

IX INTERNATIONAL BOTANICAL CONGRESS
NOMENCLATURE SECTION

Regnum Vegetabile vol. 20

IX INTERNATIONAL BOTANICAL CONGRESS
NOMENCLATURE SECTION

REPORT PRESENTED
BY THE
BUREAU OF NOMENCLATURE

Reprinted from
Volume III of the *Proceedings of the IX International Botanical Congress*, Montreal
1959. Distributed by the International Association for Plant Taxonomy. Utrecht,
Netherlands

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS, 1960

***Regnum Vegetabile* vol. 20**

Toronto, December 1960

Regnum Vegetabile, a series of publications for the use of Plant Taxonomists and Plant Geographers, is published by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, Utrecht, Netherlands.

Nomenclature Section

BUREAU OF NOMENCLATURE

President: J. ROUSSEAU

Vice-presidents: H. MELCHIOR, A. PONCE DE LEON
Y. PROKHANOV, W. ROBYNS, R. C. ROLLINS, R. ROSS

Canadian Secretary: B. BOIVIN

Rapporteur-général: J. LANJOUW

Vice-rapporteur: F. A. STAFLEU

FIRST SESSION

Sunday, 16 August 1959, 10:00 A.M. — 11:00 A.M.

(Chairman: J. ROUSSEAU)

J. ROUSSEAU:

A l'ouverture de ce congrès, je suis particulièrement heureux d'accueillir au Canada et à Montréal, pendant que la chose m'est encore possible, les spécialistes les plus réputés de la taxonomie végétale et de la nomenclature botanique. Il y a cinq ans nous nous trouvions sur les bords enchanteurs de la Seine. On m'avait invité alors à présider les séances.

Again this time, I am the chairman of the section, but this is not a habit I am starting. I fill this position for the last time.

We are gathered from different countries to study our problems from an international angle, not a national one, nor a personal one.

Beim Anfang dieser Sammlung möchte ich alle Botaniker mit einigen Worten in Ihrer eigenen Sprache herzlich willkommen heissen. Unser Kongress ist international und alle Sprachen sind offiziell hier, aber leider ist es mir nicht möglich soviele Sprachen zu sprechen.

Me gusta mucho de saludar nuestros amigos del Sur. Algunos vienen de la atmósfera clara de los países tropicales. Aquí tenemos también el calor tropical para acomodarles.

Since we are in an international congress, all languages are allowed, but we might recognize that some members are also allowed not to understand all languages. The two languages more easily understood by the majority of the botanists here are English and French. There will be no systematic translation except in the rare cases where it is absolutely necessary and then we shall rely on the good and spontaneous co-operation of some of our colleagues.

Among the different problems that we shall discuss, there are some about which we shall not be unanimous. This is normal. This is human. But I am convinced that everybody will accept the decision taken by the majority. The Code is the work of a collectivity and unfortunately it so happens that taxonomists are often individualistic. It would certainly be better if each of us, individually, were

writing the Code. There would be more unity; but such a solution is impossible. There are many parts of the Code with which I personally disagree, but since these sections are the expression of the opinion of the majority, I consider that I have to be adamant to defend them.

There was a time when a disagreement in nomenclature looked as important as a world calamity. Now we look at these problems with more serenity. Today, we are here to amend the Code. The Code, like life, is not perennial. It is subject to evolution, to progress. Nevertheless we should not change it completely at every congress.

I would not like to start the discussions on the amendments to the Code before expressing my most sincere thanks to the Utrecht team which has done the bulk of the work. This team has given to the study of our problems and to the organization of this session of nomenclature more time and more thought than all the other taxonomists of the world together.

We should also remember the important collaboration of the International Union of Biological Sciences. Without this international organization, our financial problems would not easily be solved.

In a period of five years, between two congresses, many sad events happen. It was only a short time after the Paris congress, that our French secretary, M. Pichon, who had been of such great help at Paris, died. Nos collègues français peuvent être assurés que nous tous avons été profondément émus par ce décès prématuré. Pichon was followed by other botanists who were very active workers in the field of nomenclature. These members of our group were Dr. Elmer Drew Merrill, Prof. B.P.G. Hochreutiner, and Dr. Thomas Sprague. To all of them, botanical nomenclature owes much. Since Mrs. Sprague was a very active figure in our circles, I suggest that we send her a telegram expressing our sympathy. [Applause.]

