are cited and "et al." is added."

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. It would be of advantage to have some provision like this as a Recommendation e.g. "in the case of more than two authors, the citation may be restricted to that of the first one followed by et al.". It is suggested that this proposal be referred to the Editorial Committee on the understanding that it form the basis of a recommendation. The example should be preserved by all means!

Proposal B is not recommended (see Arts. 22 and 26).

Proposal C is superfluous here; it is suggested that it be referred to the Editorial Committee together with proposal A for its consideration in drawing up a pertinent recommendation. In an Article this provision would be out of place.

Recommendation 46A

Prop. A (44 – Rowley, Taxon 7: 154)

For "Hort." read "hort."

Prop. B (78 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 221)

To read: "When a name has been proposed but not validly published by one author and is subsequently validly published and ascribed to him by another author, the name of the former author and the connecting word *ex* are

added between square brackets, followed by the name of the publishing author If it is desirable or necessary to abbreviate such a citation, the words between square brackets are left out.”

Prop. C (89 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 223)

The wording to be changed to emphasize that “Spruce ex” in the example (and in similar cases) should be used only as a deliberate indication of a type chosen by the publishing author and that its use merely to indicate the originator of the name should be forbidden.

Prop. D (233 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 280)

To read: “When a name has been proposed but not validly published by one author and is subsequently validly published (validated) by another author, to whom the authorship of this taxon has been ascribed, then the name of the second author, who has validly published the name, should be added in the citation to the name of the original author by means of the connecting word “ex”. This holds also for the validation of a name in “starting-point” works, for the names of taxa of garden origin with the authorship shown by the abbreviation “hort.” etc. The citation of authors connected by means of “ex” may be abbreviated but then the name of the author who validly published the name (cited second) must be retained, as it is more important.”

Add to examples: “*Anabaena* Bory ex Bornet et Flahault (starting-point), abbreviated: *Anabaena* Bornet et Flahault. — *Bankera fuligineo-alba* (Schmidt ex Fries) Coker et Biers ex Pouzar, abbreviated: *Bankera fuligineo-alba* (Fries) Pouzar.”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. The personal name Hort should be cited with initials. It would be rather ugly to use “hort.” instead of “Hort.” for plants of unknown garden origin.

Proposal B. This proposal would rather complicate matters and it is questionable whether this is desirable. Adoption is not recommended.

Proposal C. It is really the originator of the name who is usually cited before “ex”. This proposal is contrary to current usage.

Proposal D. This is a rather involved way of saying what the present Recommendation says shorter and better. Adoption not recommended.

Recommendation 46B

Prop. A (33 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 150)

Add to paragraph 1: “In such cases the name of the author who supplied the description is the most important and should be retained when it is desirable to abbreviate such a citation.”

Recommendation 46B

Prop. B (79 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 222)

To read: “When a name with a description (or reference to a description) supplied by one author is published in a work by another author, then the word *apud* should be used to connect the name of the two authors unless the name of the publishing author forms an integral part of the title of the publication; in this case the two authors should be united by the word *in*.”

Prop. C (229 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 279)

Insert behind first sentence: “This holds also in those cases where one author proposed a name and another published this name in his work with the original author’s approval. Without this approval, however, only the author of the publication is cited. Obvious mistakes, however, must be corrected.”

Prop. D (230 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 279)

Alternative to proposal C: “This holds also in those cases where one author published in his work a name that had been proposed by another author, or which he ascribed, either intentionally or by mistake, to another author. The author of the publication is always cited second. Only evident mistakes by the author of the publication are corrected.”

It is further suggested that as from 1 Jan. 1961 all ascriptions to other authors in cases where it is not stated that they had been made with their explicit approval will be considered invalid (see also Rec. 23B, lit. i).

Prop. E (238 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 281)

Add: “The citation of authors connected by means of “*in*” may be abbreviated, but in such cases it is necessary to retain the name of the author who supplied the name (it is cited first).”

Alterations and additions to the examples:

“E x a m p l e s: *Viburnum ternatum* Rehder in Sargent, abbreviated: *Viburnum ternatum* Rehder. — *Rhabdoderma lineare* Schmidle et Lauterb. in Schmidle, abbreviated: *Rhabdoderma lineare* Schmidle et Lauterb. — *Thelephora areolata* Chaillet in Fries, abbreviated *Thelephora areolata* Chaillet (although Fries’s work is “starting-point”, Chaillet’s species was described here for the first time and not validated).

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A is recommended in principle. Since this is more a matter of bibliography than of nomenclature it is suggested that the proposal be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal B was rejected by the Stockholm and Paris Congresses.

Proposals C and *D* contain provisions which are impracticable; their adoption is not recommended.

Proposal E has the same aim as proposal A but proposal A is better worded. The adoption of proposal E is therefore not recommended.

New Recommendation 46C

Prop. A (80 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 222)

“It is desirable to indicate after the name of the author of a taxon the year in which the taxon was validly published. If one wishes to extend the citation of the author, one may add, after the year of publication, the respective title and separated by colon, the number of the page on which the taxon is described.”

Comments Rapporteur

The proposal does not deal with nomenclature but with bibliography. It is not desirable to give such detailed bibliographic instructions in the Code.

Article 47

Prop. A (248 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

“An alteration of the diagnostic characters does not warrant the citation of the name of an author other than the one who first published its name” — but in Rec. 47A abbreviations are put in front of the name of the “second” author in a case of change of diagnostic characters (*mutatis characteribus*). — In “Examples” the name of the emending author is cited in the first case without, and in the second in parentheses.

Comments Rapporteur

This proposal should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Recommendation 47A

Prop. A (81 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 222)

Insert after *emendavit* the following words: “. . . ., *amplificavit (amplif.)*, *restrinxit (restr.)*,”

Prop. B (239 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 281)

To read: “If the change mentioned in Art. 47 applies to general correction of an old, incorrectly described taxon and is followed by an alteration of the original concept of the author, of the original diagnosis (in important features) and of the diagnostic features, the name of the author of the change is added to the original author by means of the abbreviation “*emend.*” (= *emendavit*).”

Example: In the year 1892 *Pteromonas cordiformis* Stein was described. The description is incomplete and cannot be used for the description of any single species of this genus. Stein’s drawings include several types, out of which no iconotype was determined. In 1957 Fott changed and supplemented the original diagnosis, chose an iconotype corresponding to the species he was studying, and applied to this species Stein’s original name. Citation: *Pteromonas* Stein *emend. Fott.*”

Recommendation 47A

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A is again more a matter of bibliography than of nomenclature and for this reason its adoption is not recommended.

Proposal B contains a good suggestion which should be referred to the Editorial Committee. No principles are involved here.

New Recommendation 47B

Prop. A (241 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 282)

“If the change mentioned in Art. 47 was caused by a misinterpretation by the later author who applied the old name to specimens that are not systematically identical with the type, or if the same name was used later in several different concepts, and it is not certain which of them corresponds to the type, then to the name (of the original author) is added the name of the later author (whose concept we have in mind) preceded by “*sensu*”.

Example: In 1903 *Anabaena planctonica* Brunnth. was described. In 1920 G. M. Smith applied the same name (including the abbreviation of the author's name Brunenthaler) to the *Anabaena solitaria* f. *smithii* of today. To the synonymy of this form belongs “*Anabaena planctonica* Brunnth. sensu G. M. Smith, 1920.”

Comments Rapporteur

This proposal contains a good suggestion which could well be referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Recommendation 47C

Prop. A (242 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 282)

“If the change is not so important as to necessitate the complementing of the citation with the author's name (if it does not comply with the conditions as set down in Rec. 47A and 47B), it may be expressed by means of any suitable Latin abbreviation. This, however, is not a part of the citation itself, it serves only as a complementary note and is always put behind the complete citation.

Examples: *Trichodesmium* Ehrenb. ex Gom. Ann. Sci. Nat. Bot. ser. 7. 16: 193. 1893 (*nom. cons.*) sensu lato sec. Prescott; — *Enteromorpha* Link in Nees, Hort. Phys. Berol. 5. 1820 (*nom. cons.*) p.p. — *Bartlingia* Brongn. Ann. Sci. Nat. 10: 373. 1827, non Reichenb. nec F. Muell.”

Comments Rapporteur

This proposal concerns bibliography rather than nomenclature. This kind of prescription is not appropriate in the Code.

Article 48

Prop. A (310 – Rickett, Taxon 8: 19)

The second sentence to read: “When a name is conserved with a type different from that of the original author, it must not; instead the name of the author of the name as conserved, with the new type, must be cited.”

Prop. B (278 – Silva, Taxon 8: 10)

To read: “Publication of a treatment of a taxon which purposely excludes the original type is considered as publication of a new taxon, the name of which is a later homonym ascribed solely to the emending author.

Example: *Lemanea* as treated by Sirodot (1872) explicitly excluded the type of *Lemanea* Bory (1808) and hence must be cited *Lemanea* Sirodot rather than *Lemanea* Bory emend. Sirodot.

Note: Retention of a name in a sense that excludes the type can be effected only by conservation.

Prop. C (240 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 281)

Delete “*mutatis characteribus, etc.*”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. This is a welcome modernization of this rule which brings the wording into agreement with the type method. Its adoption is recommended.

Proposal B has much in common with proposal A but has a wider scope. The Article as amended by proposal A would be preferable to the entirely new version of proposal B. The example could perhaps be used.

Proposal C is not obviously necessary. The entire negative clause could equally well be deleted but it does no harm and is perhaps even helpful.

Article 49

Prop. A (90 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 223)

To be amended so that the citations in the chosen examples may be written *Fumaria solida* [Linnaeus] Miller and *Corydalis solida* ([Linnaeus] Miller) Swartz. The [Linnaeus] indicates the type chosen by Miller.

