

NEW ARTICLE 33 bis

PROP. 1950 — 48; HYLANDER

The same two components may, however, build up a periclinal chimaera in more than one way, so that morphologically and histologically different forms may be distinguished. All these forms should be united under one and the same binary name, if such names are used, but when it is desirable to give them special designations, they should be recognized as mixomorphs and designated by epithets in the same way as forms of species. This epithet, preceded by the term mixomorpha (mm), may be placed after a binary name or after a formula of the type just mentioned.

Ex.: *Solanum + tubingense* mm. *Koelreuterianum* or *Solanum Lycopersicum + nigrum* mm. *Koelreuterianum*. — + *Pirocydonia Danielii* mm. *Winkleri* or *Cydonia oblonga + Pyrus communis* mm. *Winkleri*.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See comment under Art. 31.

RECOMMENDATION XX

Half-breeds or putative half-breeds may be designated by a name and a formula. Names of half-breeds are intercalated among the subdivisions of a species, and are preceded by the sign \times . In the formula the names of the parents are in alphabetical order. When the half-breed is of known experimental origin, the formula may be made more precise by the female (seed-bearing) parent being placed first.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 5; VAN DIJK)

Delete the Rec.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 5; LANJOUW)

Delete § 6 and § 7 (Art. 31—35, Rec. XX).

PROP. 3 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Transfer the Rec. to Appendix VII.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See comment under Art. 31.

ART. 34

When different hybrid forms of the same parentage (pleomorphic hybrids; combinations between different forms of a collective species, etc.) are united in a collective group, the subdivisions are classed under the binary name of the hybrid like the subdivisions of a species under that of a species.

Examples: \times *Mentha niliaca Lamarckii* (= *M. longifolia* \times *rotundifolia*). The preponderance of the characters of one or other parent may be indicated in the formulae in the following manner: *Mentha longifolia* $>$ \times *rotundifolia*, *M. longifolia* \times $<$ *rotundifolia*. The participation of a particular variety may also be indicated, e.g. *Salix caprea* \times *daphnoides* var. *pulchra*.

The name *Asplenium Guichardii* R. Litardière in Bull. Géogr. Bot. XXI (1911), 76, for a form of the hybrid *A. foresiense* \times *Trichomanes* was incorrectly published by its author. The binary name for this hybrid group is: *A. Pagesii* R. Litardière in Bull. Géogr. Bot. XX (1911), 204, to this name can be attached *A. Pagesii* forma *Guichardii*.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)

To read as follows:

„When different hybrid forms of the same parentage (pleomorphic hybrids, hybrids between different forms of a collective species, segregates, back-crosses, etc.) are grouped under a binary name, they are classed under the binary name like the subdivisions of a species under that of a species (see Arts. 28, 29, 30).”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 5; VAN DIJK)

Delete the Art.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 5; LANJOUW)

Delete § 6 and § 7 (Art. 31—35, Rec. XX).

PROP. 4 (1950 — 12; HELLYER)

Add to the Art. the following:

„These forms are recognised as nothomorphae; when desirable they may be designated by an epithet preceded by the binary name of the group and the term ‚nothomorpha’ (nothom., or nm.), in the same way as subdivisions of species are classed under the binary name of the species.”

Example: *Mentha* \times *niliaca* nothom. *Lamarckii*.

The remainder of the example to read as before.

PROP. 5 (1950 — 72; CAMP)

When the different hybrid forms of the same parentage (pleomorphic hybrids; combinations between different forms of a collective species, etc.) are united in a collective taxon, the subdivisions are classed under the binary name applied to the hybrid population or group similar to the subdivisions of a species under that of a species.

Example: *Mentha* \times *niliaca* forma *Lamarckii* (= a form of the pleomorphic hybrid *M. longifolia* \times *rotundifolia*).

„Note: Where greater precision is desired a collective taxon of this sort may be specially designated under the category of hybrid-group (*grex-hybrida*, abbreviated as *gh.*), thus differentiating it from the

names of more casual individual hybrids preceded by the sign \times . Thus, *Mentha* \times *niliaca* forma *Lamarckii*, might become *Mentha* gh. *niliaca* forma *Lamarckii*, thereby indicating more of the nature of the taxon designated '*niliaca*.' Another method designed to indicate the preponderance of the characters of one or other basic parent, usually the result of natural genetic segregation or of back-crossing primarily to one parent, may be employed as follows: *Mentha longifolia* $>$ \times *rotundifolia*; *M. longifolia* \times $<$ *rotundifolia*."