I do not at all intend to run the meeting—this is your collective function—but I have to help to co-ordinate our common efforts. Consequently, I have to supply some information and to suggest, occasionally and mildly, some rulings.

1) *Proposals that were sent in too late* (that is after the closing date of September 1, 1958)

A closing date was necessary because the proposals had to be printed and distributed in advance, but since the Utrecht people have very good hearts, they moved this date to December 1958. In this way no delays in the mail would be responsible for proposals not being printed. The proposals which came too late, that is after December 1958, are not valid. This is my first and, I hope, my last ruling. Nevertheless their authors or other botanists can present these proposals again from the floor in due time. This is an assembly with unlimited power in its field. Each member can make any proposal to amend the Code even if this was not previously submitted.

2) *Power of the Editorial Committee*

It will be necessary to refer matters to the Editorial Committee and for this reason we have to define the powers of this Committee at this moment. As a basis for the discussion on this point, we might refer to the ruling adopted at Stockholm and used again at Paris. This ruling was:

i) That the Editorial Committee be empowered:

1. To change, if necessary, the wording of any article, and to avoid duplication.
2. To add or remove examples.
3. To place articles and chapters of the Rules in the most convenient places.
4. To place all or part of the recommendations as notes under the proper articles if necessary.
5. And, in general, to make any editorial modification not affecting the meanings of the provisions concerned.

ii) All the delegates are invited to submit their recommendations concerning editorial aspects, and to send them in writing to the committee before January 1, 1960.

MR. GILMOUR proposed the adoption of the same regulations as in Paris. This motion was seconded by DR. REEDER.

DR. ROUSSEAU called for a vote on the motion with the date of January 1, 1960. The motion was *carried* unanimously.

DR. FOSBERG suggested that the Editorial Committee be instructed never to insert something which it supposes to be the "sense" of the congress, but to adhere to the definite decisions.

DR. ROUSSEAU answered that it was very difficult never to make any mistakes. It may have happened that the Editorial Committee did insert a certain "sense" rather than a decision, but then perhaps the decision was not very clear and the Committee did its best to interpret it.

3) *Technique of voting*

For the final vote on the proposals we shall, in general, take a vote by show of cards. If, after the count, somebody requests a formal vote by ballot, this will be ordered.

In former Congresses we used to reject automatically proposals which, in the preliminary vote, had only received less than one-third of the votes. We know by experience that the preliminary vote is not final. After discussion, we all have the right to change our minds and I hope that in these discussions, for instance on *nomina specifica conservanda*, everyone will change his mind at least three or four times during the discussion. It is the opinion of our Rapporteur and also of myself that the preliminary vote should be used only as an indication, but that it should never be taken as a final decision. We shall vote on each separate proposal.

At Paris, we needed a majority of two-thirds of the votes for a proposal to be accepted. At Stockholm it was just a vote by simple majority. In provision 4 of Division III of the Code, there is no authorization for anything other than a final vote by simple majority. Unless it is the unanimous wish of this Section, for we should have to modify the Code, I rule that all our decisions will be by simple majority. [Dr. Rousseau then asked whether this ruling was *accepted*: unanimous approval.]

4) *Nominations Committee*

This is a Committee that will have to report at the end of the Sessions. It is customary in Canadian scientific organizations like the Royal Society that the chairman, at the beginning, suggests names for this Committee. I suggest:

Dr. M. Fulford, Mr. J. S. L. Gilmour, Madame M. LeGal, Dr. H. Melchior, Dr. G. F. Papenfuss, Dr. W. Robyns, Dr. B. Schischkin [NOTE: it became known later that Dr. Schischkin could not attend the Congress because of ill-health], and Dr. J. M. Schopf. Chairman, Dr. A. C. Smith; Secretary, Dr. F. A. Stafleu.

DR. ROLLINS moved the nomination of these candidates (seconded by Dr. Cowan); this motion was *carried* unanimously.

The Chairman then described in some detail the procedure to be followed and requested the various Nomenclature Committees to present their reports on Wednesday. He called for meetings of these committees immediately after the closure of this session.

DR. STAFLEU gave a list of the questions that still had to be studied by the various committees.

The meeting was adjourned until 2:30 P.M.

SECOND SESSION

Sunday, 16 August, 2:30 P.M.—5:30 P.M.

(Chairman: J. ROUSSEAU)

DR. ROUSSEAU explained that the first task now was to adopt or reject the Paris Code as printed, because this Code would be the basis of our discussions.