Comments Rapporteur

This would be a good idea and very useful but as an Article it would work out rather confusing. It might perhaps be put in amended form as a recommendation and as such it might be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Recommendation 49A

New Recommendation 49A

Prop. A (82 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 222)

“It is desirable to indicate within a citation between parentheses the former status of the taxon.

“E x a m p l e s: *Isoetes tenella* (Leman 1822, Dict. Sci. Nat. 24: 24, pro var. *I. lacustris*) Desvaux 1827, Mém. Soc. Linn., Paris 6: 127).

Pulsatilla pratensis (L. 1753, Sp. Pl. 539, sub *Anemone*) Miller 1768, Gard. dict., ed. 8: n. 2.

Cuspidaria [Andrzejovsk mss. ex] A. P. Decandolle 1821, Syst. Nat. 2: 493, pro sect. *Erysimi* Besser 1822, Enum. Plant. Volhyn. 104 non A. P. Decandolle 1838, Bibl. Univ. Genève 17: 125 (*nom. cons.*)”

Comments Rapporteur

To be referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Recommendation 49B

Prop. A (236 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 280)

“If simultaneously with change of rank a taxon is validated, the original author is cited in square brackets. The citation may be abbreviated by leaving out the name of the original author (in brackets).

E x a m p l e: *Agaricus* trib. *Amanita* [Pers.] Fr.

Prop. B (237 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 281)

Alternative proposal: “If the rank of a taxon is changed when it is validated, the name of the validator is added after “ex” behind the name of the original author, which is enclosed in parentheses.”

E x a m p l e: *Agaricus* trib. *Amanita* (Pers.) ex Fr.

Comments Rapporteur

Both proposals should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 50

Prop. A (91 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 223)

Amend to conform with Art. 49 as amended by proposal A.

Comments Rapporteur

To be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Recommendation 50A

Prop. A (83 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 222)

To read: “In order to avoid confusion, author’s names put after names of plants should not be abbreviated. Exception is made only for Linnaeus who is abbreviated as L.

If there exist more than one author with the same surname, the initials of their Christian names should be added.

Examples: J. Fr. Gmelin (= Johann Friedrich Gmelin); J. G. Gmelin (= Johann Georg Gmelin); C. Chr. Gmelin (= Carl Christian Gmelin); S. G. Gmelin (= Samuel Gottlieb Gmelin).”

Prop. B (291 – Morton, Taxon 8: 13)

Transfer the Recs. 50A-H to follow Art. 46.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A goes too far and is contrary to general usage. As an alternative the Editorial Committee might perhaps be instructed to change “should” into “may” in the first line of the actual Recommendation.

Proposal B should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Recommendation 50B

Prop. A (234 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 280)

Delete the Recommendation.

Comments Rapporteur

The first paragraph is certainly a useful recommendation although it is of course not nomenclature. The second paragraph says more or less the same as Rec. 46A. It is not clear that deletion would be useful.

Recommendation 50C

Prop. A (84 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 222)

Add: “. or *nomen solum* (*nom. sol.*).”

Comments Rapporteur

Not recommended. *Nomen nudum* is in general use and no alternative is needed.

Recommendation 50D

Prop. A (29 – Donk, Taxon 6: 255)

To read: “The citation of an author who published the name before the introduction to the binomial system of Linnaeus is indicated when considered useful or desirable, preferably between square brackets.”

Example: *Lupinus* [Tourn. Inst. 392. pl. 213. 1719] L. Sp. Pl. 721. 1753, Gen. Pl. ed. 5. 322. 1754, or *Lupinus* [Tourn.] L.

Recommendation 50D

Prop. B (85 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 222)

(Change the word ‘or’ in ‘and’, and read the last sentence as follows:)
“..... This method is especially applicable when reference is made to authors earlier than those listed in Art. 13.”

Prop. C (92 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 223)

Delete: “preferably between square brackets or”.

Prop. D (235 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 280)

Delete the Recommendation.

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of *proposal A* is recommended. It is indeed better to restrict the use of “ex” to the cases outlined in Rec. 46A. The other proposals deal with the same matter, but A seems preferable.

New Recommendation 50Dbis

Prop. A (19 – Donk, Taxon 6: 256)

To read: “The citation of an author who would have validly published the name if the starting-point of a later date than 1 May 1753 of the group concerned and listed in Art. 13 had not been adopted, is connected by the word *per* with the citation of the author who actually validly published the name.

Example: *Boletus piperatus* Bull. Herb. France *pl.* 451, f. 2. 1789 per Fr. Syst. Myc. 1: 388. 1821, or *Boletus piperatus* Bull. per Fr.”

Comments Rapporteur

The Bryologists, Mycologists and Algologists (unless they favour the abandonment of later starting-points for their group) are requested to vote on this Recommendation in the preliminary vote in order to inform the Congress of the feelings of these groups on this matter.

Recommendation 50G

Prop. A (292 – Morton, Taxon 8: 14)

Cite: “*Combretum* Linnaeus in Loeffling”.

Comments Rapporteur

It is *Combretum* Loeffling 1758!

Recommendation 50H

Prop. A (86 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 222)

Insert after the last sentence: “..... should be added between quotation marks.”

Comments Rapporteur

This is actual practice. Adoption recommended.

(51-72) Chapter V. RETENTION, CHOICE AND REJECTION OF NAMES

(51-53) Section 1. RETENTION OF NAMES OR EPITHETS OR TAXA WHICH ARE REMODELLED OR DIVIDED

Article 51

Prop. A (279 – Silva, Taxon 8: 10)

To read: “An alteration of the diagnostic characters or of the circumscription of a taxon does not warrant a change in its name, except as required (1) by exclusion of the original type (Art. 48) or (2) by its union with another taxon of the same rank bearing an older legitimate name or epithet (Art. 57).”

Prop. B (293 – Morton, Taxon 8: 14)

To read in line 4: “Arts. 57, 58, Rec. 58A”.

Prop. C (178 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 261)

Add at the end: “An unique exception is made for the family name *Papilionaceae* (see Art. 18, Note 2).

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. The present numbers (1) and (3) should certainly be retained. The proposed new (1) is irrelevant here because such cases are not dealt with by this Article. The proposed change of wording in (2) is purely editorial. The proposal is not recommended for acceptance.

Proposals B and C should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 52

Prop. A (249 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

To read (end of first sentence): “. . . . must be (for one of them) reinstated”.

Prop. B (294 – Morton, Taxon 8: 14)

The end of the first example to read: “and it is now retained for that part of *Glycine* L. (1753) containing the lectotype of that genus”.

Comments Rapporteur

Both proposals should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 53

Prop. A (203 – Prokhanov, Taxon 7: 270)

Add the following example: “*Stipa pennata* L. (Sp. Pl. 1753) has been split into several species all bearing other names. Mansfeld (Verz. Pfl. Dtschl. 1940) rightly reintroduced this name for one of the species, namely *Stipa joannis* Cel. (Oest. Bot. Z. 34: 318. 1884). The latter has to be abandoned.”

Comments Rapporteur

The proposal should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

(54-56) Section 2. RETENTION OF EPITHETS OF TAXA BELOW
THE RANK OF GENUS ON TRANSFERENCE TO ANOTHER GENUS

Article 55

Prop. A (122 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 253)

The last part of example f. to read: “The citation in parentheses (under Art. 49) of Bongard indicates the original author using the epithet in a name based on a type different from that of *Tsuga heterophylla*.”

Prop. B (204 – Prokhanov, Taxon 7: 271)

Add the following example (after *Tsuga mertensiana*): “The species comprising the cultivated soya-bean was published by Linnaeus twice: as *Phaseolus max* and as *Dolichos soja*. The species has been transferred to *Glycine* first by Siebold and Zuccarini (1843), who made use of the latter name, but misapplied it to the wild soya species of Japan, *Glycine ussuriensis* Regel and Maack. Nevertheless the name *Glycine soja* (L.) Sieb. and Zucc. is the correct one for the cultivated species in the original sense of Linnaeus.”

Prop. C (250 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

In examples to read: “(Stschegl.)” and not “(Stscheg!)”.

Prop. D (251 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

Clarify paragraph 2 (p. 39).

Prop. E (296 – Morton, Taxon 8: 14)

Substitute for example e) the following: *Polypodium tetragonum* Swartz (1788) is a validly published, legitimate species. In transferring this to the genus *Dryopteris*, Urban proposed the combination *D. tetragona* (Swartz) Urban (1903); but this is illegitimate, because it is a homonym of the earlier and different *Dryopteris tetragona* (Presl) Kuntze (1891). Therefore, Dr. Maxon took up the next oldest taxonomic synonym, *Polypodium subtetragonum* Link (1833) and made the new combination *Dryopteris subtetragona* (Link) Maxon (1926), the correct name under *Dryopteris*. Recent students have considered that this species belongs in the genus *Thelypteris*, and the combination *Thelypteris subtetragona* (Link) E. P. St. John (1936) was proposed. Art. 55 makes it clear that when this species is being transferred to *Thelypteris*, the earliest legitimate specific epithet i.e. *tetragona* must be retained, and therefore Small was right in making the new combination *Thelypteris tetragona* (Swartz) Small (1938), which is the correct name at present under the genus *Thelypteris*. This Article gives one reason why the same species can have two (or conceivable even more) correct epithets depending on what genus it is referred to.

Comments Rapporteur

All proposals deal with editorial matters and should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

(57-58) Section 3. CHOICE OF NAMES WHEN TAXA OF THE SAME RANK ARE UNITED

Article 57

Prop. A (297 – Morton, Taxon 8: 14)

Delete the *Ipomoea* example.

