

ENGLERA

9

**Werner Greuter
John McNeill
Dan H. Nicolson**

Report on botanical nomenclature - Berlin 1987

**XIV International Botanical Congress, Berlin:
Nomenclature Section, 20 to 24 Juli 1987**



**Veröffentlichungen aus dem Botanischen Garten und Botanischen Museum Berlin-Dahlem
Berlin 1989**

Preface

This is the official report on the deliberations and decisions of the nine sessions held by the Nomenclature Section of the XIV International Botanical Congress on five consecutive days immediately preceding the Congress proper. It is based, primarily, on the taped record of the proceedings, which proved to be of excellent quality thanks to the modern equipment and skilled technical monitoring at our disposal, and also thanks to the remarkable discipline of speakers in consistently using the microphone and always identifying themselves by name. It is also based, whenever appropriate, on the written texts subsequently submitted by each speaker on one of the numbered sheets available to that effect (documents that were often invaluable for finding out what speakers thought they had actually said) and on three parallel sets of handwritten notes, by the Rapporteur, the Vice-Rapporteur and the Recorder, on the sequence of speakers and on the decisions taken.

The report was generated in two successive, distinct phases. As soon as possible after the Congress, a first transcript of the tapes was produced, which already underwent quite some editing. Dan Nicolson took responsibility for the first half (Sessions 1 to 4), John McNeill for the second half (Sessions 5 to 9). Their texts were sent on floppy disks to Berlin, where they were formatted, laser-printed and duplicated in time for the Editorial Committee meeting (January 3 to 7, 1988) responsible for preparing the "Berlin Code". On the basis of the preliminary transcripts and, again, of the original tapes and written documents, Werner Greuter subsequently undertook the final editing of the report, his text being proofread by his two co-authors before being transformed into the laser-printed, camera-ready master copy from which this volume was produced. This means, in essence, that the full taped and written documentation of the Section's proceedings was independently and critically worked through by two of the three authors in all its parts, and that all three bear joint responsibility for the published version.

Needless saying, the oral contributions had to be severely edited and condensed. We did not therefore feel entitled to maintain a fiction of direct speech but (as for the "Sydney Report" – Englera 2, 1982) consistently used indirect speech instead. We did nevertheless endeavour to give a lively and readable account and not to obliterate the occasional sparkling evidence of wit and originality. As Ed Voss aptly stated in his preface to the "Sydney Report", it "is presented not merely as an official record of five days of deliberations and decisions. It is also a document in the history of nomenclature. The bare account of decisions taken cannot convey the spirit of the discussions, the arguments for and against certain actions, or the often extensive debate preceding selection of words to express a desired amendment."

The Section consisted of 157 registered members (Appendix A) also carrying 296 institutional votes as delegates (Appendix B), so that the total of possible votes was 453. It had to consider no less than 336 proposals, as compared to 215 submitted to the Sydney Congress. This was a very substantial task (even taking into account that 84 of the 97 proposals which had received a negative mail vote of 75% or more were ruled as rejected without discussion) and at least in part accounts for the unusual length of the present report. Apart from the proposals on registration, which were extensively debated in context on the first and third day, proposals were basically acted upon in the sequence in which they were reviewed in the "Synopsis" (Taxon 36: 174-281. 1987), *i.e.*, in the sequence of the provisions of the Code they were to affect. There were however many departures from this order, for a number of reasons, so that this report would be hard to use, and indeed somewhat chaotic, if it were to faithfully reflect the chronology of the actual proceedings. We have therefore opted for an arrangement in which the "normal" sequence has been partly restored (as explained by bracketed notes when appropriate) and, in those cases where this was not practicable, we have provided cross-references to the relevant entries. By this means, and also by preparing an index to speakers integrated with the list of Section Members in Appendix A, we hope to ease the task of those looking for particular items within the Section's debates.

The decisions taken by the Section of Nomenclature were ratified by the Congress at its final Plenary Session, on August 1, when the following resolution was adopted: "The XIV International Botanical Congress resolves that the decisions of its Nomenclature Section with respect to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, as well as the appointment of officers and members of the nomenclature committees, made by that Section during its meetings, July 20 to 24, be accepted." (See W. Greuter & B. Zimmer, *Proceedings of the XIV International Botanical Congress*: 89. – Königstein 1988). The decisions themselves were published in December 1987 (*Taxon* 36: 858-868), and were subsequently incorporated in the newest edition of the "Code" (*Regnum Veg.* 118, July 1988).

Berlin will be remembered as a fairly conservative Congress in the history of plant nomenclature. No sweeping changes were adopted, although the discussions may, in retrospect, prove to have prepared the ground for some important changes of the future. Many issues engendered extensive debate and several led to close results, as witnessed by no less than 18 card votes. One of the proposals (Art. 69 Prop. B) failed by two votes, and another one (Art. 14 Prop. C) would have failed if a single vote had been cast the other way!

In publishing this report, we want to thank the Botanical Garden and Museum Berlin-Dahlem for having again accepted its inclusion in the serial "Englera". Thanks are also due to the International Association for Plant Taxonomy for contributing to the printing costs, thereby enabling free distribution of copies to all registered Section Members. We want to express our most sincere appreciation to Frans A. Stafleu, President of the Bureau of Nomenclature and chairman of the sessions, not only for the masterly way in which he led the debates but for all he has done for plant nomenclature, in many different capacities, during the past fourty years. To him, whose absence from the next Congress will be bitterly felt, we dedicate this volume.

Werner Greuter
John McNeill
Dan H. Nicolson

Note: The figures given in parenthesis for each proposal, in the following report, correspond to the result of the Mail Vote (Yes : No : Special Committee : Editorial Committee).

**FOURTEENTH INTERNATIONAL BOTANICAL CONGRESS
BERLIN 1987**

NOMENCLATURE SECTION

Bureau of Nomenclature

President: F. A. Stafleu

Vice-Presidents: D. H. Nicolson, W. G. Chaloner, R. Grolle

Rapporteur-Général: W. Greuter

Vice-Rapporteur: J. McNeill

Recorder: P. Hiepko

FIRST SESSION

Monday, 20 July 1987, 10:00 – 12:35

[Chairman: Stafleu]

Stafleu welcomed the Section members to Berlin, a grand city for botany and not least for nomenclature, where Engler in the 1890s had devised for his botanical garden some of the basic rules that led to our present Code, including priority of publication starting from 1753 and the notion of *nomina conservanda*, rules that found their consolidation in 1905 in Vienna at the first International Botanical Congress to be held in the German language area.

Many botanists active in nomenclature and other taxonomists had passed away since the 1981 Congress in Sydney. Among them was Joseph Lanjouw, the man who organized the Nomenclature Section at the 1950 International Botanical Congress held at Stockholm and became the founder of the present structure and procedural rules of the Nomenclature Sections. At that Congress he also proposed to set up an International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy with a supporting body now known as the International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT). He was Rapporteur-Général from 1950 until 1964 and, as such, chief editor of the Stockholm, Paris, Montreal,

and Edinburgh Codes. Botanical nomenclature must be grateful to him for his initiative and his drive.

Delegates were asked to stand for a moment of silence in memory of the deceased:

Airy Shaw, Herbert Kenneth	Cramer, Jörg
Alexander, Edward Johnston	Croizat, Léon
Alexopoulos, Constantine J.	Dahlgren, Rolf
Almonte, José de Jesús Jiménez	Darrow, S. N.
Amshoff, Gerda Jane Hille- gonda	Davis, Ray J.
Andrade-Lima, Dárdano de	Deyl, Milos
Aubréville, André	Dolezal, Helmut
Bailey, Ethel Zoe	Drouet, Francis
Bakhuizen van den Brink, F. Reinier Cornelis	Edwards, Phyllis Irene
Bally, Peter R. O.	Fogg, John Milton
Barghoorn, Elso S.	Foster, Robert Crichton
Barnard, Peter D. W.	Fuller, Albert M.
Becker, Herman F.	Gallé, Lasló
Blunt, Wilfred	Gilbert, Georges
Bobrov, Evgenij Grigorovich	Gilmour, John Scott Lennox
Bocquet, Gilbert	Gordon, Robert Benson
Böcher, Tyge W.	Gould, Frank Walton
Boivin, Bernard	Guédès, Michel
Borssum Waalkes, Jan van	Hara, Hiroshi
Bremekamp, Cornelis Elisa Bertus	Harrington, H. D.
Brenan, John Patrick Mickle- thwait	Harris, Thomas Maxwell
Brunel, Jules	Héban, Charles
Cantino, Edward C.	Henry, Blanche Elizabeth Edith
Ching, R. C.	Hitchcock, Charles Leo
Chouard, Pierre	Hodgson, Eliza Amy
Clausen, Robert T.	Hoyle, Arthur Clay
Core, Earl Lemley	Jacobs, Marius
Cooley, George G.	Jafri, S. F. M.
Correll, Donovan Stewart	Jayaweera, Don Martin Arthur
	Kanis, Andries
	Knight, F. P.
	Koster, Joséphine Thérèse

- Krukoff, Boris A.
 Lacour, L. F.
 Lange, Carla
 Lanjouw, Joseph
 Laundon, Geoffry Frank (later
 Gillian Fiona Laundon)
 Lepage, Abbé E.
 Letty, Cynthia Lindenberg
 Lipschitz, Sergej J.
 Long, Charles Robert
 Luther, Hans Edmund
 Lütjeharms, Wilhelm Jan
 Markgraf, Friedrich
 Mattick, Fritz
 Melchior, Hans
 Meyer, Dieter E.
 Meyer, Sergio V.
 Möschl, W.
 Moreau, Fernand
 Mühlenbach, Victor
 Müntzing, Arne
 Nannfeldt, John Axel Frithiof
 Nelson, Erich
 Ooststroom, Simon Jan van
 Pabst, G. F. J.
 Papenfuss, George Frederik
 Penland, Charles William
 Theodore
 Pereira, Edmundo
 Polunin, Oleg
 Puig, Felix Cardona
 Questel, Adrien
 Quisumbing, E. D.
 Rauschert, Stephan
 Richards, James Donald
 Robyns, Walter
 Roivainen, Heikki
 Sachet, Marie-Hélène
 Schelpe, Edmund André
 Charles Lois E.
 Schulze, Georg Martin
 Schwartz, Otto
 Sharsmith, Helen Katherine
 Skinner, Henry T.
 Skvortsov, Boris V.
 Smith, Alexander H.
 Soest, Johannes Leendert van
 Sparre, Benkt
 Steenis, Cornelis Gijsbert G.
 Jan van
 Stehlé, Henri
 Stuntz, Daniel Elliot
 Svenson, Henry K.
 Tamamschian, Sophia G.
 Taylor, Thomas M. C.
 Thanikaimoni, Ganapathy
 Tomaselli, Ruggero
 Vakhrameev, V. A.
 Valéra, Máirín de
 Venema, H. J.
 Verdoorn, Frans
 Vermeulen, Pieter
 Wasson, R. Gordon
 Waterhouse, John T.
 Watt, Alexander Stuart
 Weimarck, Hennig
 Wendelbo, Per
 Whalen, Michael Dennis
 Wherry, Edgar T.
 Womersley, John Spenser
 Ying, Tsiang
 Yü, T. T.
 Zahariadi, Constantinos A.
 Zalensky, Oleg V.
 Zohary, Michael

The section would have to deal with 336 proposals, several Committee reports, etc. The number of proposals was twice as high as in Leningrad (161) and considerably higher than in Sydney (263). The time available would be the same as on previous occasions. All were requested to be concise in remarks and to concentrate on the major problems.

Stafleu announced the composition of the Bureau of Nomenclature (see above) to which three Vice-Presidents had been coopted.

The Nomenclature Section also appointed the Nomenclature Committees that worked between the Congresses. The Chairmen and Secretaries of the Committees were to meet and provide proposals of Committee members to serve 1987-1993 by Thursday noon. He appointed a Nominations Committee consisting of the members of the Bureau of Nomenclature plus A. Cronquist, Hj. Eichler, D. L. Hawksworth, and S. W. Greene, to be chaired by himself.

The General Committee would later have to discuss a problem that had arisen in connection with the preparation of this Congress. The record number of proposals might be a little difficult to handle for this section, but far more difficult for "Taxon" and IAPT providing the finance. While admittedly free, uncensored publication of proposals in Taxon was important, cost had this time been excessive, and the contents of two issues of "Taxon" had to be postponed because of the extensive comments accompanying the proposals proper. The past, lenient policy in publishing such comments as submitted would have to be reconsidered.

Greuter acknowledged the efforts of the two previous Rapporteurs, F. A. Stafleu (now in the chair) and E. G. Voss. Because of other functions (he was at the same time Secretary General of the Congress) he had unfortunately not been able to devote his full time to preparing for the nomenclature sessions, and would have to be absent a couple of times during the sessions. He was glad to rely on the Vice-Rapporteur, J. McNeill.

He proceeded with the following announcements:

- Daily schedule: 09:00 to 12:30 with one break and 14:00 to 18:00 with one break.

- Inauguration of the new Herbarium and Library Wing of the Botanical Museum Berlin-Dahlem on Wednesday the 22nd at noon (break from 12:00 to 14:30).
- IAPT General Meeting on Thursday 23rd at 16:00 followed by the nomenclature dinner, preceded by an IAPT reception.
- Photographs would be taken and could be ordered, on the following day.
- Those expecting to make comments should seat themselves in the front half of the audience, where the seats – while less comfortable – were equipped with a writing desk. Numbered sheets of paper would be handed out to submit a written version of each comment.
- All speakers must wait for the microphone, and preface their remarks with their name and home base. Students would hand out the numbered sheets, the microphone and the ballot boxes.
- Voting would first be by show of hand. If the result was unclear or a request was made, a card show using coloured voting cards (each colour for a given number of votes) would follow. If the result was still unclear, then a card vote would be taken, the appropriate numbered tickets from the voting cards being put into the yes or no box.
- Tellers would be K. J. Karttunen (Helsinki) and J.-G. Knoph (Berlin) under the supervision of the Recorder.
- Mail vote results had been given to all at registration; the mail vote was an indication but did not bind the Section.
- A few reprint copies of the Synopsis of proposals were still available.
- Voting cards should be signed by their holders and should not be misplaced or lost.

The following procedural decisions were taken (moved by the Rapporteur, seconded, and accepted without objection):

- The printed Sydney Code was officially approved as the working document for these debates. (Meaning that, even when there should be a discrepancy between action taken in Sydney and what appeared in print, the printed Code would stand.)

- Proposals would be dealt with in the sequence of the Synopsis with the option to postpone consideration of proposals dependent on a major issue still to be debated.
- Proposals with a negative Mail Vote of 75% or more would be ruled as rejected without discussion unless they were brought up again from the floor.
- A 60% majority of the votes cast would be required for adoption of proposals to modify the Code; but in the case of competing proposals on the same matter, a 60% majority would first be required to decide to make a change, and then a simple majority to choose between the options.
- The Editorial Committee was empowered (1) to change, if necessary, the wording of any Article or Recommendation, and to avoid duplication; (2) to add or remove examples; (3) to place Articles and Chapters of the Code in the most convenient places but to retain the present numbering in so far as possible; and (4), in general, to make any editorial modification not affecting the meaning of the provisions concerned.

Cronquist requested strict and narrow interpretation of this empowerment so that the changes would be minimal rather than reflecting views of individual members of the Committee. This was granted.

DISCUSSION ON REGISTRATION (I)

Staffleu announced that the remaining time of the first session would be devoted to a first discussion of registration of names and approval of publications. No decisions were to be taken now, in order to give time for deliberations among the delegates. The corresponding proposals deserved very careful consideration.

Greuter introduced the discussion. Several of the general proposals pertained to registration. Registration was one of the basic ideas on which the Section would have to decide. Outside awareness would be focused on the Section's deliberations. Nomenclaturalists ought to know that others than themselves used the Rules, and that not everyone outside this meeting was necessarily in agreement with their opinions and decisions. The Section, while basically autonomous (and open to all those interested), did also have some obligations to those who did not attend.

The basic idea of the Code was stability, and it had been claimed that stability was best served by strictly conforming to the Rules. This theory worked often but not always. There were many instances where the effect of the application of a rule was controversial, since it was impossible for the Rules to account for everything. In fundamental questions such as: is a name effectively published, validly published, legitimate and what is the date of the name, the answer was often uncertain. This uncertainty did result in nomenclatural instability, which could not be obviated by strict application of the Code.

One of the possible answers was to set up lists of all scientific names – not a feasible task in view of the multitude of such names. One set of proposals before the Section aimed, however, at registration of names to be published in the future (from a date not yet fixed but in no case prior to 1993). Registration of names in the future would require an operational, fully implemented machinery. Once this existed and registration was made mandatory, there would be no more uncertainty as to the effective publication, validity and date of any new name. Whereas there could be a lot of discussion on details, the basic concept of registration of names was as plain as that.

Another set of proposals wanted to register not names but their vectors, *i.e.*, publications. They would rule registration on a second level, not on the primary level with which nomenclature is dealing, and would tackle problems of effective publication and its date, but would not deal at all with valid publication. These two sets of proposals were not necessarily uncombinable, but registration of names would largely make registration of publications obsolete.

The proposals on registration of names aimed at introducing into the Code a concept that would not yet be operational – which was somewhat unusual. The reason was that devising the new system of registration had organizational and financial implications that could scarcely be handled if there was not at least a formal declaration of intent of a Nomenclature Section to make registration mandatory in the future, on condition that it proved workable. What was now proposed was (1) to set up a Committee; and (2) to introduce the principle of registration into the Code – but not to make it obligatory before the detailed procedure had been worked out and tried out, and had been discussed and approved by the following Congress (or by any later Congress).

The indexing services at the International Mycological Institute and at Kew had been using procedures quite similar to those required for registration for many years. Electronic data processing systems had been implemented at the International Mycological Institute. Hawksworth was prepared to present the results of a test run that could demonstrate to what an extent registration was already now a feasible task.

Cronquist, speaking on Prop. A, feared that we were jumping from the frying pan into the fire. The only good thing he could see in Prop. A was that it would exclude names appearing in theses offered for sale individually by University Microfilms. This was a difficult question, and he hoped that it could somehow be dealt with, but he shuddered at the thought of being controlled by some future editor. Having been an editor himself, he knew what the temptations were.

Faegri drew attention to the fact that the mandate of the Committee for Registration, set up very late, was partly overlapping that of the existing (but admittedly lethargic) Committee on Effective Publication. He did very much recommend the principle of registration and thought that Cronquist had completely misunderstood the issue when speaking about censorial activity. In the word registration there was nothing like censorship. On which basis registration should be organized was a matter which needed very profound study. He was therefore afraid of accepting the first three proposals, whereas Prop. D, which had had a more favourable reception in the mail vote, seemed to be the correct step now. This did not preclude the important step referred to by the Rapporteur, *viz.*, to accept the baby in some way, by accepting the proposed addition to Art. 6. It would not be proper to do any more at present.

As a historical note, the principle of registration had been adopted at Amsterdam in 1935. But what was adopted at Amsterdam was never realized because of a certain Mr. Hitler and his doings...

McNeill drew attention to other proposals that came within the general ambit of this discussion: linked to Gen. Prop. A were Art. 30 Prop. A and B; linked to Gen. Prop. C-E were Art. 6 Prop. A,

Art. 32 Prop. A, and Div. III Prop. A. It was indeed Div. III Prop. A that Faegri had been most notably addressing, although Gen. Prop. D was a concomitant part of it.

Brummitt introduced himself as one of the five members of the Committee for Registration and also as the representative of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, which would play a significant practical part in any of the proposed schemes.

He explained that there were two completely different institutions at Kew which happened to be next door to each other, the CMI (CAB International Mycological Institute) which compiled all the mycological literature, and the Royal Botanic Gardens which did all the vascular plant literature.

The Committee on Effective Publication had failed to come up with any answer as to how to define effective publication. One of the Committee, **Roger Hnatiuk**, together with **Judy West** who was not at Berlin, had made a practical suggestion involving approved publications. Three members of the Committee for Registration took up their idea, which in their opinions provided the only possible solution to the problem of defining effective publication.

The suggested list of approved journals would involve a major operation at Kew (Royal Botanic Gardens and CMI). The CMI would doubtless be able to handle the technical side of their share of the project. The RBG had had somewhat of a cloud over its own publication, the "Index Kewensis", for the last few years, but this had now been totally brought up to date with the publication, all on the same day (June 25th), of two of the five-yearly supplements and the first annual "Kew Index", all produced by computer. The late appearance was due to enormous technical problems, but Kew now had the technical side fully buttoned up and running.

Kew's institutional policy was not to care whether nothing was decided, or approved journals would be adopted, or a full registration system. If required by this meeting, Kew would cooperate fully and to the best of their ability with whatever was being put before them.

The idea of approved journals left several options. Either a Committee could agree to list any journal when asked by its editor or

publisher to do so, the only proviso being that a copy be actually sent to the appropriate registering authority. (This Brummitt personally favoured.) Or the Committee could be very selective. (This option had made a poor score on the mail ballot.) What mattered was that those journals in which names were likely to be published be known.

Similarly there would be two possibilities with respect to the date of publication. Either the date given on the journal would be the date accepted (as favoured by himself), or the date of publication would be the date of receipt at one of the registration centres – which would impose an enormous responsibility on the various registration centres.

The best answer to the problem of effective publication was to keep the present status as far as possible, enabling authors of new names to publish in any journal they wanted, so long as it was on the list, but forcing them to send a copy to the registration centre if they wanted to publish in a book or any other one-off publication. Books were more critical than journals because the Kew indexers simply had no idea of which literature they should comb and it was very much a matter of hit-or-miss whether they got the relevant ones. Kew could cope with the proposed new system, more or less, at no additional expense.

Registration of names was a quite different matter, and far more far-reaching. It had great attraction because it would decide, not only effective publication but also validity and legitimacy of names. Brummitt had some personal misgivings about this because of the procedural difficulties involved – a minor one being that it would not always be possible for the registering authority to determine legitimacy and validity under the present Code from the printed page (as with a name being illegitimate because of inclusion of the type of an earlier name). Perhaps it was the idea that a mistake made by the registering authority be simply forgotten, and that the fact that it had been registered would give a name legitimacy even if otherwise illegitimate.

One would also have to check the basionyms of new combinations and the replaced synonyms of *nomina nova*, in order to determine

validity – which Kew did not do at the moment. This would involve a great deal more searching of the literature, and the compiler of "Index Kewensis" would be faced with a very much more onerous task. One suggestion made within the Registration Committee had been that the author of a new combination would have to submit a xerox copy of the protologue of the basionym. This would save checking in the library but would involve an awful lot of paper work.

Inevitably, more work would increase the expense. The time for each entry would probably double. A lot of correspondence with botanists failing to read the Code or to comply with its rules might become necessary. The additional expense, at Kew, had been very roughly estimated at £ 20,000 to £ 25,000 a year (more than one additional staff member).

Even more significant was the danger of placing all the eggs in one basket. Registration of names would be done in a single institution for each taxonomic group. Authors themselves would not have the possibility of registering a name. In the case of a postal strike or, worse, of a major political upheaval or world war, the system would break down and no name could be registered. Ride, in a paper comparing zoological with botanical nomenclature, had commented on the efficiency of the botanical system which had devolved responsibility round the world rather than concentrating it on one institution as the zoologists have, who had recently encountered financial difficulties.

Brummitt saw great problems, financial and bureaucratic, with the registration of names. Any Committee appointed to consider this issue should be entirely free to recommend against a registration system. Comments made previously tended to imply that the idea of registration should be accepted in principle subject to feasibility. Feasibility was probably not in question, but for desirability this was a different thing.

Demoulin spoke in the name of Belgian botanists, who were now convinced that it was absolutely necessary to have some form of registration to replace the present rules on effective publication. Available systems of xerox copying clearly made it impossible nowadays to define effective publication. Some firm decision was

needed, not just another Committee to make proposals (as unsuccessfully decided in Sydney). While supporting Prop. A, Belgian botanists urged that a fast solution be found for the algae that were not covered by Prop. A – possibly because of special problems caused by the frequent publication of new algal names in zoological journals. Algae should not once more be the subject of a special rule, or lack of a rule, all the other groups being covered. Prop. A should be voted on and, if it failed, be replaced by a new proposal rather than deferred to a later congress.

Fosberg was disturbed a great deal by this matter. The Botanical Code, in the past, had been fairly liberal. As a result, in 99 cases out of 100, a person who understands the Code could come up with a correct name. When trying to use the Zoological Code, he had never come up with the correct solution. The need for a profession of botanical lawyers should be avoided.

Registration *per se* was not objectionable so long as it was not made a requirement of effective or valid publication. Index Kewensis was a form of registration, and so were the various indices for other groups. Making registration mandatory was, however, objectionable. In a reasonably democratic society, a person should not be required to conform with the whims of a committee or bureaucracy.

The matter of approved publications was a little easier to accept, so long as any publication would be approved if a publisher submitted a copy and asked for approval. This was essentially what the Code now required, that the publication must be available to the botanical public. To make a limited list of publications picked out by somebody, committee or otherwise, would be very objectionable, and would be too easily abused.

Fosberg had really not found the present way of doing business as bad as some people seemed to think. If something different were adopted, the bugs would come out in that too – perhaps not those one had anticipated, but they would be there. Every change that had been made that was of major consequence had turned out to have side effects that the proposers had not anticipated. We had got a pretty good Code and maybe should better not mess around with it in any except minor ways.

Stafleu pointed out that Fosberg was one of the very few who had attended all Nomenclature Sessions since Stockholm in 1950.

Hawksworth was convinced that one must go the way of registration in the interest of stability and long-term credibility of botanical nomenclature. Reference had been made to zoology and the problems of the Zoological Code. In fact there was a system of registration that worked already and was very effective under the Bacteriology Code. Mycologists had been repeatedly criticized for hanging on to the archaic approaches of the Botanical Code. In the longer term, botanists would have to work towards a more rigid system to relate to what users wanted. Interestingly, the impetus of the move toward registration had come from resolutions of the International Congress of Systematic and Evolutionary Biology and the International Union of Biological Sciences, rather than from the sessions on nomenclature.

The CAB International Mycological Institute had looked into the question of feasibility with regard to registration and had produced some notes which were going to be tabled, explaining how the system worked now and what would actually be involved in the mechanics of a registration scheme. The technicalities were straightforward, subject to whatever details the Committee would feel appropriate. There would be extra costs with the full registration system but they would, in fact, be relatively modest.

Effective publication was an immediate problem and should not be put off yet again. The compilers of the "Index of Fungi" had the problem all the time of not knowing what was validly published under the present Rules and what was not. Having a system established as under Prop. A would at the same time mean in effect a trial of part of the full blown registration system for the future.

D'Arcy stressed that the present proposal (Prop. A) mainly addressed serial publications. Its adoption would make life much easier for the compiling institutions, such as Kew, Harvard or Missouri. The major problems with effective publication were, however, in single pieces of paper: books, master's theses, student theses, computer printouts, maybe electronic printouts of some kind one

did not know about presently. Effective publication and registration of journals had to be separated. Adoption of any of the present proposals would merely put the question of effective publication into the hands of a new Committee in addition to their setting up registration of journals.

To **Faegri** the discussion had clearly shown the complexity of this matter. Apart from registration or no registration, there was the question of whether one should register journals or names or, as a third possibility that had not yet been discussed, diagnoses.

Another, independent pair of options was whether registration, in any of the above fields, should imply an authorization or should be purely mechanical. Any form of authorization would result in all the complications that **Brummitt** had mentioned, and some more. No registration authority, not even **Kew**, would have the knowledge necessary to vet all the new names – but they would certainly have the faculty of registering them.

Hnatiuk, as a list-maker, would find it very handy to be able to turn to a register of names. However, he had grave doubts about being able to compile that list consistently over long periods of time. It would be a highly risky exercise to tie nomenclature to an on-going, virtually day-to-day process of registering names. It would work for a while and then something would go wrong: a computer failure, a postal strike, all sorts of things. It was just too dangerous.

Registering publications, as an answer to the problems of effective publication, seemed to have much in its favour. A lot of time was spent searching literature for publications on a particular plant group. There was a lot of wasted taxonomic effort – and not nearly enough taxonomic work being done. In Australia, the amount of taxonomic effort over the last two hundred years which was no longer of any but purely academic interest had been estimated to about one third. At the species level, one third of the names were not used any more, for one reason or another.

All of that was not going to be saved by a system such as registering publications, but certainly a significant portion of it was. Registration of places of publication, by an open-ended system such as

Brummitt suggested, was to be supported. There was no reason to restrict where people publish, the important thing being to know where it was published. That was what the word effective in effective publication meant.

Art. 29 Prop. D was also relevant in the context of Gen. Prop. A.

Silva had begun compilation of the "Index Nominum Algarum" in 1948. In the intervening 39 years he had, in effect, registered close to 200,000 names, meaning that he had assessed, as best he could, validity (but not legitimacy, which had changed progressively). The progressive tightening up of requirements for valid publication had had to be kept in mind, which had made it impossible to copy down naively what appeared in the publication. At least 30% of names currently published in algae were in grey areas or clearly invalid, *e.g.*, through the apparent failure of a new combination to fulfil the requirements of Art. 33. Registration was therefore very important. An arbitrary decision on validity (certainly not legitimacy), for such grey area cases, would be very much preferable to the uncertainty of competing usages of names based on conflicting interpretations of validity.

Singer, as a mycologist, did appreciate very much the lists that were being made in Ferry Lane [CMI], and felt that registration was also very important in other groups; but registration was one thing and the Code was another. It was up to the individual nomenclaturalists to judge on questions of valid and effective publication and to correct, if appropriate, the mistakes of the compilers of registers. Fosberg was 100% right on this point.

Chaloner made a plea on behalf of the small minority dealing with fossil plants. The two sets of proposals presented particular problems for palaeobotanists. The registration of publications would be made difficult by the fact that palaeobotanists published in an entirely different spectrum of journals and books, particularly geological ones, that were usually absent from a botanical library. If the author was expected to persuade the editor to get, *e.g.*, a Geological Survey Publication from Sarawak sent to Kew to have the journal registered, that would hardly be on.

The registration of names presented a series of problems. Where would this be conducted for fossil plants? Kew would hardly want to take on board fossil vascular plants!

[Chairman: Nicolson]

Stuessy hoped that Prop. D would be supported, but not the other ones. Registration was so complex that it had to be studied more carefully. Clearly registration was needed, but it would be costly. Discussion within the Section would not resolve the problems. In order to seek and obtain funding, the Bureau of Nomenclature would have to present a strong, concrete and detailed proposal and a defensible budget. We were nowhere near that point yet.

The question of sanctioning or selecting certain journals, however appealing, must be viewed with great care. Many institutions throughout the world, particularly in lesser developed countries, had their own in-house journals, not only to provide an outlet for their work but to serve as exchange with other journals worldwide. If some journals were not to be approved this could lower their prestige internally and externally, with grave consequences for botanical activity on an international scale.

Voss made it clear that two different matters, approval of publications and registration of names, were being discussed, and also different levels of action. Some had supported registration of names in the sense merely of indexing, and he had no problem with that. But, when registration should become obligatory as a condition, say, of valid publication, a new level of bureaucracy would have been inserted.

Having two different sets of dates would mean a major problem: a date when the publication was effectively published (however that might be defined) and the date when it was registered. Would one be allowed to use the name between those two dates?

Using the date of registration would lead to the problems of postal strikes, insurrections, and political upheavals, and would put botanical nomenclature at the disposal of others outside its realm. It would be difficult to accept registration of names as a condition of

valid publication. It might be a little easier to accept a list of approved journals, assuming that it was broad and that the date that mattered was to be the date of publication and not the date of arrival at whatever indexing centre.

Demoulin agreed there were two issues that should not be confused, registration of publications and registration of names. Registration of publications could be rapidly achieved by accepting Prop. A and would satisfy the urgent need for a decision in matters of effective publication. The other issue, registration of names, would have implications on the validity of names and might possibly have to be deferred to another Congress.

While not opposed to deciding right now on the principle of registration of names, Demoulin argued for a positive decision on the registration of publications. It was important that there would always be at least one major library where one could find a copy of a publication that, if present there, would be effectively published irrespective of its having been xeroxed and of the number of copies distributed. A simple system was needed to decide whether publication was effective.

It would have been possible to change the name of the Corsican *Alnus* in the guide booklet for the post-Congress excursion to Corsica. Such a thing shouldn't happen any more – but might still be acceptable if a copy went to Kew.

Friis reported that the problems of effective publication had been discussed extensively in Copenhagen before the Sydney Congress, that Dahlgren had raised them there and that, as a result, a Recommendation had been put into the Code. He supported Demoulin's plea for Prop. A, and so did a majority of botanists in Copenhagen.

Yeo noted that the discussion so far did suggest that registration of journals and other publications could ease the work of taxonomists in the future. However, only registration of names – should that prove feasible – would meet the need for improved stability felt by users of names, *i.e.*, the call that came from outside the narrower circle of taxonomists and nomenclaturalists.

Ride, speaking as a zoologist and as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Biological Nomenclature of the International Union of Biological Sciences, reviewed the history of the issues at stake. The request to support registration had come to IUBS in the form of a resolution that was carried at the ICSEB Conference in Brighton in 1985. Three major issues had been considered there.

The first issue was the progress of information technology. The Codes, Botanical as well as Zoological, had for many years dealt with effective publication by attempting to define the means of publication. The difficulties now raised by the use of xerography and by the policy of University Microfilms had already been addressed; other recent advances in electronic technology were currently greatly changing the whole publication process. The Zoological Code had in its time outlawed, *e.g.*, carbon copies, following the invention of the typewriter; it had not succeeded in outlawing the Gestetner because it was produced by "ink on paper". In the most recent edition of the Zoological Code, xerography had been accepted. This was a never-ending process, and a process that was rapidly escalating. For that reason, the ICSEB Conference had seen a possible solution, not in defining publication but rather in designating the means of publishing. The proposals made for the registration of publications fell into that category.

The second issue was the very great increase in number of publications and of opportunities for publication which had been brought about by new methods of information technology. It was very easy for anybody now with a personal computer, a laser printer and a xerox machine to produce publications that were acceptable under the Zoological and, presumably, Botanical Code.

The third issue was the difficulty, for biologists who had to use names, in knowing whether these names were validly published. The registration procedures here discussed were a means of overcoming that difficulty, although one had to recognize the extreme difficulty and high cost of actually producing a register that could reliably be said to include all validly published names.

These three issues were the ones presently under discussion. The simple procedure would be to do what the Bacteriologists had done,

and what Linnaeus had done before them: simply to start again, to set a date, to have all names in use registered and then to require all future names to be published in one place. Bacteriologists had done this very effectively, but they had done it with something like one tenth of the known plant taxa, which in turn were one tenth the number of taxa that zoologists were involved in.

One would therefore have to consider in the longer term whether actually controlling the avenues of publication was the way to go – which might well be the most acceptable way to zoologists.

This led on to the question of "nomenclatural terrorism" – a term that had actually been first introduced in the form of "taxonomic terrorism" and was related to irresponsible taxonomy.

The problem was that, with the aid of a personal computer, a laser printer and a xerographic machine, people could now produce extremely irresponsible taxonomy very, very rapidly. At present, the Zoological Commission had before it a proposition to cancel, nullify, and annul three works produced by two Australian herpetologists working in isolation and in defiance of locally accepted views, wherein some 700 nomenclatural acts, including many new names, had been committed. But even if the Commission did so there was nothing to stop the authors from simply changing the titles of the works, adding another author, going back to the xerox machine and running them off again: a business of endless suppression.

It was Ride's belief that, in view of such happenings, it was no longer possible to attempt to define what was effective publication within the Zoological Code. It had become inevitable that, while recognizing the unrestricted freedom of taxonomists to make their own judgements and to produce their own hypotheses, any such hypotheses were to be made informally. At present, no matter how irresponsible a name was, it had to be taken into account. But those 700 names in Australian herpetology, which might well be followed by 10,000 names in Australian entomology, did create an almost insoluble problem, unless one would decide either to empower some authority to accept or reject names for registration, or to limit the publication of new names to defined journals operating at an acceptable professional standard.

Conran supported the comments made about nomenclatural terrorism. One of the close associates of the herpetologists referred to was a botanist who had stated to him that he was "out to get the system." The botanical community could not afford to remain complacent about unrestricted validation of new names.

Zander confessed to be a potential arms merchant in "nomenclatural terrorism". He was publishing two journals, both with a micro-computer. The first, "Clintonia", was a local botanical journal that was distributed to local botanists but was also subscribed to by two large botanical libraries. Apparently one might, if one wished, validate new names in it. The second was "Flora Online" and did not exist on paper but it had an ISSN number so it was a genuine scientific journal. Nomenclatural novelties were not now allowed in it under the present Code, because of its archaic requirement of "paper". He did support Prop. A, or at least D.

Brummitt thought that a potential new Committee on Registration would have some very simple tasks, *e.g.*, determining how much extra time was required to look up basionyms (indeed, Hawksworth had already covered this). But in other respects – *e.g.* the fact that botanists would have to write individually to Kew, which was bound to create an enormous bureaucratic load, each letter requiring a response, for 30 new names per day – a realistic assessment could not be made of the additional work until one actually imposed registration.

He also questioned Ride's mathematics. The bacteriologists had to deal with c. 2,500 species, as opposed to 250,000 species of flowering plants, so the factor was 100, not 10. It was not realistic to compare the task faced by botanists with that of the bacteriologists.

Fosberg cautioned against any one institution, or series of institutions, being burdened with responsibility of operating registration. Institutional stability was nothing absolute. Quite a number of herbaria that had been apparently stable had been taken over by molecular biologists or had seen their funds cut off by politicians and had simply abdicated their responsibilities, given away their collections or let them be eaten up by bugs. That was a very real possibility, also for present indexing centres.

Cronquist noted that Prop. A, as written, could be interpreted as giving the Committee a great deal more power and authority than the discussion so far had suggested.

Greuter announced that decisions would be taken in about two days time so as to leave ample time for private discussion. In order to facilitate such interchanges, some conventions on vocabulary and terminology might be useful. A clear distinction should be made between indexing, registration, and approval.

Indexing was compiling extant items. Registration could be defined as an indexing whereby the items being indexed acquired a special quality. Registration authorities existed throughout the world in many fields of applied sciences where economic interests were at stake: for instance registration of cultivar names or of patents. Registration did not necessarily imply censorship, although one could devise registration systems implying a taxonomic censorship – but this was not the case of what had been proposed for the registration of names, nor of what **Brummitt** now favoured as his proposed approval system.

Approval of journals exclusively related to the question of effective publication. Effective publication had been judged in the past on the basis of two criteria: formal technical parameters, and availability. What really mattered was availability. If a publication was not available for consultation one should rather not recognize it as effectively published.

Most of the discussion so far had been centered on the notion of approved journals. Journals were, however, those vectors that had caused the least problems so far in terms of effective publication. They had a regular standing, one could foresee that there would be another issue and could prepare to get hold of it as soon as it was published. This was not the case with most books, and certainly not with grey literature. In the discussions to come, more thought should be given to the questions of non-journal publications.

The question of date should also be discussed further. **Brummitt** and **Voss** had expressed their preference for keeping the original date of publication. However, if availability was to be the basic cri-

terion, one should recognize that a publication that was not distributed except locally due to a postal strike was not generally available. This was the fault of the strike, not of the author, but still the effect was there. Names were important all over the world, and if communication broke down and if this affected their availability, why should it not affect the date of effective publication?

Furthermore, an approving authority, whatever it be, had a means of establishing an unambiguous date: that of the receipt of an issue of a journal or of a book. Establishing reliably the date of delivery by the printer's office was usually difficult if not impossible even within one's own home country.

The question of safety of communication had been asked. Postal strikes had been mentioned, telephone strikes could have been mentioned. But nowadays this was not so important, since a number of parallel, independent networks and vectors of communication existed apart from the mail and the phone. Any system to be devised should have the necessary safeguards built in. The option of decentralizing any approval or registration system was also to be considered. It should be kept in mind that there was not a geographically balanced representation in this room, *e.g.*, the Third World and Eastern European countries were badly underrepresented. To them, the question of decentralization might be very important.

[Discussion on Registration was resumed in the 5th Session – see p. 107.]

SECOND SESSION

Monday, 20 July 1987, 14:05 - 18:00

[Chairman: Stafleu]

Stafleu asked speakers again to be concise in their statements and, if possible, to avoid speaking twice on the same subject. He would certainly not allow anyone to speak three times.

General Proposals not concerned with registration were now open for discussion.

General Proposals

[Action on **Props. A-F**, relevant to registration, had been postponed (see pp. 122-130):

Prop. A (27:83:34:1) was later **rejected** and referred to the **Special Committee** on Registration.

Prop. B (13:109:18:1) was eventually **withdrawn**.

Prop. C (41:79:13:2) was **rejected** and referred to the **Special Committee** on Registration.

Prop. D (49:67:17:2) was **accepted as amended**.

Prop. E (39:72:19:1) and **Prop. F** (18:76:41:0) were both **rejected** and referred to the **Special Committee** on Registration.]

Prop. G (76:59:3:2).

Greuter explained that the proposal was to abandon official versions of the Code in languages other than English. Even now, the English version prevailed in case of discrepancy with the other two official versions. The advantage of the proposed change was three-fold: lower cost, greater speed in publication, and avoidance of problems with the choice of languages. Other languages than French and German would have valid claims, but the Editorial Committee would not be able to prepare official Codes in those other languages. If this was carried, the General Committee ought to devise ways and means by which some kind of recognition could be accorded to other language versions.

Cronquist was opposed to any expansion of linguistic chauvinism in the Rules.

Demoulin believed that the inclusion of other language versions would only add perhaps six months to production time. One had to consider those who were unable or did not want to use the English version. Belgium was almost on the verge of civil war over languages. If German speaking users did not want a German version they should have their way, but the French version should stay. The first nomenclatural Rules were Candolle's "Lois", and English came in as an equivalent language as late as Cambridge. The Zoological Code, too, had official French and English versions.

Stafleu pointed out that an English version of Candolle's "Lois" appeared two years after their publication.

Voss, while admitting that Demoulin had given good arguments for a French version of the Code, could not see why it should be sponsored by the Editorial Committee and published simultaneously with the English version.

Borbidi enquired about possibilities for the admission of translations of the Code in other languages.