DR. STEVENSON moved the adoption of the Code as printed.

DR. ROUSSEAU stated that from now on he would take it for granted that each motion from the floor was seconded automatically by the Rapporteur-général. He put the motion by Dr. Stevenson to the vote: it was *carried* unanimously.

DR. ROUSSEAU ruled that the discussions would begin with the proposals on the Appendices.

APPENDIX I

DR. ROUSSEAU stated that the Committee for Cultivated Plants [later "Committee for Hybrids"] would report on all proposals on this Appendix on Wednesday and suggested postponing the discussions until then.

APPENDIX II

DR. ROUSSEAU suggested that all proposals be referred to the Palaeobotanical Committee, to be reported upon on Wednesday. (Accepted.)

APPENDIX III

Prop. A. (17:161:2)

DR. GARDNER SHAW asked whether it was necessary to grant such permission since the Code provided for the possibility of conserving names of subfamilies and tribes.

DR. STAFLEU explained that this was indeed the case but that it was necessary to have the formal approval of the Section to have such lists in other ranks than genera. The Committees could then study such proposals and, if these were accepted by the General Committee, Art. 15 would apply. It would then still be necessary for the Section to give its final approval for the specified cases.

DR. FOSBERG wished to point out that this proposal implies much more than

the authorization of a list of conserved subfamilies and tribes, but gives the nomenclature committees authority to conserve names.

DR. STAFLEU explained that what was really meant was, of course, that the Nomenclature Committees would study the proposals and report on them to the General Committee which represents the Nomenclature Section between Congresses, as is also implied in Art. 15.

DR. ROUSSEAU put the proposal to the vote: it was rejected by a large majority.

DR. LANJOUW proposed that in due time there should be a discussion of a modification of Art. 14, consisting of the deletion of the words "and intermediate taxa". This would make proposals like Prop. A impossible in the future; it is hardly necessary to conserve names in those ranks.

Prop. B (3:162:6) Rejected because of the decision on Prop. A.

Prop. C and D

DR. ROUSSEAU explained that the Section should now endorse the approval by the General Committee of the lists of *nomina generica conservanda* published in Taxon (3: 234, 235-238, 220-243, 4: 118, as specified on p. 79 of the Synopsis and Taxon 7: 184-193 and 8: 140, the numbers 424, 899, 951, 952, 1024, 1166, 1189, 1208, 1533, 3424a, 4111, 4667, 5517, 5583, Samyda, 5599, 6626, 7380, 7741, 7887, 7990, 2261, 3553). These reports were put to the vote and *accepted* unanimously.

Prop. E

DR. STAFLEU referred to the publication of Mr. Bullock's final list in Taxon vol. 8, pp. 154-181 and 189-205.

DR. PROSKAUER was of the opinion that to take up Appendix III Prop. E at this time was prejudicial to discussion of matters dealing with families in the main body of the Code.

DR. LANJOUW pointed out that the principle of the conservation of family names was already included in Art. 14.

DRS. FOSBERG and SILVA asked for further information on the meaning of Prop. E.

DR. LANJOUW said that this list was to be considered as an actual proposal to carry into effect the relevant part of Art. 14. The list should now be studied by the Committee for Spermatophyta. We are now asked to approve the introduction of an actual list which will be drawn up on the basis of Mr. Bullock's list.

MR. BULLOCK explained the intention of his list of *nomina familiarum conservanda proposita* and pointed out that names proposed elsewhere could also be considered by the Committee for Spermatophyta. The proposal in effect was to state the desirability or otherwise of establishing such a list.

DR. LANJOUW explained further that the Committee for Spermatophyta would study this list as it studies other proposals. It would report to the General Committee in the usual way.

DR. ROUSSEAU then asked for a vote on the proposal by Mr. Bullock to have in principle a list as proposed by him (see Taxon 8: 154. 1959), the actual names to be studied further by the Committees. This proposal was *accepted* by a large majority (5 against).

Prop. F (12:4:136)

DR. STAFLEU explained that Dr. Rickett and he had gone over all cases of conservation of generic names inserted in the Code since the Vienna Congress. Since then many errors had crept in and the application of the rules of nomenclature had changed in several respects. The first instalment of this list was to be found in the August number of *Taxon* (8: 213-243. 1959). The Committee for Spermatophyta should be asked to study this list and to give the necessary instructions through the General Committee to the Editorial Committee before the publication of the new edition of the Code.