Prop. B (205 – Prokhanov, Taxon 7: 271)

Add the following example: "Fiori and Paoletti (Fl. Ital. I (1): 107. 1896) rightly united *Triticum aestivum* L. (Sp. Pl. 85. 1753) and *T. hybernum* L. (l.c.) into one species under one of these names, *T. aestivum* L. Consequently the latter name is obligatory for the combined taxon comprising common soft wheat. The creation of a new name or the use of an illegitimate one, such as *Triticum vulgare* Vill. (Pl. Dauph. 2: 153) is inadmissible. Furthermore *T. vulgare* has exactly the same circumscription as *T. aestivum*, originally also referring only to the summer varieties of soft wheat."

Comments Rapporteur

Both proposals should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 58

Prop. A (103 – Tate Ames et al., Taxon 7: 227)

Delete the *Steinhauera* example.

Comments Rapporteur

The proposal should be referred to the Palaeobotanical Committee.

(59) Section 4. CHOICE OF NAMES OF FUNGI WITH A PLEOMORPHIC LIFE CYCLE

Article 59

Prop. A (123 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 253)

It is proposed that the Committee for Fungi and Lichens should reconsider the wording of this Article with especial regard to the use of "state" and "stage" in the third sentence.

Prop. B (124 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 253)

In the last line of the first paragraph to replace "transfer" by "new combination".

Article 59

Comments Rapporteur

The present wording was drawn up by the Committee for Fungi and this Committee as well as many mycologists are of the opinion that it is perfectly clear. It is doubtful whether there would be any advantage in referring the Article back again to the Committee. The adoption of *proposal A* is therefore not recommended.

Proposal B contains a useful suggestion towards a more precise and correct terminology.

(60-61) Section 5. CHOICE OF NAMES WHEN THE RANK OF A TAXON IS CHANGED

Article 60

Prop. A (206 – Prokhanov, Taxon 7: 271)

Add the following example: “*Valeriana locusta* var. *olitoria* L. When transferred to *Valerianella* must not be named *Valerianella olitoria* (L.) Poll., because in the specific rank there is already an epithet available, namely *locusta*, the type of which is var. *olitoria*. The name must accordingly be *Valerianella locusta* (L.) Betcke.”

Prop. B (227 – Dostál e.a., Taxon 7: 277)

Add: “Taxa whose ranks have not been precisely designated by means of terms according to Art. 4 and published on and after are invalid. If they were published before this date, it is necessary to designate them subsequently by means of one of the terms admissible according to Article 4.

If the original author of such an inadmissible designation himself explained in a valid publication which term is denoted by this or that symbol, the taxon is designated by means of this term. In the other cases they may be designated as of any rank within the species. However, in each case only the name of the original author of the epithet of the taxon is cited, and its priority is governed by the date of the original valid publication.”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A should be referred to the Editorial Committee. The adoption of *proposal B* is not recommended. Art. 44 contains the required rule and the rapporteur's comments on proposal A to that Article should be referred to.

Article 61

Prop. A (63 – Proskauer, Taxon 7: 217)

Repeal and substitute at another place in the Code:

“The type genus of a family is that genus included in it which first supplied the stem of its name or of a synonym of its name to the name of a validly published taxon of rank higher than a genus and not higher than an order, even if the resultant name was nomenclaturally superfluous in its original circumscription.

The type genera of subfamilies and tribes are designated in a similar manner.”

Prop. B (275 — Silva, Taxon 8: 9)

Delete the Article without the adoption of a substitutional text.

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of *proposal A* is not recommended. The rule contained in its first part is very dangerous; its adoption would necessitate a tremendous amount of bibliographic work and would have awkward consequences.

The Article itself is perhaps not strictly necessary but to delete it as *proposal B* suggests would go too far. It is useful to have this rule more or less repeated in this part of the Code.

(62-72) Section 6. REJECTION OF NAMES AND EPITHETS

Article 62

Prop. A (207 — Prokhanov, Taxon 7: 271)

Add the two following examples: “. — The name *Scilla sibirica* Andrews (Bot. Repos. 5. pl. 304. 1804) must not be rejected because the species does not grow in Siberia. — The name *Petrosimonia oppositifolia* (Pall.) Zitzw., based on *Polycnemum oppositifolium* Pall. (Reise 1: 422, 431, app. 484. 1771), must not be rejected because the species has leaves only partly opposite, and partly alternate, although there is another closely related species, *Petrosimonia brachiata* (Pall.) Bunge having all its leaves opposite.”

Comments Rapporteur

The proposal should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Article 62bis

Prop. A (10 — Rickett and Camp, Taxon 4: 39)

To read: “No name, even if prior, may displace a hitherto accepted name unless it is associated with a holotype cited in the original place of publication.

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of this Article is recommended. It constitutes a step towards stabilization. Even if the principle of *nomina specifica conservanda*, or its counterpart, is accepted, it would still be useful to have this Article because it would keep down the number of proposals for conservation or rejection.

Article 63

Prop. A (34 — Fosberg, Taxon 7: 150)

It is proposed to simplify this Article to “A name must be rejected if it is illegitimate.”

Article 63

Prop. B (304 – Dandy et Ross, Taxon 8: 17)

Add: "If it is included in the List of *Nomina specifica rejicienda* (Appendix ..)".

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of *proposal A* is recommended. Names that must be rejected under the Code should all be called illegitimate.

Proposal B should be referred to the Editorial Committee because it is connected with the proposal on *nomina specifica rejicienda*.

Article 64

Prop. A (64 – Proskauer, Taxon 7: 217)

Delete the first sentence of (2) and substitute: "Except in the cases of taxa of rank higher than a genus but not higher than an order, if it is a later homonym, that is if it duplicates a name previously and validly published for a taxon of the same rank based on a different type."

Prop. B (280 – Silva, Taxon 8: 11)

Delete section (3).

Prop. C (192 – Ross, Taxon 7: 267)

Add to (1): "Note: A nomenclaturally superfluous new combination is not illegitimate if the epithet of its basionym is legitimate. When published it is incorrect, but it may become correct later.

"Examples: *Chloris radiata* (L.) Sw. (Prodr. 26. 1788) based on *Agrostis radiata* L. (Syst. Nat. ed. 10. 2: 873. 1759) was nomenclaturally superfluous when published since Swartz also cited *Andropogon fasciculatum* L. (Sp. Pl. 1047. 1753) as a synonym. It is however the correct name in the genus *Chloris* for *Agrostis radiata* when *Andropogon fasciculatum* is treated as a different species as was done by Hackel (DC. Monogr. 6: 177. 1889).

"*Spiranthes tortilis* (Sw.) Rich. (Mém. Mus. Hist. Nat. 4: 59. 1818) was nomenclaturally superfluous when published since Richard cited as synonyms *Neottia quadridentata* Willd. (Sp. Pl. 4: 73. 1805), an illegitimate superfluous name for *Ophrys peruviana* Aubl. (Pl. Guiane 2: 816. 1775), and the basionym *Neottia tortilis* Sw. (K. Vet. Akad. Nya Handl., Stockh., 21: 226. 1800), a legitimate new name for *Satyrium spirale* Sw. (Prodr. 118. 1788) non *Neottia spiralis* (L.) Sw. (1800). After the publication of *Spiranthes peruviana* C. Presl (1827) and *Spiranthes spiralis* (L.) Chevall. (1836), it became the correct name in *Spiranthes* for the species as circumscribed by Richard. Should *Ophrys peruviana* Aubl. and *Satyrium spirale* Sw. be regarded as different species of *Spiranthes*, *Spiranthes tortilis* (Sw.) Rich. would be the correct name for *Satyrium spirale* Sw. and a new epithet would be required for *Ophrys peruviana* Aubl. Neither *Spiranthes quadridentata* Lindl. (Bot. Reg. 10: sub t. 823. 1824), based on *Neottia quadridentata* Willd., nor *Spiranthes quinquelobata* Urb. (Fedde Repert. Sp. Nov. 15: 305. 1918), based on *Ophrys quinquelobata* Poir. in Lam. (Encycl. Méth., Bot. 4: 568. 1798), another illegitimate name for *Ophrys peruviana* Aubl., can be used, for both were superfluous when published and their epithets are not derived from legitimate basionyms. The combination *Spiranthes peruviana* was not pre-occupied in 1824, and Urban cited *Satyrium spirale* Sw. and *Neottia tortilis* Sw. as synonyms."

Prop. D (172 – Ross, Taxon 7: 261)

Add: “The names of two subdivisions of the same genus, or of two infraspecific taxa within the same species, even if they are of different rank, are treated as homonyms if they have the same epithet and are not based on the same type. The same epithet may be used for subdivisions of different genera, and for infraspecific taxa within different species.

“Examples: Under *Verbascum* ... (from present Art. 21).

“The following is illegitimate: *Erysimum* ... Art. 26.” (from present Art. 27).”

Prop. E (200 – Deighton, Taxon 7: 270)

Alter the wording at the end of the Note to (2), from “(See Art. 75)” to read “(See Arts. 73 and 75)”.

Prop. F (208 – Prokhanov, Taxon 7: 271)

Add to (1) the following example: “*Picea excelsa* (Lam.) Link is illegitimate, because it is based on *Pinus excelsus* Lam. (Fl. Franç. 2: 202. 1778), a superfluous name for *Pinus abies* L. (Sp. Pl. 1002. 1753). Under *Picea* the proper name is *Picea abies* (L.) Karst. (Deutsch. Fl. 325. 188).”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A would mean that later homonyms would be permissible above the rank of genus. This is clearly not acceptable under our present system of nomenclature and would lead to many awkward consequences.

Proposal B concerns the Algologists and they alone are requested to vote on this proposal in the preliminary vote.

Proposal C is recommended for acceptance because it would take away some of the undesirable consequences of a strict application of the present rule (1). It is a proposal which is in full agreement with the principles of the type-method.