Stafleu explained that the Paris Code included an unofficial Spanish translation. The point was not so much whether there were translations or not but whether the translations should be published at the same time as the English text. A plea had been made by Spanish-speaking botanists for an official Spanish version of the Code. On the other hand, the Soviet botanists had always been happy to publish their own, unofficial Code in Russian.

Adolphi did not read the German version of the Code and felt no need for it.

Whereas **Forero's** institution, the Missouri Botanical Garden, was in favour of English-only, he himself as a Latin American wished to have a Spanish version with some kind of blessing from the IAPT rather than an unofficial version full of mistakes. Prop. H was vague and needed revision.

Greuter agreed that Prop. H, which would become important if Prop. G was carried, might usefully be made more precise, and invited a motion to that effect. There should indeed be a possibility of giving some sort of official recognition to other language versions published separately and subsequently. The only body in the position to grant such recognition was the General Committee, which should be instructed to define the conditions under which such recognition would be granted. He was prepared to publish a German edition of the Code subsequently in Berlin, to be based on the current German edition as modified by the present Congress. Language editions that had not been in the official Code so far would cause more difficulties, but they were not insurmountable.

Panigrahi urged that the Code be made available at the lowest possible cost.

Stafleu promised that the new edition would be cheaper by virtue of the typesetting of the previous Code having been kept on tape. It should not be too difficult to find separate channels for the publication of other language versions.

Prop. G was accepted.

Prop. H (74:52:5:6)

McNeill moved an amendment to substitute the second clause of the proposal as follows: "The General Committee is asked to declare the conditions under which translations of the Code be authorized." The amendment was seconded and carried, and the proposal, as amended, was accepted.

Prop. I (16:112:3:2).

Eichler thought that the proposal had not been properly understood. He explained it by means of an example: *Planta vulgaris* var. *minor* and var. *major* had both been described, the first not being validly published because it contained the type of the name of the species. Later another *P. vulgaris* var. *minor* was described, not including that type. The later name was difficult to be recognized as legitimate, seemingly being a later homonym of the earlier. Acceptance of the proposal would make the later name illegitimate.

Greuter replied that the proposal had been well understood by the Rapporteurs. Lots of infraspecific names that had first been proposed for a taxon including the type of the name of the species were now in current use for taxa not including that type, having later been validated in that sense. If these names were now ruled to be illegitimate from the start this would create many more problems than would be solved by Eichler's proposal.

Prop. I was rejected.

Prop. J (12:116:2:2) was ruled as rejected.

Preamble 9bis (new)

Prop. A (15:118:4:4) was ruled as rejected.

Preamble 11 (new)

Prop. A (75:42:0:9) had, as McNeill suggested, been made irrelevant by the acceptance of Gen. Prop. G. Nevertheless it was, upon his advice, referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Principle I

Prop. A (10:100:16:9) was rejected.

Article 3

Prop. A (43:95:1:0).

Thomas mentioned that similar proposals, to change the term *Division* to *Phylum*, had been defeated in Leningrad and (very narrowly) in Sydney. The reasons had been discussed at length, and the *Rapporteurs'* comments suggested that nothing was new – but the history of the usage of the terms had meanwhile been traced. It was true that the *Zoological Code* did not mention the term, not dealing with names at this rank, but current textbooks in zoological systematics did use *Phylum*. 75 letters were solicited for support, and of the 30 replies, 20 were most positive. The Section had an obligation to those in other fields who were not present. If the proposal should fail, a modified version of it would be introduced.

Voss addressed a major issue already raised at Sydney: what would be the status of names simultaneously published in both ranks by botanists who used both ranks. If both were declared possible there would be a problem.

To **Johnson**, it seemed absurd to have different names for the same rank in Botany and Zoology. *Phylum* was mostly used in biological textbooks, and it would be better for biologists to show a united front.

Brummitt pointed out that the term subdivision [of families or genera] was being used in the Botanical Code in a totally different sense, so that it seemed nonsensical to have the word Division for one of the formal categories.

Demoulin maintained what he had said at earlier Congresses, that phylum was not an appropriate name for such a category. It had too strong an implication of what one felt was the nature of that category. Other people preferred to call a truly phyletic unit a clade. Just because zoological textbooks had a bad habit one should not start the same bad habit in botany.

Prop. A was rejected by a card vote (43.9% in favour, 160:205).

New Proposal (Thomas & Raven).

Thomas, also authorized by his co-proposer Raven, introduced the following new proposal in substitution for the defeated Art. 3 Prop. A: "Either name, Division or Phylum, can be used for this rank." The Code was already full of choices, such as eight families with two correct names, the option to capitalize some specific epithets, etc.

Greuter made sure that these would be alternative names for the same rank. He felt it would have been more logical to use these terms to denote two different ranks, providing the option to either use them both as had sometimes been done before or to use only one of them. The new motion did not improve much on what had just been defeated. It would have the drawback of newly introducing an alternative terminology for ranks.

Stafleu enquired why the proposal was not to have Phylum as a higher category to Divisio?

Thomas had thought of this, but he and Raven preferred the solution now proposed.

Cronquist pressed the point that Division and Phylum would be co-equal. A name proposed for a Phylum could be treated as a Division without change of authorship or date, and vice versa.

Voss drew attention to the fact that there were botanical authors who had used both ranks, which was presently possible so long as it

did not introduce confusion. It would, however, introduce confusion to state now that they were simultaneously the same rank.

Stafleu confirmed that one was completely free to intercalate ranks under the present Code. The term *Phylum* might be used for a rank not identical with *Division* but higher or lower.

Stuessy asked whether it was procedurally possible to introduce new proposals from the floor. These had not been considered by the Mail Vote.

Stafleu explained that the Section was independent and had the power to entertain entirely new proposals. Whether or not this was advisable was a matter of opinion. The proposal was in order.

Faegri warned that the two words, "name" and "term", should not be confused. This discussion was about terms, not names.

Greuter, while admitting the possibility of bringing up new proposals from the floor, strongly warned against voting for them if there was any doubt about the consequences.

The **New Proposal**, as written on the blackboard ("Terms *Phylum* and *Division* be equivalent and at the same rank"), was **rejected**.

Prop. B (94:28:1:7), as the *Rapporteurs* had stated, would avoid complications that would result from adoption of the proposed new Art. H.5bis, but that was unlikely since the latter was opposed by 95% of the mail vote.

Prop. B was nevertheless **accepted**.

Article 4

Prop. A (18:103:2:9) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. B (31:82:2:14).

McNeill explained that the proposal could be referred to the Editorial Committee with the instruction to add a Recommendation that *Phylum* not be used.

Prop. B was, however, **rejected**.

Prop. C (12:20:2:95)

Yeo suggested that the word "subordinate", in Art. 4.1, meant "in order of decreasing rank". Therefore, the Editorial Committee should consider to replace "subordinate" by such a phrase rather than to delete "regnum".

Voss called attention to the alternative in his proposal, to delete the word "subordinate".

Prop. C was ruled as referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. D (9:20:2:94) was ruled as referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. E (2:45:1:74)

Greuter made it clear that the Editorial Committee was not forced to accept anything referred to it, so that there was no danger in referring the proposal to the Editorial Committee even though it might turn out not to be a real improvement. Ruled as referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Article 6

[Action on **Prop. A** (44:84:13:2), concerning registration of names, was deferred. The proposal was later **rejected** and referred to the **Special Committee** on Registration (see p. 129).]

Prop. B (9:110:19:2) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. C (9:110:19:2) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. D (8:110:19:3) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. E (9:107:19:11) was **rejected**.

Prop. F (15:58:5:61).

As explained by **McNeill**, the next three proposals dealt with retroactivity of conservation and rejection of names, an essential point if conservation and rejection were to be effective. The *Rapporteurs* had expressed concern about the wording. If the concept was approved, the Editorial Committee might make some changes.

Nicolson had made this proposal with good intentions, thinking it would save work; but he had since realized that it would create as many if not more problems as it would solve, and he now was opposed to his own proposal.

Prop. F was rejected.

Prop. G (25:45:4:57) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. H (12:43:4:66).

McNeill found the intention of the proposal to be clear but the wording was not. As it stood, the proposal was hardly acceptable.

Zijlstra explained that her proposal had the same intent as Art. 6 Prop. F. She was surprised that **Nicolson** had now opposed the latter. She did not see why her wording was not clear, but since **McNeill** said he understood the intention he might perhaps explain what he thought her intention was.

McNeill took the deletion of the words "unless it is conserved" to mean that one could not conserve an otherwise illegitimate name.

Zijlstra had not intended this, but did not feel able to explain her purpose more clearly.

Prop. H was rejected.

[Action on **Prop. I** (40:29:2:41), dependent on proposals to Art. 14, was postponed; the proposal was later referred to the **Editorial Committee** (see p. 171).]

Prop. J (28:93:1:3).

McNeill explained that this was a very clear, although complex, package which would completely reverse the principle of priorability of autonoms that was adopted in Sydney. The Rapporteurs felt that such a reversal would negatively affect the credibility of nomenclature as a whole.

Staffleu objected that the autonym principle, that had been in general use since shortly after World War II, had in effect been reversed at Sydney.

McNeill disagreed. The way autonoms operated until Seattle was not, in the majority view, very dissimilar from the situation since Sydney. They were names that had to be taken into account. In Seattle the decision was taken to remove, essentially, their status as priorable names. Between Seattle and Sydney there was continual debate and uncertainty about autonoms which was finally resolved at Sydney. The only new point introduced at Sydney was that an autonym was to date from the date of the name that created it. Priorability of autonoms was introduced at Stockholm, abolished at Seattle and, with one change, restored at Sydney.

Staffleu was aware of the fact that people had had a great deal of difficulty with autonoms. Did Prop. J improve the situation?

McNeill felt it would be an extremely negative step.

Tryon did not think reversal of a former decision to be a real problem. The current rule conflicted with the long-standing definition of validity of publication. Autonoms were names that were simply, in fact, not published. Having the Code violate its own principles did undermine the following of the Code more than reversing a previous decision.

Prop. J was rejected.

Article 7

Prop. A (10:116:3:5) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. B (21:98:6:12).

Brummitt suggested that the first part of the proposal, being an acceptable editorial improvement, might be voted on separately. The second part was controversial.

Stafleu agreed to have separate votes on the two parts. **Prop. B (Part one)** was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Demoulin believed that the problem was different for cryptogamists and phanerogamists. Cryptogamists consulted by him were unanimously in favour of the proposal. In cryptogamy mixed collections were frequent, and "isotypes" were often completely different from the material seen by the author.

McNeill explained that at the moment, under the Code, if a holotype was lost or destroyed a substitute type must be chosen from among isotype material, whether or not there was evidence that the original author had seen that material. The proposal sought to restrict the choice of substitute types to material seen by the author.

Greuter added that there was a reverse side of the medal. Under the proposal, if a holotype was destroyed, one might be unable to select an isotype that was a clear duplicate but would have to choose some paratype instead, which might even lead to a change in the application of a name.

Stafleu pointed out that this issue particularly concerned Berlin, where many holotypes had been destroyed in the war. Duplicates (which in woody species usually came from the same tree) had often survived that had not been named by the original author, but had been accepted as types.

Cronquist suggested to change the word "must" to "may" in the last sentence. Otherwise he would vote against the proposal.

Stafleu noted that the Editorial Committees on which he had served had been rather allergic to the use of "may" in an Article.

Voss was worried about the wording of the first part of the proposal. Did it mean that a neotype might be designated even when a part of a mixed holotype was suitable to be chosen as lectotype?

McNeill reassured him: this was clearly not the intention of the original proposal.

Demoulin admitted that particularly in woody plants it could be desirable to choose an isotype, even if not seen by the author. In other cases it was dangerous to use material not seen by the original author. The best solution would be to leave freedom of choice, as suggested by Cronquist.

Stafleu explained that this would then be a Recommendation, which would have to be proposed anew after having disposed with the present proposal.

Prop. B (part two) was rejected.

Prop. C (55:51:25:6).

Greuter admitted that the two Rapporteurs had not been in complete agreement on the basic issue: from when onward did a name have a type? Had it a type from the very beginning, although it did not "know" it, or only from the moment when the type was designated. The question was philosophically interesting, but the practical considerations were what really mattered. Many people had been working with names that were not yet typified, especially older names of which very few were holotypified, the type notion being young. Those people could not know what type would be chosen later on. By subsequent selection of a type a name could suddenly, if lectotypification was granted retroactive effect, become invalid or illegitimate. This would happen very often, and stability would certainly not be promoted by granting lectotypification such retroactivity. Irrespective of how one interpreted the Code as it stood (it could be read both ways), most people had not considered so far that, for purposes of legitimacy and validity of other names, lectotypification had retroactive effect.

McNeill explained that there were two elements in this proposal. Consideration of the first one, relating to the effective publication of lectotypification, might be postponed since the same point was covered by Art. 8 Prop. F and Art. 29 Prop. A. Only the matter of retroactivity was now to be considered. He took the view that many

elements in the Code assumed that a name always had a type, *e.g.*, in making the distinction between orthographic variants and later homonyms. There was one area where it was extremely disturbing to nomenclatural stability for lectotypifications to have retroactivity: superfluity under Art. 63 because of the inclusion of the type of a name that ought to have been adopted. In that case, it was clearly desirable to restrict retroactivity – a matter dealt with by Art. 63 Prop. B. The whole matter might better be referred to a Special Committee, as by Art. 63 Prop. A.

Greuter made it clear that, in order to achieve this, one should vote down the proposal. If rejected, a Special Committee, if appointed, would take care of it.

Fosberg felt the whole basis for the type method rested on its retroactivity. Why would one bother to lectotypify if the effect was not retroactive? The type method was the only way of determining what names applied to.

Stafleu agreed that, when discussed at Stockholm and at Paris, lectotypification was considered retroactive. But of course, times did change.

Demoulin supported referral to a Special Committee, the matter being too important and having too many implications. There was a conflict here between two principles in the Code: typification and nomenclatural superfluity – the latter concept being a big flaw. Cryptogamists had, since Seattle, refused to apply Art. 63.

Prop. C was rejected (and later referred to the Special Committee on Retroactivity of Lectotypification).

Prop. D (12:24:3:98) was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. E (42:78:2:9).

Friis explained that the term "paralectotype" had been proposed in order to fill a gap in type terminology. It referred to the remaining syntypes after a lectotypification. The term "paratype" was already in the Code (Guide Types).

McNeill reiterated the Rapporteurs' comments: those who felt that precision was improved by adoption of the term should vote yes, those who felt the term was not necessary should vote no.

Brummitt noted that the proposal used the word "paralectotype", but in discussions in "Taxon" there had been an alternative suggestion that it should be "lectoparatype". He preferred the latter term.

Stafleu observed that, linguistically, the two words had entirely different meanings – but never mind.

Wijnands asked whether, if the protologue had no cited specimens, there would be no paralectotypes. As both proposers were absent, the question remained unanswered.

Prop. E was rejected.

Prof. F (73:28:25:9).

McNeill introduced the proposal. It dealt with a situation that was not covered in the Code but could be potentially disastrous. If a holotype or lectotype had been lost or destroyed, the paratypes or remaining syntypes might be well known to be taxonomically different. One would then, under the present Code, be forced to change the application of the name. This was clearly stupid, and would be prevented by the proposal.

Greuter enquired on the degree of taxonomic difference that would be needed in order to apply the new rule. Difference at any rank? Even at that of *formae*?

According to **McNeill**, as *formae* were governed by the Code (although he would be happy to jettison them), that would have to be the logic of the proposed amendment.

Prop. F was accepted.

Prop. G (14:93:9:14).

Zijlstra had been surprised by the Rapporteurs' critical comments and the consequent negative mail vote. She had only tried to make explicit what she believed the present Arts. 7.11 and 63 meant.

Others believed the same, as shown, *e.g.*, by the Algae Committee report on *Falklandiella* (Taxon 36: 68. 1987). She now regretted not having formally proposed the opposite, namely to delete the final phrase of Art. 7.11, "unless the author of the superfluous name has definitely indicated a different type." Logically, one had either to accept, as legitimate, a name that on publication included the type of another name (in the same rank) if the author explicitly indicated another type; or say that it was illegitimate – but then it was quite useless to state that it might have a type of its own.

The second point made by the Rapporteurs, that Art. 7 Prop. G might work better if "definitely indicated" was replaced by "definitely designated", was well taken.

McNeill agreed that the words at the end of Art. 7.11 were totally irrelevant. The present proposal, however, was different.

Greuter disagreed with McNeill's first statement. There were cases where it actually mattered whether a name, being illegitimate, was or was not typified automatically: the illegitimate name, or its epithet, might later be taken up in another position and/or rank and be made legitimate. A case in point was that of a newly described species including, as a variety, an earlier, validly named species. In such cases, the last phrase of Art. 7.11 did fulfil a useful purpose.

McNeill pointed out that the proposal, as it presently stood, was not to delete this phrase but to remove illegitimacy from names with a type definitely indicated. This would introduce a change, to which the Rapporteurs had objected.

Nicolson spoke in favour of the proposal. It was dealing with names that did not have the same type as the names causing their illegitimacy. Even though the Code did term them "nomenclaturally superfluous", they were only *apparently* nomenclaturally superfluous. The proposal was that they be not burdened with illegitimacy. This was what had normally been done; if it was indeed a change, it was a change for the better.

Brummitt disagreed. This was a fundamental issue, and the proposed change would be unfortunate.

Prop. G was **rejected**. [A late replacement **proposal from the floor** was **rejected** and referred to the **Special Committee** on Retroactivity of Lectotypification (see pp. 212-213).]

[Consideration of **Props. H-J** was, at the request of Gams, postponed to allow mycologists to study a recent paper by Kuyper:

Prop. H (27:33:3:62) was later referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. I (1:98:3:18) was eventually ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. J (10:79:16:16) was **rejected**.

A **proposal from the floor** was, however, **accepted**. (See pp. 168-171).]

Prop. K (26:49:1:58).

McNeill suggested that the proposal dealt with two rather different matters which were also covered by other proposals (Art. 37 Prop. G and Art. 8 Prop. D).

Taylor maintained that, despite what the Rapporteurs had said, Art. 7 was the right place for the proposed amendment. He did not think that the proposal dealt with two different issues. It was just as important for lectotypes and neotypes as for holotypes to state the herbarium where they were kept.

Stafleu thought this should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

McNeill requested a decision on the principle of whether it be required that the herbaria be designated. If favoured, the Editorial Committee would then decide where it should go.

Prop. K was **accepted**.

Recommendation 7A

Prop. A (4:30:0:97) was referred to the **Editorial Committee** (to be dealt with in the light of the fate of correlated proposals on Art. 37).

Recommendation 7B (new)

Prop. A (49:55:0:28).

Greuter warned against overcrowding the Code with Recommendations that could not be enforced, unless they were absolutely essential.

Prop. A was rejected on a show of hands, then, upon request, on a card vote (48.6% in favour; 188:199).

Recommendation 7C (new)

Prop. A (31:91:5:3).

McNeill pointed out that this did not affect only Fungi and could be dealt with straight away.

Fosberg generally opposed neotypification. His idea was that doubtful names should be left doubtful unless they could be satisfactorily typified, rather than resurrecting them by arbitrary neotypification. He was strongly in favour of this Recommendation.

Prop. A was rejected.

Article 8

Prop. A (62:61:0:1).

McNeill explained that the Committee on Lectotypification felt very strongly that, if there was to be a stringent application of priorability of first choice of a lectotype then the rules of what was a lectotypification had to be equally stringent. The Committee had explored extensively the implications of "residue lectotypification" and had rejected introducing this as a rule.

The concept of typification had only entered the International Code in 1935, after the Cambridge Congress. It was therefore extremely difficult in many publications before that date to determine what was meant by the word "type" and whether, indeed, the use of the term by Rafinesque and other early authors should be looked upon as having anything to do with nomenclatural typification as understood today.

One of the specific issues before the Committee had been the confusion introduced in Seattle by proscribing lectotypifications carried out under the American Code, notably the types of generic names listed in Britton and Brown. The best way forward was to start priorability of lectotypification at a date at which typification had become universally accepted in international nomenclature, *i.e.*, 1 January 1935. This was also the starting date of the requirement for

Latin diagnosis of new taxa, thus postponed as part of the compromises for merging the International with the American Code. There would be a kind of balance in similarly deferring the starting date of priorability of typification, acquired from the American Code, until 1 January 1935.

A change of this sort could have very extensive implications, which was the most important thing for the Section to consider. Linnaean generic names that were typified by Britton and Brown differently from later typifications had been discussed in a recent paper in "Taxon" which made it clear that the 1935 date, for that category of names, was stabilizing rather than disruptive. A more informal review of species names which had recently been the subject of typification studies again suggested that the proposal would not be disruptive. Others had also looked at this and would doubtless comment.

In summary, the Committee had found it extremely difficult to define what constituted an act of lectotypification prior to 1935. A first lectotypification was such an important nomenclatural action that it should be clear-cut and deliberate. The proposed new starting date was the best solution to the problem.

Greuter compared the proposed change to a cut across the Gordian Knot. As with every cut, it did hurt, and it would hurt many, but the situation with respect to early lectotypifications was close to hopeless. He would have been happy to fully support the proposal if it was limited to the rank of genus and above, but, for reasons that were not quite obvious, this was not the case. Had the Committee on Lectotypification made an equally or comparably thorough investigation of the potential effects of this proposal at the lower ranks?

McNeill replied that it had not, but that a less thorough search suggested that the proposal was not disruptive.

Zijlstra pointed out that the paper by McNeill et al. in the May "Taxon" only dealt with phanerogam genera published by Linnaeus in 1753. First post-1934 lectotypifications of these could easily be found, namely in Hitchcock and Green. For the vast majority of

names, however, this was very difficult and time-consuming. Moreover, there was the as yet unresolved matter of retroactivity of lectotypification. If that principle was accepted, lectotypifications would take effect from the date of publication of the name, not from or after 1 January 1935.

The list by McNeill et al. included many cases on which Zijlstra, using additional criteria, had reached a different conclusion. A two-page analysis of this was available for distribution.

[Upon this, further consideration of proposals on Arts. 8 and 9 – here restored to their logical sequence – was postponed to the following morning.]

McNeill explained the discrepancy between Zijlstra's interpretation and the one that had appeared in the May "Taxon" mainly by the fact that Zijlstra had taken the "residue method" as a criterion for lectotypification, as spelled out by her in Art. 8 Prop. P.

The Committee on Lectotypification had thought this method to be undesirable, since it would involve very extensive search through all the literature since 1753 to find the first person to have specifically dealt with all the elements and retained only one. The Committee's own views on lectotypification were spelled out in Prop. C.

While deferring to the Chairman for the sequence, McNeill pointed out that Prop. C, particularly after deletion of the last phrase "so long as no specific exclusion of new lectotypifications is included in the work", and Prop. P were essentially two alternative ways of dealing with what specific action was necessary to constitute lectotypification. Either would resolve this problem, and the Rapporteurs suggested that a decision to adopt one or the other be done on a 60% vote and the choice between the two could then be determined on a 50% vote. This might either be done first, or one could stay with Prop. A and cut the Gordian Knot which would make the other discussion less relevant but still not irrelevant.

Stafleu ruled that Props. C and P were open for discussion.

Prop. C (46:75:3:14) and **Prop. P** (48:78:0:7).

McNeill moved that the Code be clarified to specify what priorable lectotypification entailed in terms of either Prop. C or P.

Silva asked whether retroactivity was implied in either of these two proposals. **McNeill** replied that both proposals were retroactive back to 1753 (or to 1935 if Prop. A should pass).

Brummitt supported the motion. **Greuter** explained that this was the procedure agreed upon at the beginning. The motion that a change be made required a 60% majority to pass. If it was defeated, both proposals would be defeated. If accepted, the choice between the two proposals would be made by a simple majority. **McNeill's** motion was **carried**.

Zijlstra drew attention to the fact that in the Synopsis a small part of Prop. P had been omitted that was included in the original proposal as published. She wrote the missing phrase on the board: "that the word "type" or "lectotype" has to be used".

Brummitt strongly supported Prop. C because he found the residue method (Prop. P) unworkable in practice. He asked **McNeill** whether an expression such as "This name is based on..." would be considered as acceptable as an equivalent of the term "type".

McNeill replied that, if this was the mind of the section, it would best be clarified in the Code by means of an example. The word "equivalent" had this kind of situation in mind, although the Rapporteurs had spoken of "linguistic equivalent" in their comments.

Korf strongly supported Prop. P. The current Code actually should contain such a provision. The Seattle Congress had accepted a new concept, implicit typification (which had originally been proposed as "schizotypification"), as opposed to explicit typification. The Editorial Committee had then been instructed, to introduce the concept of schizotypification but not to use the word. The kind of wording that Prop. P wanted to introduce should already have been in the Code if the Editorial Committee after Seattle had acted in concert with that request. Schizotypification (as described in a paper in "Taxon" by Korf and Rogers was not the same as the residue method. In the latter, one author removed an element, another author removed another, until one was left with only one element. In schizotypification, a single author dealt with all the eligible syntypes and excluded all but one. This was a clear act of typification and the Code should say so now.

Fosberg asked if the concept of linguistic equivalent should not be added to the addition offered by Zijlstra.

Silva felt that Prop. C depended upon passage of Prop. A, as was made clear by the proposed example. If the proposed later starting date, 1935, for priorable lectotypifications was removed, then Props. C and P were not mutually exclusive.

McNeill explained that, in order to make the two proposals comparable, the last part of Prop. C, starting "so long as no specific exclusion", had been removed. This did obviously include the example as well. The remaining first portion of Prop. C was quite general and not dependent on the 1935 starting date. The two proposals were indeed mutually exclusive. It was perfectly possible, however, that Zijlstra's proposal was intended to be limited to the period up to 1953.

Cronquist, if forced to choose between Props. C and P, would go for Prop. P. It did no harm and might do some good. Prop. C went contrary to the doctrine of residues which was implicit, if not always explicit, in taxonomic work since 1753. Throwing out all such practice over the past 200 years would result in a great many changes of names.

Zijlstra admitted that her use of the term "residual lectotype" was not ideal. Prop. P did indeed effect what Korf just had said was intended in the concept schizotype. She felt that it would not be necessary to seek for an earlier residue type if there was no problem. Incidentally, some residue lectotypes were cited in the "Index Nominum Genericorum".

Regarding the question of "linguistic equivalents", she had had many problems in finding out which Chinese words were the equivalent of type and lectotype. Such linguistic equivalents should not be acceptable.

Prop. C would be acceptable as from a later date, *e.g.*, 1953, not 1935, even if Prop. P should pass.

Traverse stated that Palaeobotanists and palaeopalynologists were concerned with the possibility of accidental lectotypification, as

there were many such potential cases in the 30's and 40's. They preferred Prop. C as it made clear that an author must definitely accept his or her lectotypification, and would prefer to explicitly rule out unintentional actions.

Greuter added a warning concerning practicability. Such actions as typification by exclusion of syntypes were not only not indexed anywhere, they were extremely difficult to trace. Successive authors would inevitably try to find an earlier case where this had happened, and would thereby upset later lectotypifications. The danger of this was very real, and it would introduce much nomenclatural instability. Although an early adherent of the method proposed by Zijlstra, which was the historically fair one, he now warned against it.

Prop. C was accepted by a card vote (63.5% in favour, 235:135).

Prop. P was thereby rejected.

Prop. A (continued)

McNeill pointed out that adoption of Prop. C had made it even more desirable that priorability of lectotypification should start at the time when lectotypification had become an accepted part of the International Code, which was 1 January 1935.

Stearn explained that generic names published by Linnaeus in the "Species Plantarum" and "Genera Plantarum" did belong to three categories as regards typification: genera with only one species (holotypified), genera on which there had always been agreement as to the lectotype (which were the majority), and genera for which more than one type had been designated. Preparation of an index to specific names in the "Species Plantarum" had provided him an opportunity to list generic lectotypes, using special signs to indicate the designator (e.g., a dagger sign for Britton said to be a quarrelsome person, or the sign of taurus for Copeland said to have "behaved like a bull in a china shop"). Uncritical acceptance of either Britton & Brown's or Hitchcock & Green's designations would be disastrous, not only as regards generic but also sectional nomenclature. The best procedure would be to accept neither as a whole but to authorize the preparation of a new list of acceptable lectotypes.

The Section was asked to exclude Linnaean genera from the provisions of Art. 8, deleting the example, and to authorize the preparation of a list of lectotypes of Linnaean generic names for the next Congress.

McNeill interpreted this as a clear amendment being newly proposed, on which the Section should vote. The number of Linnaean names in dispute was actually very small, and conservation could take care of these.

Stafleu ruled that discussion of Prop. A was to continue before coming back to Stearn's amendment.

Zijlstra disagreed with McNeill's suggestion that it was harmless to ignore pre-1935 lectotypifications. The date was artificial. On one hand, from 1935 to 1950 scarcely any lectotypifications could be found in e.g. German literature. On the other hand, use of the present type concept was much older in German literature; e.g., Karsten (*Linnaea* 28, 1857) had lectotypified *Bactris* Jacquin, originally described with two species, by the following statement (translated): "The second species placed in *Bactris* by Jacquin cannot be retained in it for the reasons given below; therefore *Bactris minor* is the type of Jacquin's genus." The fact that 1953 had been accepted as the starting date for the requirement of explicit typifications also did indicate that the type concept had developed quite gradually.

Korf strongly opposed any date limitation on lectotypification, and most particularly the proposed date of 1935. This might have been proposed to avoid yet another starting point date for rule application. As McNeill et al. had stated in their 1987 paper, an earlier date (1931) would not materially affect their result. But such a date would make a great difference for mycologists. In 1931 there had been published a book of major importance in typification of fungal genera, Clements & Shear's "The Genera of Fungi", in which the authors had scrupulously attempted to follow the typification rules adopted in 1930 at Cambridge. This book listed well over 1000 fungal generic names and provided for each a lectotype. These typifications had had a major influence on fungal taxonomy in later years, since 40% or more of them were the first explicit lectotypifications of these names.

As soon as he was made aware of the Lectotypification Committee's decision not only to date-limit lectotypifications but to choose 1 January 1935 and thus rule out a major source of fungal typifications, Korf had sent an urgent call to the members of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens to elicit their response. Eleven of the fourteen members had responded, eight of which wished to save the Clements & Shear typifications by either moving the date back to 1930 or making a special exception to the rule. Two of the three dissenting (Demoulin and Hawksworth) were present and might wish to explain why they did not want to save these typifications. Unfortunately, the Lectotypification Committee report had come far too late for discussion even among the members of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens, let alone the mycological community at large.

Brummitt had been a corresponding member of the Committee on Lectotypification and, as such, had voted in favour of the proposal. On later reflections, however, he had realized that all the examples discussed by the Committee were at the generic level, although species names would also be affected by the proposal. Pre-1935 literature contained many references to type specimens since, as Zijlstra had said, the type method evolved long before 1935. Jarvis, having done extensive work on the typification of Linnaean specific names, might wish to comment on the extent of pre-1935 lectotypifications in his field. The conclusions in the paper by McNeill et al. suffered from a fatal flaw: it did compare the effect of adopting the present proposal (1935 starting-point) and Prop. H (obligatory acceptance of Britton & Brown). Nobody in their right mind would go back to Britton & Brown, whose lectotypifications were at present supersedable. What was needed was a comparison of the 1935 starting date with the present rules. Since one could not predict the effect of the proposal, particularly on specific names that could not be saved by conservation, it would be best to do nothing at all and to reject it.

Stafleu agreed with Brummitt and asked the Rapporteurs to comment.

Greuter felt that the extremely pertinent comments that had been made had prevented the Section from taking a rash decision. The Committee on Lectotypification, being faced with the intricate problems presented by the present ruling, had come forward with what he had called a cut through the Gordian Knot. This proposal was unlikely to find a majority now, so that we would still be left with the problems inherent in the present Code. He therefore moved that the Section authorize the setting up of a new **Special Committee on Lectotypification** and that all matters concerning lectotypification, including all relevant proposals that were defeated here, be referred to that Committee for reconsideration.

The motion was seconded and **carried**.

Stearn's proposed **amendment to Prop. A** was **rejected** and referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. A was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. B (29:91:3:10) was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. D (10:117:2:6) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. E (9:115:0:6) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. F (94:27:1:11) was **accepted**.

Prop. G (40:66:13:9) was **rejected** and referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification (but might also be considered by the Special Committee on Registration that was later authorized).

Prop. H (34:71:1:24) was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. I (40:71:2:24).

McNeill explained that this proposal could either be acted upon independently or rejected and referred to the Special Committee.

Voss felt that the proposal was based on a misunderstanding of the definition of "protologue" which, as defined in the Code, was a "discourse", *i.e.*, printed matter, and did not include the actual specimens cited but only the specimen citations; it did not include the earth or sea, but included the citations of the type localities. Therefore there was no conflict in the present wording.

Brummitt had made the proposal from the floor, at Sydney, that resulted in the present provision in the Code. His original wording was "... in serious conflict with the description", but this had been changed somewhere along the line and "description" had become "protologue". He still preferred "description".

Prop. I was rejected and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. J (62:54:2:10).

As **McNeill** pointed out, the Lectotypification Committee had felt that there was an unintentional anomaly in the present wording of the Code. At the moment one could only supersede a lectotype that was in serious conflict with all major elements of the protologue if another element existed that one could choose. If no such element had survived, the "best" type having been destroyed and all remaining elements being in conflict, one could not reject the lectotype. This seemed illogical, and neotypification should be possible in such a situation.

For **Brummitt**, the proposal tended to reduce the importance of type specimens and to lead back toward the circumscription method. One should not place major emphasis on the description if there were type specimens available.

Demoulin strongly disagreed with **Brummitt**. Being in Kew one might prefer to look at the specimen in one's cupboard, but botanists all around the world preferred to go first to the description. Acceptance of the proposal would alleviate some of the problems caused by the rejection of the second part of Art. 7 Prop. B.

Greuter advised not to take a rash decision since there was disagreement.

Prop. J was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. K (48:66:0:9) was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. L (51:72:2:6) was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. M (57:59:0:15) was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. N (63:37:4:28).

Voss called attention to the very favourable mail vote. The proposal merely attempted to improve the clarity of the present Article in the light of what had been decided at Seattle, but over which there had been nothing but controversy ever since. Before Seattle, it was possible to supersede a lectotype only if its choice had been based on a misinterpretation of the protologue. The position in Seattle had been that Britton and Brown did not base their lectotypifications on *any* interpretation of the protologue. That was why the word "arbitrary" had been inserted, that had later been changed to "mechanical". The implication of the word "supersede" was that the inferior was being replaced by something better, but this was not the only definition of the term. Addition of the phrase "if a better choice is available" gave a clearer expression of what was intended in Seattle.

Cronquist, for a change, spoke in favour of the proposal. It would minimize the problems in dealing with American Code lectotypifications.

As **Zijlstra** had explained in her paper in the November "Taxon", American Code typifications were not, in general, "largely mechanical". Britton & Brown had not more often chosen the first species in order than Hitchcock & Green. Even at present there were authors who were working rather mechanically. The proposal should be rejected.

Stafleu had, in another context, read through all the correspondence between Britton and his associates while he was working on Britton & Brown. To his surprise, he had found no indication whatsoever of instructions to take the first species as the type. There were only careful considerations in the light of Britton's opinions. One might object to those opinions, but they had nothing to do with automatism.

McNeill endorsed what had just been said about the Britton & Brown lectotypifications. They were, for the most part, very considered lectotypifications. Accepting this proposal, having rejected Prop. A, would mean heading for a change in the current application of a number of generic names, because their Britton & Brown lectotypification was not in conflict with the protologue. The reason why the Hitchcock & Green lectotypifications were different, for the most part, was not because they were better, but because they conformed more closely to what was then current usage. Given that everything else had been referred to the Special Committee, this proposal should be handled in the same way.

Greuter assured that the straightforward, genuine editorial improvements included in this proposal, even if it was rejected and referred to the Lectotypification Committee, would be taken care of by the Editorial Committee.

Prop. N was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. O (10:113:0:4) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. Q (32:75:1:20) was **rejected** and referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Article 9

Prop. A (12:117:1:1) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. B (16:108:1:6) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. C (75:54:3:5).

Brummitt felt that Props. B, C and D were all based on a misinterpretation of Art. 9.3. This provision did not say that a name could only be typified by an illustration if it was impossible to preserve a specimen. If B was unacceptable, C and D seemed unnecessary.

McNeill pointed out that Brummitt's objection merely concerned Prop. B. Prop. C related to the matter of descriptions as types and, as the Rapporteurs had commented, came closest to the present situation. It would maintain the possibility of having illustrations as types but not descriptions. The latter option, although long in the Code, seemed to the Committee to be in conflict with the very notion of neotypification.

Brummitt agreed but would have preferred to delete Art. 9.3 altogether.

Fosberg believed that outlawing the use of descriptions as types was letting oneself in for a lot of trouble. Thousands of neotypes which would have no relation whatever to the intent of the original authors would have to be designated.

Greuter made it clear that, if Prop. C should be deliberately rejected, one could editorially delete the very notion of neotype from the Code. All names were linked to a description. If one declared, as the Code presently did, that descriptions were eligible as lectotypes, and since lectotypes always took precedence over neotypes, there would never be the slightest chance to designate a neotype. Was it really practical to take a description as a type and fix the application of a name to it?

Demoulin disagreed. There was a difference between descriptions which were synthetic (based on various elements) and descriptions of a single collection. The latter could be as good a representation of that collection as an illustration, and might be better than a badly conserved specimen. It was usual in mycology, where specimens did not keep all details, that they be accompanied by a descriptive note and an illustration. Neotypification should be discouraged, since a lot of harm had been done by hasty neotypification.

Korf believed that some time or other one must come to grips with the question of both type descriptions and type illustrations vs. neotype specimens. A description or an illustration did not allow to apply a reagent or to look at microscopic structure, all of the things that cryptogamists in general must do. For him, neotypes would always supersede any illustration or description because one could work with them.

Prop. C was accepted.

Prop. D (55:72:3:5) was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. E (41:63:19:8).

Karttunen, as a bryologist was in agreement with **Korf** in opposing the use of figures as types. **Prop. E** would greatly reduce that use. In bryophytes an old figure cannot reliably be identified to the species. Better then to select a neotype and clearly reject the figure as a type.

Brummitt related the proposal to the wider issue of what to do when a known type was either lost or was inadequate for taxonomic purposes. For example, the type of *Butyrospermum paradoxum* was a seed but there were two subspecies based on foliage characters. This was a problem to be examined by a Special Committee.

Prop. E was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. F (33:80.3:12) was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Prop. G (22:87:4:3) was ruled as **rejected**.

Hawksworth had a great deal of sympathy with **Prop. G** as it addressed a practical problem regarding situations where living cultures had been stated to be nomenclatural types. This was a continuing problem with certain groups of algae, cyanobacteria and microfungi, especially yeasts, that had not been resolved at Sydney.

He moved that a **new Special Committee** be established to investigate the question of living types of microscopic organisms treated under the Botanical Code.

Demoulin, who worked with the same groups of organisms, knew there was a problem, but felt that it came from the bad habits of some people, not from real difficulties. He opposed the set-up of a Special Committee.

Hawksworth's motion was **rejected**.

Article 10

Prop. A (7:120:0:6) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. B (34:80:2:15).

Chapman explained that the Committee on Valid Publication had not got underway until late and only three (occasionally four) members responded, so that the 2/3 majority became meaningless. Proposals that had not got the 2/3 majority now appeared under his name in the Synopsis, but had been mostly put forward by either Zijlstra or Brummitt, who would speak to them.

Zijlstra, unlike the Rapporteurs, did not believe this to be an editorial matter. The original proposal as printed in the Synopsis had the wrong portions italicised ("*10.3*" instead of "*or*"). It did introduce an exception for 10.2, now provided only for 10.3, and would permit generic names that were not conserved to have a type that was not the type of a specific name.

McNeill still thought this to be editorial. There was a parallel between the wording of Arts. 10.1 and 9.1.

Zijlstra insisted that this was not editorial. She wanted to introduce Art. 10.2 as a further exception to Art. 10.1.

Brummitt agreed with Zijlstra on the principle. The basic issue was, however, Prop. H. If that was accepted then the Editorial Committee could take care of Prop. B.

Greuter agreed. Prop. B was irrelevant under the present wording because Art. 10.2 was not presently an exception to Art. 10.1. It would become one if Prop. H was to be adopted. This was a purely editorial question.

Stafleu decided to deal with Prop. H first. **Prop. B** was subsequently rejected.

Prop. H (34:84:2:10).

Brummitt assured that this was no attempt to reverse the decisions taken at Sydney but simply addressed one small point where he felt the wording in the Code was contradictory. There were many names of genera in which no species were originally included. Their type, according to the present Art. 10.2, was the type of a name of a species to which the original material of the author taxonomically belonged. The Code stated that a type was that element to which a name was permanently attached, but in this case, this was emphatically not so. The element to which the name was permanently attached was the original material used by the author of the generic name, whereas the type determined under Art. 10.2 might well be a specimen which was not even in existence when the generic name was validated, as in the case of *Didymocarpus*.

Fosberg asked whether the word "type", in the proposal, should not be changed to "lectotype".

Zijlstra was not happy with the *Didymocarpus* example since that name was already conserved. Prop. H concerned generic names that were not conserved and for which, at present, one would have to publish a new species name if one wished to take seriously what was stated in Art. 7, that the type should be an element investigated by the original author.

Greuter explained the reasons for the present wording: By tradition and throughout the literature, types of names of genera had been stated in the form of binomials. Theoretically it would indeed have been possible to rule that types of the names of genera were to be chosen from among the specimens examined by the author of the generic name. This option had been discarded mainly because it

would have meant starting again from zero with generic lectotypification. This was exactly what the proposal would now effect for those names in whose protologues no binomials had been cited.

Of course, logic was in support of what Brummitt said. Nevertheless it would serve no useful purpose, and might even be risky, to open the cases of all these names for renewed lectotypification. There was no need for this. At present, types of the names of genera with protologues without any cited binomials had a status that was roughly comparable to neotypes of specific and infraspecific names. It was better to live with rather this than upset past lectotypifications on grounds of purism.

Demoulin strongly supported the proposal. In the past, it had been perfectly normal to designate, not necessarily a specimen but, for example, a plate as type of a generic name. Adanson often based his new genera on a cited plate that, before Sydney, was considered the type, which was extremely logical. The present rule enforced taking a taxonomic decision on the identity of this plate.