There are a number of cases of conservation that are superfluous and there are a certain number of reasons why it would be of advantage to keep these names in the list (duly marked) without mentioning any *nomina rejicienda*. Dr. Rickett and he suggested for reasons of convenience that these names be kept on the list.

DR. LANJOUW said that it would be a good thing if it was decided to instruct the Editorial Committee to print this revised list in the new edition of the Code instead of the old one upon approval by the Committee for Spermatophyta. The reprinting of the old list with its many mistakes would be most undesirable.

DR. FOSBERG asked whether the newly conserved names, accepted at this Congress, would be inserted.

DR. STAFLEU said that this would certainly be done.

DR. ROLLINS asked for further information on the changes that had actually been made and on the errors that had been discovered.

DR. RICKETT said that there were several categories of mistakes:

1. Simple mistakes in references, etc.
2. Mistakes in dates (names can often be ascribed to earlier publications).
3. Incorrect conservations because of subsequent changes in the rules. The adoption of the type method made it necessary to change many entries; a large part of the list had been compiled before this introduction.
4. The names of the type-species were often incorrect; many of them had to be changed because the list still adopted the combination which was legitimate under the Kew Rule.

DR. PAPENFUSS said that, as regards the list that Dr. Rickett and Dr. Stafleu are preparing, he could not see the need of retaining in the Code names of genera that are not in need of conservation.

DR. STAFLEU said that it would be safer to keep the names on the list because in this way future users of the name would be warned that the cases had been duly studied. If the names were removed, others, who did not know the history, would have to do all the work all over again.

DR. FOSBERG suggested that they could be eliminated from the Code since the cases had been duly dealt with in the publication of the revised list in *Taxon*.

DR. WHEELER said that it would be possible to publish the list in the Code but to accept changes or additions provisionally.

MR. STEARN said that superfluous names should be retained in the list of *nomina generica conservanda* with their status indicated. It will show that the work has been done. The results of bibliographical work are lost too easily and the retention of the names will cause no harm and save inconvenience.

DR. FAEGRI proposed that a certain period, e.g., six months after publication of the last instalment of Rickett and Stafleu's list, be allowed for individual

botanists to state their objections against any name on the list and the way in which it has been treated.

DR. ROUSSEAU said that this was the usual procedure which would certainly be adopted also in this case. The new Code would certainly not be ready before such a period has elapsed.

DR. ROLLINS would like to be sure that no names accepted by previous Congresses would be made "provisionally accepted" by any action to be taken here.

DR. LANJOUW said that this should certainly be avoided. We should not, however, reprint the list with all its old mistakes.

MR. ROSS said that the only difference between the present inaccurate list and Rickett & Stafleu's is that the latter is more correct editorially. Accordingly, the correct action would be to refer Rickett & Stafleu's list to the Committee for Spermatophyta, instructing them to report to the Editorial Committee.

DR. STAFLEU thought that some of the speakers were perhaps overestimating the importance of the changes, which were all editorial. The Committee for Spermatophyta will have to check whether these changes are indeed within editorial limits. Most changes were purely technical and it was the Committee for Spermatophyta which should give its fiat for printing, as suggested by Mr. Ross.

DR. FOSBERG stated that there was no practical difficulty here at all, because if a mistake was made this would at once be corrected by the next Congress.

DR. ROUSSEAU put the proposal to refer this to the *Committee for Spermatophyta* to the vote: it was *accepted* unanimously.

Prop. G (11:4:126) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*.

Prop. H (4:3:133) Referred to the *Committee for Fungi*.

Prop. I (7:3:144) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*.

Prop. K (3:3:145) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*.

Prop. L (1:35:112) and M (3:36:100): Referred to the *Committee for Spermatophyta*.

Prop. N (103:4 2)

DR. STAFLEU explained that the proposal should read: "... be authorized to study proposals to conserve names ...".

DR. PROSKAUER objected to considering this proposal at this time. Taking it up now was prejudicial to the discussion of the reports of the Nomenclature Committees on Wednesday. These committees would then report on the desirability of applying the rules of priority and typification to names of orders.

DR. ROUSSEAU ruled that the discussion on this proposal be postponed until Wednesday.

Prop. O (8:5:134)

DR. ROUSSEAU proposed that those names on this list that were not yet included in proposals C and D be referred to the various *nomenclature committees*. This was *accepted* unanimously.

APPENDIX IV

Prop. A. (171:4:14) *Accepted*.

Prop. B (28:67:42) *Postponed*.