Proposal D is also recommended for acceptance. This rule is not a new one, but it expresses the consequences of the present Arts. 21 and 26.

Proposals E and *F* should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 65

Prop. A (8 – St. John, Taxon 6: 198)

Delete the Article and examples.

Prop. B (45 – Rowley, Taxon 7: 154)

Delete the example of *Rosa villosa* L. and substitute a better one.

Prop. C (209 – Prokhanov, Taxon 7: 271)

To read as follows: “A name must be rejected as ambiguous (nomen ambiguum) if it originally referred to a taxon vaguely circumscribed or ill-defined and subsequently persistently restricted or typified in two or more irreconcilable manners.”

Article 65

“Examples: *Lavandula spica* L. (Sp. Pl. 572. 1753) included must be rejected (see Kew Bull. 1932: 295). — *Betula alba* L. (Sp. Pl. 982. 1753) comprises in its original sense the two species *Betula pendula* Roth (Tent. Fl. Germ. 1: 405. 1788) and *B. pubescens* Ehrh. (Beitr. 6: 98. 1791). The name *Betula alba* was typified by Roth (1788) in the sense of *B. pubescens* and somewhat earlier by Du Roi (1771) in the sense of *B. pendula*. Subsequently it was used in either sense. It has therefore become ambiguous and must be rejected. — *Fumaria bulbosa* L. was typified by Miller in two opposite ways, at first (Gard. Dict. ed. 8. 1768) in the sense of *Fumaria cava* (L.) Mill., or *Corydalis cava* (L.) Schweigg. et Kuerte, and then (Gard. Dict. Abr. ed. 6. 1771) in the sense of *Fumaria solida* (L.) Mill., or *Corydalis solida* (L.) Sw. Consequently the name must be rejected.”

“This does not apply to the name of a taxon, originally well defined and circumscribed, so as to leave no doubt about its exact application but subsequently misapplied to other taxa outside its original limits. Such a name, if neglected, must be reinstated in its original sense, in view of the temporary character of the confusion involved, presenting no serious obstacle to the usage of the original name. If it is desirable to exclude all possible confusion from the beginning, the reinstating author may be cited after the name of the original author, preceded by the word *rest.* (restituit).”

“Examples: *Rhinanthus major* L. (Amoen. 3: 53. 1756) originally referred strictly to one species, subsequently known as *Rhinanthus alectorolophus* (Scop.) Poll. Unfortunately, the name *Rhinanthus major* was used by Ehrhart (Beitr. 6: 144. 1791), and persistently later on, outside its original circumscription, to indicate a different species. Nevertheless the latter must bear another name, *R. vernalis* (Zing.) B. Schischk. (the name *R. glaber* Lam. being illegitimate), and the name *Rhinanthus major* L. must be reinstated and used in its original sense. — Pugsley rightly reinstated *Orchis latifolia* L. (Sp. Pl. 941. 1753) in its original sense, because its original diagnosis leaves no ambiguity. The name *O. latifolia* L. *rest.* Pugsley must not be replaced by any later one, such as *Orchis strictifolia* Opiz (1825) or its misapplied conventional name *O. incarnata* auct., non. L.”

Prop. D (314 – Mansfeld et Schulze, Taxon 8: 21)

Add: “A list of names to be rejected for this reason will form Appendix . . .”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. The adoption of this proposal is recommended notwithstanding the circumstance that similar proposals were defeated at previous Congresses. The disadvantage of this Article and of Arts. 66 and 67 is that these Articles themselves are sources of confusion and error. It is not at all clear what status is to be given to names which are rejected under them and the objective application of these rules is very difficult. In many of these cases it will not be possible to typify the pertinent names and it is then not possible to use them.

Proposal B should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal C contains a useful clarification of the Article, should proposal A be rejected. In this event it would be advisable to accept proposal C subject to further consideration by the Editorial Committee.

Proposal D is discussed in the report of the Special Committee on Stabilization.

Article 66

Prop. A (35 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 150)

Delete the Article.

Prop. B (193 – Ross, Taxon 7: 267)

To read: “A name must be rejected if it is based on a type consisting of two or more entirely discordant elements believed by the author to be parts of a single individual, unless one or more of them form so minor a part that the other can be chosen as type.”

Prop. C (315 – Mansfeld et Schulze, Taxon 8: 21)

Add: “A list of names to be rejected for this reason will form Appendix ...”

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A is recommended for acceptance; see comments under Article 65. *Proposal B* is therefore not recommended. *Proposal C* is dealt with in the report of the Special Committee on Stabilization.

Article 67

Prop. A (36 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 151)

Delete the Article.

Prop. B (46 – Rowley, Taxon 7: 154)

After “A name must be rejected when it is based on a monstrosity” add: “An exception is made in the case of double-flowered mutants, where the name is taken to apply to the single-flowered species as found in the wild.

Example: *Rosa roxburghii* Tratt. is taken to be the spontaneous single-flowered species (*R. roxburghii* f. *normalis* Rehd. & Wils.) although originally described from a double-flowered cultivar (now *R. roxburghii* var. *plena* Rehd.).”

Prop. C (252 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

Define precisely the term “monstrosity” and exclude from it numerical floral anomalies.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A is recommended for acceptance, see comments under Article 65. *Proposal B* is a good example of the confusing nature of the present Article. *Proposal C* is not recommended.

Article 68

Article 68

Prop. A (366 – Proskauer, Taxon 8: 17)

Add a Note to (3) stating that the names of Necker's 'species naturales' in his *Elementa Botanica* 1790 are not to be regarded as unitary designations of species but that they are to be accepted as validly published generic names.

Prop. B (149 – Holm, Taxon 7: 257)

Add (5): When they coincide with names of taxa of higher rank.

Example: *Myxomycetes* Renault, Fl. Foss. Autun et Épinac 2: 422. 1896.

Prop. C (173 – Ross, Taxon 7: 261)

Delete the Article and transfer its contents to Chapter III.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A. The adoption of this proposal is recommended in principle (see also the comments under Art. 5). The Editorial Committee should decide in what place this note could be inserted.

The consequences of *proposal B* are not clear because we do not possess a list of all suprageneric names. Its adoption is not recommended.

Proposal C is recommended for acceptance. The provisions of this Article do not belong here but in Chapter III. These "names" are not illegitimate but are not validly published.

Article 69

Prop. A (150 – Holm, Taxon 7: 257)

Delete Note 1.

Prop. B (174 – Ross, Taxon 7: 261)

Delete (3) and transfer its contents to Chapter III.

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A goes too far. It would be better to amend the note to read: "Illegitimate epithets must not be . . .". If this view is accepted it is suggested that proposal A be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal B is recommended for acceptance: see comments under Art. 68 proposal C.

Article 70

Prop. A (47 – Rowley, Taxon 7: 155)

Delete paragraph (4).

Prop. B (175 – Ross, Taxon 7: 261)

Delete (2), (3), (4), (5) and Note 1 and transfer the contents to Chapter III.

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of *proposal A* is not now advisable. Tautonyms have for long been abandoned and their reintroduction would cause too many name-changes. *Proposal B* is recommended for acceptance: see above.

Article 71

Prop. A (87 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 222)

To read: “Infraspecific epithets such as *typicus*, *originalis*, *originarius*, *genuinus*, *verus*, and *veridicus* are illegitimate except where they repeat the specific epithet because Art. 26 requires their use.”

Comments Rapporteur

The difference between the present reading and the proposed one is perhaps only linguistic and depends upon the interpretation of the word “purporting”. It is suggested that *proposal A* be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 73

(73-75) Chapter VI. ORTHOGRAPHY AND GENDER OF NAMES

(73-75) Section 1. ORTHOGRAPHY OF NAMES AND EPITHETS

Article 73

Prop. A (14 – McClure, Taxon 6: 239)

Add to the phonetic alphabetical equivalents: “ç becomes s and not c”.

Prop. B (21 – Rickett, Taxon 4: 188; 253 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

Add a note to the effect that in maintaining the original spelling of names, “J” and “V” must be changed to “I” and “U” respectively when they represent vowels, while the reverse changes must be made when consonants are required.

Prop. C (37 – Fosberg, Taxon 7: 151)

Add “geographic or vernacular” after “personal” in Note 5.

Prop. D (88 – Fuchs, Taxon 7: 223)

Add “*Note 1*: a matter of typography. One may if one wishes so, add the original spelling after the author’s quotation between quotation marks.

Note 3: as an orthographic error. One may if one wishes so, add the original spelling after the author’s quotation between quotation marks.”

Prop. E (312 – Fosberg, Taxon 8: 19)

The first paragraph to read: “The original spelling of a name or epithet must be retained except that typographic or clearly unintentional orthographic errors and those indicated in Notes 2 and 3 should be corrected.”

Prop. F (298 – Morton, Taxon 8: 15)

Delete the *Gluta benghas* example.

Prop. G (125 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 253)

Paragraph 1 to read: “The original spelling of a name or epithet must be retained, except that typographic or orthographic errors may be corrected.”

Prop. H (125 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 253)

Alternative wording: “The original spelling of a name or epithet must be retained, but corrections of typographic or orthographic errors are permitted.”

Prop. I (126 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 254)

Note 3 to read: “The wrong use of the terminations which are dealt with in Rec. 73C (a, b, d) is treated as an orthographic error.”

Prop. K (127 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 254)

To combine the 'Examples of typographic errors' and 'Examples of orthographic errors' under the heading "Examples of typographic or orthographic errors".

Prop. L (127 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 254)

To establish a special paragraph with the heading "Example of both a typographic and an orthographic error: *Rosa pissarti* Carr. (Rev. Hort. 1880: 314) is a typographic error for *R. pissardi* (see Rev. Hort. 1881: 190) which may be corrected to *R. pissardii* (see Rec. 73C, b).