Prop. H was **rejected** by a card vote (54.2% in favour, 202:171).

Prop. I (2:121:1:2) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. J (7:124:0:0) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. L (4:122:1:2) – addressing a problem that, according to Yeo, would be dealt with in another way, in the Report of the Committee for Hybrids – was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. M (1:106:0:19) was ruled as **rejected**.

THIRD SESSION

Tuesday, 21 July, 1987, 09:00 – 12:30

[Chairman: Stafleu]

[Most of this session was devoted to deliberations on Arts. 8 and 9, here reported under the previous session.]

Article 10 (continued)

Prop. C (25:100:0:3).

Brummitt disagreed with the Rapporteurs' comments. **Parkinson** was quite right that Art. 10.2 was, at the moment, directly contrary to Art. 7.10. All that was needed was to put in a Note in Art. 10.2 saying "except as covered by Art. 7.10". The proposal should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. C was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. D (25:21:0:85) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. E (24:19.:0:87) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. F (21:19:0:90) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. G (1:73:1:50) had been **withdrawn** in favour of Prop. H.

Prop. K (77:21:1:32).

McNeill commented that this would allow more flexibility in the choice of types of conserved names. At the moment there was a restriction in Art. 10 that the type of a conserved generic name, other than the type of a name of an included species, could be a specimen but not another element.

Prop. K was **accepted**.

Recommendation 10A

Prop. A (88:42:0:7).

McNeill gave the reason why the Rapporteurs thought that the Recommendation could be deleted as proposed. The instruction was entirely to the Editorial Committee, that alone included information on conserved names in the Code.

Veldkamp disagreed with the Rapporteurs. The Recommendation was a clarification of Art. 10.3. It did not only concern the Editorial Committee but also the writers of local floras in which types were being cited.

Prop. A was rejected.

Prop. B (25:86:2:9) was **rejected** (since Art. 10 Prop. A had been rejected).

Prop. C (4:116:1:6) was ruled as **rejected**.

Article 13

Prop. A (4:106:4:2).

Singer claimed that the comments of the Rapporteurs had misinterpreted the proposal. He had merely wanted to exempt the *Basidiomycetes* sensu stricto (not *Gasteromycetes*, *Uredinales* and *Ustilaginales*) from the consequences of sanctioning, in conformity with several of the aims of nomenclature as expressed in the Preamble.

Korf stated that the vote of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens, after very seriously considering the proposal, had been 14 to 0 against. A group of mycologists had met the day before and heard Singer explain his position. He did not manage to change Korf's opinion.

Prop. A was rejected.

Prop. B (55:42:7:7).

Kuyper explained that the present proposal aimed at including lichens in the sanctioning system. It was exactly what had been accepted at Sydney but was later changed by the Editorial Committee which thereby exceeded its mandate. Anyhow, the number of species involved, and the consequences, were small. Fries did not want to treat lichens but he mentioned some, chiefly in his Introduction, that would now be sanctioned. Biological decisions (lichens vs. non-lichens) would still be necessary under Art. 59.

Demoulin disagreed with **Kuyper's** opinion on the Editorial Committee's action. At Sydney this particular issue had not been discussed at all. Subcommittee A of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens had been appointed specifically to discuss the application of Art. 13 to different groups, *i.e.*, the present issue. Subcommittee C, which was not supposed to deal with this problem, had also dealt with it, along with many other matters, and seemed to have been in favour of the present proposal. However, in Subcommittee A, the final vote was exactly split, 4 : 4.

When sanctioning and a changed starting point had been introduced one had endeavoured to change nomenclature as little as possible. Lichens had always remained outside the complex system applied to the fungi, and it was doubtful that most lichenologists would be happy to use **Fries** as the sanctioning book, a work they had never used that way before. Although the consequences were relatively limited, as shown by **Hawksworth's** investigation, several very important names of tropical lichens would change. The proposal should be rejected.

Holm underlined that the intent of the proposal was to exclude taxonomic decisions from the Code.

Hawksworth explained that the reason why the question had been left open at Sydney was that no study had been made to determine the effect. Having done the study it was now clear that one would lose some names and have to make some conservation proposals whichever route one followed. The consensus was to get rid of the need of making biological decisions. He was in favour.

Prop. B was accepted.

Prop. C (73:18:6:13) was accepted.

Article 14

Prop. A (31:103:1:1) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. B (92:37:3:2) was accepted.

Prop. C (41:89:1:1), that had received the unanimous support of the Committee for Spermatophyta, was **accepted** by a card vote (60.1% in favour, 220:146).

[Discussion on **Prop. D** (50:58:1:16), closely related to Rec. 75A Prop. A, was postponed. The proposal was later **accepted** (see pp. 193-194).]

Prop. E (52:56:4:6).

McNeill explained that the proposal was to clarify the meaning of the term sanctioning, which had been introduced at Sydney. The Editorial Committee, based on the discussion there, had concluded that the simplest and clearest way to express this procedure was to treat it as a form of conservation, which was how it currently appeared in the Code. The Editorial Committee might have erred in the interpretation of some details, however.

Korf announced that the Committee for Fungi and Lichens had voted 14:1 in favour of the proposal.

Demoulin must then be the one dissenting, and he was surprised to be alone. The proposal was unnecessarily long and included some strange and unacceptable items at the end concerning the typification of homonyms etc. There would be problems ahead for the Editorial Committee when trying to clarify this. Subcommittee C had not sufficiently taken into account previous committee work of the last 15 years. The idea to include such provisions in Art. 14 had been considered and discarded by the IMA Committee 10 years ago.

There was a single issue on which a clear vote was needed: the question of "competing sanctions". Acceptance of the proposal would solve this, but at the cost of much unnecessary text. It would suffice to retain the essential position: "In case of competing sanctions, the earliest validly published name has priority".

Kuyper disagreed. The fact was that the Editorial Committee, in trying to interpret the previous wording, had come to a different

conclusion than most mycologists wanted. In the discussions in Subcommittee C at least two further options had been introduced. This indicated that there was a problem to be solved. He strongly supported the proposal.

Greuter summarized the Rapporteurs' comments, which were largely in line with what Demoulin had said. The present provisions were simple and straightforward, they actually fulfilled what apparently mycologists wanted. Clarification of a single point was needed, in which the Editorial Committee's interpretation might not have been the best and was certainly not the only logical one. This was but one of several issues that were covered by the proposal. Perhaps it would be wiser to vote down the proposal and invite a motion from the floor along the lines suggested by Demoulin.

Gams, as author of the proposal, mentioned that it had also been favourably received by Subcommittee C, where the vote was on the paragraphs individually, not all having had equal support. Perhaps it had been careless to package them together as a single proposal, and he now suggested an individual vote on each of the three paragraphs (n-p).

Prop. E § n was **rejected** by a card vote (52.6% in favour, 172:155).

Prop. E § o was **accepted**.

Prop. E § p was **accepted** by a card vote (62.3% in favour, 197:119).

Upon announcement of the results of the card votes **Demoulin** felt that the situation had become impossible. One could not have § o and § p without § n. The day before a proposal on Art. 13 had been accepted that was conditional on acceptance of Prop. E § n. Sanctioning was not operational unless one either had § n or returned to the previous wording of Art. 13. He moved that the previous vote on Art. 13 Prop. C be reversed and the former wording of Art. 13 re-established.

McNeill thought that, since § n had been defeated, the Editorial Committee clearly would take no action on Art 13 Prop. C. The

Section had instructed the Editorial Committee not to change from conservation to sanctioning.

Demoulin preferred to have this confirmed by the Section, lest the Editorial Committee be again accused of doing things it should not do.

At **McNeill's** request, the Section confirmed that the previous day's vote on Art. 13 Prop. C, which was positive, was in effect an instruction to the Editorial Committee to operate in the light of the decision that was to be taken on Art. 14 Prop. E.

[An **amended wording** relating to the accepted portions of fProp. E was later referred to the **Editorial Committee** (see pp. 171-172).]

[Discussion on **Props. F-H** was postponed to allow for further deliberations among the mycologists.

Prop. F (3:95:12:5) was later **rejected**.

Prop. G (44:55:12:6) was **accepted as amended**.

Prop. H (22:53:14:22) was **rejected** (see pp. 172-175).]

Prop. I (9:100:8:2) was ruled as **rejected**.

Article 17

Prop. A (34:77:4:11), now irrelevant due to rejection of Art. 4 Prop. A, was **rejected**.

Prop. B (82:6:0:12) was **accepted**, and the Section authorized a similar change in Rec. 16A.4.

Borhidi moved, in the context of Art. 17 Prop. B, that the Editorial Committee be instructed to establish the criteria for determining "improper Latin termination".

Greuter felt that the motion did not affect Prop. B because the word "improper" had been already in the Code before (only "Latin" had been added). The notion of "improper termination" had been

understood by all previous nomenclaturalists as meaning a termination that was not in agreement with those now prescribed in the Code for the rank given.

Borhidi explained that in recent publications a number of formal Latin descriptions had been published that were less informative than the phrase-names of Linnean and pre-Linnean authors but were followed by very thorough descriptions in English or another modern language. It was necessary to establish criteria for really informative Latin descriptions.

Greuter suggested that the motion, since it concerned Latin descriptions not terminations, might be more appropriately put forward in the context of Art. 36 Prop. A.

Article 18

Prop. A (14:103:5:5) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. B (94:45:2:5).

Adolphi was not happy with one sentence in this proposal, "For generic names with alternative genitives the one implicitly used by the original author must be maintained." There were not only genitives for words but also for certain suffixes that had well-established genitives, e.g., *-itis* from Greek always had the genitive *-itidis*. **Demoulin** had suggested that there were alternative genitives in this case, but it was unfortunate that family names based on the generic names *Grammitis* and *Gymnogrammitis* should be formed from different stems, giving *Grammitaceae* and *Gymnogrammitidaceae*. Some suffixes were often used, e.g., *-opsis* and *-stachys*, and compounds were based on generic names such as *Orchis* and *Agrostis* and it was no good to accept different stems for the same endings. He therefore moved an amendment, to delete the last sentence of the proposal.

Demoulin found the preceding comments helpful to explain why, after six years of receiving lengthy manuscripts with discussions of this kind, he refused absolutely ever again to be Secretary of an Orthography Committee. It had been extremely sterile work on

trivial, minute problems, and it had been very difficult to get agreement on at least some issues. All those memoranda had resulted in only a few proposals agreed on by a 2/3 majority, that could be put forward in the name of the Committee. This proposal was the one that had had the largest support. It had been devised by Nicolson and himself in close cooperation. There was no perfect solution to any orthographic problem, but the proposed one was as good as it could be, and he hoped it would pass as it was. If the proposed deletion was made, one would again have to deal with alternative genitives for one and the same name.

Stafleu complimented the Orthography Committee on its work. Orthography had been a pain in the neck for many years, and now for the first time there had been a reasonable clean-up of the situation. The Rapporteurs did caution against making amendments at this stage, during a meeting, on minutiae that could not be fully understood by the whole Section.

Christensen felt that the idea of standardizing grammar in cases of alternative genitives was part of the larger problem of standardization of Latin grammar, that indeed might make things easier in many cases (to think but of the alternative masculine forms *silvester* and *silvestris*). But if one started this process, there would be no end to it. Standardization of Latin grammar should be abandoned.

Adolphi's amendment was **defeated**.

Prop. B was **accepted**.

Prop. C (58:61:0:6).

Demoulin explained that the problem of the ambiguous term "stem" had been raised at Sydney and had been referred to the Orthography Committee. A good example of ambiguity could be found in the Zoological Code, that sometimes spoke of "stem in the sense of the Code" and sometimes of "stem in the sense of the Appendix" (the former being what people usually mean by stem, the latter being the grammatically correct sense). The Botanical Code had used the term in a loose sense until Leningrad where the grammatically correct stem concept was introduced. This was usually not understood, and it was more reasonable to get rid of this ambiguous term. As

the Rapporteurs had pointed out, the Orthography Committee had overlooked one place (Art. 17) where the word "stem" was used. Demoulin therefore moved an amendment to Prop. C, to add the following general instruction: "The Editorial Committee is to remove the word "stem" everywhere in the Code, including Art. 17".

Demoulin's motion was **carried**.

Prop. C was **accepted**.

Prop. D (0:126:1:1) was ruled as **rejected**.

Article 19

Prop. A (67:49:1:9), linked with Art. 18 Prop. C, was likewise **accepted**.

Prop. B (30:82:1:8).

Brummitt explained that, under the Code, names of families, sub-families, tribes, and subtribes must be based on a generic name, but that no such rule existed, as would be logical, for names intercalated between these ranks. Orchidologists had proposed, in recent years, names such as *Apoda*, *Caulescentes*, etc. for names of subdivisions of families. Such names were undesirable.

Stafleu made it clear that this was dealing with informal categories. There was a large body of such names in existence, and this proposal would render them invalid. Orchid people had widely used these informal categories and aberrant names.

Cronquist doubted the wisdom or necessity of this proposal. He had taken part in a symposium on *Rhododendron* taxonomy, where people had been using some intercalated names that did not meet Brummitt's specifications either. As they seemed comfortable with these names, there was no need to force them to conform.

Kuyper added that the use of cladistics in botany was leading to many new informal ranks, and tremendous confusion would result from using regularly formed names at such ranks.

Prop. B was **rejected**.

Article 20

Prop. A (110:7:0:17) was accepted.

Prop. B (52:78:1:6).

Taylor admitted that some might think this was a minor problem, but the Code at present was not clear. There were a small number of generic names, published in a hyphenated form, which now had to be hyphenated unless conserved, but were mostly used without the hyphen (as was the case of two Chilean conifers, *Fitz-roya* and *Saxe-gothaea*). It was also unclear whether the second element should be capitalized or not. One of the examples given in the Code was written *Neves-armondia*, although the second element should better have been capitalized. The proposal was that such names be simply written as one word.

Stafleu doubted that this was really necessary. Taking out the hyphen made names such as *Sebastiano-schaueria* and *Neves-armondia* look terrible. This had been in the Code for very long, and should stay there.

Demoulin stated that a majority of the Orthography Committee had voted against deleting the hyphens.

Borhidi mentioned that there were many names like this, written without hyphens, such as *Ottoschulzia*, *Schmidtottia*, etc. One might define a maximum number of syllables for such names.

Silva pointed out that the proposal answered a question that the present Code did not, namely, how many hyphens were allowable. In the algae recently a generic name with two hyphens had been proposed, raising the question as to whether the second and third elements should be capitalized. [Transcriber's note: *Johnson-sealinkia* – horrible, with or without hyphens!]

Adolphi drew attention to the fact that there were many long, unhyphenated generic names, e.g., *Echinofossulocactus*. He was in favour of the proposal, because *Fitzroya* was much more frequent in literature than *Fitz-roya*.

Prop. B, first thought to be accepted on a show of hands, was subsequently **rejected** by a card vote (51.8% in favour, 175:163).

FOURTH SESSION

Tuesday, 21 July 1987, 14:00 – 17:55
[Chairman: Stafleu]

Article 21

Prop. A (6:52:1:73) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. B (8:116:2:5) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. C (27:88:2:9).

Taylor, having made it clear that Props. C and D were alternatives, suggested that the **Rapporteurs** had made a mistake in implying that an adjectival epithet could not also be considered as a noun, such as in names like *Impatiens* and *Gloriosa*. Perhaps one of the classical scholars present could comment. Work on *Index Kewensis* had been hampered by uncertainty of how to interpret transfers of names from, say, the rank of series to that of subgenus with correlated change of the epithet (as recommended in Rec. 21B). Was this a *stat. nov.* or a *nom. nov.*? Either of the alternative proposals would resolve this uncertainty.

Stearn did not want to give an opinion on this because he was not a classical scholar [laughter]. It must be evident to anybody that there were differences between substantives and adjectives. It was quite possible, in Latin, for an adjective to be converted into a substantive, often by the loss of an implied word such as *herba*. He would regard *Balfouriana* as a noun and, on the other hand, *Balfourianae* as a plural adjective.

Greuter interpreted **Stearn's** comment to mean that Prop. C would not introduce anything new, but it might be needed because not everyone saw the point. Prop. D would certainly be a change, as indicated by the strongly negative mail vote.

Demoulin wondered whether it really was necessary to add a long paragraph for this. Would it not be enough to ask the Editorial Committee to include the example? He moved an **amendment** to Prop. C, to refer only the example to the Editorial Committee.

Demoulin's motion was seconded and **carried**.

Prop. C was **accepted** as amended.

Prop. D (2:126:0:1) was ruled as **rejected**.

Article 23

Prop. A (7:21:93:12).

Friis, apart from some minor points, largely agreed with the Rapporteurs' suggestion that a Special Committee be set up to further investigate this matter.

The Section decided that a **Special Committee** on Binary Combinations be authorized to deal with questions related to Art. 23.

Prop. A, being technically **rejected**, was referred to that **Special Committee**.

Prop. B (56:24:35:14).

Adolphi found the intent of the proposal to be OK but wondered about some of its effects. What would happen to an epithet like *ruta-muraria*? It was neither an adjective nor a name in the genitive nor a word in apposition. It was formed of two independent words, and there were many such epithets.

Staffeu explained that the two words had been made into one word by being hyphenated.

Singer was strongly against the proposal for another reason. Most botanists of the present generation were not capable of analysing an epithet under this complicated scheme, deciding whether it was in the genitive or ablative. Not only Latin and Greek were involved but also other languages; e.g., *Agaricus sayor-casu* [?] was Malayan.

Demoulin regretted the rush in which the decision to set up a Special Committee for Prop. A had been taken. If Props. B and C were now passed, some of the problems addressed by Prop. A would be solved and it might not have been necessary to have a Special Committee.

Nicolson reminded the Section of the fact that the Orthography Committee sifted a lot of material, and that a 2/3 majority had been required for any proposal put forward in the Committee's name. On the specific question addressed by Prop. B, the Committee had tried to define what an epithet could be, but most specifically the one thing that it could not be: a phrase in the ablative, the classical case of polynomials.

Johnson replied to **Singer** that the language of botanical nomenclature was Latin and therefore there had to be prescriptions in the Code concerning cases etc. in Latin. The fact that many people, nowadays, could not understand this was just too bad, but they could read **Stearn's** "Botanical Latin", and if they could not do that then they were not fit to be in the subject.

Eichler feared there might be a discrepancy between Prop. B and Art. 23.2 which allowed names to be composed arbitrarily.

Greuter explained that the proposal aimed at removing a contradiction in the Code. Art. 23.6 said that polyverbal epithets were not admissible and, therefore, could not be used in validly published binary combinations. Art. 23.1 said that if one had epithets of more than one element one had just to hyphenate them. The tradition was to discard polyverbal epithets that were ablative phrases. It was absolutely clear which way stability was best served. The present proposal was very suitable to remove the ambiguity.

Demoulin responded to **Eichler** that there was no problem: an arbitrarily formed epithet would become a word in apposition, which was covered.

Prop. B was accepted.

Prop. C (74:4:5:43) was accepted.

Prop. D (13:61:39:9).

Voss pointed out that the proposal was unnecessary. Art. 45.4 already covered the matter for all Algae, there was no purpose to narrow this down to "phytoflagellates", whatever that meant. At best, the proposal could be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. D was rejected.

Prop. E (2:117:3:1) was ruled as rejected.

Recommendation 23B

Prop. A (3:126:0:1) was ruled as rejected.

Article 24

Prop. A (19:52:0:63) was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. B (10:114:0:8) was ruled as rejected.

Article 29

Prop. A (14:31:1:90).

Demoulin felt this was not editorial. It was a good proposal to be supported but it must be voted on.

McNeill agreed. The mail vote reflected the Rapporteurs' instruction that those favouring the proposal but not agreeing with its placement under Art. 29 should vote "Ed. Comm." The Section had already approved Art. 8 Prop. F dealing with this matter in relation to lectotypification. This was the more general issue. There should be a general vote on the principle, the Editorial Committee being empowered to decide where it would appear in the Code.

Voss failed to understand what was meant here.

McNeill explained that, under the proposal, any action that had nomenclatural effect was only effective if it was effectively published. To write on a herbarium specimen "Type" did not constitute lectotypification. To publish that information did constitute lectotypification.

Voss agreed this example to be acceptable, it had come up under lectotypification. What he was concerned about was the idea that *any* action affecting nomenclature must be effectively published. If so, proposals from the floor to amend the Code would be ruled out because they did affect nomenclature most severely.

McNeill promised that the Editorial Committee would keep this point in mind. "Affecting the status of a name" might be the phrase that was wanted.

Greuter made it clear that this was the reason why the Rapporteurs had not recommended a straightforward yes vote on the proposal. They had instead suggested that a corresponding provision be incorporated in those places where such nomenclatural actions were described: in particular, under Arts. 57.2, 64.4 and 75.2. He asked the Section to vote on Prop. A, as modified by the Rapporteurs' Comments.

Prop. A, as modified by the Rapporteurs' comments, was accepted.

Prop. B (111:21:0:5) was accepted.

[Action on **Prop. C (25:73:26:4)** and **Prop. D (1:98:25:4)**, concerning approval of publications, was deferred. **Prop. C** was later **withdrawn**, and **Prop. D** ruled as **rejected**, both to go to the **Special Committee on Registration** (see p. 129; see also pp. 131-132 on a proposed new Rec. 29B).]

Article 30

[Action on **Prop. A (8:93:26:3)** and **Prop. B (19:77:28:3)**, concerning approval of publications, was deferred. Both proposals were later **withdrawn**, to go to the **Special Committee on Registration** (see p. 129).]

Article 32

[Action on **Prop. A** (41:72:11:4), concerning registration of names, was deferred. The proposal was later **rejected** and referred to the **Special Committee** on Registration (see p. 129).]

Prop. B (92:22:2:16) was **accepted**.

Prop. C (36:24:1:73) was **referred** to the **Editorial Committee**, to be dealt with in the light of the Rapporteurs' comments in the Synopsis.

Prop. D (24:60:2:47).

Brummitt had attempted, by this proposal, to achieve some clarification in a large grey area over whether names were valid when they had a very inadequate description. The problem was emphasized by the following Prop. E that would enforce the opposite conclusion on the same example, Sweet's "Hortus Britannicus". Sweet had given columns with short "descriptive" notes, such as "flowers blue" for all the maybe 20 or more species of a genus. In a few cases, people had accepted this as a validating description for a new species. This was hardly appropriate, but Prop. E took the point of view that it was indeed acceptable. Fosberg would then have been justified in taking up *Boerhavia rubicunda*, replacing a well-known but later name, on the grounds that the little squiggle that looked like a 4 with a line through it, that stood for perennial habit, was equivalent to a validating description. The present Code did not make clear he was wrong, still it was hardly in the spirit of the Code. The wording of the proposal could do with some touching, and maybe a Special Committee should be appointed to look into the question.

Chapman made it clear that this was one of the proposals that had been attributed to him but was in fact Brummitt's. He had considerable sympathy for the idea but was not really certain of how to get around the problem. Under the Code there no longer was what people had termed *nomina subnuda*. To his mind, a description was a description, and trying to eliminate descriptions of one word or

flower colour only, etc., would make problems. Where was one to draw the line? In the past, when a description was inadequate the name had been discarded as a *nomen dubium*. Brummitt's suggestion of setting up a Committee might have merit, but such a Committee might well do a lot of work and still get nowhere.

Nicolson supported the proposal. Unfortunately at present, the question was not whether the description was diagnostic but whether there was descriptive information or not. From the point of Indian botany, Roxburgh's "Hortus Bengalensis", a work of exactly the same format as Sweet's with little symbols corresponding to descriptive information in the various columns, had never been considered to include validly published names. The Code should be tipped away from these *nomina subnuda* which, if neotypified, could be brought into use and would overturn hundreds of currently used names.

Cronquist recognized the problem but doubted that the proposal would solve it without creating as many new problems. There were plenty of names, presented *e.g.* in travellers' accounts, which gave adequate descriptions but might not meet the requirements of the proposal as written. The ambiguities of the present Code were preferable to a strait-jacket. If someone had not intended to propose a name then it was not proposed. If he had not given adequate information to tell what it was then one should not use it.

Voss identified himself with the artful comments of Chapman and Cronquist. There were problems and, as Nicolson had said, one should tip away from some of these. However, the Code did not now require that the description be even accurate. Why should one be splitting hairs over the amount of wording needed to discriminate between a *nomen nudum* and a *nomen subnudum*, if it was perfectly legal to describe a blue-flowered perennial as being an annual with red flowers?

Veldkamp agreed with the proposal. Further to Nicolson's comment on "Hortus Bengalensis", that in the tables of that work there were all kinds of squiggles, but in the footnotes there was real validating information for names of taxa actually considered as new. It was necessary to get rid of all the names just mentioned in tabular form

and to only accept those described in the footnotes. It would upset Indian nomenclature considerably to have to accept those other names as dating from 1814.

Johnson acknowledged that there was a very real problem there. If one were to accept these marginal descriptions then one would have to change a lot of names in tropical and southern hemisphere botany. Earlier authors, such as Bentham, had customarily ignored such names. He favoured the setting up of a Special Committee to deal with the matter.

Stearn was very familiar with this situation. It was perfectly evident that Sweet had not the slightest intention of proposing new names. When he did want to propose new names, he had his own periodical, "The British Flower Garden", in which to publish them. The "Hortus Britannicus" was merely a list, and there were a number of similar horticultural lists, for example, Don's "Hortus Cantabrigensis". Accepting the names appearing there as validly published would open the floodgates to an enormous amount of uncertainty. There was no doubt whatever of the intent of these works, they were merely to list plants available in gardens, without any real botanical scope. The proposal would save a lot of bother.

Fosberg agreed that there were cases, perhaps such as Sweet's, where the author's intent was at least probably understood. But having accepted this proposal, one would not only have to deal with Sweet, there were maybe a thousand other places where one would have to decide what the author had meant. Having to base conclusions on what one thought was someone's, who was long dead, probable intent was unsatisfactory.

Greuter stressed that the problem was real, as recognized by several speakers, and concerned many works with very many new names in them, even earlier than those which had been mentioned (*e.g.* the "Tableau" of Desfontaines, 1804). However, the actual proposal was, in the Rapporteurs' opinion, problematic, not to say inadequate. First of all it was worded as a Recommendation although it should be a rule. Second, the borderline cases would be numerous and there was always, in such instances, a fear that the remedy might be worse than the plague.

He therefore moved an amendment, to include the first example of the proposal (Sweet), as a "voted example", into the Code. By means of such a voted example, similar situations could then be handled by analogy. The (non-essential) final parenthesis of first example, and the second example, would remain at the disposal of the Editorial Committee.

Chapman objected that, since there was descriptive matter present, the example could not be used in Art. 32.1 as an example of names without descriptions.

Greuter explained that the example included the statement "clearly are not intended as validating descriptions." That was what the Code would now rule by means of an example.

Greuter's motion had been seconded and was carried.

Prop. D was accepted as amended.

Prop. E (5:101:1:9) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. F (15:21:2:91) was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. G (2:15:1:111) was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Nicolson pointed out that Props. F and G were contradictory. This would have to be reconciled by the Editorial Committee.

Prop. H (9:93:1:24).

This was an instruction to the Editorial Committee but it had 93 votes against.

Brummitt had been commissioned by the proposer to speak in favour of this. The proposal concerned the epithet presently given as *martini*, which was named after a General Martin. It was his surname, not a Christian name or prename, which was used. It therefore seemed that the proposal was right and that the epithet should be corrected to *martinii*. There was a well known species in Africa, *Dalbergia martinii*, named after another Martin, that he would hate to see reduced to *martini*.

Veldkamp objected that the proposal was wrong, since the original publication had one *i* and one should keep it that way.

Stafleu explained that the point of the proposal was whether the original spelling was to be corrected or not.

Greuter made it understood that the question of whether Martin was a family name or a given name was irrelevant. The question was whether or not Martinus, in Latin, was a personal name – which was indeed the case.

Zijlstra, having checked the original publication, had found that there was no "Martinus" there but: "General Martin collected the seeds..."

Demoulin put it on record that, whereas Greuter and he had had quite some disagreements on the latinization of names, on this case they for once were in total agreement.

Prop. H was, in conformity with a procedural motion from the floor (and in order to avoid a card vote), referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. I (0:19:1:98) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Recommendation 32B

Prop. A (58:58:0:13).

McNeill explained that the proposed addition represented good procedure, but whether or not it was important enough to be added to the Code was up to the Section to tell. It had come as part of Art. 36 Prop. A, heavily defeated by the mail vote, but was quite independent of it.

Cronquist felt that this was the kind of resolution one used to call God, motherhood and country type. Everyone agreed with the sentiment but the question was whether it was worth putting it into the Code and would it make any difference if one did? His answer to both questions was: no.

Prop. A was rejected.

Article 33

Prop. A (79:12:0:47).

McNeill stated that the proposal was generally satisfactory but would need some editorial modification, which could be dealt with by the Editorial Committee.

Yeo was worried about the phrase "next higher taxon" (which was just the editorial point made by the Rapporteurs).

Prop. A was accepted.

Prop. B (50:5:0:75) was, as Greuter explained, on rewordings that were required now that Prop. A had been adopted, and was therefore referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. C (53:6:0:71) was similarly referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. D (6:117:2:10) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. E (37:100:2:13).

Greuter explained that, since Prop. D had been rejected, the proposed example was not supported by a rule and that the present Code, strictly interpreted, did say that such names were not validly published (although they had indeed been widely accepted). There had been a tradition, most widespread in German-speaking countries but also found elsewhere, to write, e.g., sect. *Mammillarisia*, instead of *Pandanus* sect. *Mammillarisia*, which was contrary to Art. 21.1. By analogy to Art. 33 Ex. 2, dealing with specific names, it was obvious that combinations that were not spelled out were not validly published.

Some concern had been expressed as to whether one should be rigid in applying this rule at ranks between genus and species. There were good reasons for this concern, although these ranks were relatively little used. Nevertheless, it was inappropriate to try and change the Code by means of an example.

Voss was glad that this point had been brought up. It could be argued that the example was right on the borderline of what was still acceptable. The title of the corresponding paper included the phrase "key to sections", so that intended rank and combination were at least indicated.

Greuter would have been glad to have this referred to a pertinent Special Committee if there had been any. Since there was not, a proposal should be made to change the rules, but not to insert such an example even if its thrust was felt to be commendable.

Chapman noted that the Committee for Valid Publication was split (2:2) over this example, which was why the proposal had come under his name.

Yeo felt that the example did exemplify what had just been voted for in Art. 33 Prop. A.

Prop. E was rejected.

Prop. F (3:130:0:1) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. G (43:68:5:15).

This proposal, Brummitt said, concerned what was referred to at Kew as "nude combinations". The Code ruled that from 1953 onward one had to fully cite the place of publication of a basionym, but it did not tell what was to happen before 1953. Although even a rather vague reference to the basionym was, hopefully, acceptable, there were many cases where there was absolutely no reference to a basionym but strong circumstantial evidence that the author did, in fact, intend to make a new combination, whether he knew it or not. As an example, *Xanthostemon pubescens* was one of a number of species transferred from another genus by Brongniart & Gris. They referred to the basionym for all their species but for *X. pubescens* of which they gave a description. If one took the hard-line view one would have to accept that *X. pubescens* was a newly described species, which would block the transfer of the apparent basionym to the genus concerned. Having two names with the same epithet, *pubescens*, applying to the same species but based on different types, was

the recipe for complete disaster, as Greuter had explained recently (Taxon 35: 708. 1986) in a note on *Helleborus corsicus*. The common-sense solution was not to accept such names as the names of new species but as new combinations.

Veldkamp corrected **Brummitt's** statement on *Xanthostemon*. There was in fact a reference to the basionym under *X. pubescens*: the collection number cited, no. 781 which was also that of the type of the missing basionym.

Kuyper supported the proposal. Its rejection would result in tremendous problems for the nomenclature of the *Agaricales*. The work by Kummer (Führer Pilzkunde, 1871), which included 500 to 1000 new names, gave only extremely circumstantial evidence that it included new combinations. Accepting these as the names of new taxa would completely upset the agaric nomenclature of the last 100 years.

Zijlstra added that several of **Kummer's** names had been conserved in the form of, e.g., *Pholiota* (Fries) Kummer and *Pleurotus* (Fries) Kummer, although there was only one place in the whole book where a person's name was mentioned at all, the title page with Kummer as the author.

Chapman stated that the proposal had the unanimous (4:0) support of the Committee on Valid Publication. In preparing the "Australian Plant Name Index" some 150 names of this type, mostly by Bailey, had been found. All had traditionally been treated as new combinations.

At **Stafleu's** request, **Brummitt** confirmed that he was supporting the proposal. When asked on his reaction to the points raised in the Rapporteurs' Comments, he had no immediate answer ready, and somewhat later just reiterated what he had said before, adding that Art. 32.4 was not relevant since it dealt with indirect reference, not with lack of reference.

Greuter explained the misgivings of the Rapporteurs. What was basically the same issue was already addressed under Art. 32.4. If one had no reference at all, one could never be sure that the earlier

description applied to the same taxon in the mind of the author of the new name. Any kind of evidence that the earlier name was the basionym, or was intended as the basionym, was an indirect reference to that basionym under Art. 32.4. One would, by accepting the proposal, have the same ground covered in two places in the Code, in slightly different ways and with some contradictions. It was unwise to introduce unclarity into such an important Article as 33, dealing with valid publication.

Prop. G was rejected.

Prop. H (7:95:3:26), an alternative to proposal I that was favoured by the Committee on Valid Publication, was **rejected**.

Prop. I (50:58:3:22).

Cronquist opposed the proposal as being unduly picayune. The procedure illustrated by the example was perhaps not very good, but there could be no question at all about what the authors had meant.

Voss strongly favoured the proposal, not necessarily because of the example, which might be good or bad, but because of the clear reference in the first line to "page or pages". The present wording of the Code merely had "page", which had sometimes been misinterpreted to mean that a single page had to be cited. Some editorial attention was however needed. For instance, the phrase "basionym or protologue" might be more appropriate, because the basionym might be on one page and designation of the type on another page and there was certainly no harm in citing the total pagination of the protologue. The example was defective, perhaps not only in the way that Cronquist had mentioned. It said "publication of the name ..." but at the end concluded that the combination was not validly published. The word "name" was not to be used in the Code except to refer to validly published names.

Stafleu made it clear that, even if the proposal was accepted, the Editorial Committee would have the freedom not to take up the example if it was found to be inconsistent or incorrect.

Korf felt that, as long as the Code allowed us to make corrections of errors, such as the wrong volume, year, etc., it could hardly penalize citing too many correct pages. He did not propose to follow this.

Nicolson acknowledged that indexers were most valuable people, and they needed this kind of precision although other botanists did not. He was personally against the proposal but was sympathetic with the indexers who had to struggle with the problem.

Stafleu pointed out that the proposal was retroactive (to 1953) and did not merely deal with the future.

Brummitt confirmed what Nicolson had just said. Drawing the line between valid and invalid publication of names was a daily problem in the compilation of "Index Kewensis", and a clear guidance was needed. The proposal included "page or pages" and did not adopt the very hard line of only accepting one page. One had to draw a distinction between a reference to the protologue and one that gave the full pagination of the paper or book concerned. The Committee for Valid Publication's vote was unanimous (4:0) to favour this proposal.

Silva, having been an indexer for almost 40 years, opposed the proposal. The proposers apparently had never dealt with the German authors who wrote in a very diffuse fashion. Friedrich Stein, for instance, who was responsible for many generic names of dinoflagellates, had described organisms by making comparisons of one morphological character at a time, resulting in a diffuse protologue scattered over perhaps 65 pages. Sometimes the name did not appear until the caption of the plate. It was impractical to define "page" so narrowly.

Greuter reminded that this proposal, or a similar one, had been extensively discussed at Sydney. There the opinion had prevailed that "page reference" did mean "reference to page or pages". The proposal had been defeated and referred to the Committee on Valid Publication, which apparently did not feel like this and had therefore now made this proposal. If it was really felt to be necessary to make it explicit what "page reference" did mean, the proposal could be accepted. It did not constitute a change with respect to the *status quo*.

Johnson thought a misunderstanding had arisen because of the example given, that referred to a paper of just three pages. If it had been a paper of 600 pages, things would have looked rather different. This was not a question of pages (plural) but a question of giving a bibliographic reference, not to a publication as whole, but to that portion on which the protologue occurred. He recommended acceptance.

Prop. I was accepted, the assurance being given that the Editorial Committee would look for a better example and would not consider the present example appropriate.

Prop. J (26:98:2:4).

Brummitt pointed to the fact that the issue raised by this proposal was analogous to that addressed by Prop. G, where one presently ended up with the same epithet used for the same species in two names with different types. He quoted from Greuter's already mentioned note on the Corsican hellebore: "The only clear lesson to be learned from this whole vexing story is that it is unwise to typify in different ways names that bear the same epithet and apply to the same taxon if one can at all help it."

Cronquist thought Prop. J would loose a whole host of unforeseen problems. Many botanists in the past had described new species from their own material and quoted doubtful synonyms with the same epithet. Asa Gray, for example, describing a species in *Compositae*, had given a full description, put it in the genus he thought it belonged in, indicated a specimen, and then quoted as a doubtful synonym a name with the same epithet in another genus. This had been uniformly accepted as a new species based on the cited material and not as a new combination based on the doubtful synonym. Taking doubtful synonyms as basionyms would just create a lot of unnecessary problems.

Fosberg mentioned that sometimes there were synonymies with a single name with a query, but other times there were half a dozen synonyms, only one of which had a query. He was not sure which situation (or both?) was addressed here.

Greuter explained that Prop. J boiled down to the question of forcing people who, when proposing a new name, had quoted in synonymy with doubt an earlier name, to have their new name typified on the element that they only had included with doubt. He was personally opposed to this since it would, as Cronquist had said, destabilize nomenclature.

Prop. J was rejected.

Prop. K (111:8:4:7) was accepted.

Prop. L (7:21:88:7).

McNeill noted that Props. L-R did all relate to the matter of bibliographic errors of citation but were to some extent overlapping and conflicting. He moved on behalf of both Rapporteurs to authorize the setting up of a new **Special Committee** on Bibliographic Errors of Citation. This motion was **carried**.

Prop. L was rejected and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Bibliographic Errors of Citation.

Prop. M (8:20:87:7) was rejected and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Bibliographic Errors of Citation.

Prop. N (8:22:86:7) was rejected and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Bibliographic Errors of Citation.

Prop. O (2:23:88:7) was rejected and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Bibliographic Errors of Citation.

Prop. P (6:16:91:8) was rejected and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Bibliographic Errors of Citation.

Prop. Q (2:24:85:7) was rejected and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Bibliographic Errors of Citation.

Prop. R (20:15:81:7) was rejected and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Bibliographic Errors of Citation.

Prop. S (42:36:34:13).

[Action was deferred since it was dependent on the outcome on Rec. 46D Prop. A and Rec. 46E Prop. A. These having both been accepted, the following discussion took place during the last session (see p. 197).]

McNeill explained that, since the current Recs. 46D and 46E had now been made into rules, it was appropriate to accept the proposal.

Cronquist put it on record that – to provide a surprise, perhaps, to some people – he would vote in favour of the proposal. [Laughter and applause].

Fosberg asked how serious an error was to be tolerated under this proposal. An error might be so serious that one did not know what was intended. Was there a way to limit this provision?

Yeo, as the proposer, believed one might amend the proposal by inserting the word "necessarily" between "not" and "invalidate". **Stafleu** pointed out that this would not work.

Greuter erroneously believed that the proposal was now really important. In Art. 32 it was stated that in order to be validly published a name must, among other things, comply with the special provisions in Arts. 33-45. So long as the "*in* and *ex*" provisions had been Recommendations, they could not affect the validity of names, but now they were rules, with retroactive effect, incorrect author citations could be construed to invalidate numerous names. It was, therefore, important that this be carried.

Demoulin found the wording dangerous. In mycology, in particular, one often had not merely incorrect forms of author's citations but incorrect author citations. These had always been treated as correctable bibliographic errors. There was a risk that the new wording be understood as if "bibliographic error" covered only wrong dates, page numbers and the like, whereas with author citation only errors in the use of "*in* and *ex*" would be tolerable.

McNeill stated this was not the case. Bibliographic errors of citation meant, among other things, that the checking of the bibliographic data as to who really published the basionym was wrong, *i.e.*, that not the first use but a subsequent use was referred to.

Prop. S was accepted.

Prop. T (9:115:5:3) was ruled as rejected.

Recommendation 33A (new)

Prop. A (101:27:0:3) was accepted.

Article 34

Prop. A (101:26:0:4).

Demoulin knew there were problems with defining incidental mention but, as in two previous Congresses, warned against the proposed deletion. As an example, Gomont, in a paper "Sur quelques *Phormidium*s à thalle rameux" discussing morphology (Bull. Soc. Bot. France ser. 2, 15: lxxxviii. 1893) wrote "On en trouvera une description détaillée, sous le nom *Phormidium penicillatum*, dans un travail d'ensemble sur la végétation algologique des Mascareignes..., par M. Jardin". There were a lot of descriptive elements in this paper, in fact an excellent description of the new species. Later, in the same *Bulletin*, appeared the work by Jardin, a formal taxonomic treatment with "*Phormidium penicellatum* [sic] Gomont mss. nov. spec.", a reference back to Gomont's paper, the number of the collection, the date, and an excellent Latin diagnosis. Gomont was not intending to introduce a new name in the first paper, which was a morphological discussion; it was neither a name not accepted by its author nor a provisional name, but this could be interpreted as incidental mention.

Stafleu would not have drawn the conclusion that this was incidental mention. It was admittedly a strange case but not incidental mention. He was delighted that Demoulin had come back on incidental mention; he would have missed it. [General laughter.]

Voss found this example to be quite parallel to one he had proposed some years ago, that had been discarded, and he was now in favour of deleting reference to incidental mention. A similar example involved a series of articles through various issues of the journal "Rhodora". The first issue included a key to species with adequate descriptive material. The species was formally described some months later. He had been convinced that one had to accept the publication of the name as valid from the description in the key, rather than from the later formal description.

Faegri provided a note of historical interest: incidental mention was not in the Candolle rules of 1867. It had come in at Vienna, was maintained at Brussels and, for effective publication, it had been thrown out at Cambridge.