PROP. 6 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Transfer the Art. to Appendix VII.

COMM. RAPporteur

See comment under Art. 31.

NEW ARTICLE 34 bis

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Forms which are more or less intermediate between two subspecies of the same species but are not with certainty the result of a cross between these should be designated by a formula consisting of the specific name followed by the subspecific epithets in alphabetical order and combined with the sign $>$
 $<$

COMM. RAPporteur

I cannot see any reason for such an article. Such suppositions can always be expressed more clearly in words.

NEW ARTICLE 34 ter

PROP. 1950 — 72; CAMP

Apomictic races, if so desired, may be designated by a name appended to the recognized taxon of next higher rank, up to that of genus, with which it can be biologically associated. The name will be preceded by the symbol *apomict* (abbreviated as *apm.*).

Examples: (To be supplied).

„Note: The formal taxonomic names of apomicts are subject to the same rules as those of other categories in matters of typification, priority, transference, etc. Although biologically equivalent, for nomenclatural purposes one named apomict may be treated as a binary name, whereas another may be given a ternary or lower classification. In informal taxonomy the names would be in the vernacular, not in Latin form.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See comment under Art. 31.

NEW ARTICLE 34 quater

PROP. 1950 — 72; CAMP

Clonal races, reproducing by vegetative means, may be designated by a name appended to the recognized taxon of next higher rank, up to that of genus, with which it can be biologically associated. The name will be preceded by the symbol *clone* (abbreviated as *cl.*).

Example: *Hemerocallis fulva* *cl. Europa*, itself completely seed-sterile, is of wide dispersal, often escaped and fully established outside of cultivation.

„Note: In using the clonal symbol, either *cl.* or *CL* is permissible, depending on typographical expediency.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See under Art. 31.

NEW ARTICLE 34 quinques

PROP. 1950 — 72; CAMP

Polyploid or genetically differentiated races may be named, or the cytological condition expressed by an appropriate symbol.

„In general, when formally named, such races should have sufficiently different morphological characters to be distinguishable from related taxa by the usual taxonomic methods.

„Where the morphological differences in such races are not clearly obvious symbols may be used; these symbols will not constitute part of the formal name but will be appended in some appropriate manner for the sake of greater precision.

„Examples: *Erythronium americanum* (3 ×), indicating the triploid race of this species, thus distinguishing it from the known diploid and tetraploid races. In groups where the basic, ancestral diploid number is in doubt or, as in the Rosaceae, where several basic numbers are known, the gametic (G) or somatic (S) number might be indicated, as *Rosa virginiana* (S-28), thus distinguishing it from another race of this taxonomic species known to possess 42 somatic chromosomes. Where it seems expedient to designate various races of somewhat similar appearance but with physiological or ecological differences, these races may be named in an informal manner, the identifying name to be in the vernacular in a language using Roman characters and listed in parenthesis, with or without the accompanying chromosome number; e.g., *Vaccinium vacillans* (Cumberland Mt., S-24), *V. vacillans* (Coastalplain, S-24); *Fagus grandifolia* (Southern White), *F. grandifolia* (Mountain Red), *F. grandifolia* (Northern Gray).”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See under Art. 31.

NEW PARAGRAPH (Proposed Art. 34 bis)

PROP. 1950 — 48; HYLANDER

§ . . . „Designations of forms intermediate between two subspecies of the same species.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See comment under § 6.

§ 7. Names of plants of horticultural origin (vide Appendix VII)

PROP. 1 (1950 — 62, 1950 — 72; CAMP)

Delete the present title, and substitute the following:

§ 7. Names of plants originated or maintained in cultivation.”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Delete the present title and substitute the following:

„Fancy” epithets of lower taxa of garden plants.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See comment under § 6.