ARRANGEMENT OF THE CODE

Prop. A (17:16:153)

DR. FOSBERG said that in his opinion this was more than permissive. It tended to instruct the Editorial Committee. On this basis he objected to this motion, as we had already rearranged the Code so much that it had become unfamiliar.

DR. LANJOUW pointed out that the Editorial Committee would be "authorized" not "instructed".

DR. LANGE proposed that the proposal be considered as already covered by the motion accepted in the previous session dealing with the power of the Editorial Committee. This proposal is superfluous and should be rejected.

DR. A. C. SMITH also thought the motion to be superfluous.

DR. SILVA pointed out that the Code, as now arranged, was difficult to follow. It was his intention to draw the attention of the Editorial Committee to this fact.

DR. LANJOUW thought that Dr. Silva's suggestions were certainly valuable. All suggestions made to the Editorial Committee were carefully studied. He again invited all concerned to send their remarks after the Congress to this Committee.

DR. SILVA said that he had allowed the discussion to proceed without clarifying the proposal in order to call attention to the need of putting the Code in a more logical order. He thought that this purpose had been accomplished, and was therefore quite willing to withdraw the proposal.

Prop. C (14:3:164) was now brought forward by Dr. Rousseau. This proposal was now superfluous because these remarks were also automatically passed on to the Editorial Committee. The matter was strictly editorial.

Prop. B. (39:3:141)

DR. ROUSSEAU said that this was strictly editorial.

DR. TRYON thought that it would indeed be convenient to have the contents at the beginning.

DR. LANJOUW would like to know the opinion of this group on this particular item.

MR. STEARN said that it was general practice to put the contents in the beginning.

DR. ROUSSEAU asked for a vote; a large majority was in favour of having the contents at the beginning, 1 was in favour of having them at the end.

PREAMBLE

Prop. A (10:17:183) Referred to the *Editorial Committee* (unanimous).

PRINCIPLE I

Prop. A (23:19:162)

MR. ROSS stated that this proposal would affect a much wider field than the Algae. The whole Section should vote on the proposal. In his view the Rapporteur's view should be accepted.

DR. DONK agreed with Mr. Ross. There is a group of Fungi, viz. the Myxomycetes which are referred by some to the Plant Kingdom, by others to the Animal Kingdom. One often ignores the position of the author describing new species of Myxomycetes.

DR. ROUSSEAU would like to settle this problem right away.

DR. FOSBERG was of the opinion that the present proposal dealt with something quite different from the original text, which was of prime importance for homonymy.

DR. LANJOUW suggested that Silva's proposal would not replace but simply complete the present Principle I.

DR. SILVA explained that in his work on the I.N.G. cards for algae he found it alarming to see how complicated the Code is. In many cases the intentions of previous Congresses were not at all clear from the texts. As Principle I now reads, the qualifying clause, "in the sense that the name of a plant must not be rejected merely because it is identical with the name of an animal", is objectionable because it implies that in all other respects botanical and zoological nomenclature are not independent (therefore dependent). If this clause were to be transferred to the body of the Code, for example as note 2 of Art. 64(2), dealing with homonymy, the residual statement would be innocuous, if not particularly informative. The wording proposed constitutes, as Dr. Fosberg mentioned, a new principle. It affects Art. 45, paragraph 3, which permits algae to be validly described without a Latin diagnosis provided they are originally treated as animals and subsequently transferred to the plant kingdom, and Art. 64(3), which for purposes of homonymy discriminates against names of taxa not originally treated as plants. Any discussion of the Latin requirement in algae should be in connection with Art. 34 rather than with the subterfuge in Art. 45. As for Art. 64(3), this needlessly complicates nomenclature by requiring the tracing of the taxonomic vicissitudes of all names likely to have been applied to groups treated as animals at some time during their history.

MR. ROSS thought that such an amendment to Art. 45 would cause a lot of extra bibliographical work. There are many organisms that are dealt with by some as animals and by others as plants under the same generic name. For questions of homonymy (e.g. if there was a later homonym in the flowering plants) it would depend on what position one took whether the name for the flowering plant was legitimate or not. Under the present rule, once an organism is transferred, its name would acquire status for purposes of homonymy.

DR. MARTIN pointed out that there was evidence from the discussion that there might be great difference of opinion on the question whether a certain organism was to be considered as a plant or as an animal. He merely wanted to suggest that he was definitely in favour of Silva's proposal, provided it was amended to read "... groups treated as plants".