Zijlstra felt that one should consider Art. 34 Prop. A together with Prop. B that gave three concrete examples of incidental mention.

Greuter explained that Props. A and B were alternative proposals. Prop. A would delete incidental mention. Prop. B would try once more to define it by means of examples. This issue had come up repeatedly, and every time someone had volunteered to produce examples to show that incidental mention existed indeed – and had failed. In Sydney the decision was taken to refer the question to the Committee on Valid Publication, which now recommended deletion. This would deprive the Section of the pleasure of having the issue brought up again at future Congresses. If this was felt to be a drawback, one should oppose Prop. A.

Chapman pointed out that the Committee on Valid Publication strongly (3:1) supported Prop. A over Prop. B. The Committee had looked at many examples and in everyone the name could either be rejected under other provisions or be regarded as validly published.

Fosberg, who had always opposed deletion, admitted that most examples purporting to concern incidental mention were of names that could be accepted as validly published because some descriptive information accidentally accompanied the name. However, it might be unwise to delete the provision as also applying to new

combinations, many of which, in earlier literature, were not intended to be published, with their basionym being implied or understood. There were thousands of such cases, and they should at least be considered before throwing out the baby with the bath water. (A rather superannuated baby, **Stafleu** felt.)

Singer had been sure, before the Congress, that he could find dozens of examples of incidental mention. He was not so sure now, since the votes that had been taken, and would be taken, would change some of the picture. Nonetheless he opposed the proposal.

Stearn maintained that, for those who had to deal with the nomenclature of species in cultivation, it was very important to keep this provision in. In the "Gardeners' Chronicle" and the "Records of the Royal Horticultural Society" awards were reported that had been given at shows, and some journalist had written up a few descriptive comments. *E.g.*, *Lilium waliense* had been thus mentioned in the "Gardeners' Chronicle", and the same species was later provided with a Latin description by E. H. Wilson under the name *Lilium wilmottii*. Whereas there was no doubt about the latter, one could argue backwards and forwards about the slight mention in the "Gardeners' Chronicle" of the earlier name.

Greuter raised a further point. If one retained the provision and was now to take incidental mention literally, this would rule out very many names that were currently accepted. Incidental mention could only be defined in a way that would preclude accepting such names as being validly published. This was implicit in what Fosberg had just said, that very many new combinations had been accepted although they were proposed incidentally. It would be very destabilizing to (a) retain incidental mention and (b) take it seriously.

Prop. A was accepted.

Prop. B (2:125:1:2) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. C (41:74:1:11).

Nicolson was in favour of the proposal. From his limited experience in the nomenclature of those groups, he found this a serious problem in fossils, particularly the microfossils. The "fossil people" had

used the concept of form-genus, an unnatural group. They felt that some day they would find the natural taxon, but in the meantime they used and accepted these names, even though they might say that they would soon replace them. The names were accepted, only the taxa were provisional.

Zijlstra explained that in the case of true provisional names there were alternative names that one could use. In the cases addressed by the proposal this was not so. It would be arbitrary to say that such a name was validly published by the first author who did omit the word "provisional", and it took much time to find out who this was. It would be better to simply accept the name from the first author who used it for a provisional taxon.

Greuter had serious misgivings about the distinction made between provisional names and provisional taxa. Most names that had been customarily rejected as provisional had been introduced by such statements as "*nova species ad interim*". This statement referred to the taxon (species), not the name. Such names would now be ruled to be validly published through a voted example, and without a legal basis in the Code itself. If the example was not accepted as a "voted example" but just referred to the Editorial Committee, the Editorial Committee would have no choice but to discard it because it was not supported by the provisions of the Code. In some cases it was indeed a good solution to use a voted example to legislate, but here it was undesirable.

Prop. C was rejected.

Prop. D (23:76:1:26).

Brummitt thought that these proposals arose from an addition to the Article, made by the Editorial Committee after the Sydney Congress in relation to the autonym rules. [In fact, the addition corresponds to Art. 34 Prop. I, accepted in Sydney! – ed.] The intention was good but the Committee on Valid Publication (3:1 vote after considerable correspondence) considered that the inserted wording had unfortunate side effects and that the addition was undesirable. He now suggested that Prop. D be referred to the Editorial Committee for reconsideration of their post-Sydney action.

Zijlstra urged that Prop. D should not be acted upon without having looked at Prop. E. The four members of the Committee on Valid Publication had all voted in favour of Prop. D, but later she had realized that there was something good in what the Editorial Committee had done, although it did not really relate to alternative names. This occasioned Prop. E, in which (as Brummitt had agreed in correspondence) one word should be added in the final paragraph: "When an author *simultaneously* publishes..."

Greuter believed that the suggestion by Brummitt would be acceptable. Some people, including the Committee, had had problems (that he personally did not have) with the present wording and with the implications of this wording if misunderstood. He would be happy to have both Props. D and E referred to the Editorial Committee on the understanding that it should look into a possible editorial improvement but should not incorporate anything that would change the meaning.

Prop. D was, accordingly, referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. E (6:93:1:25) was, on the same understanding, referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Article 35

Prop. A (23:89:9:1).

McNeill referred to the Rapporteurs' comments in the "Synopsis". Props. A and B were alternative proposals by Subcommittee C of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens. The latter had felt that the new provision should not be confined to the Fungi and Lichens. Generalizing that a name was to be considered as having been published at the rank of variety if denoted by a Greek letter, and of forma if denoted by a Roman letter, would hardly, however, have a stabilizing effect.

Prop. A was **rejected**.

Prop. B (2:111:9:0) was ruled as **rejected**.

Article 36**Prop. A (28:101:1:17).**

McNeill, as one of the proposers, thought this had been a very interesting proposal to have put forward but, in view of the clear mail vote, did not want to raise the issue at this time.

Traverse pointed out that fossil plants could be, and had been for decades, described in any language, including those not written in the Latin alphabet, but were this proposal to be accepted palaeobotanists would be forced in the future to use either Latin or English. Nevertheless, the Committee for Fossil Plants (7:4, 2 abstaining) was in favour of the proposal and (8:4, 1 abstaining) had declined to instruct its representatives, in case it was accepted, to introduce a motion to permit usage of any language written in the Latin alphabet for validating the names of fossil plants. Speaking personally, not as Secretary of the Committee for Fossil Plants, he felt that if Linnaeus was living at present he would publish his basic works in English not Latin, and he favoured the proposal.

Kabuye felt that, although this proposal would help some plant taxonomists with no basic training in Latin, the result might be that they would miss important issues in taxonomy and taxonomic literature. As an alternative, she suggested that botanical Latin should be made an obligatory subject for students of taxonomy so that they would be conversant in the language they were to deal with in their professional careers.

Demoulin found it unfortunate that the "Fossil Committee" had favoured this proposal for reasons completely opposite to those of other botanists. What they should have done was to make a proposal in order to limit the number of languages admissible for the validation of names of fossil plants.

Cronquist objected to the proposal as being yet another deplorable example of linguistic chauvinism. He was pleased with the very heavy mail vote against the proposal. Much of that negative vote might reflect the views of botanists living in other parts of the world

who, for financial or other reasons, could not be present. Accepting this proposal would be unethical and immoral. Suppose that the Russians, Chinese, or Japanese would decide that if English was good enough, so was their language. After a few years, one would have no choice but to accept. One could easily live with the present situation, but might not be able to live with the situation arising if the proposal was to be adopted.

Prop. A was rejected.

Prop. B (17:52:47:5).

As McNeill pointed out, this was part of a package of proposals of which two (Princ. I Prop. B and Art. 23 Prop. B) had already been rejected as being unnecessary. The Committee for Algae should give an opinion on the present one, which concerned organisms that had been considered to belong to more than one kingdom.

Christensen reported that the Committee for Algae had unanimously rejected the proposal as it stood, while a minority only had been willing to consider an alternative possibility that involved obligatory bilingual diagnoses.

Prop. B was rejected.

Prop. C (13:81:5:25), being unnecessary since Art. 32 Prop. B had been accepted, was **rejected.**

Article 37

Prop. A (105:23:0:6) was accepted.

Prop. B (6:121:1:6) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. C (83:42:0:8) was accepted without discussion after corresponding action had been taken on Prop. D.

Prop. D (98:29:0:9) was accepted.

Prop. E (18:89:2:24) was rejected.

Prop. F (6:75:1:53), that had been made just in case both Props. D and E were to be defeated, was **rejected**.

Prop. G (74:49:0:11).

McNeill explained that the proposed rule would replace the present Rec. 37B and, from 1990 onward, would make it mandatory that the herbarium be indicated where the type of a name of a new taxon was deposited.

Voss had voted against this proposal because it needed major editorial attention. After all, this would become a requirement for valid publication. It said: "after 1990, when a nomenclatural type is a specimen", which was indeed required because, if the type was an illustration, it could not be in a herbarium. However, types of names of new genera would now also fall under that provision. The whole issue seemed a bit muddled.

Greuter pressed **Voss's** point. He urged the Section not to accept the proposal exactly as it stood but to refer it to the Editorial Committee on the understanding that it should be made to apply only to taxa of the rank of species and below. It was uncustomary, and would certainly be unwise, if in describing a new genus one would have to state the place of deposit of the type specimen of the name of the "type species".

Brummitt concurred. The intention of the Committee had been correctly interpreted by the Rapporteur. The reason why the Committee vote on Prop. G was split (2 : 2) was that Prop. F had taken two of the votes away. All four of the Committee on Valid Publication were certainly in favour of Prop. G now that Prop. F had been eliminated.

Veldkamp pointed out that the Section had already accepted the essence of this proposal when accepting Art. 7 Prop. K, which had more or less the same wording.

Prop. G was **accepted** and referred to the Editorial Committee, to be **amended** in conformity with the Rapporteur's comments.

Prop. H (3:128:3:2) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. I (4:126:3:3) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. J (70:42:0:19).

McNeill felt the proposal to be clear and commendable, but thought that the terms "equivalent" would require clarification, e.g., "equivalent in a modern language". This could be dealt with by the Editorial Committee.

Zijlstra feared that, since Chinese was a modern language, this would cause problems. For many years she had accepted a certain Chinese word as meaning type, but later on she had started thinking it might mean only "representative species" or "typical species" or something like that, not "nomenclatural type".

McNeill replied that this was a problem one had to deal with even in English and Latin.

Prop. J was **accepted** and referred to the Editorial Committee for **amendment** in conformity with the Vice-Rapporteur's comment.

Prop. K (38:60:0:29), now essentially redundant, was **rejected**.

Prop. L (50:55:0:20).

McNeill explained that this proposal was part of the same package as Art. 36 Prop. A, which had been rejected. However, it was not necessarily dependent on that. It would rule that from 1990 onward one must include, for valid publication of names of new taxa, a clear statement of intent such as *spec. nov.* or *gen. nov.* Dropping the requirement of Latin diagnoses might otherwise have led to many accidental validations.

Greuter urged the Section to bear in mind that any restriction on valid publication would likely result in many names being published invalidly at least for a number of years. He was reluctant to recommend the proposal, because it did not serve a really essential purpose.

Brummitt concurred. The compilers of "Index Kewensis" frequently had to correct the stated intentions of authors who had in mind the right thing but did not say the right thing. When they had in essence managed to describe a new taxon, it seemed desirable to allow their new names.

Prop. L was **rejected**.

Prop. M (25:27:1:80).

McNeill felt that acceptance would be advantageous in view of the previous adoption of Prop. C. It would require editorial attention, and the Rapporteurs had recommended it be referred to the Editorial Committee for improvement, which was confirmed by the mail vote.

Prop. M was **accepted** and referred to the Editorial Committee, to be dealt with in conformity with the Rapporteurs' advice.

Prop. N (18:92:2:12), which due to rejection of Art. 10 Prop. H had become an editorial matter, was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. O (10:106:2:7) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. P (11:28:0:87) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. Q (15:106:1:4) was ruled as **rejected**.

Recommendation 37B

Prop. A (10:49:1:70), which had become irrelevant due to the rejection of Art. 37 Prop. I, was **rejected**.

Article 40

Prop. A (15:5:0:103) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Article 41

Prop. A (74:17:1:38) was **accepted**.

Prop. B (14:87:1:22) was **rejected**.

Article 42

Prop. A (2:123:0:2) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. B (9:99:2:16) was ruled as **rejected**.

Article 45

Action on **Prop. A** (19:28:0:72), belonging to a series of mycological proposals, was deferred. The proposal was eventually referred to the **Editorial Committee** [in the Seventh Session] without further discussion (see p. 175).

Article 46

Prop. A (12:10:0:101) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. B (9:87:1:30).

McNeill explained that the proposal would rescind the necessity of citing the authorship of names except when considered "necessary or useful". It would make the following Articles and Recommendations on how to cite authors' names somewhat redundant.

Holm maintained that the wording of the present Art. 46: "For the indication of the name of a taxon to be accurate and complete, and in order that the date may be readily verified, it is necessary to cite the name of the author(s)..." was in fact nonsensical. First, one did rarely *indicate* names, one *used* them. Second, to be really "accurate and complete", an indication in the form of, *e.g.*, *Rosa gallica* L., *i.e.*,

without reference to an actual work or date, was obviously not sufficient. But it was also apparent that, in most cases, such an accurate and complete indication was not needed.

The Rapporteurs had correctly remarked that the proposed wording would "turn the rule into a Recommendation." They had suggested substituting "are to be cited" for "should be indicated". Holm fully agreed with this amendment.

McNeill stated that the suggestion was that the proposal go to the Editorial Committee if some of the present rather bombastic wording was felt to require modification.

Cronquist pointed out that the present wording was a compromise, designed many years ago, to permit each of two different schools of thought to make their own conflicting interpretation: Those who felt that the author citation was an integral part of the name and must always be cited, and those who thought it was purely bibliographical information and need not be cited except for purely bibliographic purposes. The Article was designed to be a bit obscure, and all had lived with it that way for some time. Why not continue living with it the way it was?

Chapman voiced the opinion that all of Section III of the Code, perhaps with the exception of Art. 50, should not involve rules. They made no difference with regard to validity or legitimacy of names, and merely dealt with author citation. Arts. 46, 47 and 49 should be Recommendations, and Art. 48 should be a Note.

Voss had long been interested in the matter of citing authors' names. Two of the key features of Art. 46 were (a) that it was not obligatory to cite authors' names (in spite of what was sometimes incorrectly maintained, the author citation was not an integral part of the name); and (b) that if authors were cited they had to be the ones who validly published the name. This seemed to have been unintentionally lost sight of in the proposal. If the present wording was to be changed at all, it might better be rephrased as follows: "When it is necessary or useful to cite authors of scientific names, the authors to be cited are those who validly published the name".

Yeo agreed with Chapman about the nature of Art. 46 and some of the following. If they were infringed it did not affect the validity of the names. There had however to be in the Code certain instructions in the form of rules, even if they had no effect on validity. Voss's point also was important. Prop. C offered another way of dealing with this question.

Panigrahi pointed out that *Rosa gallica* L. (1753) was different from *Rosa gallica* L. (1759), the latter being a synonym of *R. rubra* E. Blackwell (1757). The example of *Rosa gallica* L., under Art. 46.1, was not appropriate unless the year (1753 or 1759) was also given.

Prop. B was rejected.

Prop. C (5:112:1:3) was ruled as rejected.

Recommendation 46A

Prop. A (10:102:1:12) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. B (1:111:1:11) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. C (3:28:14:81).

Brummitt moved that matters dealing with "*in* and *ex*" be referred to a Special Committee – but, as pointed out by McNeill, the present proposal had nothing to do with "*in* and *ex*."

Traverse asked whether the proposal, changing a Recommendation to a Note, did not have the effect of increasing its weight to the force of an Article. If so, it would not be appropriate to refer the proposal to the Editorial Committee.

McNeill explained that, in conformity with the Rapporteurs' suggestion, the "Ed. Comm." vote did not support the proposal as it stood, but would have the effect that the language of Rec. 46A, that was somewhat more appropriate for a rule than for a Recommendation at the moment, be brought into accord with its status as a Recommendation. Those feeling it should be a rule should vote for accepting the proposal.

Prop. C was referred to the **Editorial Committee**, to be dealt with in conformity with the **Rapporteurs'** comments.

Recommendation 46B

Prop. A (2:35:2:76) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**, to be handled in accordance with the decision to be made later on Rec. 46F **Prop. A**.

Recommendation 46D

Prop. A (65:45:0:18).

McNeill pointed out that this proposal was one of those dealing with the matter for which **Brummitt** had just suggested that a Special Committee be set up. It would have the effect that the present Recommendation dealing with "*in*" should instead become a rule.

Yeo explained that this covered exactly the point that **Voss** had raised. It was no matter of particular importance, but there was a right way and a wrong way of dealing with author citations as used by secondary authors, and the appropriate status was that of a rule.

Prop. A was accepted.

Prop. B (76:17:0:34) was accepted.

Recommendation 46E

Prop. A (60:46:0:18).

McNeill felt that, having just accepted Rec. 46D **Prop. A**, the Section would be totally illogical if it did not accept this one.

Faegri commented that **Yeo** had properly identified these provisions as concerning "secondary authors". The majority of secondary authors couldn't care less.

Voss was assured by the Rapporteurs that the intention of the proposal was *not* to eliminate the present option of omitting the name of the author before *ex*.

Chapman could not see why one should try to clutter the Code with Articles in a whole section which merely recommended how to cite authors' names and literature for the purposes of precision and had no bearing on the valid publication of names. This provision, and the others associated with it, should be left as Recommendations.

Greuter pointed out that Chapman's comments referred equally well, and perhaps primarily, to the proposal that had just been passed. It was understandable that one might object to both, but not that one objected to handling both matters in the same way.

Fosberg protested against the statement, just made by Chapman, that the Code only applied to the publication of botanical names. It also applied to the use of botanical names.

Prop. A was accepted.

Prop. B (9:22:0:88), dealing with an example, was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. C (7:101:3:17).

Yeo stated that this was his only proposal on Art. 46 and its Recommendations that would bring a real innovation. The use of "*ex*" by current authors, when publishing new names, ought to be recommended against. He had cited several relevant examples with the published proposal.

Brummitt apologized for his previous motion made out of context a few minutes earlier. As had been noted, he had got his numbers mixed up. He felt there were sufficiently serious problems, particularly now that the matter had been made the subject of Articles and not Recommendations, to justify the setting up of a Special Committee on *in* and *ex* Citations. He moved that a new Special Committee be set up, and Props. C and D be referred to it.

Stafleu doubted one would find enough competent members. Would not such a Committee involve just the same people, Brummitt and Yeo? There were four Special Committees set up after Sydney, and one did not get out a report. In Berlin the number four had already been exceeded.

Brummitt responded that the proposed new Committee, dealing with a relatively small subject, would be more likely to come up with definite proposals than one like the "Committee on Ineffective Publication", which had been given a colossal task.

Brummitt's motion was seconded and **carried** by a card vote (65.8% in favour; 229:119). **Prop. C** was thereby **rejected** and referred to the **Special Committee** on *in* and *ex* Citations.

Prop. D (29:20:0:80) was also, by the same action, **rejected** and referred to the **Special Committee** on *in* and *ex* Citations.

[The three following decisions on Recs. 46E-F, here reported, were actually taken on the next morning (see p. 119).]

Prop. E (3:105:14:7) and **Prop. F** (1:128:1:2) were both ruled as **rejected**.

Recommendation 46F

Prop. A (29:13:0:91) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

FIFTH SESSION

Wednesday, 22 July 1987, 09:00 – 11:55

[Chairman: Stafleu]

DISCUSSION ON REGISTRATION (II)

Stafleu expressed his gratitude to the Section for being so co-operative in getting through a large number of proposals that were relatively minor on the previous days, because this gave the opportunity

for some of the major issues such as registration to be considered with greater care. The morning's session would start with discussing Registration.

Greuter announced that the Committee on Registration had met on the previous evening and had had a very thorough discussion. Taking into account all that had been said in the First Session and all that members of the Committee had received by way of feedback from the members of the Section in the meantime, whether critical or supportive, it had tried to identify what might hopefully achieve a broad consensus of support from the Section: to give both approval of publications and registration of names a chance of being tested and implemented in the next six years without committing nomenclature to anything definite at this stage. If a majority should feel that one of the issues was sufficiently mature to go beyond such a testing stage, it would be given an opportunity so to decide: the submitted proposals, especially Gen. Prop. A, were not being withdrawn but would be put before the Section, possibly in a slightly amended form, and, if accepted, would be implemented between this and the next Congress. Even those who did not feel like supporting such a course might in fairness want to give the whole process an opportunity to keep moving and to produce something that the next Nomenclature Section could judge in six years' time.

Technically, the Committee proposed that the Section first consider a core of three proposals: Div. III Prop. A, to set up a Permanent Committee on Registration; and Gen. Props. D & E, defining the mandate of this Committee (D dealing with the registration of names and E with the registration or approval of publications). If this core was accepted as common ground, the other individual proposals, or any other suggestions that might come from the floor, would be discussed and voted on; if defeated, they would be referred for further examination and possible implementation to the Committee on Registration; if accepted, they would be implemented immediately.

The Section should be aware of the general importance of these issues. In the past the technical difficulties in any system of registration would have been unsurmountable. Technology was, however,

progressing very rapidly: the available means and instruments would be much safer, much more refined, much easier to handle and also much cheaper by the time the next Congress would decide on whatever was being proposed to it. Nomenclature had to do justice to expectations from the world of users of names. There were considerable economic interests involved in achieving a stabler nomenclature. But there was a very important point, not usually noted by the users of names but always to be kept in mind: that stabilization of nomenclature **must** not in any way hinder taxonomic progress. Nomenclature was to help taxonomists to express what they had found and to make them understood by others.

The proposed procedure reminded **Cronquist** of an old jibe: "Heads I win; tails you lose". If the proposals were passed, fine; if not, they would be sent to a Committee for further action. But one should also have the opportunity to say: "to hell with the Committee!" (Which, as **McNeill** explained, was exactly the first question to be voted on, Div. III Prop. A.)

In reply to a question by **Fosberg**, **Greuter** explained that a Committee on Registration of Plant Names had been set up by the General Committee in late 1985 following resolutions passed at ICSEB III in Brighton and at the IUBS General Assembly in Budapest, both held in 1985. **Stafleu** added that the role of the General Committee was to prepare the ground for the nomenclature sessions and that it therefore had the right to set up such a Committee, but that it was not a Committee set up at the last Congress.

Chaloner was concerned that a premature decision might be taken as to the dichotomy of dealing with this problem by registering names or by approving the vectors which carried those names. Whatever system was to be established should not at this stage pre-judge the choice between those two separate, alternative and mutually exclusive pathways. To some people, approving publications was relatively innocent and had less of a big-brother air to it than a register of all names that were acceptable.

Stafleu made it clear that no decision had been or was being pre-empted by the proposals made, and that the Section was completely free to take any course it pleased.

Faegri, as a member of the defunct Committee on Effective Publication, wholeheartedly endorsed the core proposals. **Stafleu** was glad to note that the Committee on Effective Publication was in favour of having their own problems solved by others in another way.

Baer pointed out that the living surface of Earth consisted of individual organisms, which through evolution existed as multitudes of species. It was the primary purpose of nomenclature to identify and name all species for the use of mankind now and in the future. Deliberations on registration should be conducted with this objective in mind.

Fosberg felt that the fundamental dichotomy was between simple indexing of validly published names for information purposes, on the one hand, and registration in the sense of approval or sanctioning of registered names. Past experience with lists of standardized plant names was relevant in this context. There had been a tendency for editors and other official entities to force authors to use a name on such a list (designed to be purely informative) rather than another name. He was rather conservative, or maybe cautious, about this. Registration might just play into the hands of editors who wanted to simplify their work.

Stafleu provided a historical perspective to the debates. Nomenclature had started out with the "Lois" of Candolle which, while providing a general framework of rules, left the responsibility for application to the user. In the course of this century things had slowly begun to change. There had been repeated attempts to lay down the law for the community instead of keeping a freedom of choice on the basis of a general set of laws. The first example was the proposal made from Berlin by Engler and his allies, in reaction to Kuntze, to introduce *nomina conservanda* into the Code. A *nomen conservandum* was by itself a limitation of freedom. This limitation had been accepted by meetings like the present one, so that introducing a limiting principle like registration was not really new.

On the other hand registration went much farther. One of the main reasons invoked in favour of registration was that the technology was now available, implying that one had always wanted to stabilize,

that general rules had not been successful in doing so, and that now there was a mechanism to achieve this, just as *nomina conservanda* formed a mechanism to achieve stabilization on a more limited scale. Previous attempts in a similar direction had failed, because Nomenclature Sections had always been very cautious in accepting any infringement of their liberty. One had indeed to caution against transferring nomenclatural authority to any body that was placed outside the domain of influence of the Section or of the botanical community. In at least one of the proposals under consideration, even individual institutions were specified, to act as authorities that were not directly under the control of the Section. This point should certainly be discussed.

It was untenable now to maintain the early Candolleian liberty. One could not go on as in the nineteenth century: Things had become much more involved. Some change was needed, and the set of proposals now before the Section was to be welcomed. Registration was something to be discussed here, but not finally decided. Fortunately, this was reflected in the proposals as now presented. Whatever was eventually to happen would have to be worked out over the next six years, and at the next Congress the firm decisions would then have to be taken. It was therefore important to set up a system now that would allow testing the options, but gave six years' grace before taking a final decision. The risk of a Section becoming either weary or enthusiastic and making far-reaching decisions that might later prove rash would thus be avoided. An open discussion about the future was now needed. The sheer amount of information had become too large to be controllable in the way it was when there were only 500 taxonomists all over the world, as was the case in 1905. Those present should keep in mind that they were not alone in this world, that there were outside interests, that they also worked for society – but they should nevertheless be cautious.

Cannon was interested in the terms of reference that would be given to a Committee on Registration. Most people would not be too worried about approval of publications as laid out in Gen. Prop. A. However Gen. Prop. D implied to some people the extension of responsibility of such a Committee from overseeing nomenclature to

overseeing taxonomy as well, effectively to approve individual botanists' classifications rather than decide on rules about names. Could Greuter set people's minds at rest about this?

Voss reiterated that no one had any objection against indexing names that had been validly published. The new idea was to introduce registration as a requirement of valid publication for names in the future (not retroactively, at least at this stage), irrespective of their taxonomic justification. In cases of competing names, the date for purposes of priority would presumably be the date of receipt at the registration centre. This would be one of the aspects to be considered. Whether registration as such was good or bad was open to debate. Of this package of three proposals, he would actively oppose Div. III Prop. A. This would be a binding decision, introducing into the printed Code a new Permanent Committee equivalent to, e.g., the Committee for Spermatophyta. The proposal stated that the ex-officio members of the General Committee would be members of the Committee for Registration, although they were often those least interested in participating actively. A Committee on Registration was perhaps acceptable, but not as a Permanent Committee written into the Code.

Greuter explained that it was premature to answer the question of what exactly registration of names and approval of publications could and should look like. All that had been said would, if a Committee was established, be taken into careful consideration by that Committee and borne in mind when formulating proposals for the next Congress. It was in the Committee's interest to do so, because otherwise the next Nomenclature Section would turn down their proposals. The general option now was to confer to a Committee a mandate to investigate the various possibilities. If this option was taken, the Section would hopefully have before it, in six years' time, one or more sets of proposals that were concrete enough to be acted upon. A rash decision on these matters was not possible. A sensible scheme could hardly have been devised without this prior feedback from the Section: without it the Committee would work high up in the clouds and fall down to the depths at the next Congress. Concrete answers to the questions that had been asked would be premature – but the questions themselves would make the Committee's work useful and good.

Nevertheless a few concrete points could be made – as his personal answers and not binding in the least the future work of the Committee. First of all approval of publications and registration of names were two different things. To some extent they covered the same ground, but it was not certain from the outset that one alone should be implemented. This had to be carefully studied on grounds of feasibility, of acceptability, and of need or usefulness. The Committee would have to conclude whether it was better to go one way or the other way, or to go both ways in parallel. The Section should not bind the Committee, but should advise it.

Second, whatever the Committee would decide should not involve censorship. There had been one proposal (Gen. Prop. B) suggesting this, but it had been so heavily defeated in the mail vote that it would certainly not be pursued. There should be no taxonomic censorship nor, so far as possible, should the liberty of an author to publish in whatever vector of publication he judged good (as long as this vector was generally accessible) be restricted. It was aberrant to expect that taxonomic censorship could be exerted by a Registration Committee, and it was equally aberrant to think that the Committee should judge arbitrarily which publications were to be approved and which not. All such decisions had to be made on the basis of laid-down criteria that were objectively testable, such as already existed in the fields of effective and valid publication – but in a way that was easier to apply than the present rules. One could not predict what these mechanisms would be; one might make guesses, but this was not useful at this stage.

Third, Voss's statement that the *ex-officio* members of the General Committee were the least active was surprising. The contrary was more likely to be true because actually these were active nomenclaturalists as the Permanent Committee Secretaries.

[Voss: but also the President and Secretary of IAPT, for instance. – Staffleu: one of them was Voss, and no one had ever complained of him. – Laughter.]

To make the *ex-officio* members of the General Committee members of the new Committee had been proposed in order to allow a direct control of this very important matter by the Section, as represented by the General Committee between the Congresses.

Hnatiuk echoed Voss's concern about setting up a Committee for Registration as a Permanent Committee under Div. III; it should be a Special Committee. Rather than a single Committee to investigate "registration of names" and "approval of publications", there should be two separate Committees so as to allow an independent investigation of both ideas and to permit proposals on both to be presented to the next Section meetings in 1993. The Committee should not be in a position to recommend one of these options over another – the Section should have both presented to it for it to decide which way to go.

D'Arcy felt that the most obvious issue addressed by the proposals was publication in obscure and marginal publications. From the discussion it seemed possible that all proposals, in spite of their merits, might fail. If they should, a proposal should be made to add the following Recommendation to the Code: "An author publishing a new name or combination or the like in a place where such publications are not commonly found should promptly forward to an appropriate indexing centre a full citation or a copy of the publication".

Stafleu stated that it would be premature to deal with such a proposal at this stage. It could be presented if the other proposals should fail.

Karttunen thought that there had been too much talk about this monster of new technology. Modern communication and publication technology was not to be feared. It would help to make indexing more effective in the future, thereby solving some of the problems addressed by the proposals. Gen. Prop. A would solve some problems of effective publication and could be supported, but Gen. Prop. D, concerning valid publication, was too far-reaching.

Silva pointed out that present-day technology made indexing much easier, indeed almost instantaneous, thus increasing the difficulties for indexers who had to make decisions on effective and valid publication on the moment. Indexing of the kind here discussed often involved subjective decisions – also a form of censorship, so to say – wherever the application of the rules of nomenclature was uncertain. If an index included only effectively published names, as was

the case of "Index Kewensis" and of the "Index Nominum Algarum", in certain instances subjective decisions as to whether or not a name was effectively published had to be made. One of the main merits of registration was that it would remove the responsibility of making such subjective decisions from the indexers and would confide it to a body with official authority, approved by the Nomenclature Section. The alternative to registration was a very detailed ruling, within the Code, on any possible special case and exception.

Speaking to Voss's concern about the addition of a further requirement for valid publication, Silva made it clear that as a member of the Committee on Registration he had taken the view that the date of registration was not to affect the date of valid publication, which would still be determined as under the present Code.

Chapman disagreed with Silva that indexing was necessarily censorship. As in the "Australian Plant Name Index", all names could be indexed and a comment be appended in cases of doubtful validity or effectiveness of publication. The decision was then left to the individual taxonomist. Whether this was the right way to go was not sure, however.

It was not the Berlin Congress that should incorporate a Permanent Committee on Registration into the Code, in Div. III. This Congress was the place to set up a Special Committee to investigate Registration and, if this should decide that the procedure or mechanisms were feasible, then the next Congress was the place to set up a Permanent Committee. Also, at this stage, the title "Committee for Registration" was misleading since it implied a committee for the registration of plant names and not merely a committee to look into the feasibility of registration.

Brummitt's thoughts had been triggered by Hnatiuk's suggestion of having two Committees, one on approved publications and the other on registration. Approved publications were a simple concept that could be coped with by the registration centres without much difficulty. Registration was more far-reaching, and setting up a Committee to investigate it would cost IAPT a sum of thousands of pounds to do the trial run. He was still ambivalent on the question of registration. Splitting the Committee was a good idea.

Stafleu explained that costs of some thousands of pounds per year could no doubt be borne by IAPT, but such an estimate was very optimistic. To hire just a single secretary, with some overhead, cost much more. From the financial and organizational point of view it was the feasibility that must be addressed, which had obviously been recognized by the proposers.

One of the proposals was completely based on existing institutions, with no financial implications for IAPT. The actual need, however, was for an economically independent organization. Although this could be housed in existing institutions, the control should, in principle, be in the hands of the Nomenclature Section. IAPT had been set up in 1950 to do things like this, and had indeed done a lot but never anything as grandiose as registration. Financial dependence on national institutions was the worst thing that could happen to nomenclature; despite goodwill, it left the door open to undesirable situations. The present proposals were only a mandate for investigation. But the Section should be very careful, at the next Congress, to keep the control of whatever system would then be decided in its own hands. He would not then be there to advise. The mandate of the Committee to be set up should be defined in such a way as to leave open all possible options – including financing through IAPT.

Cronquist recalled an old political technique known as the bologna-slicer technique. First take a little slice, not enough to worry about, then take another, and another, and eventually you get the whole sausage. He was opposed to the first slice, and called attention to the very heavy mail vote against all these proposals, reflecting at least in part the views of botanists from many countries, who for financial or other reasons were unable to attend. These botanists were not less worthy than those present.

Forero also opposed the inclusion of a Committee for Registration in Div. III of the Code. If Special Committees were set up, there should be two, one for names, one for publications.

The use of the word "approval" of publication was dangerous, "recognition" or "registration" was preferable. The list of publications should be open-ended. This was important for institutions in developing countries, since they needed a recognized vector to publish

their own work, so as to get additional funds, local and international recognition, and to use it for exchange. A requirement for "approval" would result in more and more regulations as time went by. To think of "Index Herbariorum (Herbaria)", this used to be open to everybody, and being included had been very useful for small institutions, but now holdings of more than 5,000 specimens were required in order to be listed.

Fosberg felt that committees tended to advocacy, rather than simply investigation of facts. He hoped that the proposed Committee would look into the facts in a completely unbiased manner.

McNeill, speaking from a personal perspective rather than as Vice-Rapporteur, thought that the Section was being altogether far too complacent. It looked as though they were "fiddling while Rome burns". The situation with regard to electronic publication, and more particularly with regard to the user community, *e.g.* in the protists and in groups related to organisms of major economic importance, was such that nomenclature was in serious danger of being taken out of this Section's hands and of stumbling into the pitfalls to which Fosberg had rightly drawn attention earlier. Something had now to be done about it – but still it seemed that with a few exceptions nobody present was interested in doing anything. In the past lists of standard names had been straitjackets, very restrictive to the growth of taxonomy. It was to be feared that any kind of standard names that groups of users might want to adopt would be of this type. There was, for example, a list of standard scientific names of crops and weeds adopted at each congress of the International Seed Testing Association; these names must be used in all its communications. At the moment these lists were revised at each of their congresses and there were good taxonomists on their Nomenclature Committee, but this might not always be so, and not all groups of users were so enlightened and so aware of the rules of nomenclature. What the users of systematics wanted was a ready and available list of usable names – not necessarily the "taxonomically correct" names (that was the straitjacket to be avoided) but names that were established as being available for use by the user

community, *i.e.*, names fully in accordance with the Code. This was what registration was about. The various mechanisms that had been discussed, such as a register of approved publications and registration of the names themselves, were different ways of achieving it. It was indeed very important, as Stafleu had said and as Fosberg had certainly implied, that control of such registration remain in the hands of the international community.

There were two main reasons why a Permanent Committee should be established. One was the urgency of the matter: a Permanent Committee would do justice to the seriousness of the issue while at the same time not committing nomenclature to mechanisms whose implications were not yet fully understood. The other was to ensure that the responsibility for working out registration procedures would not pass simply to a group of advocates. Such a group would not carry the authority, at the next Congress, that the proposed Permanent Committee would, which was to include the secretaries of each of the Permanent Committees for the various taxonomic groups. These were the people who dealt with day-to-day nomenclature most extensively.

Having a single Registration Committee was appropriate because the areas of approval of publications and registration of names were interlinked. Accepting these three proposals would not preclude going on faster in the matter of approved publications if that was the Section's wish. Having one Committee would ensure that all these matters be considered in context by a broadly based body, that was international in its origins and responsible to the whole taxonomic community.

Stafleu thought that too much of a distinction was being made between Permanent and Special Committees. Both only existed between Congresses, for the next Congress could abolish any Permanent Committee. What was needed was a Committee to investigate this situation, a Committee that would be active and was respected, and that would report to the next Congress so that the next Congress could take the appropriate steps.

Faegri enquired about the possibility of relying, to a certain extent, on ISSN and ISBN numbers for the approval of books and journals. These numbers were attributed nationally, and very freely, just as if scattering fertilizer on one's lawn.

Stafleu cautioned that ISSN and ISBN numbers did not completely cover the relevant output, especially in the developing countries. The philosophy of the Code had always been that if a publication conformed to the rules it had to be taken into consideration.

Korf strongly endorsed McNeill's position and believed a single Committee was needed. A Committee was needed to address the evolving technology, and in particular to judge what publications were effectively published. Indexes were important, but as far as registration was concerned all one needed was a list of effectively published, not of validly published names. Whether a name was validly published he could determine by consulting the Code, but he could often not determine if it was effectively published. This problem was the one the Committee needed to address.

Gibbs-Russell emphasized the problems of working with a major Flora outside Europe and North America. For southern Africa there were a minimum of 100,000 names to evaluate. It was no coincidence that indexing projects had developed independently in southern Africa and in Australia, as part of their Flora studies, but it defeated the purpose of overall treatment of names to do this country by country. It was time to tackle the problem worldwide in a co-ordinated way.

Panigrahi felt that, while indexing of names did serve a useful purpose, registration of names, which would mean that the international community would confer on them the sanctity of correctness, was not practicable. There was a lasting controversy on whether some tree ferns belonged to the genera *Cyathea* or *Alsophila*. Under which genus would the Committee for Registration list new tree fern species? Even some of the names registered in the Appendices of the Code were not correct! Unless IAPT would rule that all names of new taxa and all new combinations must be published in one place, after proper vetting (just as proposals for conservation had to be published in "Taxon" and considered by the appropriate

Committee), it was not practicable to register names that were validly or effectively published with the aim of their universal acceptance.

Bhattacharyya claimed that taxonomy was a meeting ground of Art and Science, and required an intellectual pursuit not a mechanization.

[At this point the Session adjourned for a break. Afterwards, in the absence of Greuter, who had to leave because of the festivities to be held at the Botanical Museum, discussion of registration was discontinued in favour of other proposals (Rec. 46E Prop. E to Art. 63 Prop. Q: see pp. 106 and 132-142). For the purposes of this report, the registration context has been kept together.]

SIXTH SESSION

Wednesday, 22 July 1987, 14:30 – 18:06

[Chairman: Stafleu]

DISCUSSION ON REGISTRATION (III)

Greuter spoke on **Div. III Prop. A**. As **Stafleu** had explained earlier, it did not make much difference whether one had a Permanent Committee or a Special Committee. What counted was that a Committee existed and did work. **Stafleu's** statement had had the purpose of persuading the Section that the proposal was not quite as bad and as binding as some had thought. But since some present had still expressed concern at making this a Permanent Committee to be written into the Code, **Greuter** was quite prepared to go along with them. He therefore moved an amendment to **Div. III Prop. A**. Instead of approving a Permanent Committee for Registration that would enter into Division III of the printed Code, the Section was requested to authorize the setting up of a Special Committee on Registration – a normal procedure that had already been followed for some almost equally important issues like the "*ex* and *in*" question!

Stafleu explained that only a simple majority would be required for acceptance.

Gibbs Russell asked whether there should be one Committee or, rather, two Committees: one for Registration and one for Approved Publications.

Stafleu explained that this one would be called the Committee on Registration. If the Section did not want to send everything to the Committee on Registration, then a subsequent proposal for a second Committee should be made.

Cronquist was confused about the procedure. He had thought discussion was on Gen. Prop. A, and suddenly found it was on Div. III Prop. A. It seemed to him that the general proposals ought to be disposed of first.

Stafleu explained that this would not be a Committee *for* Registration (which would assume one would have registration) but a Committee *on* Registration, to study the need for registration. Listening to the Section this morning he had come to the conclusion that there was a great variety of opinion on registration (a matter on which there had been substantial discussion and publication already) and that not everyone was happy to take steps that looked like making things definitive. A Committee on Registration, not written into the Code, would have the mandate to study the need for and, if there was a need, the feasibility of registration, and to report to the next Congress. This was a completely innocent thing, and the Section had already set up nearly twenty such Committees!

D'Arcy asked what would be sent to this Committee. Why at this time should one want to deal with this issue instead of the general proposals, as Cronquist had suggested?

Greuter tried to explain this in terms of what did happen in other cases where a Special Committee had been established. If there were controversial matters before the Section and there was a general feeling that a decision was premature, a Special Committee on that subject was first established. This Special Committee could then be instructed to take care of any proposal in that field that was formally rejected. What would happen was that any proposal in the

field of registration that was defeated would be referred by the Section to this Special Committee, which was to report to the next Congress.

McNeill added there were two proposals that would specifically come under the charge of the new Special Committee: Gen. Props. D and E. These were the two that came from the previous Committee on Registration and which that Committee suggested would be a charge to the new Committee. There might be other proposals that could be referred to it later. It would, as **Staffeu** put it, be an investigating committee not a legislative committee, to look into the question of registration rather than definitely accepting or rejecting the principle here. Discussion would resume in Tokyo, for the time being the sting would be out of the bee.

In reply to a question by **Chaloner**, **Staffeu** reiterated that action on the present proposal did not preempt the possibility of later creating a second Committee on publications. This would require a new motion, which would likely be put forward.

A second question, by **D'Arcy**, concerned the bearing of the creation of the Special Committee on the fate of the general proposals on registration. **Staffeu** replied that the logical answer would be for the Section to subsequently reject these proposals and refer them to the Special Committee.