Prop. M (128 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 254)

In 'Examples of typographic errors' to read: "*Globba brachycarpa* Baker (in ...) and *Hetaeria alba* Ridley (Journ. ...) are typographic errors, the correct names being *Globba trachycarpa* Baker and *Hetaeria alta* Ridley respectively (see Journ. ...)."

Prop. N (128 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 254)

In 'Examples of orthographic errors' to replace in lines 4, 7, 9, 13 (twice) "should" by "may".

Prop. O (196 – Deighton, Taxon 7: 269)

Add: "Note 7. Non-latin or non-latinized words used as names or epithets are indeclinable.

Examples: *Cercospora sissoo* Sydow, on *Dalbergia sissoo*; *Cercospora mombin* Petrak & Ciferri, on *Spondias mombin*. The names *sissoo* and *mombin*, being indeclinable, cannot have a genitive form which, in accordance with Note 6(2) above, would have been used if available. Also *Nectria hauturu* Dingley (a vernacular epithet), *Nectria ruapehu* Dingley (from Mt. Ruapehu, New Zealand)."

Comments Rapporteur

The proposals A, C, I, K, L, M, N and O should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal B is recommended for acceptance because it will enable authors to follow a rule where the original publication is chaotic.

Proposal D is superfluous because it deals with bibliographic practices which are not regulated by this Code.

Proposal E is not recommended because it has become clear that it is very difficult to know which mistakes are "unintentional".

Recommendation 73C

Prop. A (130 – Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 254)

(d). To read: "When an epithet taken from the name of a man is used as an adjective, it is formed in the following manner: (1) when the name of the person ends in a vowel, *anus* (*a, um*) is added (thus *clarkeanus* after Clarke; *koidzumianus* after *Koidzumi*; *berteroanus* after Bertero), except when the name ends in *a*, when *eanus* (*a, um*) is added; (2) when the name ends in a consonant, *ianus* (*a, um*) is added (e.g. *dielsianus* after Diels), except when the name ends in *-er*, when *anus* (*a, um*) is added (*hassleranus* after Hassler)."

Recommendation 73H

Comments Rapporteur

The proposal should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Recommendation 73H

Prop. A (197 – Deighton, Taxon 7: 269)

“Epithets of fungus names derived from the generic names of the host plant should be spelt in accordance with the accepted spelling of such a name; other spellings must be regarded as orthographic variants and should be corrected.

Examples: *Phyllachora anonicola* Chardon, 1940, should be altered to *annonicola*, since the spelling *Annona* is now accepted in preference to *Anona*; *Meliola albizziae* Hansford & Deighton, 1948, should be altered to *albizziae*, since the spelling *Albizia* is now accepted in preference to *Albizzia*.”

Comments Rapporteur

The proposal should be referred to the Committee for Fungi.

New Recommendation 73I

Prop. A (198 – Deighton, Taxon 7: 270)

“Epithets composed of the stem of a substantive (often the generic name of a host plant) with the addition of either *incola* or *i-cola* (both derived from the stem of the Latin verb *colo*) are nouns in apposition, and epithets differing only in the spelling of the appended element ‘*incola*’ or ‘*icola*’ should be treated as orthographic variants. The epithet *corticola* is an error (perhaps now to be regarded as sanctioned by usage) for *corticicola*, and must be regarded as an orthographic variant of it.

Example: *Cercospora acalyphincola* Petrak, 1957: the name *Cercospora acalyphicola*, should it ever be published, would be homonymous.”

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of this proposal is not recommended. It is questionable whether such detailed regulations should find a place in the Code.

Article 74

Prop. A (210 – Prokhanov, Taxon 7: 272)

Add the following examples: 1) At the end of paragraph (1) incorporate as follows: “..... e.g. *Thuja* (not *Thuya*), *Prunella* (not *Brunella*).”

2) At the end of paragraph (2) incorporate as follows: “..... e.g. *Agrostemma* (not *Agrostema*), *Euonymus* (not *Econymus*).”

Comments Rapporteur

The adoption of this proposal is recommended because it means that two very useful examples would be added.

(75A) Section 2. GENDER OF GENERIC NAMES

Recommendation 75A

Prop. A (211 – Prokhanov, Taxon 7: 272)

Add the following examples: 1) At the end of paragraph (1) incorporate as follows: “E x a m p l e s: *Atriplex* should be neuter (not feminine) according to its classical gender, e.g. *Atriplex tataricum* L. — The names *Euonymus* and *Celastrus* should be feminine (not masculine) according to their classical gender, e.g. *Euonymus verrucosa* Scop. and *Celastrus orbiculata* L. — *Bidens* should be masculine as the words *dens*, *tridens* and the like are masculine.”

2) Under (2), incorporate into the partial paragraph, beginning with the word: Examples of names formed from Greek words, at the head of the examples, the following:

“Examples of names formed from Greek words: *Parthenocissus* Planch. (in A. DC. Monogr. Phaner. 5(2): 446. 1887) formed from *parthenos* (fem.) and *Cissos*, or *cissus*, (masc.) must be masculine, in accordance with the gender of the last word, e.g. *Parthenocissus quinquefolius* (L.) Planch.”

Prop. B (254 – Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

Reconsider the listing of *-carpha* in paragraph 2 on p. 50.

Prop. C (299 – Morton, Taxon 8: 15)

Rearrange the first three paragraphs of examples to section (2) as follows: Examples of names formed from Greek words:

Modern compounds ending in *-codon*, *-myces*, *-odon*, *-panax*, *-pogon*, *-stemon*, and other masculine words should be masculine. The fact that the generic name *Andropogon* L. was originally treated as neuter by Linnaeus is immaterial.

Similarly, all modern compounds ending in *-achne*, *-carpha*, *-cephala*, *-chlamys*, *-daphne*, *-mecon*, *-osma* (the modern transcription of the feminine Greek word *osme*) and other feminine words should be feminine. The fact that *Dendromecon* Bentham and *Hesperomecon* E. L. Greene were originally ascribed the neuter gender is immaterial. An exception may be made in the case of names ending in *-gaster*, which strictly speaking ought to be feminine, but which may be treated as masculine in accordance with botanical custom.

Similarly, all modern compounds ending in *-ceras*, *-dendron*, *-nema*, *-stigma*, *-stoma*, and other neuter words should be neuter. The fact that Robert Brown and Bunge respectively made *Aceras* and *Xanthoceras* feminine is immaterial. An exception may be names ending in *-anthos* (or *-anthus*) and *-chilos* (*-chilus* or *-cheilos*) which ought to be neuter, since that is the gender of the Greek words *anthos* and *cheilos*, but which have generally been treated as masculine; botanists are recommended to assign that gender to them.

Comments Rapporteur

All proposals should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

New Article 75bis

Prop. A (294 – Bullock, Taxon 7: 267)

“A Greek or Latin word adopted as a generic name will retain its classical gender, or the gender assigned to it in 1753 or later.

Note 1. In spite of their classical gender, however, certain generic names will be treated as feminine in accordance with botanical usage.

E x a m p l e s: The following masculine words are treated as feminine generic names:

Article 75bis

Adonis, *Diospyros*, *Strychnos*. Also *Orchis* and *Stachys*, masculine in Greek and feminine in Latin are treated as feminine.

Note 2. The name *Hemerocallis*, derived from the Latin and Greek neuter *hemerocalles* and given masculine gender by Linnaeus, is treated as feminine, as are all other generic names ending in *-is*.

Generic names compounded of two or more Greek or Latin words will take the gender of the last of these, unless the ending is altered deliberately to give a contrary gender.

Examples: *Andropogon* was treated as neuter by Linnaeus, but since *pogon* is masculine, it should, like all other compounds ending in *-pogon*, be treated as masculine. Other masculine endings are *-codon*, *-myces*, *-odon*, *-panax*, *-stemon*. Similarly generic names ending in *-mecon*, are feminine, as are those with *-achne*, *-carpha*, *-cephala*, *-chlamys*, *-daphne*, and *-osma*, whilst the endings *-ceras*, *-dendron*, *-nema*, *-phragma*, *-stigma* and *-stoma* are neuter. Classically, names ending in *-anthos*, *-anthus*, *-chilos*, *-chilus* or *cheilos* should be neuter, but they are treated as masculine by botanical usage. Also, names ending in *-gaster* should be feminine but are treated as masculine. Deliberately changed endings are shown by compounds ending in *-carpus* (masculine), *carpa* or *carpaea* (feminine) and *-carpon*, *-carpum* or *carpium* (neuter).

Generic names ending in *-oides* or *-odes* are treated as feminine, regardless of the gender originally assigned to them.

Arbitrarily formed generic names, vernacular names or adjectives used as generic names, whose gender is not apparent, take the gender assigned to them by their authors or by the first author to do so.

Examples: *Taonabo* Aubl. (Vernacular name) made feminine by Aublet. *Agati* Adans. (vernacular name) with no apparent gender, was made feminine by Desvieux who was the first subsequent author to adopt the name. *Cordyceps* Link (adjective) was made masculine by Link by assigning to the genus species such as *C. capitatus* with normal masculine endings."

Comments Rapporteur

It would be much better to keep these provisions as recommendations. To have them as an Article would mean that they would have to be followed in all cases, whereas in matters like this it is useful to have very flexible provisions, especially with regard to past usage.

APPENDICES

(H. 1-5) Appendix I

Names of Hybrids and some special Categories

Article H. 1

Prop. A (48 — Rowley, Taxon 7: 155)

After "Where binary "specific" names . . are used . . all offspring of crosses between individuals of the same parent species receive the same binary name." Add: "An exception is made in the case of amphidiploids behaving as species, which bear a separate epithet without the × sign and are subject to the same rules as wild species.