DR. RUTH PATRICK proposed that Principle I read, "Botanical nomenclature is independent of zoological nomenclature. The Code applies equally to taxonomic groups of plants whether or not they were originally assigned to the plant kingdom." The statement "in the sense ..." should be placed under the article dealing with homonyms.

DR. FAEGRI thought that the proposal should be reworded to deal with *names*, not with taxonomic groups of *plants*. The expression *taxonomic groups* might possibly be changed to *taxa*. The Editorial Committee should reword the proposal in that sense.

DR. LANJOUW suggested the wording: "... names of taxonomic groups of plants".

DR. FOSBERG would agree with Dr. Patrick's suggestion as amended by Dr.

Faegri. The loophole in Art. 45 could be closed by deleting the parenthetical material. He would object to any modification of Art. 64(3) since to change that would cause much more confusion than it would alleviate.

Mr. Ross said that as far as this Principle was concerned he was quite in agreement with Dr. Patrick. We could now accept this amendment and postpone the discussion on Arts. 45 and 64 until we had reached it. However, if "in the sense . . ." were deleted from Principle I, a similar provision would have to be incorporated in Art. 64.

Dr. ROGERS explained that Myxomycetes have been repeatedly treated as animals, and repeatedly as fungi. Dr. Silva's proposals are necessary to avoid endless complications in the nomenclature of these and other fungi. It appears necessary, furthermore, to insert "treated as" before plants, since it is the author's treatment, rather than the fact of plant or animal nature, that is significant.

Dr. ROUSSEAU ruled that the vote would now be taken on the "Principle" which applies to all plants. Dr. Patrick's proposal, seconded by Dr. Silva (who thereby withdrew his original proposal) and amended by Dr. Faegri and Dr. Rogers, was now put to the vote and *accepted* unanimously.

Dr. ROUSSEAU then stated that it would be the duty of the Committee for Algae to submit a proposal incorporating in Art. 64 what had been deleted from Principle I.

PRINCIPLE III

Prop. A (43:153:6)

Mr. BULLOCK withdrew the printed proposal and substituted "the nomenclature of a taxonomic group is based upon priority of publication". He pointed out that the present wording is incorrect, but that his original proposal is equally incorrect.

Dr. LANJOUW expressed his approval of the new proposal.

Dr. SILVA asked and obtained permission to read his comments on Principles III and IV from Taxon vol. 8, p. 6.

Principle III is not only ambiguous, but its meaning, when finally ascertained, is seen to be encompassed by Principle IV. The phrase, "naming of taxonomic groups" ("Dénomination des groupes taxonomiques"), can be construed to mean the formulation of names, the application of names, or the selection of correct names. The first choice seems most appropriate, but this as well as the second choice results in a false statement: neither the formulation nor the application of names is based on priority of publication. The selection of correct names is based on priority, but this idea is clearly stated in Principle IV.

Dr. FAEGRI thought that Mr. Bullock's new proposal was certainly an improvement but that it did not give anything really new. Could not the Section discuss only those proposals with a real bearing on taxonomic practice?

Dr. LANGE was of the opinion that Principle III was superfluous. The argument should be dropped.

Dr. ROUSSEAU agreed with Dr. Silva that the idea could be incorporated in Principle IV.

Dr. LANJOUW did not think that Dr. Faegri was really in favour of deleting Principle III.

Dr. ROLLINS thought that it was very important that a statement like this be retained because it was concerned with one of the fundamental concepts of the Code. It should neither be withdrawn nor materially modified.

Dr. ROUSSEAU asked for the vote on Mr. Bullock's proposal as amended.

DR. PROSKAUER proposed that this be referred to the Editorial Committee.

MR. BULLOCK asked for a straight vote because his proposal was not purely editorial.

DR. ROUSSEAU put Dr. Proskauer's proposal to the vote: it was rejected by 28/30 votes. He concluded that it was not an editorial matter and took the vote on Mr. Bullock's proposal reading "the nomenclature of . . .". It was *accepted* (44 in favour, 13 against).

End of second session (5:30 P.M.)

THIRD SESSION

Monday, 17 August 1959, 9:00 A.M.-12:30 P.M.

PRINCIPLE IV

Proposal A (22:191:1)

Proposal B (10:202:2)

Proposal C (8:198:1)

DR. ROUSSEAU opened a simultaneous discussion on these three proposals.