Chapman asked for the exact wording of the amended proposal to be written on the board. ["That a Special Committee on Registration be set up, to report to the XV International Botanical Congress".] He foreshadowed a motion to the effect that two separate Committees be set up, one on the registration of names, the other on the registration of publications. The reason was his fear that a single Committee would devote all its energy to a large and expensive feasibility study of the registration of names and that the much simpler question of registering publications would get swamped. Both Committees should correspond regularly and before the next Congress should attempt to find some common ground.

Art. 29 Prop. D, which seemed to have been lost in the discussion, was also relevant in this context.

In reply to **Voss**, **Greuter** explained that the words "including the ex officio members of the General Committee" were not part of the amended proposal. Like all Special Committees, this one would be set up by the General Committee.

The motion to amend Div. III Prop. A was **carried**.

Chapman, after some procedural quibbles, moved a second amendment by adding the following words to the amended proposal: "and a second Committee be set up to investigate the registration of publications in which names are effectively published".

Faegri pointed out that these were matters which were before the Section in the form of existing proposals. They could not be introduced as amendments to this one.

Stafleu advised that, rather than making things very involved, one should make them very simple. Why not introduce a completely new proposal, to set up two Committees to study these matters?

Chapman thereupon withdrew his second amendment, to bring it up later as a separate proposal.

Div. III Prop. A was accepted as amended.

Greuter explained that **Gen. Prop. D** was designed to confer a concrete mandate to the Committee on Registration. In a way, it did not really matter how one voted on it: if one voted "yes" the Special Committee would have that mandate, if one voted "no" the proposal would thereby be referred to the Special Committee! But for the record one should act on it, as amended by changing "for" to "on" in the name of the Committee.

Stevens was unclear as to the procedure that would have to be followed if one wished that something should specifically not be referred to a Committee.

McNeill explained that this generally came out clearly from the discussion. If for example it was thought that some element of a proposal should not be considered by the Committee and should be dropped completely, and if this view was expressed without dissent in the Section, the Committee would bear this view in mind. There

could even be a specific proposal from the floor, to exclude consideration of some element from the Committee's remit.

Chock moved an amendment to Prop. D, to add after "mandate" the words "to determine the feasibility".

Cronquist felt that the proposal, so amended, was self-contradictory, in that it implied a positive answer to the question of feasibility – otherwise the second portion would not make sense.

McNeill suggested inserting the words "and if appropriate" after "feasibility". This, **Cronquist** acknowledged, would help. The proposers accepted this and the previous suggestion as friendly amendments, not to be voted on.

Morin thought that, as long as one was adding words, one should add "desirability" before "feasibility". This was also accepted by the proposers as a friendly amendment.

Gen. Prop. D was accepted as amended, to read: "That the Special Committee on Registration be given a mandate to determine the desirability and feasibility and, if appropriate, to negotiate and test the structures, procedures and mechanisms, including finance, required for the implementation of a system for the registration of new plant names."

In **Gen. Prop. E**, as **McNeill** noted, the same correction as in Prop. D of the name of the Committee was to be implicitly assumed.

Fosberg asked whether a "Guide for the registration of new plant names" did exist and, if not, how could anything be incorporated into it? **Stevens** felt that the proposal as now worded was incomprehensible. **McNeill** suggested adding the three words "a means for" before "incorporating".

Nicolson explained that Gen. Prop. C was the logical basis of this proposal in that it would set up the "Guide for the registration of new plant names".

Stuessy advised to just defeat Gen. Prop. E. It was too limiting. One should not tell the Committee what they were to be doing.

McNeill agreed. The Committee on Registration at its meeting on the previous night was of the opinion that Gen. Props. C and E should be rejected and referred by implication to the Special Committee. In view of the mind of the Section they indeed involved too great detail at this stage.

Gen. Prop. E was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Registration.

Gen. Prop. C was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Registration.

Gen. Prop. A was, **Hawksworth** explained, being amended by the co-proposers to fit the mood of the Section, as follows: In the first line, after "Insert in the Code", add "in a place considered appropriate by the Editorial Committee". In line 4 of paragraph 1 of the main text, replace "approve" by "designate". Delete the two following paragraphs and the two footnotes.

Stafleu had thought the Section was moving in the direction of not putting anything into the Code but setting up two Special Committees with certain tasks, one of which had already been approved. This proposal would put something into the Code, and if the Code said one had to designate approved publications, these must then be published – and all that before the next Congress? Was this what was actually meant?

Hawksworth confirmed the intent of the proposal, that if thought desirable by the General Committee, and upon advice from the new Publications Committee, some action could be taken before the next Congress.

Stafleu drew attention to the fact that the new Code would be published fairly soon after the Congress. Lists of approved publications could not be included in the next but only in later editions. Approved publications were a very fundamental issue, and he was definitely averse to handle it in a rush – while not necessarily unsympathetic to the basic idea.

Brummitt, while sympathizing with Stafleu's caution, wanted to give the meeting here the opportunity actually to introduce something before the next Congress. It had been claimed that nomenclature was in danger of being overtaken by events outside. The problem of effective publication was a critical one, and the Section should be given the chance to do something. There was no question of inserting a list of approved publications into the printed Code.

McNeill asked whether the proposers could agree that their intent would be met if the first sentence were omitted entirely and the first line of the text rephrased to read: "The General Committee is instructed to appoint a Publications Committee..." [The answer was unclear.]

Chock disliked the word "approved" which reflected censorship and should be replaced by another adjective.

Stuessy respected the attempts to tone down the proposal by amending it, but still felt that it must be defeated. There was no need of a Publications Committee. There now was a Special Committee on Registration to explore new avenues, and it was inappropriate to set any limits on it. The issues were so complex and difficult, and had so many ramifications, that they had to be studied very carefully.

Voss strongly supported Stuessy's comments. Even with McNeill's amendment the proposal had two major defects: nowhere was there a statement of the purpose for which such publications should be approved; and the Section had no authority whatsoever to request that the documenting centres publish annual lists.

Demoulin pointed out that problems of effective publications were intensively studied before and at Sydney, and it had clearly emerged that there was no possible solution in terms of a rule. Such a solution was absolutely necessary, and the only way out was to have some sort of Committee. Even if the proposal was not perfect it should be accepted, otherwise by the time of the next Congress one would be submerged by computer printouts in three copies and the like, and it would be hell.

Karttunen, while acknowledging that the concept of registering names was problematic, stressed that the present proposal, concerning effective publication, was entirely different. In its amended form, it would serve to designate the places where names could be effectively published and would provide an excellent, much needed solution to the problem of effective publication.

Forero was still concerned over the use of the dangerous word "approved", and therefore opposed the proposal. Whether there was a single or a double Committee on Registration, it should be left free as it was, and not be tied by an additional set of instructions as here proposed.

Hnatiuk suggested that, for the sake of clarity, the discussion be broadened by considering Art. 29 Prop. D at the same time, since it was partly overlapping Gen. Prop. A. It included the requirement of publishing lists of registered publications in the Code and, in view of Stafleu's earlier comments, would need some tidying up to make it workable. Such lists would have to wait for the Tokyo Code, but it was important to make them widely available. Art. 29 Props. C and D also answered some of Voss's earlier questions by putting Gen. Prop. A into the appropriate context. Since these two proposals were fairly similar they should be treated as alternatives, with a normal vote on the principle first and then a simple-majority vote to choose between the options.

McNeill explained that Art. 29 Prop. C was indeed relevant since it was really an integral part of Gen. Prop. A as originally submitted, and was designed to put the teeth into it. Did the proposers still uphold Art. 29 Prop. C? The proposed date of implementation, 1 January 1990, seemed to be beyond the mood of the Section at the moment.

Clements, being involved in the new electronic technology, felt that procrastinating action in this matter for another 6 years would lead to severe trouble. It was pertinent to make a decision in the affirmative at this meeting.

Conran noted that the amended version of Gen. Prop. A still included the phrase "lists of new names appearing in approved works". Were names of publications or names of taxa meant?

Lack opposed both the amendment and the amended Prop. A. He proposed to amend the accepted Prop. D by adding at the end the words "or of acceptable publications". **Stafleu** had to point out that it was not possible to amend an accepted proposal.

Brummitt feared that the discussion was getting bogged down in semantics. The objections to the word "approved" could be accommodated, *e.g.* by speaking of effective rather than approved publications. There was a reasonable objection against the two-line paragraph on an obligation of documenting centres to publish annual lists, and he would be happy to eliminate that paragraph. Many had expressed to him their strong support for something along these lines, irrespective of semantics.

Stafleu felt that the objections raised were not a question of semantics but of principle. There was strong resistance in the Section against approval of publications without further specification of its limits. It was normal that people did disagree on a proposal, and it was inappropriate to qualify their arguments as pertaining to semantics.

Brummitt, to clear the air, asked for a show of hands of those who were interested in pursuing this matter. If the Section was not interested in pursuing the discussion one might better forget the whole thing.

On a motion of order, the Section decided that debate on Gen. Prop. A should not continue.

Chapman, in view of the rather close vote, moved that discussion on Registration of Publications be deferred until the following morning. Several proposals, including a lengthy one that had just been considerably amended, were involved. The proposers should be given the opportunity to come together and work out a compromise proposal. A second Special Committee might be the way to go.

Stafleu had simply agreed to **Brummitt's** request to test whether or not there was sufficient interest to continue discussion. **Brummitt** could have drawn his own conclusion and might have wished to abandon the proposal – but as he had not, discussion would continue.

Faegri protested. There had been a vote of closure, and according to all parliamentary practice, a vote of closure overrode everything else and closed the debate – unless the counting of votes was contested and a card vote on the vote of closure be asked for.

McNeill considered it a waste of the Section's time to have a card vote on a procedural matter of this type. Would Brummitt like a card vote on the proposal itself? This would then be a definite decision.

Hawksworth agreed. Brummitt and he wished a card vote to be taken on Gen. Prop. A as amended. If rejected, this would mean this afternoon's proceedings need not be prolonged and would perhaps enable a replacement proposal to be made later on.

Greuter, in his capacity of Rapporteur, cautioned against rash decisions taken on an amended proposal – an extensively amended and re-amended proposal – on a fundamental matter that was controversial. There was little to be gained and much to be lost in accepting this proposal if, as it presently stood, it aimed at writing something into the Code for the record but without teeth, without date, without actual implications in concrete terms of effectiveness of publications. If accepted in this very vague sense, it would tie the hands of the Special Committee on Registration that had just been agreed (or of a particular subcommittee of that Special Committee – which would probably be the best solution). It would hinder that Committee to investigate fully the various issues, their feasibility and desirability. It would create an instrument and, at the same time, virtually spoil it. On the other hand, if the proposal still aimed at introducing concrete provisions, with teeth, through the back door of correlated proposals on Art. 29, it would be extremely dangerous in the present state of knowledge and information. This was not a proposal that in its amended form had been thoroughly studied by people at large, had been tested by a mail vote and so on. The original proposal had been entirely remodelled. A rash decision on such a fundamental question would inevitably have deleterious effects. When realizing the gravity of the problem of effective publication, one was naturally tempted to find a solution at all costs – a solution that the Committee appointed at Sydney had not found, a

solution that was being laboriously patched together during this session. It would be very unwise to yield to this temptation. The proposal should be rejected.

Gen. Prop. A, as amended, was rejected and thereby referred to the Special Committee on Registration.

Gen. Prop. B had been withdrawn.

Art. 29 Prop. C, Art. 30 Prop. A and Art. 30 Prop. B were all withdrawn.

Art. 29 Prop. D was ruled as rejected (to go to the Special Committee on Registration).

Art. 6 Prop. A and Art. 32 Prop. A were both rejected and thereby referred to the Special Committee on Registration.

McNeill introduced Gen. Prop. F, by Hnatiuk & Chapman, which aimed to produce a world-wide index of names – looking backwards and not just forwards as the previous proposals.

Chapman explained the problems he had faced when preparing the "Australian Plant Name Index", covering c. 60,000 names. In old literature found in the libraries, which nobody had ever indexed, he had turned up a lot of hitherto unnoticed validly published names. In 20% of the c. 3600 seed catalogues of botanic gardens that he had looked up, new validly published names were included. These had now all been indexed if referring to Australian plants, but not for the rest of the world. There was a risk that, on checking, many familiar names would be displaced by earlier names validated in seed lists – and he had not even yet touched on nursery catalogues.

The idea was to prepare a new list of plant names for the whole world and to rule that names not on that list by a given date (the year 2000 as proposed, or maybe 2010 if that was not feasible) be considered not to be validly published for the purposes of nomenclature. With the right set-up and sufficient institutional goodwill worldwide this index was a feasible task. Costs would be involved,

and IAPT might be prepared to assist. The "Australian Plant Name Index" had been done chronologically, without using secondary references – contrary to "Index Kewensis" where in earlier volumes secondary references had been used (which had resulted in no less than 20% erroneous or missing entries for Australian plant names). Recent issues of "Index Kewensis", since 1960, had been fairly thorough, indexing names at all ranks, but for earlier years, particularly before 1910, there were lots of problems.

Greuter found the idea very interesting and having great appeal to working taxonomists, except that the question of feasibility and fundability was unclear. Basically it fell under the wide concept of registration. The Special Committee on Registration – not the General Committee as proposed, as Voss would certainly agree – had been set up specifically to study such questions. The logical procedure was to reject the proposal and thereby refer it to the Special Committee on Registration.

Johnson thought it would be far better for botany if forgotten names from *Indices Seminum* etc. were not recorded but passed out. He was in favour of a date of limitation as proposed but not of an exhaustive search.

Forero called attention to the heavily negative mail vote. The proposal should go to the Committee on Registration.

Hawksworth pointed out that this was part of the route that was being envisaged in the longer term with respect to registration, and that the question of "approved lists" was mentioned in the tabled document that had been produced by the Commonwealth Mycological Institute. For the fungi, CMI planned to start in 1988 to computerize the back-issues of the "Index of Fungi": if some outside funding could be obtained, it would be easily possible to produce, by the year 2000, a list of names mycologists wanted to use.

Chapman was not entirely unhappy with the idea that the proposal go to the Special Committee.

Gen. Prop. F was rejected and thereby referred to the Special Committee on Registration.

D'Arcy moved a **proposal from the floor**, that the following new Recommendation be inserted into the Code, after Art. 29: "An author publishing a new name, combination or taxon in a place where such publications are not commonly found should promptly forward to an appropriate indexing centre a full citation to the publication or a copy of the publication".

Adoption of such a text would signal at least some small progress in the area of effective publication. It would provide a basis for experience for the next Congress, and if that Congress was equally indecisive about a new solution, it could at least consider converting the Recommendation into a rule. It would get things moving in the right direction immediately upon publication of the new Code instead of postponing action to future Congresses that were not bound by the present deliberations. It would also give a reading on the intent of people publishing "marginally effective names", and would discourage cryptic publication. Finally, it would provide an explicit support to the work of indexers of plant names and to their institutions.

The text of the motion was deliberately kept simple and should be voted on as submitted. There was, however, a problematical point in it, that might either be taken care of by the Editorial Committee or be the subject of a separate motion later on. This was the notion of "appropriate indexing centre". Stafleu had suggested that accredited indexing centres should be in some way or other under the suzerainty of the Section, but this was a rather nebulous concept. One might want to be more specific and add to the new Recommendation the footnote to the rejected Gen. Prop. A, spelling out what the appropriate indexing centres presently were.

Greuter was unwilling to recommend D'Arcy's proposal for acceptance because it dealt with matter to be covered by the Committee on Registration. Apparently D'Arcy wanted to include it in the Code with the afterthought of making it mandatory after a while, say after the next Congress. Following this course would indeed place a restraint on the work of the Special Committee. It was appropriate to reject the proposal, thereby drawing the attention of the Special Committee to this particular issue.

Stuessy, while in sympathy with the intent of the proposal, agreed with Greuter. He had specific qualms with the submitted text. "Not commonly found" were not the right words. There were some very obscure publications in which new names were commonly found. The outlet was: "not commonly available". As proposed, the Recommendation would touch only on a small part of the problem.

Morin thought that the Recommendation would do no harm nor would it direct the Special Committee's efforts. Waiting for that Committee's report meant losing another six years. The Recommendation should be passed now, to solve some of the current problems. If necessary, it could be taken out again in six years time.

Greuter added that one notion introduced by the proposal, an indexing centre, was not defined. There would have to be names and addresses if this was to be operative as a Recommendation in the Code. As worded now it would barely serve a useful purpose, and it would hardly be possible to find a completely suitable wording because all these problems were so complex – that was why a Special Committee was needed. Although a Recommendation could in general do little harm, it was not commendable to introduce this one into the Code.

D'Arcy's proposal from the floor was defeated.

[Discussion on proposals from Art. 48 Prop. A to Art. 63 Prop. Q (save Art. 63 Prop. D), here reported, had actually taken place in the second half of the morning session (see p. 119).]

Article 48

Action on **Prop. A** (1:117:1:5), dependent on Art. 7 Prop. I, was deferred. The proposal was later ruled as **rejected** without further discussion (see p. 175).

Article 49

Prop. A (72:44:2:8).

Prop. B (28:84:2:12).

McNeill explained that Props. A and B were alternatives; the adoption of either would clarify something that was currently unclear in the Code. The Rapporteurs were not specifically advising in favour of one or the other, but comments from one of the proposers would be welcome. The mail vote showed a clear preference for Prop. A.

Taylor stated the proposers' preference for Prop. A. Prop. B would involve quite a lot of work.

Korf had great difficulty with Prop. A. On transfer of a taxon from, *e.g.*, the rank of tribe to that of family parenthetical author citation alone could indicate where the name came from. He was not sure, however, that he would favour Prop. B either.

Nicolson spoke in favour of Prop. A. Parenthetic author citations were primarily important as flags showing that the type was to be sought elsewhere. Above the generic level the types were obvious from the name itself since such names were based on a generic name.

Korf should have made clear his worry was not indication of the type, but that such transferred names would lack reference to a description.

Brummitt felt there was no problem of validity of such names since reference to a basionym would still be sufficient to validate them. Names above generic rank were, however, essentially different in character from those at lower ranks, as already explained by Nicolson and as shown by their different treatment, *e.g.*, under Art. 64.

Voss recalled that it had been pointed out at Sydney that author citations at suprafamilial ranks were needed neither for typification (which was automatic) nor for priority (which did not apply at the higher ranks). A third option would be to limit the application of Art. 49 to taxa below the rank of family.

Pichi Sermolli favoured Prop. B. In Pteridophytes many family names originated from names of tribes or subtribes, described *e.g.* by Presl, and without parenthetical author citations the origin of these names was not clear.

Demoulin opposed both Props. A and B because the *status quo* was, he felt, ideal: if one had the information one could give it but, if not, one was not obliged to do the search. It was a facultative option, just as with authors preceding the *ex*.

Hawksworth pointed out that, in the case of the fungi, he had always used parenthetical author citations at these ranks. An "Index of Fungi" supplement cataloguing all the fungal family names proposed was in press, and did use parenthetical author citations. If phanero-gamists had not done this so far, it meant that they would have some homework to do. He strongly supported Prop. B.

Prop. A was rejected.

Prop. B was rejected by a card vote (38.2% in favour, 137:222).

Article 50

Prop. A (4:17:0:109) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Recommendation 50A

Prop. A (7:16:0:106) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Recommendation 50E

Prop. A (19:93:0:8).

Hawksworth explained that the proposal had been supported strongly by several members of a subcommittee that had been appointed to look into the problem, but not by a majority. At present some mycologists used the colon (:) routinely but others did not, and some clarification was desirable. The use of the colon was confusing to general biologists, and the concept of sanctioning was difficult even for nomenclatural specialists – to judge from the confused voting on Art. 14 on the previous day. As a teacher of nomenclature he strongly urged the Section to accept this proposal in the interest of simplicity in author citations for the general users of fungal names.

Kuyper Opposed the proposal. The use of a colon in sanctioned names did indicate, not only that such names had protected nomenclatural status but also protected taxonomic status (at least if some of the proposals on Art. 7.17 were to be accepted). It would create problems if such names were cited with one author but were to be typified in the sense of another (sanctioning) author. The colon did, among others, point to this possibility.

Johnson could not understand what was meant by "protected taxonomic status". Surely the Code could not confer such status?

McNeill explained that, although one did not perhaps like to think of sanctioning as conferring protected taxonomic status, there was the same element of protection in it as there was in conservation of names.

Prop. A was rejected.

Recommendation 50F

Prop. A (97:28:0:6).

Cronquist asked whether Prop. A would indeed recommend that names in synonymy be cited according to the recommended spelling rather than the original spelling.

McNeill explained that the proposal was the logical consequence of changes made to Art. 75 in Sydney. It was designed to have the same Recommendations for citing synonyms as for accepted names.

Cronquist did not want to be deprived of the option of being precise. There had been changes in Recommendations on spelling, and sometimes conversions of Recommendations into rules. This could happen to the present Recommendation next time. He was writing a Flora that he hoped would be used for the next 50 years, and wanted to be free to cite the synonyms in the form in which they were originally published.

McNeill read out the text of the Recommendation as modified by Prop. A. He explained that (a) it would concern both adopted

names and names cited in synonymy, and (b) it would not discourage citing synonyms in their original spelling (although it would not any longer recommend to do so). Presently, the Code recommended citing synonyms in a way that was incompatible with what Art. 75 ruled for adopted names. **Cronquist** was satisfied that the proposed change would not make a lot of difference to him.

Demoulin, in spite of being the secretary of the Committee that made the proposal, felt strongly with **Cronquist**. However, with the present Art. 75, the two sentences proposed for deletion had little meaning. He urged the Section to consider very seriously the arguments for the next proposal (Prop. B), which he supported.

Prop. A was accepted.

Prop. B (10:121:0:1).

Adolphi had co-authored **Weber's** proposal. **Weber** had to cite hundreds of synonyms in *Rubus*, a genus in which infraspecific epithets had often been given feminine form. It was a waste of time and space to cite all these synonyms as, e.g., *Rubus carpinifolius* f. *crispus* ("*crispa*").

Voss agreed it was a waste of paper – so why do it? This was only a Recommendation. **Stafleu** advised never to get really excited about Recommendations. They did not do any harm but could do some good.

McNeill pointed out that Prop. B was at variance with the spirit if not the letter of the present Art. 75, and was not supported by the Committee on Orthography. **Demoulin** explained that the proposal, having been made at a late stage, had not really been considered by that Committee.

Borhidi was in favour of the Recommendation because it was a good tool for improving the knowledge of languages.

McNeill cautioned against accepting this. It had a very substantial negative mail vote. Also the present wording did not in any way encourage people to use the double citation, as **Voss** had pointed out. It was possible to cite only the correct form, if one so wished.

Prop. B was rejected.

Article 57

Prop. A (12:116:0:0) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. B (6:10:0:110) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Article 62

Action on **Prop. A** (17:29:1:65), that was dependent on deferred proposals regarding fungi, was similarly deferred. The proposal was later referred to the **Editorial Committee** without further discussion (see p. 175).

Article 63

Prop. A (36:81:10:2).

As explained by **McNeill**, **Prop. A** dealt with the matter of retroactivity of lectotypification, which had already been discussed in an earlier Session [under Art. 7 **Prop. C**]. At that time it had been stated that further consideration of retroactivity would have to occur under Art. 63. The present proposal, coming from the Committee on Lectotypification, asked that a Special Committee be set up to study the question of whether or not a name was always considered to have a type from its date of publication – the so-called retroactivity of lectotypification. Although the mail vote was substantially negative, it did appear from the earlier discussion that the Section was very strongly divided on this issue, while recognizing the importance of doing something about it under Art. 63.

Demoulin believed one of the Rapporteurs' comments to be inadequate and to have influenced negatively the mail vote. It might be true for phanerogams that "abolishing the notion of illegitimacy" would have "a far-reaching destabilizing effect", but in fungi and algae (several hundred thousand names) Art. 63 had barely been applied, and applying it strictly now would lead to destabilization. It

was absolutely necessary to set up a Committee to evaluate the effects of abandoning the concept of illegitimacy, or of implementing it for fungi and algae. A possible compromise might be to abolish illegitimacy for non-vascular plants only.

McNeill reminded the Section that this matter was a very long-standing concern among nomenclaturalists. There had been committees set up in the past which had not resolved the problems, and it seemed from the discussion that had taken place earlier that there were very clearly divided points of view – some saying they considered a name always to have a type from the start, and others pointing out the difficulties that this created with invalidity and illegitimacy. The only solution at this point was, indeed, to establish a Special Committee.

Brummitt suggested that a positive vote on Art. 63 Prop. C could settle the issue now. If that proposal failed, one should set up a Special Committee.

McNeill explained that setting up the Committee did not preclude consideration of Props. B and C. These only dealt with one facet of retroactivity, that of illegitimacy, by specifying that subsequent lectotypification of a name could not render other names superfluous. These proposals could still be taken up at this time and, he felt, it would indeed be stabilizing to do so.

Prop. A was accepted.

Prop. B (76:40:5:13).

McNeill mentioned that **Rauschert** had regrettably passed away since submitting Props. B & C.

Under Art. 63, a name was nomenclaturally superfluous if it included the type of a name that ought to have been adopted under the rules, and it was then automatically typified by the type of the earlier name. The proposals dealt with what happened when the earlier name was later lectotypified, although at the time when the name had been cited, and its type had thereby been included, that type had not yet been selected. It was quite clear that in many

groups, notably in the ferns, orchids, grasses, and in other groups in which there had been extensive generic instability over the years, to apply Art. 63 rigidly in such situations would be extremely destabilizing. The Rauschert proposals provided a "bandaid solution" pending a report from the Special Committee that had just been established.

Demoulin thought that the Rauschert proposals only addressed a very small part of the problem of illegitimacy, and that their adoption would prejudge what the Committee might conclude. The real problem, in the fungi and algae, was with the whole thrust of Art. 63: all those old authors of names now accepted who included long synonymies full of earlier names that they should have adopted. The proposals should be left aside for the time being.

McNeill agreed that the proposals did not deal with the whole issue of illegitimacy. The Rapporteurs felt, however, that the situation was potentially serious at this moment, and that it would be wise to have this "bandaid solution".

Prop. B was accepted.

Prop. C (37:35:4:55) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. D (8:80:5:34)

[Action on this proposal was deferred since its author was unable to be present at that time. The discussion reported below actually took place at the end of the seventh session.]

Zijlstra had distributed a sheet of text with comments and with the following two amendments to the original proposal (consequent to the earlier rejection of Art. 7 Prop. G): in part *a*, lines 4-5, delete the phrase "second sentence of 7.11"; and delete part *d*.

McNeill explained that the amended proposal was not fundamentally different from the original one. The amendments reflected the earlier rejection of Art. 7 Prop. G. The proposal dealt with an area of the Code that was indeed rather strange: Art. 63 currently specified that a superfluous name was illegitimate and Art. 7.11 that it

was to be typified by the type of the name that ought to have been adopted under the rules *unless the author of the superfluous name had definitely indicated a different type*, in which case that different type was the type of the superfluous name – but still that name was illegitimate. Zijlstra's proposal was to ensure that such names which had a different type would become legitimate – at least this was his understanding – since they would be "taxonomically superfluous" not nomenclaturally superfluous. The comments made originally by the Rapporteurs did still hold, that although Zijlstra had analysed the implications at the generic level, the effect below the level of genus was unclear. The proposal should go to the Special Committee on Retroactivity of Lectotypification.

Zijlstra did not understand anything of the Vice-Rapporteur's comments. By her amendment, she had just eliminated the controversial connection between Arts. 7.11 and 63.1. The main point of the amended proposal concerned Art. 63.3, which stated that names that were legitimate and had a type different from that of the name which caused superfluity were still "nomenclaturally superfluous", whereas in her opinion they ought to be termed "taxonomically superfluous".

McNeill saw Zijlstra's point, but it did not affect the Rapporteurs' recommendation. Since there now was a Special Committee examining this, and since this was a major recasting of the wording of the Article, it would seem wise to refer the proposal to the Committee.

Nicolson noted that this was the situation in which he had used the phrase "apparently nomenclaturally superfluous".

Zijlstra of course knew that a Special Committee had been established, but thought her proposal could nevertheless be accepted straightaway. Art. 63 Prop. B had also been accepted, even though in her opinion it went much farther and introduced a real change, and although it concerned just the matter for which that Special Committee had been established.

Greuter pointed out that, since the proposal had been reworded from the floor, not everyone present had been able to look at it as carefully as at proposals that had been published beforehand. He seconded McNeill in his advice to reject the proposal, which would

effect two things: merely editorial matters would be on record and could be taken into account by the Editorial Committee, matters that were not merely editorial would be taken care of by the Special Committee. It would be unwise to accept the proposal as long as its possible implications were not fully understood.

Prop. D was rejected and thereby referred to the Special Committee on Retroactivity of Lectotypification.

Prop. E (32:17:3:81) was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. F (11:29:2:86) was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. G (4:63:4:51) was rejected.

Prop. H (6:102:12:6) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. I (10:100:12:4) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. J (11:100:12:3) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. K (22:95:10:2).

Demoulin felt that this was not part of the same package as the other Parkinson proposals. It just stated what had so far been current practice and had now been altered by adoption of the Rauschert proposal (Prop. B). That action had indeed been unfortunate. Everything should have been referred to the Special Committee.

McNeill pointed out that, if it was rejected, the proposal could still be looked at by the Special Committee.

Johnson believed that Parkinson's package of proposals had considerable merit. They had all been overwhelmingly defeated in the mail vote because he was a maverick and because he wanted to change the Code rather radically – which was unfortunate. The Editorial Committee should carefully consider all the points raised by Parkinson.

Prop. K was rejected.

Prop. L (11:99:12:6) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. M (9:100:12:6) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. N (11:101:12:2) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. O (9:102:12:3) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. P (11:100:12:3) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. Q (5:100:12:8) was ruled as **rejected**.

Action on **Prop. R** (36:42:1:45), that was dependent on deferred proposals regarding fungi, was similarly deferred. The proposal was later referred to the **Editorial Committee** without further discussion (see p. 175).

Prop. S (0:49:3:69) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. T (0:47:3:70) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. U (0:53:3:63) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Article 63 bis (new)

Prop. A (10:96:13:3) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. B (10:97:13:3) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. C (13:96:12:3) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. D (11:100:9:3) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. E (8:100:8:4) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. F (10:100:8:5) was ruled as **rejected**.

Article 64

Action on **Prop. A** (61:45:2:11), that was dependent on deferred proposals regarding fungi, was similarly deferred. The proposal was later referred to the **Editorial Committee** without further discussion (see p. 175).

Prop. B (17:101:2:4) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. C (14:108:2:4) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. D (45:85:3:10).

McNeill introduced the proposal, that had come from the Committee on Orthography. It dealt with two aspects, extending the rule on confusingly similar names to subdivisions of genera – which seemed logical – but also restricting it to otherwise legitimate names. The Rapporteurs had expressed concern about the latter aspect.

Demoulin explained that the intent was to limit the number of cases where confusing similarity could be invoked. This was such a difficult matter that it could not be left to individual judgement but could only be decided by a Committee. Therefore the number of cases should be kept as low as possible. It was true that the Committee had not tried to assess the number of cases where in the past this rule had been applied one way or another – but almost every case of alleged confusing similarity had been disputed, and people were continuing to argue over them.

Voss pointed out that the proposal would extend coverage of Art. 64.2, not only to names of subdivisions of genera but also of ranks higher than genus, *e.g.* to family names, which was more serious. Would *Liliaceae* and *Lilaeaceae*, being pronounced in the same way, qualify? He was happy with the intent of reducing the number of cases, but not with the extension of coverage.

Brummitt felt that it would be convenient to apply such a restricted rule in the future, but an awful lot of decisions on homonymy had been made in the past. There was no guidance on how many past

decisions would now be reversed. [Which was exactly the worry expressed by the Rapporteurs, that many names rejected as later homonyms in the past would have to be resurrected.]

Prop. D was rejected.

Prop. E (24:89:4:5).

McNeill made it clear that, whereas on the face of it the proposal looked editorial, it did introduce a change. The present footnote said that when it was doubtful whether names were sufficiently alike to be confused a request for a decision could be submitted to the General Committee. The new wording would stipulate that there must be a request to declare a name confusable rather than an arbitration as to whether a name was confusable or not. He did not personally see the advantage in the change, but perhaps the Committee on Orthography could clarify.

Nicolson explained that the purpose was to make it mandatory that questions of confusability be subject to a Committee decision. The current text allowed an individual to judge that two names were confusable and to create a substitute name; only doubtful cases were to be submitted to the General Committee – but what was doubtful to one person might be clear to another, hence dual usage of names for the same taxon could arise. The new provision would require that, when invoking confusability, one had to obtain a Committee ruling before publishing a substitute name.

Voss, as Secretary of the General Committee for the past 18 years, had had to deal with a certain number of cases that had been referred to it for an opinion. He would much deplore any move that would make it obligatory for all such cases to go to the Committee. The General Committee had moved in the direction of setting some standards on which to base their judgement, and had not judged any pair of names to be confusable in the six years it had been voting on such issues (but it had agreed to Fosberg's past statement, that some things would confuse anybody and some people were confused by anything). To require a Committee decision before declaring names to be confusable would nevertheless result in an intolerable amount of work.

Demoulin pointed out that the previous proposal, now defeated, was aimed at limiting the the work load of the Committee. There was no other solution to this problem, so the Committee would have to be prepared to do the work. Too much work involved was not an acceptable argument. Without this instrument there would be several cases of ongoing use of different names for the same taxon.

Singer asked what would happen if an author disregarded the new rule and produced a new name. [**McNeill**: it would be illegitimate; **Greuter**: there would be no penalty.] If no penalty was foreseen, why have the rule?

Lack opposed the proposal because for practical reasons the whole process was too slow.

Johnson drew attention to the relevance of Art. 64 Prop. H in this connection. It had a lot to commend itself. The list that it incorporated, to which some people objected, was in fact just what was needed: These were the cases that caused the problems.

Nicolson pointed out that confusability referred to names that were not the same whereas homonyms were exactly the same. The zoologists in their wisdom had ruled that if two names were different, no matter how trivial the difference, they were treated as distinct. This was another option: to just delete confusability from the Code. If, however, the concept was to be retained, it required either clear definitions or a mechanism for obtaining decisions.

McNeill drew attention to the next proposal that was in large measure linked to the present one. It required that a list of confused names be maintained. The Rapporteurs' concern over that was the implication that as long as names were not on the list they would be considered not to be confusable, which would resurrect a huge number of names hitherto rejected on that ground. As Voss has noted, there was a mechanism in existence that did work, albeit, perhaps, not as rapidly as one would like. When there really was a conflict, when two schools of thought did exist, it was possible to obtain a ruling. For the moment at least, it was wiser to stick with the present rule.

Prop. E was rejected.

Prop. F (26:90:4:1) was **rejected**.

Prop. G (9:109:1:1) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. H (28:82:1:3).

Stearn strongly advocated acceptance of the proposal, despite the heavily negative mail vote. There was an increasing tendency to refer matters to a Committee – but the more one overburdened Committees, the slower they became. In many instances, one could make one's own decision. Here was a very carefully prepared, scholarly list of examples of confusable items. It was not by any means covering everything, and therefore a proviso should obviously be added that other doubtful cases should be referred to the Committee. One could argue over some of the scholarly subtleties of the list – which he would not do – but he felt that it would be unwise to get rid of this excellent proposal.

D'Arcy admitted that, at a glance, the proposal looked extremely cumbersome and complicated. It was worth while spending a few minutes to read it. It was a "cookbook approach" to Latin in botany (of which Stearn's "Botanical Latin" was the best example, designed for the untrained, self-taught user). Earlier, similar attempts had failed because they were not sufficiently classical. Now this, as Stearn had said, was a carefully worked out list which might be further refined by the Editorial Committee. The working botanists, spending most of their time in the field, when coming home and describing their plants by quality standards meeting the approval of their peers in order to get continued funding, did not want to be burdened with having to send off to Committees a claim for assistance or to deal with subtle details of old languages. The proposal should be accepted.

Voss pointed out that this approach had been discussed at length in Sydney where it had been decided it was not the way to go. The new proposal narrowed the coverage of the Article to legitimate names, whereas presently illegitimate names could lead to the rejection of later, confusingly similar names. Moreover it only considered spelling, not taxonomic or phytogeographic relationship which were two

major criteria that the General Committee had taken into account when judging on confusability. Similar names were less confusable if they applied to widely different taxa, say, one to a fossil Gymnosperm and the other to a freshwater alga of Sweden.

Cronquist believed that the proposal as written would overturn some well established decisions on non-confusability, as for example *Lomatium*, a western American genus of umbels, and *Lomatia*, a quite different genus. As an opponent of strait-jackets, he wondered if the proposer would agree to treat the proposed text as a Recommendation rather than as a rule.

Traverse had opposed a similar proposal in Sydney since in palaeopalynology there were many names, such as *Laevigato-sporites*, *Laevigata-sporites* and *Laevigati-sporites*, that had been used for fifty years without difficulty or confusion (the vowel indicating the difference between alete, monolete and trilete spores), whereas they would now be confusable under item *i* of this proposal. More generally, he was uncomfortable about such a long series of provisions that might have unexpected results.

Eichler, from the comments, realized that some of his proposal had not been properly understood. The list in the proposed Art. 64.6 applied only to epithets. Differently spelled generic names were declared not to be confusable, but could be dealt with by conservation if appropriate. The proposal was made to relieve Committees from judging on confusability; every botanist should be able, by applying these criteria, to come to his own conclusion which would be the same as that of every other botanist. There might be a few cases not covered in the list, and one was covered twice (item *m*, already covered in *h*) that could be editorially deleted. The geographical epithets under *o* should be considered as examples, not as an exhaustive enumeration.

Greuter drew the attention of the Section to the mail vote. In spite of the fact that the Rapporteurs' comments had been neutral or even benevolent, there were 72% negative votes. Furthermore, discussion so far had been limited to the first, albeit most voluminous, part of the proposal, from 64.4 to 64.6. There were two further paragraphs that were extremely problematic in that they wanted

names to be placed on a list of *nomina rejicienda* in order to avoid undesirable name changes due to the application of this set of new rules. Now that names formerly rejected under Art. 69 would be conserved under Art. 14, this would either imply a new category of names rejected under Art. 64 or an additional set of conserved names at all ranks. While personally all in favour of conserved names if a Committee could handle these, he was nevertheless reluctant to recommend such action without due consideration being given to this aspect beforehand. The proposal should be rejected.

Prop. H was rejected by a card vote (48.1% in favour, 187:202).

Prop. I (2:123:1:2).

Eichler claimed that the proposal had been defeated by the mail vote because it was an alternative to Art. 64 Prop. H. This having now been defeated, he recommended that Prop. I be seriously considered as the second best solution.

Greuter reiterated the cautionary advice of the Rapporteurs: the rule might lead to unforeseen complications in practice. He contradicted **Eichler's** statement that the negative mail vote was due to competition by the alternative Prop. H. The latter had received 72% no votes, so that a large majority must have voted against both proposals.

Prop. I was rejected.

Article 65

Prop. A (8:88:24:8), belonging to the rejected package Art. 6 Props. B-D, was rejected.

Prop. B (20:46:35:17).

McNeill explained that this was part of a series of proposals to amend both the Botanical and Zoological Codes. It dealt with the status of "phytoflagellate" names, and if recommended by the Committee for Algae it would not present general problems.

Christensen could give no clearcut recommendation. The Committee for Algae was divided: One minority supported the proposal, another, somewhat smaller group found the number of organisms with different names under the two Codes so small that it was better to solve the problems by conservation under one Code or the other. The majority, a little more than half of the voting membership, felt the problem should be left unsolved (an easy answer, rather hard on ecologists). Each specialist must then decide for himself whether to regard such organisms as plants or animals. Many members hoped that in the near future the number of organisms claimed by both botanists and zoologists would become very small.

Demoulin had been convinced to adhere to the minority view through discussion with Compère, and would cast the Belgian votes for the proposal. Analogous provisions did exist in the Bacteriological Code. The number of cases involved was in fact quite large, notably in the Dinoflagellates, and many could not be resolved under the Botanical Code by conservation because they were at the specific level. This was a fair and relatively innocuous provision.

Nicolson asked **Ride** to speak on the status of the proposals of this package under the Zoological Code, since they had also been submitted for consideration by the International Commission for Zoological Nomenclature.

Ride reported that no decision had yet been taken, but that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature was concerned that the two Codes should be as harmonious as possible. He encouraged the Section to remove difficulties in the way of persons wanting to treat organisms under either or both Codes, and he felt sure the Zoological Commission would do the same. A provision had been introduced into the Zoological Code, that a name of an animal originally described as a plant must not only be available under the Zoological Code, but must also satisfy the requirements of the Botanical Code.

Voss asked whether it would make any difference for the proposal if it were to apply to all algae and not be restricted to the "phytoflagellates" – whatever they were; and whether it did apply to names at all ranks or only at generic and lower levels.

McNeill further asked whether the term "phytoflagellates" was at all definable.

Demoulin agreed that it would have been better to include algae as a whole, especially since the blue-green algae were closely allied to the bacteria; it might indeed be difficult to define what a phytoflagellate was. But the proposal had come from flagellate specialists, who cared for their own groups.

Christensen confirmed that a precise definition of the term phytoflagellate could hardly be given. The term itself appeared to imply that they were plants not animals. Writing "algae" instead would cause other problems. The main reason for many Committee members to oppose the proposals was that it would force algologists to search the zoological literature for possible earlier homonyms. Forcing specialists in large brown algae or in Charophyta to do such a search would be felt by them as a considerable burden.

McNeill summarized the conclusions of the Committee on Algae, that (a) "phytoflagellates" could not be defined and (b) to replace the term by "algae" would be potentially very disruptive to algal nomenclature.

Traverse wondered whether the proposed provision would not also require a change of Principle I of the Code?

McNeill replied that this had been discussed by the Section earlier on, and it had been agreed that, as exceptions to the Principles already existed in the Code, it was not necessary to spell them out in the Principles. While sympathetic to the avoidance of nomenclatural conflicts resulting from the treatment of the same organisms under different Codes, he felt unable to recommend adoption of the proposal at this stage.

Prop. B was rejected.

Article 66

Prop. A (109:18:0:5).

McNeill reiterated the Rapporteurs' published comments. As Parkinson had correctly noted, the Article was a hangover from the circumscription method. It was superfluous, indeed rather harmful if taken literally, and should be deleted.