Example: *Rosa × jacksonii* Willm. = *R. rugosa* Thunb. × *wichuraiana* Crép., covering all diploid progeny such as 'Lady Duncan' and 'Max Graf', but *R. kordesii* Wulff = *R. rugosa* Thunb. × *wichuraiana* Crép., a fertile amphidiploid species."

Prop. B (300 — Morton, Taxon 8: 15)

Delete the *Potentilla tormentillo-formosa* example.

Prop. C (131 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 255)

The first sentence of paragraph 2 to read: "The formula consists of the names of the specific epithets of the two parents in alphabetical order connected by the multiplication sign."

Prop. D (132 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 255)

(Idem). The *Salix* example to read: "*Salix × capreola* = (*Salix aurita × caprea*).

Prop. E (133 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 255)

Note 2, the second example to read: "The designation *Potentilla tormentillo-formosa* published by Maund is considered as a formula *Potentilla formosa — Tormentilla reptans*."

Article H. 2

Prop. A (134 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 255)

The second sentence to read: "In the formula the order of the names or epithets and the use should follow the procedure set down in Art. H. 1."

Article H. 3

Prop. A (301 — Morton, Taxon 8: 15)

Delete the example × *Asplenosorus* and insert × *Asplenophyllitis* (*Asplenium × Phyllites*).

Recommendation H. 5A

Prop. A (135 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 255)

Delete: "or the symbol \mathcal{C} "

Comments Rapporteur

All proposals on this Appendix should be referred to the Committee for Cultivated Plants.

Appendix II

(PB. 1-6) Appendix II

Special provisions concerning fossil plants

Comments Rapporteur

All proposals should be referred to the Palaeobotanical Committee. All palaeobotanists are invited to vote on these proposals, whereas others are requested to refrain from voting (or to vote "Special Committee") in the preliminary vote.

Prop. A (139 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 255)

To insert in parentheses between the titles "Special provisions concerning fossil plants" and "1. General Principles": "(See also Preamble, par. 7; Art. 7, Note 5; Rec. 8D; Art. 13j; Art. 36, par. 1; Art. 58; App. IV, 6. and 7.)".

Prop. B. (140 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 255)

Proposal for a rearrangement of Arts. PB. 1 — PB. 6: (Former Article-number first) PB. 2 = PB. 1; PB. 1 = PB. 2 (amended in accordance with prop. 141); PB. 3 = PB. 3; PB. 6 = PB. 4; Art. 36, par. 1 = PB. 5 (amended in accordance with prop. 142); PB. 4 = PB. 6; PB. 5 = PB. 7 (amended in accordance with prop. 143); Rec. PB. 6A — PB. 6F = PB. 7A — PB. 7F.

Prop. C (212 — van der Hammen, Taxon 7: 274)

1. Both pure natural and pure artificial systematic nomenclature may be used in palynology. A species of which the natural position is known (fossil, subfossil or recent), has also its place in the artificial system. Age cannot be a classification-criterion.

2. The nature of an artificial classification-system (the lack of the criterion of natural relationship), implies the need to establish definite classification-criteria. The type-method alone is insufficient.

3. Morphological differences which represent classification-criteria are, in the order of their importance:

1st order: "Pollen-types" (principally number, shape and position of apertures, number of grains united, presence of air-sacs).

2nd order: "Sculpture type".

(3rd order: Exine structure).

(4th order: Shape).

In pollen grains showing various types of sculpture-elements, the dominant positive elements will decide.

In special cases, exceptions may be made on this rule.

4. Genera and subgenera will be based on types, but in the formation of the generic etc. names, and in the establishment of generic, etc., characteristics, general lines, established by the Congress, will have to be followed.

(PB. 1-2) 1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Article PB. 1

Prop. A (52 — Arnold, Taxon 7: 156)

Replace the first three paragraphs by: "Since the names of fossil plants are usually applied to detached parts of which the connections to other parts can seldom be demonstrated, it has been customary to name *organ genera* and *form genera* when the use of natural or biological genera is not feasible.

An *organ genus* is created for detached parts (or attached parts if they are considered independently) of the same morphological rank that are obviously related and of which affinity with some natural group is known.

A *form genus* is created for plant parts that are grouped together because of similarity in form or structure but without consideration of affinities either among themselves or with some natural group."

Prop. B (104 — Tate Ames et al., Taxon 7: 227)

Paragraph one to read as follows: "Since the names of taxa of fossil plants are usually based on specimens of detached organs and the connections between these organs can only rarely be proved, organ-genera (organo-genera) and form-genera (forma-genera) are distinguished as taxa within which organ-species are recognized."

Add a Note 3 reading as follows: "The term form-genera has been employed both in a morphological and in a nomenclatorial sense. Only the names of form-genera for which types are designated have priority.

Example: *Triletes* was used by Reinsch in 1881 to designate trilete microfossils. No genotype was given nor a species mentioned. Later authors such as Zerndt combined specific epithets with *Triletes*, (e.g. *T. glabratus* Zerndt, 1930), without designating a genotype, the genus still being used in a morphological sense. In 1936 Schopf designated a genotype for *Triletes* (*T. reinschi* Ibrahim, 1932). With the designation of this type the protection of the priority of the form-genus *Triletes* was begun in 1936."

Prop. C (141 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 157)

The first sentence, to read: "Since species, and consequently many of the higher taxa of fossil plants are usually based on specimens of detached organs"

Article PB. 2

Prop. A (55 — Arnold, Taxon 7: 157)

To be added: "except for the special provision in Art. PB. 7".

Prop. B (118 — Funkhouser, Taxon 7: 232)

To read: "All Articles of this Code apply to the nomenclature of fossil plants, including organ-genera and form-genera, unless specific exceptions are stated."

(PB. 3-6) 2. CONDITIONS AND DATES OF VALID PUBLICATION OF NAMES

Article PB. 3

Prop. A (99 — Cross et al., Taxon 7: 226)

Add the following sentence: "From 1 Jan. 1960 this description of the new taxon must indicate its difference from other taxa of equal rank that are morphologically similar to it."

Prop. B (105 — Tate Ames et al., Taxon 7: 228)

To read: "In order to be validly published a name of a new taxon of fossil plants above the rank of genus published on or after 1 Jan. 1912 must be accompanied by a description or by a reference to a previous and effectively published description of it.

From 1 Jan. 1953 the name of a genus is not validly published unless it is accompanied by a description of the taxon or by a reference to a previously and effectively published description of it.

Appendix II

In order to be validly published a name of a new species or organ-species of fossil plants must be accompanied by a description and an illustration. From 1 Jan. 1960 a new species must be additionally accompanied by a differential diagnosis and a definite designation of the type."

Prop. C (112 — Traverse, Taxon 7: 230)

Delete the Article.

New Recommendation PB. 4A

Prop. A (53 — Arnold, Taxon 7: 156)

"The whole specimen or specimens used in formulating the diagnosis of a new taxon should be considered the type or types. If type specimens are cut into pieces (sections of fossil woods, pieces of coal ball plants, etc.) that are distributed among several institutions, those portions or sections that were originally used when the taxon was described should be clearly marked with an identifying label or other suitable designation."

Article PB. 5

Prop. A (143 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 256)

The first sentence to read: "When diagnostic characters are altered or circumscription changed in taxa of fossil plants of specific or lower rank, the type"

Recommendation PB. 6A

Prop. A (106 — Tate Ames, Taxon 7: 228)

Add the following paragraph: "An author establishing an organ-species within an extant genus or transferring an organ-species to an extant genus should indicate the morphological category to which the species belongs, e.g. *Pinus peuceformis* Zaklinskaja (1957) (pollen)."

Prop. B (113 — Traverse, Taxon 7: 230)

Delete the Recommendation.

Prop. C (144 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 256)

To insert as first sentence: "An author describing a new genus of fossil plants should indicate whether it is a genus, organ-genus or form-genus.

An author describing organ-genera established.
It is desirable *theca*, etc.)."

Recommendation PB. 6B

Prop. A (107 — Tate Ames et al., Taxon 7: 229)

Delete the Recommendation.

Recommendation PB. 6D

Prop. A (114 — Traverse, Taxon 7: 230)

Delete the Recommendation.

Recommendation PB. 6F

Prop. A (108 — Tate Ames, Taxon 7: 229)

Delete the last clause ("or to specimens").

Prop. B (115 — Traverse, Taxon 7: 230)

Delete the Recommendation.

New Article PB. 7

Prop. A (54 — Arnold, Taxon 7: 157)

“Generic names of fossil plants that were constructed upon the names of genera or higher taxa of living plants (*Sequoioxylon*, *Archaeopodocarpus*, *Ginkgoites*) and which were originally proposed because of supposed affinities with or resemblances to living taxa may be rejected if it becomes evident that they were based on erroneous interpretations of affinity or likeness. Such names, however, may be legitimately retained for material to which the names were subsequently applied if new types are designated. In this case the effective date of publication of such a genus would be the date of designation of the new type.”

Prop. B (116 — Boureau, Taxon 7: 230)

“Un nom de genre de bois fossile rappelant, en première approximation, un groupe linnéen précis à l'exclusion de tout autre, reste valable tant que se trouve maintenue la signification botanique rappelée. A ce nom de genre doit être substitué tout autre nom qui rappellerait des affinités plus exactes, par rapport aux espèces vivantes connues.”

New Recommendation PB. 7A

Prop. A (55 — Arnold, Taxon 7: 157)

“It is urgently recommended that this provision be used with great caution and only when direct comparisons between the fossil material and material of the living members can be made. Furthermore, when a validly published and prior name is rejected under the conditions stated above, all characters wherein the fossil differs from the misapplied living taxon should be clearly set forth. Likewise, if the newly proposed name is based upon some living taxon it is urged that the resemblances between the fossil and the living form be given in as much detail as possible.”