DR. LANJOUW thought that the second proposal contained a definition of what is a correct name, a definition that belonged somewhere else in the Code. The third proposal might perhaps be used to modify the present text.

DR. A. C. SMITH made the following remarks: "The Editorial Committee, in carrying out the instructions of this Section at the 1954 Congress to revise the Code, deliberated for a long time in attempting to limit the Division of the Code entitled 'Principles' to the very minimum number of entities requisite with the really basic philosophy that guides us.

"You will recall that in the 1952 edition the first 21 or 22 Articles were defined as Principles. Thanks largely to the excellent logic and reasoning of our colleague Dr. Baehni, the Editorial Committee in 1955 decided that most of these 21 or 22 Principles actually were statements in the nature of introductory matter, and therefore they were incorporated into a Preamble, leaving only 6 major Principles which seem to be incontrovertible as the basic underlying philosophy of our Code. The remaining parts of the Code, the Articles and Recommendations, in effect are only explanations of the 6 basic Principles.

"Before adding 3 more Principles to this number, I feel that we should seriously question their necessity, or whether they are not actually explanatory material that can better be placed among the Articles. Of course the 1956 edition does not necessarily offer the last word in stating basic Principles, but please keep in mind your objective of reducing these Principles to the absolute minimum before you again permit their number to creep upward. There is a serious question in my mind whether or not the three statements suggested by Dr. Silva as new Principles, admirable as they are, compare in basic nature with the six already stated in the Code."

DR. SILVA thought that his first two proposals were rather to be considered as corrections of errors in the present Code.

Principle IV incorporates two fundamental concepts, but neither is stated correctly. A taxonomic group can bear more than one correct name, depending upon

its position and rank. Moreover, in the case of species the correct name is not the earliest legitimate name, but the combination of the earliest legitimate epithet. For these reasons he had proposed that Principles III and IV be reworded in the form of three principles, proposals A, B, and C. It may be, however, that the idea of priority should be retained as a principle, but that the definition of a correct name, at present incorrectly formulated in Principle IV, should be relegated to the Rules. Moreover, there undoubtedly will not be complete agreement that the idea of conservation is worthy of recognition as a Principle. At any rate, he did not think we could summarily dismiss the three proposals as suggested by the Rapporteur.

DR. LANJOUW was of the opinion that Principle IV was as short and clear as possible. There was no need to give any details in the Principles; this could be done in the Rules. The meaning of correct was explained in the Rules and was duly provided for. The words "except in specified cases" provided for Silva's third principle.

DR. DONK wanted to second Dr. Smith's proposal to keep the number of principles as low as possible. If we deviated from this policy, others would ask for still more additional principles, for instance, that a name must be associable with a description.

DR. FOSBERG said that Dr. Silva had overlooked the fact that the "combination of the earliest epithet" or the binomial, is a name. The only thing that is added to the present wording of Principle IV is the part "with a given circumscription, position and rank", which he proposed should be added to the present wording after "group".

MR. ROSS agreed with Dr. Fosberg but suggested that the phrase "the earliest . . . Code" is covered by Principle III and might be deleted. He asked whether Dr. Fosberg would accept this as an amendment to his proposal.

DR. ROUSSEAU was of the opinion that all this was purely editorial.

MR. BULLOCK agreed with the Chairman's remarks but suggested that the Editorial Committee should include the words "with a given circumscription, position and rank". He drew attention to the three "correct" names for the Clove, depending only upon its position (Kew Bull. 1958(1): 52).

DR. ROBYNS agreed especially with the remarks of Dr. Smith and pointed out that the principles must be worded in a very general way. This is the case with the wording "in accordance with the rules". He moved that this proposal be sent to the Editorial Committee.

DR. ROUSSEAU expressed the hope that the number of instructions to the Editorial Committee be kept as limited as possible.

DR. LANJOUW asked for a vote on the question of whether we want to leave Principle IV as it stands, because after all it was clear that it was not incorrect.

DR. FOSBERG asked for a vote on his proposal.

DR. ROUSSEAU put the motion of Dr. Robyns to the vote: it was *accepted*, 51 cards being shown in favour, 32 against.

DR. A. C. SMITH thought this majority too narrow and asked for definite instructions to the Editorial Committee on the actual wording that was desired.

DR. ROUSSEAU put the three proposals of Dr. Silva to the vote:

Prop. A was rejected by a large majority (3 in favour), B was rejected unanimously, and C by a large majority (3 in favour).