Kuyper wondered whether the harmful consequences of Art. 66 (and 67) would not remain as a consequence of the application of Art. 63, although he did agree that they were superfluous.

Greuter explained that, when seriously reading Arts. 66 and 67, one would see why the Rapporteurs had judged them to be dangerous. They stated that an infrageneric name was illegitimate if its author did not adopt the epithet of the earliest legitimate name available for the taxon with its particular circumscription, position and rank. This meant that, irrespective of whether or not the type of a name that should have been adopted under the rules was explicitly included, the new name could be ruled illegitimate on the basis of a taxonomic decision that might be taken at any time. This had obviously never been applied since the type method had been adopted.

Brummitt, without expressing a personal opinion, pointed out that Meikle, in correspondence, had opposed deletion very strongly. His discussion of the case of *Alkanna tinctoria* in the "Flora of Cyprus" gave the reasons for his opposition.

Prop. A was accepted.

Article 67

Prop. A (123:20:0:5), paralleling Art. 66 Prop. A, was also **accepted**.

Prop. B (2:121:1:1) was ruled as **rejected**.

Article 68

Prop. A (2:65:1:47).

McNeill explained that this proposal to delete this Article also was not in the same category as the proposals to delete the two previous

Articles. It was best to reject it. The Editorial Committee would be free to take up any relevant points from it, if need should be.

Prop. A was rejected.

Voss made a suggestion in regard to Art. 68.2, to be taken care of by the Editorial Committee. The Article said "An infraspecific name may be legitimate even if its final epithet was originally placed under an illegitimate name"; it surely should read: "An infraspecific name, autonyms excepted, may be legitimate", in order to bring it into conformity with Art. 26. **Stafleu**, on behalf of the Editorial Committee, thanked **Voss** for this information.

Article 69

Prop. A (6:119:1:1) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. B (70:36:3:19).

As noted by **McNeill**, the proproposal was contingent on the earlier acceptance of Art. 14 Prop. B, and consequently it would appear to be the mind of the Section that it also be accepted.

Korf felt very strongly that the earlier action on Art. 14 Prop. B had been mistaken and had gutted Art. 69. That Article was still needed, since there were many names which needed to be rejected for which no name existed that was suitable for being listed as conserved. Art. 69 applied to names at all ranks, not merely that of species. There had been at least two generic names proposed for rejection under Art. 69. One of them was *Helotium*, and the Committee for Fungi and Lichens was currently considering not only a proposal to reject that name under Art. 69, but three separate proposals for conservation of other generic names against *Helotium* – and a fourth one might follow, because of uncertainty on which generic name was actually imperilled. Art. 69 was still needed, and should remain uncut. He had no objection to listing rejected names in the same list with conserved names, if a separate list was a problem for some, but mere rejection of *nomina ambigua* under Art. 69 must remain a possibility, without having to list a corresponding conserved name.

SEVENTH SESSION

Thursday, 23 July 1987, 9:00 – 12:00

[Chairman: Stafleu]

Article 69 (continued)

It was not until coming to Article 69, in the late afternoon of the previous day, that Cronquist had realised the potential significance of what had been done the day before in routinely approving Art. 14 Prop. B. He had been asleep at the switch, and perhaps some of his colleagues, too. The effect of that proposal, with its seemingly innocuous reference to conservation of names in cases provided for by Art. 69, was to open the door to a great many *nomina specifica conservanda*. He well remembered the prolonged discussion in Sydney about allowing the conservation of names of species of major economic importance. In making such a provision, which passed by the barest of margins, the Section had intended to open the door only a little crack, with the intent of barring it against further opening. Now it seemed that the door was being shoved wide open while some of those present were looking the other way. It would be procedurally most difficult to rescind what had been done on Art. 14, but the Section could attack the matter under Art. 69, to which the new Art. 14.1(b) referred. Art. 69 Prop. B appeared to be the activating clause for *nomina specifica conservanda* as implied in the new provision in Art. 14. If the Section had really intended what was implied in that new provision, then Art. 69 Prop. B logically followed, and should be adopted. Props. C and D were logical accompaniments to Prop. B. If, on the other hand, the Section had not intended to have this new set of *nomina specifica conservanda*, then it should reject Art. 69 Props. B, C, and D. If these proposals were in fact rejected, then, if the Chairman permitted, he would introduce a motion, to include the following new rule under Art. 69: "No provision of this Code shall be interpreted to permit the conservation of names of species that are not of major economic importance." He realized that such a proposal would require a 60% majority for approval, instead of the 40% plus one required to defeat proposals B, C, and D. If all of these proposals were to be

rejected then he thought the effect of the new provision in Art. 14 would be unclear, and the matter would have to be addressed again at the next Congress.

Korf would not want to be party to a nomenclature session in which by failure to pay attention the conservation floodgates were opened. Under Art. 14 Prop. B, which had been passed and ought to be reconsidered now when discussing Art. 69, it became possible not only to conserve names of "species of major economic importance" but of any species, as Cronquist had pointed out, as well as other names at all infrafamilial ranks! One must not take such a step without seriously deciding that this was what was to be done. He could not believe the Section really intended to permit conservation of the names of tribes, subgenera, or varieties.

Chock felt that, regardless of nomenclatural habits, the Section must be aware of the "real world" and consider the needs of users of plant names, however wrong they might be.

Demoulin had heard those arguments twice before, and it seemed they could go on forever. But one had to be pragmatic. *Nomina rejicienda*, at all ranks, were already provided for in the Code. Did it really matter so much whether one listed names as rejected (which was generally accepted) or as conserved – which seemed to be a taboo to some. It was high time to be reasonable on this and, as had just been said, take the needs of users of names into account. A simple, quick and user-friendly procedure was needed.

Faegri admitted he had been responsible for the very involved present text of Art. 69, because it had meant as few changes in the Code at Leningrad as were necessary to get really rid of confused names. At present it was a completely negative Article, whereas Prop. B (to which Props. E and F were possible amendments) would place it on a simple, clear and positive footing. He very much recommended it.

Karttunen regretted that the catchword *nomina specifica conservanda* made it almost impossible for any proposal to pass. Prop. B presented a nice, simple solution and should be accepted, along with the following proposals.

Fosberg, as most would know, had consistently opposed the idea of *nomina specifica conservanda*, and had also opposed the whole intent of Art. 69. The reason was his belief that one either had a Code to be followed, even if this might result in some inconvenience, or one might as well set up a whole bureaucracy and let the vagaries of temporary inconvenience control the whole botanical nomenclature. Every step in the direction of these proposals (and he confessed to have also been asleep when Art. 14 Prop. B had been voted) tended to weaken the Code. There was no stopping this unless one stopped it now.

Stafleu realized he would have to speak louder in order to wake up some Section members on essential points! [Laughter.]

Friis had been convinced by his work in the Committee for Spermatophyta to support this set of proposals. He also drew attention to the large number of positive mail votes on both Art. 14 Prop. B and Art. 69 Prop. B.

Gunn urged support for Art. 69 Prop. B on behalf of national [US] and international agriculture.

Veldkamp, having some experience with Art. 69, wondered how names conserved under the new provision would be typified. Their type was the offending element as it did not belong to the taxon one had thought it did. Did this mean that a neotype would have to be designated?

Bhattacharyya believed that acceptance of this proposal would affect the early works of Vahl, Burman, and others who had intelligently selected many lectotypes. It would severely affect the lectotypification process and hamper nomenclatural procedure.

Voss asked what would be the status of all of the names that had been rejected under Art. 69 in the past, including those prior to the present listing, if this proposal were to pass. For the most part they had not been acted on in a formal way. Would they now have to be resurrected? Or proposed for conservation?

Korf reiterated his concern about opening the floodgates to names at additional ranks, and moved an amendment to the proposal, by adding the words "of familial, generic, or specific rank".

D'Arcy felt that Prop. B consisted of two distinct elements: The first had been discussed here, the second stated procedure pending consideration of a proposal for conservation. They should be voted upon separately.

Johnson, speaking to the amendment, felt – like **Ride** – that the word "familial" was not needed because the types of family names were automatically fixed. **Korf** accepted deletion of that word as a friendly amendment to his amendment.

Brummitt suggested modifying the proposed amendment, simply to add the word "specific" in the first line of Prop. B, after "Where a"?

Korf could not accept **Brummitt's** intended friendly amendment. Not only species names but names of genera had been rejected under Art. 69 and acted upon by the General Committee.

Brummitt withdrew his proposed amendment to the amendment.

Fosberg wondered whether it was appropriate to make another amendment.

Stafleu doubted it was "appropriate", but **Fosberg** certainly had the full right to move an amendment.

Fosberg moved a second amendment to the proposal, to delete its last sentence.

Johnson admitted it was unusual for him to support **Fosberg** in nomenclatural matters, but he did in this case. "The name is not to be used" was a very ambiguous statement. What did it mean? What was the penalty for those contravening?

McNeill explained that this last sentence paralleled one that presently appeared in Art. 15; it was the exhortation to defer any nomenclatural change until such time as a Congress had ruled on a proposal.

Fosberg had moved his amendment because the proposal would introduce into the Code a provision recommending non-adherence to the same Code! That would be a pretty serious inconsistency.

Tindale thought that, if Prop. B was being adopted, it might be advisable to limit the number of conservation entries to, say, 25 per year, so that the floodgates would not be opened.

Greuter spoke to the second amendment, by Fosberg. For the conservation of a consistently misapplied name in the sense of the misapplication, by designating a conserved type, it was essential that the name should not be used in its correct sense in the meantime – because then it would not only have been used consistently in the wrong sense but would become ambiguous. Avoiding ambiguity was the main point of Art. 69. It was very important to keep this last sentence in for the sake of stability, for the sake of avoiding the loss of well-known names – an opportunity that would be available in the future if the proposal was accepted.

Fosberg's motion, to delete the last sentence of Prop. B, was **defeated**.

Greuter commented on the first amendment, proposed by Korf. It would restrict the possibility of dealing with names under Art. 69 and the now correlated Art. 14 to the ranks of genus and species. Those ranks were indeed basic and most often used by the working taxonomist. Nevertheless confusion of names was not limited to those ranks, and for users of names at other ranks confusion was just as detrimental as for users of specific and generic names. This was substantiated by the fact that names at other ranks had been the subject of proposals under Art. 69, some of which had indeed been supported by the Committee concerned. Obviously, since fewer people were dealing with names at these ranks, such proposals were relatively rare. Still it would be unwise to exclude them. At Sydney, in a different context, the name of a subfamily, *Papilionoideae*, had been granted conserved status as an alternative name to *Faboideae*; this demonstrated that names outside the main ranks could be of considerable importance. The amendment could have negative effects in some cases – few, but possibly important ones – and could not be recommended.

Korf's motion was **defeated** by a card vote (46.1% in favour; 164:192).

Greuter then reverted to the original Prop. B. Many things had been said in support and some against this proposal in the previous discussion. As one of the proposers he was obviously not neutral, but then, as Rapporteur, he was not supposed to be neutral on every issue before the Section. He responded to two major objections. (1) Objections against conservation of names at ranks other than genera and families were not really relevant. Those who were opposed to the principle of exceptional rulings should note that the proposal would not introduce any additional exceptional rulings but a different way of handling existing exceptional rulings. No case would be added that was not already open to an exceptional ruling under the present Code. (2) The objection that committee work would become excessive was similarly unfounded as the cases to be dealt with under the new provisions were the same ones the Permanent Committees had to deal with anyway under the extant provisions, and the amount of labour was not thereby increased. What was to be gained was increased flexibility: the opportunity of choice between retention of names in the familiar sense, when appropriate, and their rejection if it was preferable to get rid of them.

The mail vote was heavily in favour of the proposal (c. 70% positive votes). To paraphrase Cronquist's earlier comment [on Art. 36 Prop. A], much of that positive vote might reflect the views of botanists living in other parts of the world who, for financial or other reasons, could not be present. Rejecting this proposal would be at least unfair.

Johnson suggested that, if the proposal was accepted, the Editorial Committee might reconsider the words "is not to be used". That was in fact a Recommendation; real rules must have sanctions. Instead of "is not to", "should not" would be appropriate. Otherwise, he was happy with the proposal.

Korf felt ill at ease in voting on Prop. B before having discussed Prop. C. The latter provided for the option of either conserving a name one wanted to keep or to reject a misapplied name against a conserved name. This would lead to real problems. One of the generic names upon which the General Committee had acted, *Phialea*, was not to be used since it had been used in several different senses and nobody knew to which taxon it really applied. If rejected

against a presumed (heterotypic) synonym, anyone might, say, neotypify *Phialea* and revive the name. This exemplified the major difference between a list of names rejected under Art. 69 and a set of conserved names. Straightforward rejection of *nomina ambigua* should remain an option.

Greuter agreed that this point should be further discussed. He suggested that this happen in the context of Prop. E. It was quite possible to maintain both options, conservation and sheer rejection, if the Section so wished. The text of Prop. E, slightly modified editorially, could easily be combined with the provisions of Props. B-D.

Prop. B was rejected by a card vote (59.7% in favour; 251:163). There was a call for a recount, but **Stafleu** noted that this was unnecessary as there had been a double counting already. Only a new ballot could change the figures.

Johnson moved that there be a new ballot on Prop. B. This was an important matter and the difference of 0.3% was within the limits of experimental error. People could just have put their cards in the wrong box.

Stearn asked for a ruling from the chair that a simple majority be sufficient to carry the motion. This was a procedural matter. **Holsinger** concurred. **Cronquist** pressed the point that, before re-voting on Prop. B, one had to vote on Johnson's motion.

After some uncertainty, the Chair ruled that Johnson's motion was carried.

Prop. B was again rejected by the second card vote (58.3% in favour; 239:171).

[Discussion on the remaining proposals on Art. 69, here reported in their proper context, actually took place during the last session (see pp. 197 and 205).]

Prop. C (37:31:1:59).

Greuter noted that a funny situation had arisen through the previous definite if narrow rejection of Art. 69 Prop. B. There now was a provision under Art. 14 relating to Art. 69 with, so far, nothing

under Art. 69 to correspond. His co-proposers and he had tried, in consultation with others and taking into account the comments that had been made yesterday, to find a common ground for, hopefully, a large majority of the Section. On behalf of the proposers, he put forward an amendment to Prop. C, to achieve two things: (1) to provide for disposing by conservation of names that fell under the provisions of Art. 69 while also maintaining the present faculty to simply reject them; and (2) to limit to the ranks of genus and species the option of dealing with such cases by conservation. The amended Prop. C (to be an addition to the present text of Art. 69) started with the new sentence: "A name of a genus or species that has been widely and persistently used for a taxon or taxa not including its type and would be the correct name for another taxon may also be conserved or rejected under Art. 14.1(b)", followed by the original text of Prop. C.

The amendment, **Stafleu** explained, came from the proposers and required no vote. The amended proposal was open for discussion.

Cronquist did not wish to be the first speaker, but no vote should be taken before everybody was well aware of the implications. To him, the new version proposed by Greuter was interesting but unacceptable. It included most of Prop. B, which had been rejected, plus Prop. C. This might be an acceptable parliamentary procedure, but it was unusual. All should realize that the amended proposal would provide for the possibility of a great many *nomina specifica conservanda* of plants that were not of major economic importance.

Korf did not understand why the words "or rejected" at the end of the new part of the proposal were used, since Art. 14 concerned conservation. How was this going to work?

Voss did not share the feeling that there must be something in Art. 69 because of what had been decided on Art. 14 Prop. B. There was a simple elegant alternative solution: to do what had been done at Seattle with regard to autonyms and reverse the action which the Section had previously taken. He was prepared when the time was appropriate to move that approval of Art. 14 Prop. B be simply rescinded.

D'Arcy felt the wording should be "is the correct name", not "would be the correct name" for another taxon.

Demoulin refrained from repeating the arguments for or against the principle, but stressed that the amendment was not just a legal trick but was perfectly reasonable. The two or three votes that were lacking to pass Art. 69 Prop. B might well come from people not basically objecting to the use of conservation in the context of Art. 69, but wanting to preserve the option to reject a name without conserving it and without conserving another name against it. The present proposal was much more logical than the prospect of reversing the earlier decision on Art. 14.

Clements asked Cronquist what, having rejected the amended Prop. C, was his alternative to overcome the contradiction thereby created.

Cronquist would, if the present proposal was defeated, introduce a new motion to the effect that nothing in this Code should be interpreted to permit the conservation of names of species that were not of major economic importance. If that in turn were voted down, then in his opinion the question was moot; no procedure was provided to activate Art. 14.1(b), and the matter would have to be addressed again in Tokyo. Voss's motion to rescind the former decision was unlikely to succeed, since it would need a 60% majority that none of the possible options might attain.

McNeill clarified for the Section what was being voted on. The new proposal boiled down to removing two elements from Prop. B as rejected – two elements that some, from the comments made, felt to be undesirable. One was that the new wording only covered names of species and of genera. The other concerned cases in which it was important to be able to reject a name, which was not possible under the previous Prop. B but was provided for by the current proposal.

In response to Korf, Art. 14 did indeed deal only with the conservation of names; however, the offending name, the one that would be causing confusion, might better be rejected against another name rather than be conserved.

Finally, it was hardly appropriate to say that the proposal was opening the floodgates to *nomina specifica conservanda*. As Brummitt and other members of Permanent Committees had confirmed, the proposal would not increase the number of names that must be considered for special action. These were all names that under the present Code could be proposed for rejection and would have then to be considered by a Committee. The proposal simply permitted the achievement of greater stability than was possible through mere rejection. It would, as Cronquist said, permit conservation of some names of species that were not of major economic importance, but would not increase the total number of special cases listed in the Code. It was just a simpler and better way to tackle the problem.

In response to a question from the floor, **Greuter** explained that the point raised by D'Arcy was editorial in essence, and that the Editorial Committee would take care of it.

Prop. C, as amended, was accepted by a card vote (63.4% in favour; 251:145).

Prop. D (39:32:9:44).

Greuter explained that, in the light of the previous decisions, Prop. D had to be changed slightly in order to conform. It was to read: "Names of *genera and species* rejected, or recommended for rejection, under Art. 69 prior to the Berlin Congress are to be reconsidered by relevant Committees, which *may* recommend for each case conservation of that name which will best serve stability, such names to be listed as an Appendix to the Berlin Code". The (italized) changes were (a) the restriction to genera and species, and (b) altering "are instructed to recommend" to "may recommend".

Cronquist suggested (**Greuter** might be surprised!) a friendly amendment to the proposal, to replace "for each case" by "in some cases" or some similar phraseology that did not appear to instruct the Committee to recommend conservation. **Greuter** having accepted that amendment, **Cronquist** advised that, in the light of the action that had been taken on the previous proposal, from which the present one logically followed, there was no point in holding out and dragging one's heels. The proposal as amended should be accepted.

Renner wondered whether the amended wording would not imply that in some cases conservation of a name not best serving stability was encouraged. This was to be taken care of editorially.

Voss called attention to the fact that this was an instruction by the Section to the Permanent Committees, not an amendment to the Code. It was unrealistic to expect that the Committees could complete consideration of these cases in time for inclusion of their conclusions in the Berlin Code. It was agreed to omit the word "Berlin" before "Code".

Korf was unclear as to whether the Committees were being asked to reconsider all names they had previously recommended for rejection under Art. 69, to see whether these names should now be conserved or continued to be rejected.

Greuter replied that the wording now was "may be reconsidered by the relevant Committees". The Committees could instruct "leave them as they are", or else, "handle them under Art. 14".

D'Arcy wondered about the number of cases concerned. Did the proposal mean that one was going to "unreject" some names? That would not add to stability at all.

Greuter replied that the exact number of cases could be looked up in the "Synopsis". [15 names recommended for rejection; 28 cases still open.] The proposal did not mean that actions already taken would be reversed, but that each situation could be handled differently.

Voss objected to the latter statement as being a misrepresentation. The proposal as worded left it wide open to reverse prior rejections under Art. 69, even earlier informal rejections prior to the Lenin-grad rule – which was not necessarily undesirable.

Greuter agreed. What he had intended to explain was that names that had been rejected would not have to be taken up in their correct sense.

Prop. D was accepted.

Prop. E (18:110:1:2).

Brummitt raised the proposal again for discussion, since this had been a very vexing matter for a long time. The Rapporteurs had stated that Props. E and F misunderstood the actual purpose of the whole Article. Well, if he had, there must be eleven other members of the Committee for Spermatophyta who had also misunderstood it. Prop. E, made on behalf of that Committee, had been based on ten years' experience in trying to apply Art. 69 as reframed Lenin-grad. (The author of Prop. F, Fosberg, was also a member of that Committee, and although the two proposals looked identical they were made from quite different standpoints.) Some two years ago he had felt so frustrated at the lack of agreement on basic issues in the Committee that he had conducted a small questionnaire among the members, asking some six questions on how they interpreted Art. 69. The replies were heavily divided on all six questions, and no two members had anything like similar views overall. A recent published report had stated that the Committee was in need of guidance. The Rapporteurs might have been a little more understanding about the background to the proposal, since one was a member of the Committee and the other received all correspondence. He for one did not agree with the last two sentences of the Rapporteurs' comments on Props. E and F, and he felt that the mail vote had been too heavily influenced by them.

The cases of names proposed for rejection were of two sorts. Some names had been totally misapplied for a long time, as *Ononis spinosa* L. which had been used for a taxon excluding its type for over 200 years. It had been misused persistently (*i.e.* for a long time) and consistently (*i.e.* exclusively). Others had been used for a long time in two or more different senses, one of which was correct. Examples were *Potamogeton pusillus* and *Polygonum aviculare*. Here the name had been persistently misused, but not consistently.

The simple fact was that all proposals under Art. 69 which the Committee for Spermatophyta had accepted were of the first sort. All proposals of the second sort had so far been rejected, most of them by a 12:0 vote. This meant that one of the Rapporteurs had been voting against such proposals, despite the comments in the

"Synopsis". Why should the Code keep inviting the world's botanists to spend time writing proposals on cases like *Potamogeton pusillus* when they had no chance of being accepted? This wasted the time of the proposer and of the Committee. He inclined towards the view that if a name had been used in different senses it was best to apply the type method and decide which was correct. Why penalise those people who had been using a name correctly by rejecting it because others had used it wrongly? However, the main reason for the proposal was to get the feelings of the Section one way or the other. If Prop. E was accepted names like *Polygonum aviculare* and *Potamogeton pusillus* could not any longer be rejected. If it was defeated, this would be a clear instruction to the Committee that it should in future seriously consider cases like *Polygonum aviculare* instead of voting 12:0 against their rejection every time. Had other Permanent Committees encountered the same problem?

McNeill, being the Rapporteur who was also a member of the Committee for Spermatophyta, clarified that in the case of *Polygonum aviculare*, where there had been a 12:0 vote against rejection, he had eventually judged that the name had not even been persistently misused. But the real issue was that in cases in which there had been both persistent misuse and persistent correct usage, one was in a "no win" situation. One just could not be sure what was being meant when someone used the name. This situation was even more serious than that in which there had been consistent misuse, because in the latter case there might have been a switch of usage at one point in time whereas in the former case both usages would have occurred simultaneously. This was the reason for the Rapporteurs' comment and had been his consistent position in the Committee for Spermatophyta. He believed the mail vote was a considered response.

Faegri reminded the Section that at its origin the Article addressed *nomina confusa* [or rather, as Korf subsequently stated, *nomina ambigua*]. This was indeed the important issue. With these confused names, one could not know what the majority of non-taxonomists had meant by them in the past nor would one know what they meant by them for at least the next 50 years.

Demoulin was in full agreement with the Rapporteurs' comments and with Faegri's statement. What had happened was that the Committee for Spermatophyta had followed its own special regulations, rather than applying Art. 69 of the Code. Other Permanent Committees had found this extremely perturbing, and many practising phanerogamists had been similarly disturbed by this procedure. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens had always interpreted Art. 69 in the same way as Faegri and the Rapporteurs. It would be totally inappropriate to legalize *a posteriori* the policy of the Committee for Spermatophyta.

Prop. E was rejected.

Prop. F (19:109:1:2) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. G (6:119:1:1) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. H (41:67:4:10), being inappropriate in the light of the decisions previously taken, was **withdrawn** by the proposer.

Prop. I (31:77:4:13).

McNeill claimed that Prop I was the converse of Prop. E which had just been defeated. The Leningrad wording of Art. 69 had been ill-advisedly weakened at Sydney to allow Committees to judge on their own, by replacing the "must" clause by a "may" clause. This proposal was to give again more teeth to the provision, reverting to the use of "must", but subject to prior judgement. The mail vote was substantially against.

Cronquist admitted the proposal had some logic but felt one was already in a bind, in that some things had been passed over and not rejected that would have to be rejected under this proposal; e.g., *Epilobium paniculatum* had been misapplied almost from its inception but a proposal to reject it was defeated by the Committee. Would that case now have to be reopened and, if so, with which result? He preferred to live with the present ills rather than fly to others.

Voss pointed out that Prop. I was the exact opposite of Prop. H, which would have left things optional and which he had gracefully withdrawn. He would have expected Prop. I also to be withdrawn in the light of other changes that had been made on the Article. The proposal said "A name must be ruled as rejected" – which did not allow to rule that it be conserved! As a consequence of the acceptance of Prop. C, this would be better left out. McNeill agreed.

Prop. I was withdrawn.

Prop. J (7:49:4:65) was withdrawn.

Prop. K (7:51:4:62) was withdrawn.

McNeill introduced a **proposal from the floor**, to replace Props. J and K, worded so as to reflect what had been decided earlier under Art. 69 Prop. C. (He hoped he could manage to read the handwriting of the Rapporteur, who had had to leave for a press conference.) The new proposal functioned in the same way as Props. J and K combined. It was designed to discourage a flood of new proposals for rejection of names, and made it clear that names that had been rejected more informally in the past were not to be taken up until they had been considered by the relevant Committee. It read: "A name that has been widely and persistently used for a taxon or taxa not including its type is not to be used unless and until a proposal to dispose of it under Art. 69.1-3 has been submitted and rejected". This was parallel to Rec. 15A where it was said that names proposed for conservation should not be displaced until consideration by the appropriate Committee had been completed. It had to be wider in coverage, however, because it had also to deal with the very many names that had been rejected under Art. 69 prior to its requiring rejected names to be listed.

The new **proposal from the floor**, replacing Props. J and K, was **accepted**.

Prop. L (10:92:5:13) was ruled as rejected.

[After the coffee break of the final session, **McNeill** reopened the discussion on the new proposal replacing Props. J and K, and asked the Section to agree to having the new provision reduced to the status of a Recommendation – which was apparently accepted. At this point there is an unfortunate gap in the tape recording, so that details of that action, in the absence of written notes, are unclear. The Editorial Committee, anyhow, felt that the proposed change had been rash and ill-advised, since it was not possible to set aside the rules of the Code by a mere Recommendation, and that an Article was obviously needed to grant dispensation from the strict application of the rules, as intended here.]

DEFERRED MYCOLOGICAL PROPOSALS

[Discussion of these proposals took place while the card votes on Art. 69 Prop. B were being counted.]

Demoulin introduced this matter. Mycologists here present had met twice to discuss among themselves the relevant issues. Agreement had been reached on some points that required urgent action, while on other, long debated points opinions remained divided. He moved a **proposal from the floor**, on behalf of the unanimous group, that, independently of what might happen to Art. 7.17, the following phrase be added to to Art. 7.11: "Automatic typification does not apply to sanctioned names". This did reflect the present situation, but it was essential that it be spelled out explicitly for the sake of clarity.

With respect to Art. 7 Props. H to J, affecting Art. 7.17, there had been a debate ever since World War II on whether typification should be based on material used by the original author of the name or by the sanctioning (before Sydney: validating) author. Opinions on this were still divided, as reflected by the competing proposals.

Other discussions had concerned the problems raised by contradictory actions taken by the Section regarding Arts. 13 and 14. This matter would be brought up later.

Kuyper supported the proposal from the floor and agreed it should be dealt with first.

Zijlstra asked for a short explanation of the proposal.

Korf (Demoulin being tired) explained that there were many sanctioned names that had listed synonyms, and it was important to avoid automatic typification, under Art. 63, of these sanctioned names by the earliest listed synonym. The provisions of Art. 7.17 on how to typify sanctioned names should not be allowed to be limited by the provisions of Art. 7.11.

Demoulin added that, since the use of those sanctioned names was obligatory, it would be a major catastrophe if they were to be typified in a way contrary to current usage.

Greuter noted that the proposed addition to Art. 7.11 had the virtually unanimous support of mycologists, and that it did only affect mycological nomenclature. It had always been the policy of Nomenclature Sections to follow the advice of special groups in matters of nomenclature only of importance to themselves. Moreover, mycologists had a good point here. Acceptance of the proposal could be recommended.

Demoulin's proposal from the floor was accepted.

McNeill addressed **Art. 7 Props. H to J**, all on Art. 7.17. Prop. H was a rephrasing which in itself was not, in the judgement of the Rapporteurs, an improvement, although admittedly the present wording was not ideal. The proposal should be referred to the Editorial Committee, to see if a better wording could be achieved.

Kuyper was hesitant to speak on these proposals in view of the clear preference of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens for Prop. H; but having read the comments of the Rapporteurs [to Art. 14 Props. E-H and E-I] on special provisions required by the peculiarities of mycologists rather than of fungi, and on harmony vs. disharmony, he felt a few comments were appropriate. The present Art. 7.17, whether reworded or not, introduced a major disharmony into the Code as it allowed supersession of a holotype (contrary to Art. 7.3), of a lectotype (Arts. 7.4, 7.5), and provided for typification of a

generic name by an element that was not part of the protologue (Art. 10). Such a disharmony might have been acceptable if, otherwise, the introduction of a sanctioned system at Sydney would have been destabilizing. This had indeed always been claimed, but he had recently been able to check and had found it was not true. Out of 25 names for which application of Art. 7.17 was in dispute, only 2 would be negatively affected by deletion of Art. 7.17. Such a small number of problems – due solely to mycologists having chosen to rely on a book with some rather unfortunate taxonomic decisions – did hardly justify a considerable disharmony in the Code. Also, There were several cases in which the sanctioning author had misapplied a name, and later authors had used the name either in the original sense or in the sense of the sanctioning author. The present Art. 7.17 did not provide guidance on how to act in such cases, so that conflicts were bound to arise. Finally the adoption of Prop. H could result in some difficulties with author citations. It would make it rather difficult to tell to whom a particular name was to be attributed, since a sanctioned name would not have a type from the start but only from the moment of sanctioning.

Gams admitted that, whatever decision on Props. H-J would be taken, numerous problems of author citation for sanctioned fungal names would remain. It was useless to try to rule on this. What was required was a list of sanctioned names including the appropriate author citations. This would require much work by an active team of specialists (not necessarily by a Special Committee). Decision here was between Props. H and J (Prop. I being out of the question). While Prop. J would, as Kuyper had said, bring more harmony into the Code, Prop. H was perhaps somewhat more in line with previous nomenclatural practice. Art. 7.17 had been introduced in order to please those mycologists who had had problems with the sanctioning system altogether.

Zijlstra had been considering the lectotypification of several fungal names, and had found Art. 7.17 to be a big problem. In particular it was unclear to her, and was controversial among mycologists, whether the sanctioning of a subgeneric name by Fries was to affect the application of the corresponding generic name later on. She strongly preferred Prop. J.

Greuter confirmed what **Kuyper** had said. Art. 7.17, introduced at Sydney, was quite vague – purposely vague in fact, because that was the only way to bring mycologists to agree to the concept of sanctioning. The situation had not changed much since Sydney. The recommendations of the Rapporteurs were (a) to let mycologists express again how they felt and (b), should they fail to agree clearly on Prop. J, to preserve the *status quo*. This would give them the opportunity of reaching agreement by the next Congress. What was the most recent vote of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens on Props. H and J (assuming that Prop. I was out of the question)?

Korf reported that the vote of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens was 11:3 in favour of Prop. H and 2:12 against Prop. J (one member abstaining). This vote needed not necessarily sway the Section. He could live with either solution. Prop. H was essentially editorial. He agreed with the Rapporteur that, having rejected Prop. J, mycologists might well want to come back on that point some time in the future.

Art. 7 Prop. H was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Art. 7 Prop. I was ruled as **rejected**.

Art. 7 Prop. J was **rejected**.

McNeill advised that **Art. 6 Prop. I**, while no longer necessary since the key portion of Art. 14 Prop. E had been rejected, could nevertheless be referred to the Editorial Committee. It was, as **Korf** reported, favoured unanimously (15:0) by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens.

Art. 6 Prop. I was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

McNeill, turning back to **Art. 14 Prop. E**, reported that mycologists had discussed the consequence of the rejection, on Tuesday, of the first paragraph of that proposal and of the concomitant acceptance of the last two paragraphs. They had come to the conclusion that it would be better to reword what had been passed as "§ p", and they

suggested the following wording: "When two homonyms are sanctioned, Art. 64 and Art. 72 Note 1 apply to the later of them". This would best be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Greuter asked mycologists to make it explicit what their intent was. The original proposal was indeed not very clear, but the proposed rewording was not quite clear either. The matter could be handled editorially if the Editorial Committee knew exactly what mycologists had in mind. When two homonyms were both sanctioned, was the one that was first validly published to prevail or the one that had first been sanctioned? **Gams** replied it was the one first validly published.

The proposed rewording of **Art. 14 Prop. E § p** was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

McNeill thought that, in view of this decision, Art. 14 Props. F to H should be rejected. **Kuyper** disagreed. It was still necessary to choose between Props. F and G, which were alternatives, and to act on Prop. H. These questions had not been settled by the previous vote.

Demoulin pointed out that the reasons why he – along with the Rapporteurs – had objected to some of the mycological proposals on Art. 14 were not in their content but in their form. They were too long, not sufficiently clear, and partly unnecessary. The intent was commendable, although a lot of editorial work would be needed to reconcile the decisions taken on Arts. 13 and 14. The following proposals could stand independently of whether one treated sanctioned names under Art. 13 or 14. Clarification on how the sanctioning system worked was needed in any case.

Greuter introduced the alternative **Art. 14 Props. F and G**. Although referring to sanctioned names, these proposals did not merely concern a mycological question. The question they were to resolve had never been answered explicitly for conserved names in general. It would be illogical to answer it only for one category of conserved names, *i.e.*, sanctioned names, and leave it open for "normal" conserved names. There was no provision in the Code

defining the status of rejected earlier homonyms. Nowhere was it specified whether they were, *e.g.*, available as basionyms for other combinations. This was an important question and should certainly be resolved in a general way. In the absence of a general proposal, it might be wiser to defeat both proposals unless a consensus could be reached here on which way to go for all rejected homonyms. The matter could then be raised again at the next Congress.

Kuyper was in agreement with the Rapporteur's view in that it might be premature to settle the question in a general way. He did not, however, like the idea of having to wait another six years now that the problem had been seen. This would lead to divergent interpretations and to confusion. One of the proposals should be accepted so that the mycologists would know what to do in the future, because they did write Floras and had to make nomenclatural decisions. (Mycologists were not the only people writing Floras, though, as **Greuter** pointed out.)

Gams digressed on Art. 14 Prop. E § n, previously rejected. Its rejection meant that, as before, sanctioned names would be treated as conserved against all earlier botanical homonyms. An important aspect of the proposal was the intent to rule that sanctioned fungal names be protected against fungal names only. This he wanted to put on record.

Nicolson supported Prop. G in a general way, as applied to all rejected homonyms, because he was opposed to any extension of illegitimacy.

Cannon echoed Kuyper's comments. The situation for "normal" conserved names was admittedly parallel. However it was the mycologists, both here and elsewhere, who had become aware of the problem and who, while not all in agreement on the appropriate solution, wanted a decision. The nomenclatural effect would not be far-reaching either way, and it was not so important which option was eventually chosen. But it would be useful to have a ruling rather than carrying on with the present uncertainty.

Korf reported that the Committee for Fungi and Lichens had voted 15:0 against Prop. F and 14:0 (1 abstaining) in favour of Prop. G. He urged for a vote.

Greuter was not opposed to finding an immediate solution to the problem if the Section felt this to be appropriate – and **Nicolson's** comments pointed in that direction. He only opposed divorcing sanctioned names from other conserved names when the problem was exactly the same. To give the Section an opportunity of so deciding, he moved a (double) amendment to Props. G and F, to replace the word "sanctioned" by the word "conserved". Thus, if the amended Prop. G was accepted, the solution favoured by mycologists for sanctioned names would apply to all conserved names.

Nicolson wondered whether a sanctioned name had the same status as a conserved name. Should one not rather say "conserved or sanctioned"?

Greuter felt this was purely editorial. One might say "conserved or sanctioned", or "conserved including sanctioned". At any rate, sanctioned names were also to be covered by the proposed amendment.

McNeill noted that Prop. F had received a greater than 75% negative mail vote. Unless someone spoke to it, it would be ruled as rejected. **Kuyper**, however, expressed his preference for Prop. F.

Greuter's motion on Prop. G was **carried**.

Art. 14 Prop. G was **accepted as amended**.

Art. 14 Prop. F was **rejected**.

Korf reported that, by his error, **Art. 14 Prop. H** had been voted on only once by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens, not twice as was normally the case, and that the vote had been 2 in favour, 2 opposed, with 11 wanting continued discussion.

Demoulin was among those who, in the Committee, had opposed very strongly this proposal and he was surprised it did get some support. It emanated from **Rauschert** – apparently in relation to some generic names for which he already had introduced conservation proposals on the assumption that this proposal would be accepted. The problem was not relevant for generic names (they could be dealt with by conservation) but for specific names. When the sanctioning system was introduced at Sydney, the intention was to

change current usage as little as possible. Before Sydney, valid publication of fungal names dated from what was to become the sanctioning works, and the spelling used there was the one that had always been used. Introducing a special rule, that sanctioned names be treated as conserved in every respect except for orthography, would achieve nothing but destabilize usage. This should not be discussed any further but just rejected.

Art. 14 Prop. H was rejected.

Art. 48 Prop. A, related to Art. 7 Prop. I already rejected, was ruled as **rejected**.

Art. 45 Prop. A, Art. 62 Prop. A, Art. 63 Prop. R and Art. 64 Prop. A were all referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Article 72

Prop. A (5:92:3:26), being part of a package to remove illegitimacy from the Code, was **rejected**.

Article 73

Prop. A (117:2:1:4) came from the Committee on Orthography.

Adolphi drew attention to the fact that some names or epithets, as originally spelled, included an apostrophe or an abbreviation or even a full stop. Nowhere was it stated whether these signs were to be retained or not. He moved an amendment to Prop. A, to add the following sentence to Art. 73.1: "An apostrophe or full stop in the original publication is not to be retained." There was no point in retaining the apostrophe in epithets such as *l'heritieri*, since French names like *L'Héritier* were not uncommonly spelt without an apostrophe. In the examples in the Code it had consistently been omitted.

Demoulin regretted that the Section was losing its time with this kind of proposals. Adolphi had had six years to defend his point,

having presented it to the Committee on Orthography, but it was heavily defeated. It was absolutely ridiculous to bring it up again before the Section.

Johnson seconded Adolphi's motion. The matter had not been overwhelmingly defeated, although technically rejected, in the Committee on Orthography, of which he had been a member; indeed some members of that Committee did not function at all. This was a problem that troubled many people. Think of names starting with "Mac" or "Saint", giving, e.g., *st.johnii*; how on earth was one supposed to write that? English-speaking people had no objection to write *olearyanum* without an apostrophe – a sign certainly quite foreign to Latin.

Stafleu observed that the Code was not written only for English-speaking people.

Brummitt agreed that apostrophes and full stops were an embarrassment in names (as were hyphens). Particularly in computers they caused chaos, and it would be much simpler to omit them consistently.

D'Arcy, whose family had written their name with an apostrophe for centuries, and who liked to see his name spelt that way, nevertheless thought it entirely inappropriate to put it into a botanical name. He supported the amendment, and would have wished to add the hyphen. The hyphen had two different functions, joining and breaking words, and Linnaeus had never used it for joining only for breaking. In botanical names it was used for joining.

Stafleu pointed out that the Section had already decided the day before on the question of the hyphen when defeating Art. 20 Prop. B and maintaining *Sebastiano-schaueria*. He would not entertain a motion to come back on that decision.

Demoulin gave the result of the Committee vote on this matter: 2 in favour, 7 against. Suppressing the apostrophe in *l'heritieri* was absurd. In French the name L'Héritier without the apostrophe could not stand. (Adolphi did not want to teach him French, he hoped! [laughter].) The facility of computer programmers should

not be allowed to rule out good scholarship and botanical tradition. "TL-2" had been produced using computer facilities and nevertheless correctly included apostrophes and the like.

Stafleu would also have liked to comment, but refrained from doing so – being in the chair.

Greuter drew attention to the fact that in the moved amendment there were two quite different elements. One of these, concerning the apostrophe, had now been fully considered and should not, in view of the mood of the Section, be discussed any further. The other, related to abbreviations used in epithets, was much more important. Rejection of the amendment, which seemed likely, should not be taken as preventing all those who voted against it from henceforth expanding abbreviations in epithets as they appeared in the original publication. In, e.g., Linnaeus's "Species Plantarum" a number of lengthy epithets appeared only in abbreviated form. It had been customary to expand these, although it was not explicitly permitted by the Code – which was indeed a gap in the rules. Until there was a concrete proposal to fill this gap, traditional procedure should be followed. The proposed amendment did not present a solution to this, and should be defeated.

Nicolson suggested that the amendment be rejected and referred to the Special Committee on Binary Combinations. The question was within their purview. The proposal itself was to be commended. It aimed at removing the phrase "orthographic error" that presently was used in matters, not of correctness or error but of standardization that botanists had chosen to apply.

Adolphi's motion was **defeated** by a card vote (54.4% in favour; 222:186) and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Binary Combinations.

Stafleu confessed that one of the things that had always delighted him since 1951, in these sessions of the Nomenclature Section, was the way these trivialities took the Section's time. Maybe this made it understandable that he sometimes put a little pressure on!

Prop. A was later [at the beginning of the Eighth Session] **accepted**.

Prop. B (20:90:2:4) was ruled as **rejected**.

Hnatiuk had been asked by several plant taxonomists in Australia to introduce a new **proposal from the floor**, to amend Art. 73.1 to read: "The original spelling of a name or epithet is to be retained." The remainder of the Article was then to take the form of Recommendations. The necessary editorial changes could be left to the care of the Editorial Committee.