New Article PB. 8

Prop. A (56 — Arnold, Taxon 7: 157)

“When two or more organs of different morphological rank are found connected, or when connection is obvious through similar epidermal or other structures, it is permissible to:

- (a) propose a new *combination genus*, or
 - (b) use one of the two or more existing organ genus names for the combination.
- However, if the combination consists of an organ and a form genus, the name of the organ genus takes precedence.”

New Recommendation PB. 8A

Prop. A (57 — Arnold, Taxon 7: 157)

“New combination genera should be proposed only when no other suitable name exists or when enough of the organs of the plant are brought together to give a previously unrevealed concept of the habit or appearance of the plant. The mere discovery of a specimen of a validly named stem with leaves attached would not constitute grounds for a new combination genus unless the newly discovered attached leaves are very different from those commonly observed as borne by that particular stem.

In selecting one of the organ genera for a combination it is recommended that:

1. For compressed fernlike foliage bearing fructifications the name that has been applied to the fructification be used.
2. In genera based mainly upon stems and branches, as in most of the Lycopsidea,

Appendix II

Sphenopsida, Coenopteridales, Pteridospermopsida, Cycadopsida, and Coniferopsida, that those names legitimately applied to these organs be applied. In case of detached inflorescences of these groups, the names of the organs having the highest degree of complexity take precedence. Example: *Lepidostrobos* would take precedence over *Lepidophyllum*, *Cordaianthus* over *Cardiocarpon*, etc., for any of these found in connection. If seeds (*Pachytesta*, *Trigonocarpus*) are found attached to foliage generally assigned to form genera (*Alethopteris*, *Neuropteris*) a combination genus would be in order in most instances if the stem to which they belong is not known. The name of the "seed genus" would not always be appropriate because it is often determined by the type of preservation.

3. For remains of Angiospermopsida that part should be selected which best expresses the affinities of the combination.

4. For other groups or under special circumstances, whatever course of action is most appropriate."

New Article PB. 9

Prop. A (100 — Cross et al., Taxon 7: 226)

"From 1 Jan. 1960, for the name of a genus of fossil plants to be validly published, the description of the genus must be expressed in morphological terms and must not depend on mere citation of affinity or similarity to other taxa."

New Article PB. 10

Prop. A (313 — Potonié, Taxon 8: 19)

If organ genera or form genera based on detached organs are referred to genera based on groups of organs connected together the name of *that* group of organs which contains the organs on which the other name is based must be adopted, even if published later. For example, names of spora dispersae may be replaced by those of sporangia, these by names of sporophylls, these by names of fertile shoots. This is only allowed, after it has been absolutely proved that the spore shape etc. in question only occurs in one genus.

Note

The 'Comments Rapporteur' are given above immediately following the title of this Appendix (p. 74).

Appendix III

Nomina conservanda et rejicienda

Prop. A (22 — DeWolf, Taxon 5: 52)

The Congress is asked to authorize the Nomenclature Committees to conserve names of subfamilies and tribes, if necessary.

Prop. B (22 — DeWolf, Taxon 5: 52)

Nomina conservanda proposita *Nomina rejicienda proposita*

Subfamilial Names

Monandroideae Kunth, Handb. Bot. 291. 1831. *Cyripedoideae* Lindley, Orch. Scel. 7. 1826
Diandroideae Kunth, Handb. Bot. 292. 1831. ['-ieae', Lindl.]

Tribal Names

Ophrydeae Lindley, Orch. Scel. 7. 1826.

Neottieae Lindley, Orch. Scel. 7. 1826, emend.

Bentham in Bentham and Hooker f., Gen. *Granulosae* Blume, Bijdr. 1: 402. 1825.
Pl. 3(2): 480. 1883. *Pulvereae* Blume, Bijdr. 1: 417. 1825.

Prop. C (General Committee — Taxon 4: 118)

The Congress is asked to endorse the approval by the General Committee of the *nomina generica conservanda* referred to in the report of the General Committee published in Taxon 4: 118. 1955 for *Algae* (see Taxon 3: 234. 1954), for *Lichenes* (see Taxon 3: 235-238. 1954, names printed in bold face type), and for *Phanerogamae* (see Taxon 3: 240-243. 1954 the nos 982, 1553, 2908, 5621, 7097, 7393, 9439 and 9581 p.).

Prop. D (General Committee — to be published in Taxon vol. 8)

The General Committee will study the reports of the Nomenclature Committees that have been or will be printed in Taxon before the Congress (e.g. the report by the Committee on Spermatophyta, Taxon 7: 184. 1958). The report by the General Committee on these committee reports together with its recommendation to the Congress will be published in the "Preliminary Opinions" to be issued shortly before the Congress.

Prop. E (Bullock — to be published in Taxon vol. 8)

It is proposed to conserve as a whole a selected list of family names in Phanerogams based on the *Indicis Nominum Familiarum Angiospermarum Prodrromus* (Taxon 7: 1, 159. 1958). For technical reasons it was impossible to print this list before this Synopsis of Proposals.

Prop. F (Rickett and Stafleu — to be published in Regnum Vegetabile, Spring 1959)

It is proposed to replace the current list of *nomina generica conservanda et rejicienda* in Phanerogams by a revised list to be published in *Regnum Vegetabile*, Spring 1959. For technical reasons it was impossible to publish this revised list before this Synopsis of Proposals.

Prop. G (255 — Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

Delete: "III. Chrysophyta".

Prop. H (256 — Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

On p. 211 complete the type paragraph for *Tuburcinia* (sub *Urocystis*).

Prop. I (257 — Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

On p. 213 rearrange: *Thamnolia*, *Thelopsis* (alph.).

Prop. K (258 — Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

On p. 251-252 insert *Tithymalus* as 4498 pp.

Prop. L (261 — Dostál, Taxon 7: 285)

It is proposed to include among the *nomina familiarum rejicienda*, the names listed on p. 285 and 286 of Taxon vol. 7.

Prop. M. (262 — Dostál, Taxon 7: 286)

It is proposed to include among the *nomina familiarum conservanda* the following names (full particulars are given in Taxon 7: 286-287): *Achraceae*, *Atzoaceae*, *Antidesmaceae*, *Citracae*, *Crypteroniaceae*, *Daucaceae*, *Dichapetalaceae*, *Fevilleaceae*, *Impatientaceae*, *Loniceraceae*, *Oenotheraceae*, *Opuntiaceae*, *Peripterygiaceae*, *Pirolaceae*, *Ribesaceae*, *Stellariaceae*, *Stemonaceae*, *Utriculariaceae*, *Viciaceae*.

Prop. N (138 — Schulze et Buchheim, Taxon 7: 255)

It is proposed that the nomenclature committees be authorized to conserve names of orders as provided for by Art. 14.

No.	Group	nom. cons. prop.	Taxon orig.	Taxon rep.	proposed by	note
(1)	Sp.	7662 <i>Arrabidaea</i> DC.	4: 43	4: 70	Sandwith	withdrawn
(2)	Sp.	7665 <i>Anemopaegma</i> Meisn.	4: 43		Sandwith	
(3)	Sp.	7679 <i>Phaedranthus</i> Miers	4: 43		Sandwith	withdrawn
(4)	Sp.	7732 <i>Tabebuia</i> DC.	4: 44	4: 70; 7: 191	Sandwith	accepted
(5)	Sp.	7741 <i>Dolichandrone</i> Seem.	4: 45	4: 70; 7: 191	Sandwith	withdrawn
(6)	Sp.	7761 <i>Kigelia</i> DC.	4: 46		Byles	rejected
(7)	Sp.	5408 <i>Malacocarpus</i> Dyck	4: 47	7: 190	Hara	accepted
(8)	Sp.	4667 <i>Euscaphis</i> Sieb. et Zucc.	4: 47	7: 190		rejected
(9)	Sp.	891 <i>Vriestia</i> Lindl.	4: 179		L. B. Smith	rejected
(10)	Sp.	7000 <i>Astrochlaena</i> Hallier	4: 198	7: 191	Meeuse	rejected
(11)	Sp.	34240 <i>Santaloides</i> Schellenb.	5: 57	7: 190	Hemsley & Bullock	accepted
(12)	Sp.	7990 <i>Stenandrium</i> Nees	5: 58	7: 191	Thieret	rejected
(13)	Sp.	3753 <i>Clianthus</i> Lindl.	5: 81		Bakhuizen & v. Steenis	
(14)	Sp.	5599 <i>Leptospermum</i> Forst.	5: 162	7: 191	McVaugh	accepted
(15)	Sp.	5557 <i>Myrteola</i> Berg.	5: 163	7: 191	McVaugh	accepted
(16)	Sp.	5583 <i>Syzygium</i> Gaert.	5: 164	7: 191	McVaugh	accepted
(17)	Sp.	<i>Samyda</i> Jacq.	5: 194	7: 191	Sleumer	accepted
(18)	Sp.	<i>Cuarea</i> L.	5: 194		Sleumer	
(19)	Sp.	5278 <i>Erythrospermum</i> Lam.	5: 197		Sleumer	
(20)	Sp.	6626 <i>Kopsia</i> Bl.	5: 197		Bullock	
(21)	Sp.	2428 <i>Anredera</i> Juss.	5: 198		Bakhuizen & v. Steenis	
(22)	Sp.	<i>Himantandra</i> Diels	5: 198		Buchheim & Smith	
(23)	Sp.	9712 <i>Heteropyxis</i> Harvey	6: 58		Bullock	
(24)	Sp.	3763 <i>Gueldenstaedtia</i> Fisch.	6: 59		Ali	
(25)	Al.	<i>Stilophora</i> J. Agardh	6: 144		Silva	
(26)	Al.	<i>Spermatochmus</i> Kuetz.	6: 144		Silva	
(27)	Al.	<i>Microcystis</i> Kuetz.	6: 148		Komarck	accepted
(28)	Sp.	<i>Bambusa</i> Retz.	6: 155	7: 189	McClure	
(29)	Sp.	417 <i>Phyllostachys</i> S. & Z.	6: 156		McClure	
(30)	Sp.	2066 <i>Stenocarpus</i> R. Br.	6: 198		St. John	
(31)	Sp.	4303 <i>Breynia</i> Forst.	6: 198		St. John	
(32)	Sp.	3657 <i>Lotononis</i> Eckl. & Zeyh.	6: 233		Gillet & Bullock	