DR. FOSBERG then repeated his proposal to add the words "with a given circum-

scription, position and rank" to the present wording after "group". This proposal was seconded by Mr. Ross and put to the vote by Dr. Rousseau. It was *accepted* (66 in favour, 22 against).

PRINCIPLE V

Prop. A (3:215:0) Rejected (1 in favour).

Prop. B (171:52:0)

DR. ROGERS proposed that this be referred to the *Editorial Committee*.

DR. ROUSSEAU put the proposal by Dr. ROGERS to the vote: it was *accepted* (62 in favour, 24 against). He again invited all botanists to send any suggestions of an editorial character to the Editorial Committee.

Dr. A. C. SMITH wanted to point out that the word "scientific" should be kept.

Prop. C (29:188:0) Withdrawn by the author.

PRINCIPLE VII

Prop. A (184:25:11)

DR. PROSKAUER stated that acceptance of this proposal called for deletion of Art. 2.

DR. TRYON wanted to keep Art. 2 because Arts. 1 and 3 would become less intelligible.

DR. LANJOUW pointed out that if Art. 2 was deleted, Arts. 1 and 3 would have to be reworded to some extent.

DR. A. C. SMITH agreed with Dr. Tryon that Art. 2 was correctly placed. It was not a basic principle, but merely a statement of operation.

DR. ROLLINS thought that it was not an operative article, but did not see any reason to take it away from its present place, because it was certainly not at all a principle.

DR. ROUSSEAU thought that if Prop. A was accepted, Art. 2 should anyhow be kept.

DR. SILVA explained that the idea of hierarchy was a principle of nomenclature.

DR. BARKMAN stated that if this became a principle, the wording should be "belongs to" instead of "is treated as belonging to". Therefore he objected, since taxonomists must be free to attribute a given specimen to two or more taxa (e.g. varieties) of co-ordinate rank, as is sometimes done.

DR. FOSBERG thought that the only excuse for tampering with the Code was if there was anything really wrong. The present situation does not cause any trouble and he just did not see any reason why the material should be pushed around. Perfection in legislation was not a justification by itself for changing what we had.

DR. ROUSSEAU put Dr. Silva's proposal to the vote: it was rejected by a large majority (15 in favour).

NEW PRINCIPLE VIII

Prop. A (103:99:8) Rejected by a large majority (4 in favour).

Prop. B (119:71:8) 25 votes in favour, 50 against.

DR. FOSBERG asked for a card vote: the proposal was rejected, 116 in favour, 187 against.

NEW PRINCIPLE IX

Prop. A (191:16:16)

DR. ROUSSEAU explained that this was already in the Code and the question was merely whether this should be inserted here as a principle.

DR. DONK then asked for a vote first on the question of whether a name should be associated with a description.

MR. ROSS agreed with the Rapporteur that the insertion of the word "valid" in Principle III might be considered. This concept is, however, really technical.

DR. A. C. SMITH was in favour of adding the word "valid" to Principle III. He objected to the introduction of a new principle simply for the introduction of the word valid.

DR. ROUSSEAU put Prop. A to the vote: it was rejected (30 in favour, 70 against).

The proposal by the Rapporteur to insert the word "valid" in Principle III was then considered.

DR. MCVAUGH said that the amendment proposed by the Rapporteur was not at all equivalent to the original proposal. Somewhere it should be said that names have no status under the Code unless they are validly published.

DRS. LANJOUW and TRYON pointed out that this was stated in Art. 6 (note) and Art. 12.

DR. ROLLINS said that in Principle III as it reads now "priority" was basic; there is no need to explain here what the Code means by "publication"; for that we turn to the Code itself.

DR. LANJOUW then withdrew his proposal.

ARTICLE 1

Prop. A (4:219:2) Rejected unanimously.

ARTICLE 2

Prop. A (4:222:1) Rejected unanimously.

ARTICLE 3

Prop. A (5:220:2) Rejected unanimously.

ARTICLE 4

Prop. A (19:195:1)

DR. FOSBERG explained that his proposal was meant to cover cases like "Algae" and "Fungi", names belonging to a category not provided for by the Code.

DR. ROUSSEAU asked Dr. Papenfuss whether he could live without a provision for a subregnum Algae.

DR. PAPERFUSS said he could.

DR. RUTH PATRICK said that the Code was perfectly satisfactory and that there was no need for a change.

DR. ROUSSEAU put the proposal to the vote: it was rejected (4 in favour).