The Article as it stood (together with parts of some associated Articles such as 23.1 and 32.5) was inconsistent. Specifically, Art. 23.1 permitted any source for a name, even arbitrary combinations of letters – and this was a good thing. In Art. 73 there were rules which prescribed changes as mandatory, e.g. Art. 73.8 ("incorrect compounding forms ... are to be corrected") and Art. 73.10 which implicitly raised Rec. 73C.1 to the status of a rule.

There was an important place in the Code for Recommendations of good practice, so that people forming new names could do this in the best way possible. However, there should be no place for explicitly allowing, however strongly felt and however correct in hindsight a case might be, to change spellings from their original form. Johnson on Tuesday had admonished taxonomists to be proficient in Latin, which was indeed good. But once a name had been published it reached the public domain, and people outside taxonomy had a right to use names. One could not expect that everybody be proficient in Latin, let alone classical Greek. For a validly published, available name, users should be able to check which of various spellings was the correct one. They should be enabled to go back to the original source and to know that the spelling found there was the correct one. Presently this was not so. Changes of the original spelling were possible, and could be different from one Congress to the other (such as the switch from *muellerianus* to *muelleranus* and back to *muellerianus*, or the switch to feminine gender of generic names of trees treated as masculine by Linnaeus). Taxonomists were first and foremost putting names on plants, not providing means for recognizing particular people or places. If taxonomists were sincere in their work, they had to accept responsibility for what they did at the moment of publishing. If mistakes occurred, this was unfortunate, but they should correct them before publishing. If they could

not trust the publisher, then they should stand by him when printed matter came off the press, correcting typographical errors at that point, even paying for it to be redone if they felt strongly about it – but once a name was published it had to stay that way.

Cronquist was emotionally sympathetic to the proposal but wondered if it was intended to be quite as severe as it sounded. Did it mean that if there was a typographical error which the author did not catch, one would be stuck with that error? If so, he would have to vote against the proposal.

Hnatiuk confirmed that the proposal was as severe as that, although he would entertain a clause as currently found in the Zoological Code, that a typographical error noted by the author in the place of publication was correctable. Such a provision would moderate the absolute severity of the present proposal.

Brummitt acknowledged that Hnatiuk had rightly put his finger on a very controversial point, one which he had often thought about and which came up very frequently. The proposed solution had the advantage of giving an immediate answer to all problems – but it did not reflect common sense. A number of cases had recently come up within the Committee for Spermatophyta, to conserve later spellings. This was due to the policy of the "Index Nominum Generi-corum" to invariably go back to the original spellings, for which ING had no mandate in cases where a later correction had been generally adopted. For example, Blume in 1826 published over 100 names which he himself corrected in 1828, explaining that at the time of the original publication he had been mentally sick and had had no access to the literature (one case being *Rhynchoglossum*, originally spelt *Rhincoglossum*). One should accept at least later corrections by the author himself, and in many cases also someone else's corrections.

Voss shared some of Cronquist's emotional impressment with the proposal, but it was too drastic a solution, particularly in view of the lack of a prior formal proposal and a mail vote opinion. The proposal was indeed severe, and in spite of what Brummitt had said it would not give an immediate answer – not to those who did not

have access to a very large library. Did one want to look up each time, in the original publication, whether to use a single or a double *i*? or which was the originally used gender of a generic name? This would lead to chaos.

Friis took it that the proposal would result in the retention of non-Roman letters like the Scandinavian *æ*, *ø* and *å*, and in the retention of the originally used abbreviations just mentioned by Greuter.

Greuter shared Voss's misgivings about accepting such a change when brought up from the floor and without previous extensive discussion. Orthography might seem, and indeed was, a trivial matter in many respects, and one often felt one was losing one's time on orthography questions. Nevertheless, orthography had important consequences. Adoption of this proposal would certainly have an immediate, very heavy destabilizing effect: the orthography of very many names would have to be changed, and some changes would affect first letters that were relevant for alphabetizing. Moreover, many who were basically sympathetic to restricting the liberty to correct original spellings would draw the line at cases like *Athyrium f. foemina*. If taken literally (although this was hardly intended) the proposal could be construed to mean that specific names with a misspelt generic component could not be corrected. The proposal should be rejected (but would be considered by any new Special Committee on Orthography that the Section might decide to set up).

Hnatiuk's proposal from the floor was defeated.

EIGHTH SESSION

Thursday, 23 July 1987, 14:00 – 16:00

[Chairman: Stafleu]

Article 73 (continued)

Prop. C (6:45:1:71) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. D (54:44:1:25).

Nicolson admitted that, as the Rapporteurs had pointed out, the proposed text would open the door to names in Cyrillic being considered as scientific names and consequently transcribed. The intention was not, however, to bring in other alphabets but to deal with the relatively few characters which were not in the Roman alphabet and yet sometimes appeared in scientific names. It had also come to the Committee on Orthography's attention that the German β (or "double s") was not a letter but a ligature (along with several other ligatures that were used in print). The "long s", an unusual form of the letter *s*, had been widely used in the past, even in the published work of Linnaeus. The Committee now wished to amend the proposal, so that the proposed new sentence in Art. 73.4 would read: "Other letters appearing in scientific names such as the "long s" as in *racemosa*, or ligatures such as the German β ("double s") as in *bloßfeldiana* are to be transcribed (*racemosa*, *blossfeldiana*)".

Stafleu pointed out that the German "long s" was just an *s*; there were two ways to write the Latin letter *s*. No special legislation was necessary. The ligature β was misprinted in the proposal as it appeared in the "Synopsis" (a limitation of McNeill's laser printer, actually).

Greuter explained that the amendment was not to be voted on because it came from the proposing Committee. The main change it did introduce was to replace the words "modern alphabet" by "scientific names"; the second half of the amended proposal involved examples. Acceptance of the proposal would be interpreted as referring the latter part to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. D was accepted as amended.

Prop. E (86:30:0:9) was accepted.

Prop. F (11:86:15:6) was rejected.

Prop. G (3:111:0:6) was ruled as rejected.

Prop. H (60:47:4:9).

McNeill introduced the proposal, which came from the Committee on Orthography and dealt with the "anomaly" in which the existing wording of Art. 73.8 allowed Rec. 73G to have the force of an Article. It would, however, have other effects, which should be explained by someone on the Committee.

Demoulin spoke to the problem of the Recommendations on standardization which had gradually been turned into rules and which had long divided botanists. A simple majority in the Committee (but not a two-thirds majority) had been in favour of the McVaugh-Cronquist proposal to the Leningrad Congress and the Demoulin proposal to the Sydney Congress, simply to delete the obligation to standardize connecting vowels and genitive endings in epithets. A similar proposal, by Fosberg, was again before the Section (Prop. J). It would be more logical first to act on Fosberg's proposal. The Committee proposal, like parallel proposals on Art. 73.10, was a compromise reached after failure to obtain a two-thirds majority for deletion of obligatory standardization. His personal preference was still for the more radical solution.

Stafleu took this advice. Discussion on Prop. J was now in order.

Prop. J (23:87:2:5).

McNeill, while having no great expertise in orthography, drew the Section's attention to the fact that this would involve changes in what currently had the force of a rule, as was made clear by the examples given in the original proposal. An epithet in the form of, e.g., *opuntiaeflora* would be considered as "grammatically correct" and would not be correctable to *opuntiflora*. The proposal, as pointed out by **Stafleu**, had received 74% negative votes in the mail ballot.

D'Arcy might not have fully understood all the implications, but that connecting vowel business had always caused him the greatest problems. A simple way of dealing with it was needed. Prop. H would require looking at latinization of Greek and at other points that for the general botanical community were abstruse. If Fosberg's proposal lead to simplicity it was to be favoured.

McNeill pointed out that Prop. J was an intrinsic part of a concise and coherent package of proposals, by Fosberg, that also required the complete deletion of Rec. 73G – almost a page of the Code.

Voss agreed things should be kept simple, but what was in the Code now was relatively simple, because it referred to Rec. 73G where details were spelled out. The proposal simply referred to grammatical correctness and left it to the user to find out what grammar called for.

Demoulin insisted that Fosberg's proposal was good. The problem was that the present Recommendation [73G] did not give grammatical advice but advised on standardization only. Following the present rules of standardization had nothing to do with the correction of grammatical errors. This had been recognized when the wording of Art. 73.1 was changed [by accepting Prop. A]. The Recommendation itself could remain (especially if reduced as now recommended by the Committee on Orthography) but it should not have the force of a rule.

Greuter felt that the important point was whether scores of Botanic Gardens were going to be forced to remake their labels because of countless orthographic changes that would be enforced by adoption of this proposal. Orthography might be a minor matter for most taxonomists, but not for those who had engraved labels in their Gardens, nor for many other categories of users. The Rapporteurs strongly recommended rejection.

Cronquist did not think Greuter's point was a valid one. Even if one was to delete the whole Rec. 73G, specifying how one either should or must do things, one could still correct orthographic errors if one considered them to be orthographic errors. If Greuter choose to consider the spelling on the labels in the Berlin Botanic Garden to be correct even if different from the original spelling, he could leave them that way.

Faegri moved that the vote be divided in two, and that the first vote be on the deletion of the parenthesis "(see Rec. 73G)". The motion having been seconded, some uncertainty arose as to its implications

and as to further procedure. To clear the way for a decision on the original proposal, and in conformity with advice from the Rapporteur, Faegri's motion was **defeated**.

Prop. J was rejected.

Prop. K (12:97:2:5) was ruled as **rejected**.

Demoulin, reverting to **Prop. H**, reiterated that it represented a carefully studied compromise between those who like himself favoured deletion of the whole rule and the others. The Committee on Orthography had tried to find out which standardization had been most consistently applied and was relatively unambiguous to determine. It had concluded this was the change of the feminine genitive ending *-ae-* into *-i-*. This was a relatively straightforward matter once the few exceptions had been identified, as the Committee had done. This was a careful and balanced proposal, and accepting it would bring the debate on standardization to a close. (And stop the merry-go-round, **Stafleu** hoped.)

Chapman was in favour of simplifying this area of the Code, and believed the proposal could achieve this. He had, however, a problem with the term "well-established" and commended that the Editorial Committee should look at this aspect if the proposal was accepted.

Zijlstra also favoured simplification. The proposal left open, however, one problem: it did not tell what was a pseudocompound and what was a true compound.

Hekking moved an amendment, to the effect that standardization was to follow the rules of classical Latin. The motion was seconded.

Demoulin did not understand why **Zijlstra** wanted a definition of the term "pseudocompound"; it was just used in parentheses as an additional information or commentary for the benefit of those who knew it, but one did not need to know what the word meant to apply this rule; everything that was needed was there.

Staffleu was glad to hear this, having long wondered what the term meant. He now concluded that the presence of the word "pseudo-compound" was rather confusing.

Demoulin specified that it was not really necessary except in the second sentence; it allowed that sentence to be more concise. But one could edit "pseudocompound" out. For those who wondered what "well-established" meant, in the second sentence: it referred to words one could find in a dictionary. **Hekking's** amendment wanted exactly this: good classical Latin practice, as reflected by the transformation of the *-ae-* of pseudocompounds into the *-i-* of true compounds.

McNeill – perhaps because it was late in the week – felt it would be difficult, if **Hekking's** motion was carried, to know what had actually been decided. The amendment seemed to have no immediate connection with Prop. H. For that reason, if for no other, he recommended its rejection.

Stearn, as a botanist using Latin, had been bothered time and again by people who wanted to go back to classical Latin, whereas in fact the classical Latin of Caesar and Virgil that he had learnt at school was not the kind of Latin that he had been reading for all his life in botanical works. To go back to classical Latin would lead to a lot of completely unnecessary changes. The Latin that botanists used to-day was not classical Latin – thank goodness. It was modern Latin, modified from Renaissance Latin, modified from mediaeval Latin, modified from vulgar Latin, modified ultimately from the original Latin speech of the Roman peoples. Why waste a lot of time over this?

Singer felt one might just as well put into the Code an Article to oblige botanical nomenclaturalists to know classical Latin.

Staffleu explained that the amendment was in the form of a general instruction to the Editorial Committee. But as everybody knew, and as **Stearn** had made very clear, botanical Latin was not classical Latin.

Hekking's motion was **defeated**.

Greuter reverted once more to Prop. H. It had some merit, but it also had one drawback which had been pinpointed by the Rapporteurs in their published comments and which surprisingly no one had raised (this reassured him that no one read the Rapporteur's comments, and that they had far less influence on the outcome of the mail ballot than some had thought). As presently worded – and he would like to think this was accidental – the proposal would rule that one must correct *salviaefolius* to *salviifolius* but that one was not allowed to correct *salvifolius* to *salviifolius*. Whether accidental or not, this was certainly not desirable. If the proposers agreed on this, one might accept the proposal on the understanding that the Editorial Committee would correct the wording accordingly; if not, he would have to advise against accepting the proposal.

Demoulin refused to have this matter handled editorially. Those who felt like Greuter should move a concrete amendment to the proposal. The proposed wording was not accidental but well considered. The change of *-i-* to *-ii-* was contrary to good Latin and was a relatively recent addition to the Code, that had not been followed by all. Standardization should be restricted to the feminine genitive singular.

Stafleu discouraged any further motions from the floor. There had been clear but conflicting statements from the Rapporteur and from the proposers. It was up to the Section to take a decision. The Section was moving much too slowly.

Prop. H was rejected by a card vote (56.1% in favour; 216:169).

Prop. I (28:74:2:12).

Voss differed from the Rapporteurs' comments (which he had read!) that this proposal would become largely irrelevant were Prop. H to be accepted. Prop. H would indeed narrow the option for corrections to be made in epithets. Still, epithets were sometimes adjectives and sometimes they were nouns in apposition, particularly old generic names, and he was opposed to forcing a change on such an old generic name to conform to any particular orthographic standardization.

McNeill agreed that, although there might be very few such cases left if Prop. H were to pass, the proposal dealt sensibly with the situation and could be accepted.

Prop. I was accepted. [For Props. J and K, see pp. 182-184.]

Prop. L (67:17:1:39).

Eichler pointed out that the wording of the proposal was defective. On line 1, after "orthographic error", a new sentence should start, to begin with the words "The hyphen is". This was an editorial matter.

Prop. L was accepted.

Prop. M (25:23:1:68).

McNeill summarized the Rapporteurs' published comments on this proposal, which also came from the Committee on Orthography and, as Prop. H, would have the effect of removing the "back-door" approach permitting a Recommendation to have the force of an Article. In this case the Committee was divided as to the extent to which correction of a termination should be allowed. The high Editorial Committee vote in the mail ballot reflected preference for maintaining the *status quo* while incorporating editorial improvements included in the proposal, as suggested by the Rapporteurs. Prop. N, that could be combined with Prop. M, provided an alternative in that it would add the faculty of correcting the ending of names depending on the sex and number of the person(s), which was the present situation but was not provided for by Prop. M alone.

Yeo was one of the few people who had in fact published an epithet with the wrong gender. As the author of the name he had himself published the correction when his attention was drawn to his error.

Demoulin made it clear that Props. M and N were not really alternatives, as McNeill had said. A two-thirds majority of the Committee had agreed to Prop. M, after a lot of hard and painstaking work that should not be disposed of rashly. This left open the question of correcting gender and number of such epithets, on which the Committee was divided. The issue was therefore separated from the

main proposal, and was being addressed by Prop. N. Personally he was strongly opposed to Prop. N although it appeared under the authorship of "Demoulin & Nicolson". It was ridiculous to ask that botanists had to go back, not only to the original botanical literature but to biographical literature in order to find out the sex of a person. Two noted mycologists had changed sex in the past ten years!

McNeill had just tried to clarify the reason for the high Editorial Committee vote on Prop. M. The Rapporteurs had suggested that those favouring the principle of Prop. M but with Prop. N added should vote "ed. c." on the former. The mail ballot indicated strong support for Prop. M provided Prop. N be incorporated.

Greuter agreed that Props. M and N could be treated independently and could be referred to the Editorial Committee with the instruction to maintain the *status quo*. However, now that Prop. H had been rejected [the result of the card vote had just been announced], there was no merit in accepting Prop. M. It was obvious that Props. H and M should be handled in parallel as they covered parallel situations. He advised that Prop. M be rejected but referred to the Editorial Committee, which would then incorporate any reasonable wording improvements while keeping the parallelism between the two Articles.

Prop. M was rejected but referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. N (88:34:0:2) was accepted.

Prop. O (12:33:8:48), contingent upon the rejected Art. 14 Prop. H, was similarly **rejected**.

Hnatiuk moved the establishment of a new Special Committee, to investigate what if any limitations or guidelines on mandatory orthographic corrections to original spellings should be included in the Code, and to report to the next Congress.

Demoulin exclaimed that some had already wasted six years [as members of the Special Committee on Orthography]; others should not be made to waste six other years.

Cronquist [sitting to the back since having with him Academician Armen Takhtajan and Mrs. Takhtajan – long applause] was not, as probably most knew, sympathetic to detailed prescriptions as to how to change spellings of names. But there were now what he called the Nicolson Rules. He would like to delete them and would vote for such deletion – but could see no point in setting up another Committee to go through the same matter again and come up with either the same set of rules and Recommendations or a different one which would make one do something different from what one had been doing. He could live with what was presently there, better than he could live with what a new Committee might come up with on another try.

Stafleu's experience since 1951 was that the questions of orthography would come back at every Congress. He had heard the same discussions many times (although they might be more refined at present).

Hnatiuk's motion to set up a new Special Committee was **defeated**.

Recommendation 73B

Prop. A (69:35:1:8).

McNeill explained that the proposal was to delete the portion of the Recommendation regarding substantives derived from names ending in *-er*. It was designed to parallel the action taken at Sydney over adjectival epithets derived from such names, where there had been an impassioned plea from Stearn to rule as correct *hasslerianus* rather than *hassleranus*. Stearn might wish to comment on the Rapporteurs' suggestion that at the generic level both options were equivalent.

Stearn confirmed this had been largely an optional matter in the past. Cutting out this part of the Recommendation would leave people free to do one or the other. The proposal should be supported. [NB.: This advice was objectively incorrect. Acceptance of the proposal meant recommending names formed like *Sesleria* in preference to those on the model of *Kenera*. The Editorial Committee later decided to follow the obvious intent of the Section rather than its formal decision.]

Prop. A was accepted.

Prop. B (28:7:0:82) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Recommendation 73G

Prop. A (17:92:3:2) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. B (73:27:10:8) was **accepted**.

Prop. C (9:76:11:21) was **rejected**.

Prop. D (17:69:11:19) was **rejected**.

Prop. E (84:9:2:25) was **accepted**.

Article 75

Prop. A (78:14:1:33) was **accepted**.

Prop. B (26:50:1:48).

Demoulin admitted there was a problem in wording with this proposals, as had been pointed out by the **Rapporteurs**, which probably had led to the negative mail vote. As presently worded, the provision might be considered to overrule **Art. 73**, which of course was not intended. The proposal was to be amended by adding: "corrections under **Art. 73** notwithstanding". The addition was corrected by **Voss**, to read: "except as provided in **Art. 73**" (**Demoulin** agreeing).

Chapman asked **Demoulin** as the Secretary of the Committee on Orthography to clarify how the proposal affected a case where the spelling variant heading the description differed from the spelling consistently used in the rest of the paper. Would this now preclude the correction being made? A name might be spelled correctly twenty times in a paper, and just in the heading to the description inadvertently spelled wrongly.

Demoulin thought it was perfectly clear that this was just the case addressed by the new amendment. For example, in the protologue of *Alyssum pintodasilvae* there was a typographical mistake in the heading of the Latin description (*pintodasilyae*), whereas in the rest of the paper the name was correctly spelled. The amended proposal was not concerned with corrections but with the choice between [equally correct] variant spellings.

McNeill confirmed that, thanks to the amendment, the problem that Chapman had raised was no longer there.

Johnson, as a member of the Committee, was unhappy with this proposal, even with the new addition. It was not always clear from the protologue and associated publications that there was a typographical mistake, although it might be clear from other evidence. One well-known species of *Eucalyptus*, *E. sparsifolia*, was published with the heading *E. sparsiflora*. That was all that appeared in the actual protologue. In the index to the volume, and on all the specimens annotated by the author, the epithet was spelled *sparsifolia*, but that was external evidence. He was opposed to including this rule, which was not really necessary.

The wording of the amended proposal was then read out by the Rapporteur. Further attempts by **Demoulin** to explain his position were ruled out of order from the chair since the voting had already begun.

Prop. B, as amended, was **rejected** by a card vote (47.5% in favour; 186:206).

Prop. C (43:13:0:68), being an editorial consequence of the earlier acceptance of Rec. 50F Prop. A, was **accepted**.

Prop. D (5:51:0:65) was **rejected**.

Recommendation 75A

Prop. A (31:85:1:3).

McNeill welcomed the intent of both Prop. A and Prop. B [to change the Recommendation into an Article]. The question was whether the text should be substantially changed. The mail vote indicated a clear preference for Prop. B over Prop. A, and this certainly was the wiser direction in which to go. Both proposals would require editorial attention.

Fosberg requested that the present Recommendation be read out before deciding on changing it to an Article. This was [concisely] done by the Vice-Rapporteur.

Prop. A was rejected.

Prop. B (60:45:1:12) was accepted.

Prop. C (71:36:1:11).

Voss pointed out that the deferred Art. 14 Prop. D was relevant here, namely to add preservation of a particular gender to the reasons for which a generic name could be conserved, in cases where there was controversy. (The proposed Article would cover things nicely if there was no controversy.) Conservation of gender had already been effected in the past, but only when correlated with a difference in spelling (such as *Cortinarius* vs. *Cortinaria*, and other names by S. F. Gray). But there were cases when the spelling did not vary although the gender did. If Art. 14 Prop. D was accepted it would be preferable not to include the exceptions now given as examples under Prop. C, but to deal with those cases by conservation. Otherwise, he had no objection at all against this proposal.

Demoulin explained that there had been a controversy between Voss and the Committee on Orthography on the gender that was to be attributed to *Lotus*. The Committee considered it unnecessary to burden the list of *nomina generica conservanda* with names conserved for their gender. Until now, such problems had been dealt with under Rec. 75A, which always had had the power of an Article. It was less cumbersome, and also traditional, to handle the controversial cases by the way of "voted examples". The examples in this proposal were all well-considered cases which either had already

been in Rec. 75A or else had been thoroughly discussed in the Committee. The *Lotus* story was complex, since classical usage was mixed [masculine and feminine] but mostly referred to a tree, whereas current usage of the name for a herb was, as a review of botanical and applied literature had revealed, predominantly masculine. If Voss objected to have *Lotus* listed as masculine he should move a corresponding amendment to the present proposal.

Greuter, for once, commended adoption of the proposal, because it shortened the very unwieldy text of the present Recommendation, one that ran to over a page in small print (and would have to appear in big print now that it was to be an Article). The new text was perfectly clear, easy to understand, and listed the main examples. The Committee on Orthography had done a good job.

Prop. C was accepted.

Prop. D (85:18:1:12) was accepted.

Article 14 (Prop. D)

McNeill said this was the proposal to which Voss had just referred, which would permit gender as a criterion for conservation – e.g., *Lotus* could be conserved as feminine. (Voss: or masculine [which would however be unnecessary as the Section had just voted that it was masculine.])

Cronquist just did not want to be caught asleep at the switch again. Was this another opening of a door to *nomina specifica conservanda*? [Laughter.] No? Then it was all right.

Voss cited *Nuphar* as an example where gender had already been conserved, perhaps inadvertently. There had been some confusion over the gender of this name. The epithet of the North American species *N. advena* had often been taken to indicate feminine gender but was in fact a noun in apposition. Many authors treated the generic name as neuter, but it had in fact been conserved with its type listed as *Nuphar lutea* which meant that feminine gender had to be accepted.

Stearn pointed out that *Nuphar* had been deliberately assigned feminine gender by Smith. One could still consult the learned correspondence between Smith and Goodenough on that question. There was no reason why *Nuphar* should ever be anything else than feminine.

Adolphi felt that the proposal, if accepted, could help to clarify the cases of *Evonymus*, *Isoetes* and *Onosma*. Even under the new Art. 76, it was impossible to tell what botanical tradition was for these three names.

Greuter explained that the Code at present did not provide for conservation of the gender of a generic name. Even if *Nuphar* was conserved with a cited type in the feminine, this did not legally result in conservation of the gender of the generic name. This could lead to a problem: would it, under the new rule, be necessary to make it explicit that conservation of a name included conservation of its gender? And if so, how? There might be present entries where the listed type was inadvertently cited with the wrong gender.

It was not really necessary to go through conservation procedures to conserve gender of generic names; it was equally possible that the Section, meeting every six years, did rule on proposals to add other generic names to the "voted examples" included in the new Art. 76. The time delay would be the same, and the Committee work would be less. He did not speak strongly against the proposal, but did not think it was absolutely essential.

Prop. D was **accepted** on a counted show of hands (68:35), the Section agreeing that no card vote was needed.

Division III

[**Prop. A** (41:71:9:3), relevant to registration, had previously been **accepted as amended** (see pp. 119-122).]

Prop. B (24:82:0:0).

Hawksworth moved an amendment, that the words "and Lichens" not be omitted but put between parentheses, to reflect the view that

lichens were not a systematic group. It had first been suggested in 1950 at the Stockholm Congress by Santesson that such biological groups should not be recognized. Since the Committee itself felt that lichenologists did want separate recognition, and although the Committee did not of course deal with the algal component of lichens, the use of parentheses might be a suitable compromise.

Korf reported that the Committee vote was 10:5 against the published proposal, although he himself was sympathetic to the proposal. Since one did not talk about Fungi and Agarics, it made little sense to talk about Fungi and Lichens. The Committee had not considered the amendment.

Hawksworth's motion was **defeated**.

Prop. B was **rejected**.

Prop. C (14:114:3:6) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. D (17:107:3:0) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. E (30:98:2:1) and **Prop. F** (4:124:2:0).

McNeill explained Prop. E [which, with 74.8% negative votes in the mail ballot, fell short of the fatal mark by just a trifle]. While any attempt to reduce the number of proposals, particularly of those not well worked out when coming before the Section, was viewed with sympathy by the Rapporteurs, the present one was not at all practical.

Stafleu pointed out that the Editor of "Taxon" would have to find out whether the ten authors were really practising taxonomists – which would require an extra editor for "Taxon".

Cronquist suggested a friendly amendment to the proposer (or, in his absence, to Veldkamp from the same institute, if he was in a position to accept it), to replace the phrase "ten practising plant taxonomists residing in at least five different countries" by "two people in two different countries", on the understanding that this provision was not to not prevent action on proposals made directly from the floor.

Veldkamp refused to accept this, the number being too small. To sway more people to vote for this proposal, the word "countries" might be changed to "institutes". If that passed, a second vote for "countries" could be taken, to test how stringent the Section wanted to be.

Voss pointed out that, as **Cronquist** had alluded to, the new provision as presented would not allow any proposals from the floor, and that would be dangerous. If amended not to preclude amendments from the floor, it would encourage people not to send their proposals to "Taxon" but to wait until they came to the Section meeting and then raise them from the floor. The *status quo* was preferable to the ill one knew not of.

Borhidi wondered whether it was the aim of the proposal to discourage taxonomists from dealing with nomenclatural problems.

Stafleu believed **Kalkman's** view was that there were too many proposals made by people who were not really practising taxonomists, sometimes standing alone with their opinions. In essence, he wanted to reduce the number of proposals. There were at this Congress 336 proposals! But this proposal would entail an enormous work load for the Rapporteurs who would have to do the checking beforehand.

Singer saw that the proposal had little chance of success, but there was a second proposal with a similar aim, Prop. F, which he personally preferred. He suggested to first deal with Prop. F. If that was defeated, one might come back on Prop. E and try to suitably amend it. **Stafleu** accepted the suggestion.

Singer apologized to **Guédès**, unfortunately no longer among the living, for speaking in favour of his proposal, because whenever he started to speak in support of a proposal it was invariably rejected. [Laughter.] There was a strong movement of people outside this assembly – as witnessed by Props. C to F – who wanted to avoid these recurrent changes of the rules, especially the retroactive changes, made at every Congress. This feeling was in close relations with other demands, like *nomina specifica conservanda*. These proposals should not be just defeated, some solution was to be found.

Faegri agreed there was some merit in these proposals; on the other hand, the proposals as they stood now were completely unworkable. The General Committee had proved, between the last two Congresses, to be amenable to proposals from outside. [A reference to the setting up of the Committee for Registration at the instigation of IUBS.] It would no doubt be equally responsive to a demand from inside, from the Section, to study this problem and to come back to the next Congress with a considered evaluation of it. Nothing more could be done at present. He moved that Props. E and F, being technically rejected, be referred to the General Committee.

McNeill would gladly second the motion if **Faegri** agreed to restrict it to Prop. E. Prop. F should be plainly rejected, being totally unworkable. It would mean the end of any changes to the Code, other than the addition of Recommendations.

Faegri would have wished to make the terms of reference as broad as possible, but agreed to accept the restriction as a friendly amendment to his motion.

Stafleu gave some figures: the number of proposals had decreased from Paris (387) to Leningrad (161), but had again steeply increased afterwards to the present 336. This was indeed worrying.

Guymer opposed the motion. He urged an immediate decision to be made, without losing another six years. **Cronquist's** earlier suggestion should be formally moved, either as an amendment to the **Kalkman** proposal or as a new proposal, and should be accepted.

Faegri's motion was **carried**, and **Prop. E** thereby **rejected** and referred to the **General Committee**.

Prop. F was **rejected**.

NINTH SESSION

Friday, 24 July 1987, 9:10 – 12:10
[Chairman: **Stafleu**]

[The session began with consideration of Art. 69 Prop. C, as previously reported (pp. 159-162), followed by Art. 33 Prop. S (pp. 90-91).]

Division III (continued)

Veldkamp moved a new **proposal from the floor**, to add the following text to Div. III (being a modification of the defeated Div. III Prop. E): "Proposals for modification of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature will only be taken into consideration by the Nomenclature Section if they have been submitted to, and endorsed by, a group of at least 4 botanical scientists employed at at least 2 different institutes in at least 2 different countries. This provision will not preclude any amendments and/or proposals made during the sessions of the Nomenclature Section". The second sentence was perhaps redundant because it was already in the Code[?]. The new proposal had been endorsed by 9 members of the Nomenclature Section.

Stearn objected to the words "employed at". There were people like Holttum and himself and others who were associated with institutions but did not get one penny from them. He suggested the phrase "associated with", instead.

Veldkamp accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Fosberg felt that proposals like this, and like others in the "Synopsis", were ruling on matters not in the power of the Section. He had always understood that actions by one Botanical Congress could not bind a future Congress.

Stafleu confirmed that this was indeed so. This could only be a Recommendation. Every Congress was independent and autonomous and could take any action it wanted. This was partly reflected by the second proposed sentence, allowing proposals from the floor to be considered – which was a technically superfluous statement but an important clarification.

Cronquist acknowledged that Stafleu was correct and that one could not bind a future Botanical Congress. But one could set procedures up so that some proposals would not be presented to it for action.

Stafleu agreed – yet the proposal was unclear. Would it be up to the editors of "Taxon" to take a decision on whether the people submitting proposals were real "botanical scientists", and on whether their institutions were indeed institutions? It was not always easy to know this. This was a strange proposal, because it laid the responsibility for such decisions into the hands of the editors of "Taxon".

Veldkamp had thought of this point when drafting the proposal. At first, he had considered writing "will only be considered for publication in "Taxon" or a similar journal", but since the Code could not rule on "Taxon" he had omitted this mention.

Stafleu explained that a decision taken at Paris in 1954 was still in force, that all nomenclature proposals were to be published in "Taxon", and that the Rapporteurs and the Section were not bound to take into account proposals published elsewhere. No one had ever questioned this. So the point really was whether "Taxon" did publish a proposal or not. One of the purposes for which "Taxon" had been created was to serve nomenclature. This was not a legal but a *de facto* obligation. If publication of proposals was to be restricted, the result would be a proliferation of proposals from the floor which – as the Sydney Congress had shown – could have unfortunate consequences.

Stuessy, while in favour of a careful prior consideration of proposals, felt that the judgement of one individual was at times better than that of a hundred individuals of as many different institutions. Other solutions were needed. Some possibilities to be considered were less frequent Section meetings, more time devoted to each meeting, and more careful prior vetting of the proposals. The present proposal should, at any rate, be defeated.

Traverse concurred with many others that something should be done to limit the flood of proposals that was coming close to a critical mass. But this kind of mechanical limitation would only lead to the formation of groups of persons, ahead of Congresses, with the aim of pushing through proposals on the floor.

Gunn thought that the readers of "Taxon" could see on their own the number of proposers, number of institutes, and number of countries involved in each proposal, and could draw their own conclusions.

Stafleu had never made a nomenclatural proposal in his life, but one never knew when one got older, he might want to. [Laughter.] Under the original Prop. E he would not be allowed to do so because he would not be a practising plant taxonomist. There must be another way to stem the flood. The Rapporteurs and the editors of "Taxon" involved (Nicolson and he) had discussed this. The problem he had had to face, last year, was not so much to have 336 proposals published – that could be handled – but the appalling fact that many of the proposers took the occasion to get a free and uncensored article of great length into "Taxon". The normal contents of two whole issues – half a year – had to be postponed because of nomenclatural matters.

Nicolson moved a **proposal from the floor**, that no further proposals be accepted for publication in "Taxon" until 6 years after the publication of the Code. [Laughter.] This did not solve the problem, but did at least delay it. He agreed with those who felt that the Botanical Code was cycling too quickly (the Zoological Code perhaps was too slow). It took two years after a Congress, if all went well, to generate the new Code; the cut-off date for handing in proposals was at least one year before the next Congress so that they could be published and submitted to the mail vote; which left a window of three years or less to use the Code, to notice its shortcomings and to find out how they could best be obviated. Three years were not sufficient. Under his proposal, the Nomenclature Section in Tokyo would have before it the reports and proposals of the Special Committees set up by the Section at Berlin, and would also have the authority to entertain proposals from the floor, but would not have to deal with the 440 proposals that, he predicted, would be published if nothing was done to prevent it.

Cronquist offered a friendly amendment, to add [at the beginning] the phrase "that we recommend to the editors of Taxon". This was accepted by Nicolson.

Stafleu mentioned that in the past proposals had been sent in even before the relevant Code had been published, which was inappropriate – not to say more. In the future such premature proposals

would not be accepted for publication. To make this clear, he suggested a second friendly amendment to Nicolson's new proposal, to replace "6 years" by "6 months". This was accepted by the proposer.

Greuter had noted that the new proposals, and the various comments made, basically reflected concern on three different matters. The first was the sheer volume of printed matter associated with proposals, and the correlated cost and labour. The second was the number of proposals to be dealt with by each Section, and hence the rush in which it had sometimes to act, the time pressure under which it worked. The third was the frequency of changing the rules. These three aspects should be taken separately and could not be dealt with by a single proposal, nor presumably by this Section.

What the Section could do about the first matter – if a motion to that effect was introduced – was to empower the General Committee to set a limit to the space that the editors of "Taxon" were bound to accept for the comments accompanying each proposal. This idea was not new, but interesting and probably very wise.

The number of proposals to be considered could be influenced by the Section itself. There would have been a way to reduce the number here, had the Section acted slightly differently from the way it did. It had, by tradition, been agreed that if a proposal had received more than 75% negative votes in the mail ballot (and that figure could be lowered!) it was rejected, but that it could be brought up again from the floor by one motion and one seconder. It could be established as a new tradition, by a future Section (without the need of writing it into the rules), that this be made less easy, that just two people's dissent from the verdict of the mail ballot could not force the Section to consider these proposals but that, for instance, a number of signatures were needed in order to reintroduce a proposal. This would save a lot of time: out of the 336 proposals before this Section, 97 had received a negative mail ballot of 75% or more. If the limit had been dropped to 70%, there would have been about 30 more.

The third question had been addressed by Nicolson and was the most controversial one, because it had two conflicting aspects: the need of having a stable Code and the need of having a good Code.

Everyone concerned had at some time objected to changes made, finding them too rash or too frequent, but most had also made proposals of their own to amend the Code, and were glad they had not had to wait 12 years to have them considered.

Chapman agreed with Greuter that the General Committee be given power to reduce the size of supporting arguments for each proposal. Some proposals were indeed very verbose, and if they needed so much explanation they were unlikely to convince a majority anyway. Veldkamp's proposal, while of commendable intent, would hardly achieve a reduction in the number of proposals. Any prospective proposer would manage to find the required number of co-signatories, and would only waste some time in that effort. Nicolson's [unamended] proposal would make the task easier for the next Congress but a lot harder for the following one where there might be as many as 600 proposals. The Section had already passed a motion asking the General Committee to look at ways of reducing the number of proposals, so wait and see what they came up with. Furthermore, the editors of "Taxon" should be encouraged to set an earlier cut-off date for the submission of proposals. This would give botanists (particularly in Australia) more time to discuss and think about the proposals, and might even make it possible to have the mail vote announced prior to the Congress and not at the Congress itself. Most of the present 336 proposals had been published at the last moment, and it would be appropriate to discourage late submissions, particularly on controversial issues.

Demoulin disagreed with Nicolson on the suggested 6 years' break. On the contrary: in view of frequent criticism by outsiders with regard to the Section's decisions it was important to have proposals published as early as possible in order to enable a broadly based discussion of them. In order to discourage the proliferation of ill-considered proposals one might try to persuade granting agencies and the like not to consider nomenclature proposals as normal scientific publications. Another suggestion was to include a preliminary Rapporteurs' review with each published proposal. If totally negative, such a comment might encourage some authors to withdraw their proposal, and could help others to prepare suitable amendments.

Fosberg thought it inadvisable to prevent correction of the Section's mistakes at the very next Congress – although most of the proposals considered this time had not been aimed at correcting previous mistakes but at introducing new ones. Nicolson's approach to the problem was undesirable. Elaborating on Demoulin's idea, why not make submitted proposals the subject of review before accepting them for publication in "Taxon"?

Stafleu, having edited "Taxon" for countless years, knew this was impossible. It was also untrue that Nicolson's original proposal would have hindered the correction of previous mistakes. The proposal – which certainly had disadvantages – was not to omit the Nomenclature Section from the next Congress, but not to allow new proposals to be published in Taxon, except such as might be included in the Special Committee reports.

Voss agreed that neither of the formal proposals was fully adequate, if only because they would encourage proposals from the floor. He strongly supported the position of the Rapporteur, that there were things the Section could do to reduce the number of proposals to be acted upon. He also urged a more severe editorial review of proposals submitted for publication, just as for any other material so submitted, or if not of the proposals themselves then at least of the commentaries. Such review should focus on misunderstandings of the meaning of the provisions of the Code and on failure to survey previous action, by Nomenclature Sections, on the same subject. Already at the Leningrad Congress it had been stressed that "Taxon" was under no obligation to publish the commentaries at all. The full comments could be published elsewhere, and a reference could be provided in "Taxon" to the more extensive publication.

Stafleu was afraid that, since the reviewing process was very laborious, it was almost impossible to have all these small papers reviewed. Most reviews took about six months. Having a restricted window for the submission of proposals, starting six months after the new Code was published and lasting only twelve months, would be preferable. If no other action was taken, he would probably take the line of referring some of the more unwieldy comments to other

journals. "Taxon" was only required to publish the proposals themselves. It was impossible to continue the past generosity of publishing also lengthy commentaries.

Stuessy urged that the two proposals from the floor be defeated and the General Committee be asked to address the issue and make specific, strong recommendations to the next Congress. Some thoughts to consider were: (1) convene the Nomenclature Section every 12 years only, following Tokyo, to give people more time to use the Code and to slow down some nomenclatural activists who made a career out of proposals; (2) publish the proposals separately rather than in "Taxon", or at an extra charge; (3) empower the General Committee to screen out the minor proposals and rule on them, so that they would not be discussed by the Section unless a specific petition to reconsider them was made.

Cronquist saw it as evident that no satisfactory phraseology could be worked out here, to address the general concern that had been expressed on these matters. The pending motions should be voted down, but the editors of "Taxon" and the conveners of the next Congress should be encouraged to act in the light of the discussion here.

Chaloner considered a limited window of access for proposals submitted to "Taxon" to be an effective way of limiting their number. However, the narrower the window, the more one would push motions onto the floor. The window approach must therefore be combined with greater restrictions on motions from the floor. This could be achieved by requiring written notice of any motion from the floor 24 hours beforehand, and its support by, say, six or ten signatures. There could also be a quick procedural vote, by the Section, on which motions were going to be allowed.

Stafleu, being personally involved as editor of "Taxon", felt entitled to deviate slightly from regular procedure. There was clearly no specific motion that would be carried. So he would follow Cronquist's suggestion. Nicolson and he would have to assume more responsibility in handling future proposals, and they were both happy to do so. In the light of the previous discussion, the future editorial policy on nomenclature proposals would be much more restrictive.

The absence of a concrete decision by the Section was, by implication, a mandate to the editors of "Taxon" to follow this course – which was made much easier by the absence of concrete, binding instructions.

[At this point, consideration of Art. 69 was resumed with Props D to L, as previously reported (pp. 162-167).]

Article H.3

Prop. A (2:20:1:85).

McNeill suggested that the proposal be referred to the Editorial Committee on the understanding that only those aspects would be taken up that were in accordance with the present provisions in the Code.

Yeo pointed out that the Report of the Committee for Hybrids included additional editorial suggestions for this Article and asked that they be also considered by the Editorial Committee – which was granted.

Prop. A was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. B (9:13:0:80) was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Prop. C (6:9:0:99) was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article H.5

Prop. A (6:11:0:95) had been **withdrawn** by the proposer.

Yeo had prepared a new **proposal from the floor**, to replace his earlier Art. H.5 Prop. A and Art. H.11 Props. B and C (now withdrawn), and had duplicated and distributed a corresponding text. The proposal was to completely re-write Art. H.5, as follows:

"H.5.1. The appropriate rank of a nothotaxon is that of the postulated or known parent taxa.

"H.5.2. If the postulated or known parent taxa are unequal in rank the appropriate rank of the nothotaxon is the lowest rank expressed in the statement of parentage.

"H.5.3. When a taxon is designated by a name in a rank inappropriate to its hybrid formula the name is incorrect in relation to this hybrid formula but may be correct in relation to a component of the latter, or may become correct through changes in the accepted taxonomic position and rank of the parent taxa.