Prop. O (Nomina generica conservanda proposita) (continued)

No.	Group	nom. cons. prop.	Taxon orig.	Taxon rep.	proposed by	note
(33)	Sp.	4606	<i>Juliania</i> Schlecht.	6: 234	Wilson & Bullock	
(34)	Sp.	7012	<i>Cobaea</i> Cav.	6: 235	Wilson & Bullock	
(35)	Sp.	639	<i>Veitchia</i> Wendl.	7: 83	Moore	
(36)	Sp.	7631	<i>Castilleja</i> L. f.	7: 83	Thieret	
(37)	Al.		<i>Botryocladia</i> Kylin	7: 107	Papenfuss	
(38)	He.		<i>Conocephalum</i> Wiggers	7: 129	Proskauer	
(39)	Sp.	3830	<i>Hymenolobium</i> Benth.	7: 141	Cowan	
(40)	Sp.		<i>Agalinis</i> Raf.	7: 142	Thieret	
(41)	Sp.		<i>Bartisia</i> L.	7: 143	Faegri	
(42)	Sp.	3424	<i>Rourea</i> Aubl.	7: 143	Leenhouts	
(43)	Sp.	9343	<i>Allardia</i> Endl.	7: 233	Abidin	
(44)	Sp.	8428	<i>Gaertnera</i> Lam.	7: 233, 8: 30	Petit, Bakhuizen, Abeywickrama, v. Steenis	
(45)	Fos.		<i>Cordaitanthus</i> Grand'Eury	7: 234	Arnold	
(46)	Fos.		<i>Cladophlebis</i> Seward	7: 234	Lowther	
(47)	Fos.		<i>Asterocladumites</i> Schimp.	7: 235, 8: 30	Zimmermann	
(48)	Fos.		<i>Lyginopteris</i> Poton.	7: 236	Zimmermann	
(49)	Sp.	6914	<i>Dregea</i> E. Meyer	8: 23	Bullock	
(50)	Sp.	5331	<i>Idesia</i> Maxim.	8: 24	Hara	
(51)	Al.		<i>Chlorococcum</i> Menegh.	8: 24	Silva & Starr	
(52)	Al.		<i>Haematococcus</i> Flotow	8: 25	Droop	
(53)	Fu.		<i>Venturia</i> Sacc.	8: 25	Korf	
(54)	Sp.	4648a	<i>Rhacomia</i> L.	8: 25	Little	
(55)	Sp.	5215	<i>Hopea</i> Roxb.	8: 26	Little	
(56)	Sp.	8364	<i>Laugeria</i> Vahl	8: 27	Little	
(57)	Sp.		<i>Gerardia</i> Benth.	8: 28	Morton	
(58)	Pt.		<i>Sphenomeris</i> Maxon	8: 29	Morton	
(59)	Sp.	3899	<i>Moghania</i> J. St. Hil.	8: 29	Abeywickrama	
(60)	Sp.	4464	<i>Gelonium</i> Roxb.	8: 29	Abeywickrama	
(61)	Sp.		<i>Erneastemon</i> Exell	8: 30	Wild	

Appendix IV

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A is not recommended for acceptance. The need to conserve subfamilial and tribal names is certainly not obvious and it would be inadvisable to burden the Nomenclature Committee with such proposals.

Proposal B is therefore not recommended for acceptance.

Proposals C and *D* are routine proposals for which no preliminary vote is necessary.

Proposal E. The preliminary vote on this proposal should be one of principle: shall we or shall we not conserve family names. The necessity to conserve these names for Phanerogams has become apparent. For Cryptogams this is not the case but this does not necessarily mean that such conservation would be undesirable in principle. It is therefore recommended that this proposal be accepted in principle: a vote "yes" in the preliminary vote will mean that the nomenclature committees will be authorized to study proposals for the conservation of family names. If this proposal is accepted, this would mean that the list compiled by Mr Bullock will be referred to the Committee for Spermatophyta.

Proposal F should be referred to the Committee for Spermatophyta.

Proposal G should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal H should be referred to the Committee for Fungi.

Proposal I and *K* should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal L and *M* should be referred to the Committee for Spermatophyta.

Proposal N is recommended for adoption for reasons similar to those given under proposal *E*.

Proposal O should be referred to the Nomenclature Committees concerned.

Appendix IV

Determination of Types

Prop. A (9 — St. John, Taxon 6: 198)

In the last line of paragraph 4c *for:* species; *read:* species or infraspecific taxa.

Prop. B (316 — Mansfeld et Schulze, Taxon 8: 21)

In paragraph 4(d), delete the closing words "unless another element agrees better with the original description and (or) figure".

Comments Rapporteur

Proposal A is recommended for acceptance; it is a useful addition.

Proposal B is dealt with in the Report of the Committee for Stabilization.

Arrangement of the Code, Contents, etc.

Prop. A (271 — Silva, Taxon 8: 7)

I should like to propose that the Editorial Committee be authorized to rearrange the various parts of the Code, incorporating changes approved at Montreal, so as to present in orderly manner the principles, rules, and recommendation governing (i) the establishment of a system of taxonomic categories, (ii) the formulation of names for particular categories, (iii) the publication of names, (iv) the application of names, and (v) the selection of correct names, in this sequence.

Prop. B (201 — Bullock, Taxon 7: 270)

It is proposed that the *Contents* be placed at the beginning.

Prop. C (243 — Dostál, Taxon 7: 283)

It is proposed to introduce a consistent uniformity of typographical arrangement of the text, as for example:

a) To print the names of taxa in italics, but on p. 17 the names of publications are printed in italics and the names of taxa in capitals. The same holds for Recommendation 50H, where the names are printed in capitals and the synonyms in italics. Nomina generica conservanda (App. III) are printed in half bold-faced type, which is correct for clearness' sake.

b) In some citations of botanical works the year of publication is printed in parentheses, and in others not (e.g. p. 303, para. (9)). Similarly with citations of complete names of publications, e.g. p. 31, Article 39, Example, and Article 34, Example.

c) Volumes or parts of works are cited either in parentheses (p. 303, last line at bottom of p.) or by a superscript figure (p. 304, 9th line from top) according to App. V, para. (6), but there should be uniformity in the book.

d) Parts of publications are mostly printed in half bold-faced type, but not so on p. 7.

Comments Rapporteur

The proposals should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

ADDENDA

The following proposals were received after 1 November 1958. — On a reçu les propositions suivantes après le 1er novembre 1958.

* * *

Propositions présentées par la Société Mycologique de France.

318. — *Nomina Specifica Conservanda*

La proposition sera présentée par Dr. J. S. L. Gilmour de Cambridge, au nom du "Special Committee on Stabilization".

319. — *Nouvelle Recommandation 52A, (prop. A)*

"Quand un genre est divisé en plusieurs genres, il serait bon d'adopter pour les termes génériques ainsi créés le même genre grammatical latin que celui de la coupure générique traditionnelle.

Exemple: *Boletus: Xerocomus, Boletellus* etc. ..."

Cette proposition est une reprise de la Nouvelle Recommandation 62A de l'Article 63 (v. *Recueil Synoptique*, Paris 1955, p. 78).

Observations du Rapporteur

Dans le Recueil Synoptique de Paris, p. 78, 1954, le rapporteur approuvait cette proposition. Dans le vote préliminaire, la proposition était recommandée mais la Section de Nomenclature, à Paris, a réjeté la proposition (v. Taxon 4: 157).

Addenda

320. — Article nouveau

“A partir du 1er janvier 1960, en Mycologie, les *combinaisons nouvelles* ne seront plus suivies du nom de leur auteur”.

Cette proposition est destinée à réagir contre l’abus des *combinaisons nouvelles* faites hâtivement sans: “une connaissance plus approfondie des caractères taxonomiques” et pour des motifs d’où les considérations personnelles ne sont pas toujours absentes. Une telle pratique aboutit à la création de noms inutiles, ce qui est contraire à l’esprit même du code de Nomenclature (v. Préambule).

Observations du Rapporteur

Le rapporteur désapprouve cette proposition. On cite des noms d’auteurs “pour indiquer avec précision le nom d’un taxon et permettre de mieux vérifier la date de sa publication” (Art. 46).

Cette citation est purement bibliographique et ne sert pas nécessairement à glorifier les auteurs (dans bien des cas il est évident qu’il s’agit du contraire!). Il serait inadmissible d’adopter une telle exception pour la mycologie, car les problèmes y sont les mêmes qu’en phanérogamie etc.

* * *

Proposal by S. J. Hughes (Ottawa).

321. — Article 13

To paragraph ‘e’ add ‘Hyphomycetes’ so that the paragraph will read as follows:

‘e. Fungi: Uredinales, Ustilaginales, Gasteromycetes, and Hyphomycetes, 31 Dec. 1801 (Persoon, Synopsis Methodica Fungorum)’.

Comments Rapporteur

All mycologists are asked to vote on this proposal in the preliminary vote. Others are requested to abstain.