"Ex. 1. For hybrids with the formula *Elymus farctus* (Viv.) Melderis subsp. *boreoatlanticus* (Simonet & Guinochet) Melderis × *E. repens* (L.) Gould, the combination *E. laxus* (Fries) Melderis & D. McClintock, based on *Triticum laxum* Fries (1848) (*pro spec.*), has been published. This combination is in a rank inappropriate to the hybrid formula. The nothospecific name *E. laxus* is, however, correct for the component *E. farctus* × *E. repens* of the full formula and is applicable to all hybrids between *E. farctus* and *E. repens*.

"Note 1. When the infraspecific identity of one or more of the parent taxa of a new nothospecies is known, the nothotaxon at the appropriate infraspecific rank (Art. H.11.2) can only have a name that is autonymic in form; this name cannot exist until some other combination of infraspecific taxa of the same parent species has given rise to hybrids which have been appropriately named (Art. 26).

"Ex. 2. The name *Euphorbia xmartini* Rouy has the rank appropriate to the hybrid formula, *E. amygdaloides* L. × *E. characias* L., which is the parentage indicated by Rouy. A. Radcliffe-Smith treated *E. characias* as including subsp. *wulfenii* (Koch) A. R. Sm. and he incorrectly published the binary name *E. xcornubiensis* for *E. amygdaloides* × *E. characias* subsp. *wulfenii* (Koch) A. R. Sm.; later, he remedied his mistake by publishing the combination *E. xmartini* Rouy nothosubsp. *cornubiensis* (A. R. Sm.) A. R. Sm. Only then was the autonym *E. xmartini* nothosubsp. *martini* automatically established. However, the name *E. xcornubiensis* is correct for *E. amygdaloides* × *E. wulfenii* Koch."

If this was accepted, the reference "and Art. H.5 Note 1" was to be added in the parenthesis at the end of Art. H.11.2.

Yeo had not been able to gain support of a majority of the Committee for Hybrids for this proposal, not because the dissenting members disagreed with the proposed wording but because they wished to change the substance of Art. H.5.2. The problem addressed by the proposal was, what to do with a name of a hybrid published in a rank other than that which would be required, under the associated hybrid formula, by the present Art. H.5. Some had maintained that such a name was invalid. This was undesirable, since the Code permitted changes of opinion as to whether a taxon was a nothotaxon or an "orthotaxon" (a convenient term coined by Wagner). The changes here proposed were intended simply to make Art. H.5 workable. Presently, this Article stated that a name "had" or "must have" a certain rank. The new version, following a suggestion by Greuter, referred to the "appropriate rank". It went on to explain what happened when a name was not in the appropriate rank: it was simply incorrect, although it could be correct for part of the associated hybrid formula (as in the suggested example) or could become correct later in a different context. Other provisions in the Code provided limitations to the operation of Art. H.5, in particular the autonym rule, as explained in the proposed Note.

Stafleu felt it was clearly impossible to vote on the proposal at this time, because there were so many new considerations in it and, as Yeo had mentioned, because the Committee for Hybrids had not reached a consensus over it. It could nevertheless be taken into consideration for the new Code if the Section accepted to refer it to the Editorial Committee, to act on it in conformity with advice from the Committee for Hybrids.

Yeo's **proposal from the floor** was referred to the **Editorial Committee**, to be handled in conformity with advice from the Committee for Hybrids.

Article H.5 bis (new)

Prop. A (2:104:1:3) was ruled as **rejected**.

Article H.6

Prop. A (72:23:3:12) was **accepted**.

Prop. B (20:17:0:76) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**, to be handled in conformity with advice from the Committee for Hybrids.

Prop. C (29:69:1:7).

Veldkamp opposed the proposal. Acceptance would be inconsistent with the earlier rejection of Art. 20 Prop. B.

Prop. C was **rejected**.

Recommendation H.6A (new)

Prop. A (53:31:0:20), commended by **McNeill**, was **accepted**.

Article H.8

Prop. A (10:10:0:93) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Article H.10

Prop. A (3:103:0:2) was ruled as **rejected**.

Recommendation H.10B

Prop. A (85:15:1:13) was **accepted**.

Article H.11

Prop. A (12:6:0:91) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. B (55:19:0:31) had been **withdrawn**.

Prop. C (54:22:1:28) had been **withdrawn**.

Recommendation H.11A (new)

Prop. A (61:18:0:28) was [somewhat hastily] referred to the **Editorial Committee**, on the advice of the proposer.

Appendix II

Prop. A (20:84:12:6).

McNeill introduced the proposal, which intended to change the way in which conservation of family names was done, so that the same procedure would apply as for generic names. Presently, App. II simply listed family names that were conserved, without corresponding rejected names. The idea had some attraction in certain groups, but in the case of the Spermatophyta, where there was a very large number of conserved family names, it would result in a colossal task that would hardly be justified. Specialists of other groups of plants might wish to speak to this.

Nicolson confirmed that the Committee for Pteridophyta had supported this proposal very strongly, and the Committee for Algae would likely do the same since Silva had presented a number of conservation proposals in this form. Hawksworth had done the same in the fungi, and his proposals had been held in abeyance pending action on this proposal. This should be seriously considered after being amended to apply to non-phanerogams only.

Zijlstra reported that the Committee for Bryophyta did not support the proposal, not even if limited to cryptogamic groups. For Bryophyta it was undesirable.

Demoulin had been instructed by the Brussels Botanical Garden to present the same amendment as Nicolson had foreshadowed, which he wanted to second. He could not understand the Bryophyte specialists' position. The number of cases involved was limited in their case; and they had no right to stand in the way of those working on the fungi and algae, where the vast majority of cases arose. There was an easy solution, however, to place family names treated differently under different subtitles. If Bryophyte specialists absolutely wanted their own way, they could have it.

Christensen said that the Committee for Algae had not voted on this question, but that on the base of discussions he thought it would lend support to a proposal along the lines suggested by **Nicolson**.

McNeill suggested that it should be permissible in groups other than the Spermatophyta for family names to be conserved in the same manner as generic names. This would not obligate the bryologists to apply this procedure if they did not wish to do so.

Nicolson agreed. There was a problem of stating this simply, but the effect of the proposal so amended would be to allow Permanent Committees, other than that for Spermatophyta, to choose the technique of presentation of conserved family names according to their preference.

Prop. A, as amended by **Nicolson's** suggestion, was accepted, details of phraseology being left to the care of the **Editorial Committee**.

McNeill suggested that Props. B-D be similarly referred to the Editorial Committee, since they were corollaries of Prop. A.

Prop. B (20:84:12:5) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. C (20:85:12:3) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. D (16:85:12:7) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. E (3:106:8:1) was ruled as **rejected**.

Appendix VI (new)

Prop. A (9:84:15:3) was ruled as **rejected**.

Guide Types T.1

Prop. A (65:12:0:54).

McNeill introduced the proposal which, without making any change in the intent or wording of the Guide Types, would incorporate it in

the main body of the Code. The one new portion, the proposed "Note 2" to Art. 7.5, was withdrawn in the light of the decisions taken earlier, and should be considered by the new Committee on Lectotypification.

Cronquist opposed changing the Guide for Determination of Types into a rule. A guide could be defined as a presumably knowledgeable person who gave presumably good advice, but one was not bound to accept the advice. Things should stay the way they were.

McNeill made it clear that there would be no change in this regard. Those parts that were advisory would go in as Recommendations, which was indeed what they were. Those parts that mirrored what was already in the Code were either to be dropped or, if they were clarificatory, would appear as Notes. Nothing was to become more mandatory than at present. But the same words – or, worse still, not quite the same words – would not any longer appear in two different places.

Fosberg was one of those who had had a part in preparing the Guide at Stockholm. It had then been carefully considered whether this should better be a separate guide or a series of Articles and Recommendations. Preference had been given to an advisory guide, to have such directions conveniently placed together in one place rather than spread over half a dozen different Articles and Recommendations. He was opposed to the proposal.

Chapman had a question, possibly to be answered by the Editorial Committee: did the phrase "definitely expressed" in Note 1 refer only to the printed protologue or to a much wider area, for example to annotations of specimens?

McNeill replied that these were exactly the present words in T.1, so they would mean in the future what they had meant up to now.

Prop. A was accepted.

Prop. B (5:28:0:49), being a corollary to Art. 9 Prop. A, was likewise rejected and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Lectotypification.

Guide Types T.3

Prop. A (9:14:1:106) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Prop. B (3:8:2:116) was referred to the **Editorial Committee**.

Guide Types T.4

Prop. A (15:99:2:8) was ruled as **rejected**.

Prop. B (78:15:2:28) was **accepted**.

Prop. C (77:30:0:19) was **accepted**.

Article 7 (continued)

Zijlstra had distributed a duplicated text including a new **proposal from the floor**, which she felt was the logical consequence of the rejection of Art. 7 Prop. G and correlated Art. 63 Prop. D. The proposal was as follows:

That in Art. 7.11 the final phrase ("unless the author of the superfluous name has definitely indicated a different type") be deleted.

That one (or both) of the following two examples be added, to show how the amended Art. 7.11 would work:

"*Ex. 1. Pursellia*, a case causing confusion: When Lin in 1984 published his *n. g. Pursellia*, he included the type of *Cryptogonium* (C. Müller) Hampe 1881. For the type, however, he used the basionym *Neckera phyllogonioides* Sull. (1855), and he mentioned *Phyllogonium cylindricum* Lindb. (1865) (the type of *Cryptogonium*) as a tax. syn. of it. (Lin considered *Cryptogonium* to be invalid in generic rank.) Even though Lin indicated a different type, *Pursellia* was nomenclaturally superfluous when published, and is automatically typified by the type of *Cryptogonium*, the name that ought to have been adopted under the rules.

"*Ex. 2. Agaricus descissus*, a case illustrating possible misuse: Fries 1838 described *Agaricus descissus*, but at the same time he reduced

A. auricomus Batsch (1783) as a variant of his *A. descissus*. One might argue that Fries, by naming his species *A. descissus* instead of *A. auricomus*, indicated the main variant to provide the type ("var. *descissus*", if he would have had the autonym rules already). Despite this, *Agaricus descissus* was nomenclaturally superfluous when published, because it included the type of *A. auricomus*, the name that ought to have been adopted under the rules."

When discussing Art. 7 Prop. G, nobody had indicated which was the sense of the final phrase of Art. 7.11. The rejection of that proposal seemingly implied that a name could be illegitimate under Art. 63.1 even though its type was not the type of the name causing illegitimacy. This was difficult to understand. The ruling was useless, had caused confusion and misuse in the past, and should be deleted.

McNeill suggested that at this late stage in the proceedings it was better to reject a proposal on so complicated an issue, on the understanding that it would be considered by the Special Committee on Retroactivity of Lectotypification.

Zijlstra's **proposal from the floor** was **rejected** and thereby referred to the **Special Committee** on Retroactivity of Lectotypification.

Report of the Nominating Committee

The report of the Nominating Committee on the office of the Rapporteur-Général and on the membership of Permanent Committees on plant nomenclature for the period between the XIV and XV International Botanical Congresses had been distributed. Nicolson read out a number of corrections and additions to the circulated document. [The full report has been published in *Taxon* 37: 434-436. 1988.]

The **Report** of the Nominating Committee was **approved**.

Reports of Permanent Committees

McNeill noted that, in addition to published Committee reports that had appeared in "Taxon", some of the Permanent Committees had

submitted reports to the Section that had either been distributed or would be read out.

Committee for Bryophyta

The report was read out by **Nicolson** [it was subsequently published in *Taxon* 37: 436. 1988] and was **received** by the Section.

Committee for Spermatophyta

The Committee had reported regularly in "*Taxon*" and had prepared a summary report that would be published in due course. [See *Taxon* 37: 139-140. 1988.]

Committee for Fungi and Lichens

A report had been distributed [it was subsequently published in *Taxon* 37: 438. 1988] and was **received** by the Section.

Committee for Hybrids

The Committee had, through its Secretary **Yeo**, presented its opinion to the Section on questions concerning hybrids, and had prepared a number of suggestions to the Editorial Committee for the Berlin Code. Its summary report [subsequently published in *Taxon* 37: 438. 1988] was **received** by the Section.

Committee for Fossil Plants

A report had been distributed at one of the early sessions [see *Taxon* 37: 436-438. 1988]. Further to this written report, **Traverse** declared that Committee members and other palaeobotanists here present had again discussed the case of *Phillipsia*, and they no longer wished to oppose the conservation of *Phillipsia* Berkeley that had been unanimously recommended by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens. [Anyhow, the General Committee had already approved conservation as recommended by the latter Committee – *Taxon* 36: 429. 1987.] The report was **approved** by the Section [resulting in the acceptance of conservation proposals nos. 541-542].

Committee for Pteridophyta

A Report from that Committee had been submitted for publication in "Taxon" and was in print [see Taxon 36: 740-741. 1987]. No action was needed.

General Committee

The report of the General Committee had been distributed. Voss gave some additional comments. The Committee for Fungi and Lichens had raised no objection against the conservation of *Cystodium* J. Smith (Pteridophyta) against its earlier fungal homonym, so that the proposal was now recommended. Furthermore, the General Committee had considered some unfinished business at a meeting on the previous day, when no less than 13 out of its 17 members had been present. Decisions taken included approval of the two Committee reports that had been published in the last issue of "Taxon" (Bryophyta, Taxon 36: 429-431. 1987; Spermatophyta, Taxon 36: 432-434. 1987). The General Committee had also voted to recommend conservation of the name *Lycopersicon esculentum* for the cultivated tomato, a plant of major economic importance that had been one of the examples discussed at Sydney in this context. It further recommended that all Special Committees henceforth operate on the basis of a two-thirds vote of their active members when presenting any proposal in the name of the Committee. [These additions are included in the published report: Taxon 37: 438-439. 1988.]

The Report of the General Committee, including the additional points introduced by Voss, was **approved** by the Section [implying acceptance of conservation and rejection proposals approved by the General Committee]. This, as Stafleu pointed out, meant that the tomato was saved. [Laughter and applause.]

Following a question, by George, on the reasons for the conservation of *Lycopersicon esculentum*, Stafleu felt entitled to a personal remark. He was glad that, at least for the next six years, the tomato would now have its deserved name. [Laughter.] But, being on the verge of leaving nomenclature, he confessed to having been shocked

to see that a Nomenclature Committee [the Committee for Spermatophyta, which had declined to recommend the conservation proposal] was not really willing to listen to the interests of an enormous community of plant name users in the world. The conservation provisions in the Code were there just in order to avoid a group of nomenclaturalists – who were perhaps not all that worldly-wise – taking decisions that conflicted with the needs of the great community of plant name users. Would all those present please bear in mind, in the future, that the Code had not only been written for themselves. The Code and the Committees were there to serve Humanity.

Closing Remarks

McNeill expressed, on the Section's behalf, his thanks to the local staff who had assisted so effectively in the mechanical operation of the Section's proceedings: the taking around of the microphones, the collecting of votes, the recording of the proceedings and so forth. [Loud applause.]

Baer was allowed by the chair to speak on a project for the global mapping of life on earth, using satellite data, for whose success the use of a correct nomenclature for all living organisms was of paramount importance.

Stafleu then came to his closing remarks. In the first place he thanked the Rapporteurs and the Recorder for the splendid job they had done, especially in view of the enormous amount of material that had to be brought under control. He also thanked all members of the Section for the excellent way in which they had cooperated. The meeting would not extend far beyond the official cut-off hour (noon), but he hoped that all had understood that his occasional "pushing" had been really justified.

At this Meeting at least three (maybe more) members had been present who had attended all nomenclature sessions from Stockholm in 1950 onwards: Faegri, Fosberg and Stearn, and the last-named had even attended the Cambridge meeting in 1930. It was wonderful that they had been able to be present, and most wonderful that they had given such an invaluable assistance to the Section's

work, notwithstanding their, to some extent, advanced age. [Loud applause.]

Cronquist acknowledged the contribution made by the (still absent) Rapporteur's blonde right arm, Brigitte Zimmer, who had been responsible for a great deal of the work behind the scene. The Section owed her a great deal of thanks. [Applause.]

Stafleu had been involved in nomenclature from 1950 onwards – after the Stockholm Congress, from the time the results came to Utrecht. Apart from his continued membership in the Editorial Committee, this was his actual good-bye to nomenclature. He was grateful to all who had been present at this and at previous Congresses for their help, and was glad to know that the nomenclatural organization was now reasonably good, and that it was in good hands. **McNeill** registered the Section's thanks for Stafleu's outstanding chairmanship throughout all the sessions. [Loud Applause.]

Stearn welcomed the opportunity of saying a few words at the conclusion of the Section's meetings – as an educational opportunity for the younger members of the Section, who might not previously have been able to see a botanical antique, a survivor, so to say, from the Iron Age if not the Bronze Age of botanical nomenclature. But it was not his purpose here to reminisce and reminisce again about past events.

He wanted, however, to remark on the very happy and mild atmosphere that had prevailed at the Section's meetings. This had not always been true of nomenclatural matters. His predecessor as Librarian of the Royal Horticultural Society, H. H. Hutchinson (who had helped B. D. Jackson to compile the original volumes of "Index Kewensis"), had given him some first-hand information, not only on how the Index was compiled. Jackson, a man of strong character, once received a visit at Kew by a German who, with all due respect, was of unpleasant character, namely Otto Kuntze. The heat between the two was such that they both took off their coats to engage almost in physical combat in the Kew herbarium.

Nomenclature had seen many lost opportunities. One of these opportunities was lost when our predecessors failed to adopt tautonyms, which mainly came about because one German botanist was

firmly opposed to them – and that was Engler. Engler's objection was a very cogent one: If he should use such names his students would laugh at him. If one knew anything about the pre-war German academic situation, one would realise that there could be no worse fate for a German professor of the old school than to be laughed at. A professor then was the only teacher in his department who was paid, which made a great deal of difference to his status, so when the professor came in all the male students stood up, clicked their heels and solemnly bowed and the ladies beautifully curtsied – which, Stearn assured, had never happened to him!

However, as he had said, his intent was not to reminisce (the old people reminisced and the young people did not know the questions to ask them). His intent was to comment on the smoothness with which all the operations had been conducted. Most present – and certainly he himself – had been absolutely intimidated by the sheer mass of printed matter relating to proposals, and the Section owed, as had already been indicated, a great debt of gratitude to the Rapporteurs, not only for reading the stuff, but for analysing it and seeing its implications. Their conclusions on the whole had been good – except when they were not the same as his own! – and they had really done a remarkable job of correlating.

Then one had to come to the Chairman. Stearn had chaired meetings on occasion, and he knew one had got to keep on the ball all the time. For the chairman there was no opportunity to "switch off", as some people here had said they had done. Stafleu had dealt with everything in such a fair manner, such a light-hearted manner, such a relaxed manner and such a commonsense manner, that one might not have noticed how firm all the time his grasp on the issues had been. The Section owed him a profound debt for this.

For Stearn, this would be the last Congress. He therefore wanted to leave with a word of warning. The world expected that every International Botanical Congress would do some more harm to the naming of plants. Therefore, it was very important that people should come to a Congress like this with the idea of at least limiting the damage that the enthusiasts might do to plant nomenclature.

Thereupon, **Stafleu** closed the Nomenclature Section meetings.

Appendix A

List of registered members of the Nomenclature Section

This list is, at the same time, an index to speakers as recorded in the preceding report, with page references to all relevant entries.

- Adolphi, K., FRG – 32, 69, 72,
74, 136, 175, 194
- Ahti, T., Finland
- Anderson, J. M., USA
- Ashton, P. S., USA
- Baer, D. F., USA – 109, 216
- Barabé, D. B., Canada
- Barr Bigelow, M., USA
- Baum, R., Canada
- Bhattacharyya, P. K., India –
119, 155
- Bischler, H., France
- Bizzarri, P., Italia
- Bonner, R., Switzerland
- Borhidi, A., Hungary – 32, 68,
69, 72, 136, 196
- Botha, D. J., S. Africa
- Brandenburg, W. A., Nether-
lands
- Briggs, B., Australia
- Brodo, I. M., Canada
- Brummitt, R. K., UK – 17, 28,
35, 40, 43, 44, 49, 53, 55, 58,
59, 60, 61, 63, 71, 78, 81, 84,
85, 87, 88, 94, 98, 100, 103,
105, 106, 114, 125, 127, 133,
138, 143, 151, 156, 164, 176,
179
- Burdet, H. M., Switzerland
- Cannon, P. F., UK – 110, 173
- Chaloner, W. G., UK – 23,
108, 121, 204
- Chapman, A. D., Australia –
60, 78, 81, 84, 85, 92, 102,
105, 114, 121, 122, 127, 129,
130, 184, 190, 202, 211
- Chock, A., USA – 123, 125,
154
- Christensen, T. A., Denmark –
70, 97, 149, 150, 210
- Clements, M. A., Australia –
126, 161
- Conran, J. G., Australia – 28,
126
- Crandall-Stotler, B., USA
- Cronquist, A., USA – 14, 16,
29, 31, 35, 40, 50, 56, 71, 79,
82, 86, 88, 90, 96, 102, 108,
115, 120, 123, 135, 136, 147,
153, 159, 160, 161, 162, 166,
179, 183, 189, 193, 195, 198,
200, 204, 211, 217
- Crosby, M. R., USA
- Crusio, W., FRG
- D'Arcy, W., USA – 21, 113,
120, 121, 131, 146, 156, 161,
163, 176, 182

- Davies, R. A., UK
 Dayanandan, P., India
 De D. N., India
 Demoulin, V., Belgium – 19, 25, 31, 35, 40, 41, 42, 55, 58, 60, 62, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 74, 75, 76, 82, 90, 91, 96, 125, 134, 136, 137, 139, 141, 143, 145, 149, 150, 154, 161, 166, 168, 169, 172, 174, 175, 176, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 191, 192, 202, 209
 Dhyani, P. P., India
 Eckel, P. M., USA
 Eichler, H., Australia – 33, 75, 147, 148, 187
 Eloff, J. N., S. Africa
 Emmerich, M., Brazil
 Engel, J. J., USA
 Faegri, K., Norway – 16, 22, 36, 92, 104, 109, 118, 122, 128, 154, 165, 183, 197
 Farkas, E., Hungary
 Fertig (Gruenberg), I., Israel
 Feuillet, C., France
 Forero, E., USA – 32, 115, 126, 130
 Fosberg, F. R., USA – 20, 28, 42, 46, 50, 58, 61, 80, 88, 90, 92, 105, 108, 109, 116, 123, 155, 156, 192, 198, 203, 211
 Friis, I., Denmark – 25, 42, 74, 155, 180
 Funk, V. A., USA
 Gams, W., Netherlands – 67, 170, 172, 173
 Garnock-Jones, P. J., New Zealand
 Geissler, P., Switzerland
 George, A. S., Australia – 215
 Gibbs Russell, G. E., S. Africa – 118, 120
 Graaf, A. de, Netherlands
 Greene, S. W., UK
 Greuter, W., FRG – 12, 14, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 54, 55, 57, 58, 61, 67, 68, 69, 73, 75, 77, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 99, 105, 107, 108, 111, 119, 120, 122, 128, 130, 131, 132, 140, 145, 147, 148, 151, 157, 158, 159, 162, 163, 169, 171, 172, 173, 174, 177, 180, 181, 183, 186, 188, 193, 194, 201
 Grolle, R., GDR
 Gunn, C. R., USA – 155, 199
 Guymer, G. P., Australia – 197
 Haber, E., Canada
 Hakki, M. I., FRG
 Hanelt, P., GDR
 Hawksworth, D. L., UK – 21, 59, 65, 124, 128, 130, 134, 194
 He Shan-an, China
 Hekking, W. H. A. Netherlands – 184
 Heyn, C. C., Israel
 Hiepkko, P., FRG
 Hnatiuk, R. J., Australia – 22, 113, 126, 178, 179, 188
 Hoffmann, L., Belgium
 Holm, L., Sweden – 65, 101

- Holsinger, K., USA – 159
 Huang Tseng-chieng, Taiwan
 Höner, D., FRG
 Inoue, H., Japan
 Isoviita, P. L., Finland
 Iversen, S. T., Sweden
 Iwatsuki, K., Japan
 Jackes, B., Australia
 Jain, G. L., India
 Jarvis, C. E., UK
 Jayasuriya, A. H. M., Sri Lanka
 Jeeji Bai, N., India
 Johnson, L. A. S., Australia –
 34, 75, 80, 88, 130, 135, 141,
 145, 156, 158, 159, 176, 191
 Johri, B. M., India
 Jones, A. G., USA
 Jonsell, B., Sweden
 Kabuye, C. H. S., Kenya – 96
 Karttunen, K. J., Finland – 59,
 113, 126, 154
 Kirk, P. M., UK
 Knoph, J.-G., FRG
 Kolterman, D. A., USA
 Korf, R. P., USA – 49, 52, 59,
 64, 66, 87, 118, 133, 152, 154,
 155, 156, 158, 160, 163, 165,
 169, 171, 173, 174, 195
 Kowal, R. R., USA
 Kukkonen, I., Finland
 Kuyper, T. W., Netherlands –
 64, 66, 71, 85, 135, 151, 169,
 172, 173, 174
 Lack, H. W., FRG – 127, 145
 Leslie, A. C., UK
 Longhi-Wagner, H. M., Brazil
 Lourteig, A., France
 Luteyn, J. L., USA
 López González, G., Spain
 Lökös, L., Hungary
 Matten, L. C., USA
 Mazzola, P., Italy
 McNeill, J., Canada – 16, 33,
 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44,
 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52,
 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 63, 66, 67,
 68, 76, 77, 82, 83, 89, 90, 91,
 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101,
 102, 103, 104, 108, 116, 121,
 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128,
 129, 133, 135, 136, 137, 138,
 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145,
 148, 150, 151, 152, 156, 161,
 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 171,
 172, 174, 182, 183, 185, 187,
 188, 189, 191, 192, 193, 195,
 197, 205, 209, 210, 211, 213,
 216, 217
 Miller, H. A., USA
 Morin, N., USA – 123, 132
 Müller-Doblies, D., FRG
 Nelson, C., Honduras
 Nicolson, D. H., USA – 38, 44,
 75, 79, 81, 87, 93, 123, 133,
 140, 144, 145, 149, 173, 174,
 177, 181, 200, 209, 210, 213,
 214
 Paliwal, G. S., India
 Panigrahi, G., India – 33, 103,
 118
 Pegler, D. N., UK
 Perry, G., Australia
 Pfister, D. H., USA
 Pichi Sermolli, R. E. G., Italy –
 133

- Raamsdonk, L. W. D. van, Netherlands
 Raus, T., FRG
 Renner, S. S., Denmark – 163
 Rheenen, H. A. van, India
 Ride, D., Australia – 26, 149
 Robertson, K. R., USA
 Robson, N. K. B., UK
 Rodman, J. E., USA
 Schaarschmidt, F., FRG
 Schwabe, H., Argentina
 Sharma, R., India
 Silva, P. C., USA – 23, 49, 50, 72, 87, 113
 Singer, R., USA – 23, 64, 74, 93, 145, 185, 196
 Singh, L. J., India
 Skog, J. E., USA
 Skog, L. E., USA
 Stafleu, F. A., Netherlands – 9, 12, 14, 21, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 48, 52, 53, 57, 61, 70, 71, 72, 74, 82, 85, 86, 87, 90, 91, 93, 106, 108, 109, 112, 113, 115, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 124, 127, 136, 152, 155, 156, 159, 160, 176, 177, 181, 182, 184, 185, 186, 189, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 203, 204, 207, 215, 216, 217, 218
 Stearn, W. T., UK – 51, 73, 80, 93, 146, 159, 185, 189, 194, 198, 217
 Steiner, M., Sweden
 Stevens, P. F. USA – 122, 123
 Stotler, R., USA
 Stuessy, T. F., USA – 24, 36, 123, 125, 132, 199, 204
 Taylor, N. P., UK – 45, 72, 73, 133
 Thomas, J. H., USA – 34, 35
 Timmann, T., FRG
 Tindale, M. D., Australia – 157
 Traverse, A., USA – 50, 96, 103, 147, 150, 199, 214
 Tryon, R., USA – 39
 Utech, F. H., USA
 Veldkamp, J. F., Netherlands – 64, 79, 82, 85, 98, 155, 196, 198, 199, 208
 Vincent, M.A., USA
 Voss, E. G., USA – 24, 32, 34, 35, 37, 40, 55, 56, 76, 77, 79, 84, 86, 92, 98, 102, 105, 111, 112, 122, 125, 133, 136, 143, 144, 146, 149, 152, 155, 160, 163, 167, 179, 183, 186, 190, 192, 193, 196, 203, 215
 Wasshausen, D. C., USA
 Wijnands, D. O., Netherlands – 43
 Winter, B. de, S. Africa
 Wu Zheng-yi, China
 Yeo, P. F., UK – 25, 37, 83, 84, 90, 103, 104, 105, 187, 205, 214
 Zander, R. H., USA – 28
 Zijlstra, G., Netherlands – 38, 43, 47, 49, 50, 52, 56, 60, 61, 82, 85, 92, 94, 95, 99, 139, 140, 169, 170, 184, 209, 212
 Zimmer, B., FRG

Appendix B

Institutional votes

A revised list of institutional votes was drawn up and approved as follows by the Bureau of Nomenclature and the General Committee, in accordance with Division III of the Code. This replaces the list in the Sydney report (Englera 2: 120-124, Berlin 1982). Institutes are briefly identified by the name of the city in which each is located, followed in general by the herbarium symbol from the "Index herbariorum, Herbaria", ed. 7 (Regnum Veg. 106, 1981). An asterisk (*) indicates that the institution was represented at the Nomenclature Section in Berlin. The number of votes allotted to each institute is given in the right-hand column.

* Aarhus (AAU)	4	* Ann Arbor (MICH)	5
Aberdeen (ABD)	1	Arcata (HSC)	1
Aberystwyth (ABS)	1	Athens, Greece (ATH)	1
Abidjan (ABI)	1	Athens, Greece (ATHU)	1
Abidjan (UCJ)	1	Athens, USA (GA)	1
Adelaide (AD)	4	Auburn (AUA)	1
Adelaide (ADU)	1	Auckland (AK)	1
[Agana (GUAM), see Mangilao]		Auckland (AKU)	1
Akureyri (AMNH)	1	Austin (TEX)	3
Albany (NYS)	1	* Baarn (CBS)	3
Albuquerque (UNM)	1	Bangkok (BKF)	1
Alger (AL)	1	Barcelona (BC)	2
* Alice Springs (NT)	1	Barcelona (BCC)	1
Alma-Ata (AA)	1	Basel (BAS)	1
* Ames (ISC)	1	Belém (IAN)	1
* Amherst (MASS)	2	Belém (MG)	1
Amsterdam (AMD)	1	* Beltsville (BARC)	1
Amsterdam (AVU)	1	* Beltsville (BPI)	3
Ankara (ANK)	1	* Bergen (BG)	1
		* Berkeley (UC)	5

* Berlin West (B)	7	* Cambridge, USA (FH)	1
* Berlin West (BSB)	1	* Cambridge, USA (GH)	2
Berlin East (BHU)	1	Campinas (UEC)	1
Bern (BERN)	1	* Canberra (CANB)	4
[Birmingham (AAS), see Cambridge]		* Canberra (CBG)	1
* Birmingham (BIRM)	1	* Canberra (Bureau of Flora & Fauna)	2
Blacksburg (VPI)	1	[Canton (IBSC), see Guangzhou]	
* Bloomington (IND)	1	* Cape Town (BOL)	1
Bogor (BO)	3	* Cape Town (CT)	1
Bogotá (COL)	3	Cape Town (NBG & SAM)	1
Bombay (BLAT)	1	Caracas (VEN)	2
Boulder (COLO)	1	* Carbondale (SIU)	1
Bratislava (BRA)	1	* Cardiff (NMW)	1
Bratislava (SLO)	1	* Cayenne (CAY)	2
Bremen (BRE)	1	Chapel Hill (NCU)	2
Bremerhaven (BRM)	1	Charkow (CW)	1
* Brisbane (BRI)	4	Chengdu (SZ)	1
Brno (BRNU)	1	* Chicago (F)	5
[Bruxelles (BR), see Meise]		* Christchurch (CHR)	3
Bruxelles (BRLU)	1	* Claremont (RSA)	3
Bruxelles (BRVU)	1	Clermont-Ferrand (CLF)	1
Bucuresti (BUCA)	1	Cluj-Napoca (CL)	1
Budapest (BP)	2	Coimbatore (MH)	1
Budapest (BPU)	2	Coimbra (COI)	2
Buenos Aires (BA)	2	College Park (MARY)	1
Buenos Aires (BAA)	1	* Columbus (OS)	1
Buenos Aires (BAFC)	1	Concepción (CONC)	1
Cagliari (CAG)	1	* Copenhagen (C)	7
Cairo (CAI)	3	* Cordoba (CORD)	1
* Calcutta (CAL)	5	Corrientes (CTES)	1
Cambridge, UK (AAS)	1	* Corvallis (OSC)	1
Cambridge, UK (CGE)	1	Davis (DAV)	1
* Cambridge, UK (CGG)	1	[Delhi (HCIO), see New Delhi]	
* Cambridge, USA (A)	3		
* Cambridge, USA (AMES)	1		

Dresden (DR)	1	Ibadan (FHI)	1
Dublin (TCD)	1	Innsbruck (IB)	1
Duisburg (DUIS)	1	Iowa City (IA)	1
Durham (DUKE)	2	Istanbul (ISTF)	1
East Lansing (MSC)	2	Ithaca (BH)	3
Edinburgh (E)	6	* Ithaca (CUP)	1
Edmonton (ALTA)	1	Jena (JE)	2
[Erevan (ERE), see Yerevan]		Jerusalem (HUJ)	2
* Firenze (FI)	4	* Johannesburg (J)	1
Fort Collins (CS)	1	Karachi (KUH)	1
* Frankfurt (FR)	2	Karlsruhe (KR)	1
Gainesville (FLAS)	1	Kent (KE)	1
* Gatersleben (GAT)	3	* Kew (IMI)	5
* Genève (G)	6	* Kew (K)	7
* Gent (GENT)	1	Kiel (KIEL)	1
Göteborg (GB)	3	Kiev (KW)	1
Göttingen (GOET)	1	Kingston (IJ)	1
Graz (GZU)	1	Knoxville (TENN)	1
Greifswald (GFW)	1	Köln (KOELN)	1
Grenoble (GR)	1	Kraków (KRA)	1
Guangzhou (IBSC)	2	Kraków (KRAM)	1
Guelph (OAC)	1	Kuala Lumpur (KLU)	2
Guilin (IBK)	1	* Kunming (KUN)	2
Habana (HAC)	2	Kyoto (KYO)	3
Habana (HAJB)	2	Lae (LAE)	1
Halle (HAL)	2	La Laguna (TFC)	1
Hamburg (HBG)	3	* La Paz (LPB)	1
Haren (GRO)	1	La Plata (LP)	3
Heidelberg (HEID)	1	La Plata (LPS)	1
* Helsinki (H)	6	Laramie (RM)	1
Highland Heights (KNK)	1	* Lausanne (LAU)	1
Hiroshima (HIRO)	1	* Leeds (LDS)	1
* Hobart (HO)	1	Legon (GC)	1
Honolulu (BISH)	2	Leicester (LTR)	1
Iasi (I)	1	* Leiden (L)	7
		Leipzig (LZ)	1

Leningrad (LE)	7	Milwaukee (UWM)	1
Leningrad (LECB)	1	Missoula (MONTU)	1
Leningrad (WIR)	1	Montevideo (MVM)	1
* Liège (LG)	2	Montpellier (MPU)	3
Lima (USM)	1	Montréal (MT)	1
Linz (LI)	1	* Montréal (MTJB)	1
Lisboa (LISC)	5	Montréal (MTMG)	1
Lisboa (LISI)	1	Morgantown (WVA)	1
Lisboa (LISU)	1	Moscow (MHA)	3
Liverpool (LIVU)	1	* München (M)	6
Ljubljana (LJU)	1	* Nairobi (EA)	2
* Logan (UTC)	1	Nairobi (NAI)	1
Lomé (TOGO)	1	Nanjing (NAS)	1
* London, UK (BM)	7	Napoli (NAP)	1
* London, Canada (UWO)	1	Nashville (VDB)	1
Los Angeles (LA)	2	Nedlands (UWA)	1
* Louvain-la-Neuve (MUCL)	1	* Neuchâtel (NEU)	1
Lucknow (LWG)	1	New Delhi (HCIO)	1
Lund (LD)	4	New Haven (YU)	1
* Madison (WIS)	2	New Orleans (NO)	1
* Madrid (MA)	3	* New York (NY)	7
Madrid (MAF)	1	Nichinan (NICH)	3
Manaus (INPA)	1	Nova Lisboa (LUA)	1
Manchester (MANCH)	1	Novosibirsk (NS)	1
Mandalay (ASM)	1	Oeiras (LISE)	1
Mangilao (GUAM)	1	Olomouc (OL)	1
Manila (PNH)	1	* Orlando (FTU)	1
Maracay (MY)	1	Orono (MAINE)	1
Marburg (MB)	1	* Oslo (O)	3
Marseille (MARS)	1	Ottawa (CAN, CANA, CANL, CANM)	5
* Mayaguez (MAPR)	1	* Ottawa (DAO)	3
Mayaguez (MSM)	1	* Ottawa (DAOM)	3
* Meise (BR)	7	* Ottawa (OTT)	1
* Melbourne (MEL)	5	* Oulu (OULU)	1
Mérida (MER)	1	* Oxford, UK (FHO)	1
México (ENCB)	1	* Oxford, UK (OXF)	1
México (MEXU)	3		

* Oxford, USA (MU)	1	* Reading (RNG)	2
* Palermo (PAL)	1	Recife (URM)	3
Panama (PMA)	1	Regensburg (REG)	1
* Paris (P)	4	Rennes (RE)	1
* Paris (PC)	3	* Rio de Janeiro (HB)	2
Patras (UPA)	1	* Rio de Janeiro (R)	2
Pavia (PAV)	1	Rio de Janeiro (RB)	3
Peking (PE)	7	Riverside (UCR)	1
Peradeniya (PDA)	1	Riyadh (RIY)	1
* Perth (PERTH)	4	Roma, Italy (RO)	1
[Perth (UWA), see		Roma, Italy (ROPV)	1
Nedlands]		* Roma, Lesotho (ROML)	1
* Perugia (PERU)	1	Sacramento (SACT)	1
Peshawar (PES)	1	Saint Andrews (STA)	1
Philadelphia (PH)	3	Saint Augustine (TRIN)	1
Pisa (PI)	1	* Saint Louis (MO)	7
* Pittsburgh (CM)	1	Saint Paul (MIN)	2
* Pittsburgh (Hunt.Bot.Inst.)	2	Salaspils (LATV)	1
Pondicherry (HIFP)	1	Salisbury (SRGH)	1
Port Moresby (UPNG)	1	* Salt Lake City (UT)	1
Porto (PO)	1	* San Francisco (CAS, DS)	5
* Porto Alegre (ICN)	1	* San Francisco (SFSU)	1
Poznan (POZ)	1	San Isidro (SI)	1
Praha (PR)	3	San José (CR)	1
Praha (PRC)	3	San Miguel de Tucumán	
Pretoria (PRE)	5	(LIL)	3
* Pretoria (PRU)	1	Santa Barbara (SBBG)	1
Providence (BRU)	1	Santiago (SGO)	1
Provo (BRY)	1	Sao Paulo (SP)	3
Pullman (WS)	1	Saskatoon (SASK)	1
Pullman (WSP)	1	* Sassari (SASSA)	1
Québec (QUE)	1	Seattle (WTU)	2
Québec (QFA)	1	Sevilla (SEV)	1
Quezon City (PUH)	1	Shenyang (IFP)	1
Rabat (RAB)	1	Singapore (SING)	1
Raleigh (NCSC)	1	Sofia (SOM)	2
Rawalpindi (RAW)	1	* Stellenbosch (STE)	1

* Stockholm (S)	6	Ulan Bator (UBA)	1
* Stockholm (SBT)	1	Umeå (UME)	1
Storrs (CONN)	1	University (UNA)	1
Stuttgart (STU)	1	* University Park (PAC)	2
Suva (SUVA)	1	* Uppsala (UPS)	4
* Sydney (NSW)	5	Uppsala (UPSV)	1
Sydney (SYD)	1	* Urbana (ILL)	2
* Taipei (TAI)	1	* Urbana (ILLS)	1
Taipei (TAIF)	1	* Utrecht (U)	5
Tallahassee (FSU)	1	Vancouver (UBC)	2
Tampa (USF)	1	* Victoria (DAVFP)	1
Tartu (TAA)	2	Victoria (V)	1
Tartu (TU)	2	Vladivostok (VLA)	1
Tbilisi (TBI)	2	* Waco (BAYLU)	1
Tehran (TARI)	2	* Wageningen (WAG)	4
Tempe (ASU)	1	Warszawa (WA)	1
Tokyo (MAK)	1	Washington (NA)	1
* Tokyo (TI)	3	* Washington (US)	7
* Tokyo (TNS)	5	Washington (US Geological Survey)	1
Tokyo (TUAT)	1	Waterloo (WAT)	1
Tomsk (TK)	1	Wellington (WELT)	1
Torino (TO)	1	Wellington (WELTU)	1
* Toronto (TRT)	1	* Wien (W)	4
* Toronto (TRTC)	1	Wien (WU)	3
Toulouse (TL)	1	Winnipeg (WIN)	1
* Toulouse (TLA)	1	* Wisley (WSY)	1
* Townsville (JCT)	1	[Woking (WSY), see Wisley]	
Trieste (TSB)	1	* Wolfville (ACAD)	1
[Trinidad (TRIN), see Saint Augustine]		Worcester (CUW)	1
Tripoli (ULT)	1	Wrocław (WRSL)	1
Trondheim (TRH)	1	Wuchang (WH)	1
Trujillo (HUT)	1	Wugong (WUK)	1
Tucson (ARIZ)	1	Xalapa (XAL)	2
[Tucumán (LIL), see San Miguel de Tucumán]		Yerevan (ERE)	2
Turku (TUR)	1	Zürich (Z)	3
		Zürich (ZT)	1