ART. 35

Forms and half-breeds among cultivated plants receive fancy epithets preferably in common language, as different as possible from the Latin epithets of species or varieties. When they can be attached to a species, a subspecies, or a botanical variety this is indicated by the succession of names. The fancy epithet will be preceded by the letter „c”.

Example: *Pelargonium zonale* c. Mrs. Pollock.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 14; AIRY-SHAW and BURTT)

Amend to read:

„Hybrids, forms and half-breeds among cultivated plants may receive fancy epithets, preferably in common language, as different as possible from the Latin epithets of species and varieties. When they can be attached to a species, a subspecies, a botanical variety or a named hybrid, the fancy epithet is appended to the scientific name.

„Examples: *Pelargonium zonale* 'Mrs. Pollock'; *Daphne Burkwoodii* [= *caucasicum* × *Cneorum*] 'Somerset'; *Rhododendron* 'Aladdin' [= *auriculatum* × *Griersonianum*].”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 5; VAN DIJK)

To be added:

Where the need is felt for categories of a higher order for horti-

cultural purposes, these should be so designated that there is no danger for confusion with any of the categories dealt with in the present Rules. The naming of such categories should be as different as possible from the Latin names of such taxonomic units as are dealt with in these Rules.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 5; LANJOUW)

Delete § 6 and § 7 (Art. 31—35, Rec. XX).

PROP. 4 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)

In Art. 35 for C use c (*clon*).

PROP. 5 (1950 — 12; HELLYER)

Add the following:

„Fancy names used in a collective sense (e.g. to cover more than one clone or sexually produced individual) for hybrids, half-breeds or strains should incorporate a word such as „hybrids”, „crosses” or „strain” which makes the collective usage of the name evident.”

Examples: *Lilium* × 'Bellingham Hybrids', which covers the clones 'Kulshan', 'Shuksan'; *Primula pulverulenta* 'Bartley Strain'.

PROP. 6 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Horticultural forms of species and of interspecific hybrids should instead of taxonomic epithets better be given so called „fancy” epithets in common language, markedly different from the Latin epithets. They are placed after the real taxonomic designation and placed between ’’.

In interspecific hybrids, this fancy epithet is placed after the formula of the parentage or the epithet substituted for this, but it may, especially when the parentage is unknown or of complicated origin, be placed immediately after the generic name, preceded only by a ×; in any case it should be included between ’’. A fancy epithet may consist of more than one word but it must not in any case be followed by another fancy epithet.

PROP. 7 (1950 — 62; CAMP and STYER)

Art. 35. „Plants brought into cultivation from the wild through indiscriminate transplanting or collection of seed, and which differ in no fundamental way from the parental stock, receive the same epithets as are applied to the same species and subdivisions of species in nature.

„Plants in cultivation arising through selection, hybridization, mutant 'sports,' or other processes which tend to establish recognizable differences from the parental stock, receive fancy epithets preferably

in common language, as different as possible from the Latin epithets of species or varieties. When they can be attached to the name of a species, a subspecies, or a botanical variety, this may be indicated by a succession of names. Because of the often complicated or obscure ancestry of many cultivated plants, in actual practice in horticultural literature, catalogs, lists, etc., the fancy epithet may and often should be attached directly to the generic name.

„As applied in horticultural writings the category of ‚variety’ seldom is equivalent to the botanical ‚variety’; it often is highly ambiguous, and biologically quite different kinds of ‚varieties’ appear within the same group. Therefore, as an aid to greater precision in the nomenclature of cultivated plants, the following categories may be recognized:

„(1) A sexually reproductive and uniform-appearing group propagated entirely by means of seed, its stability maintained by selection (this known as ‚roguing the line’ by practical plantsmen). The epithet should be prefixed by the word ‚line’ (Latin, *linea*), abbreviated as ‚ln.’

Examples: *Dianthus deltoides* ln. Brilliant; *Petunia* ln. Rosy Morn.

Note: It seems that little would be gained by inserting a ‚specific’ epithet between the name of the genus and that of this selected line of garden petunias in the foregoing example, especially since it has never been positively proved what the exact ancestors were, with *P. axillaris* and *P. violacea* being suspect. However, for those desiring a complete hierarchy the following might be used: *Petunia* gr. *hybrida* ln. Rosy Morn. Here the admittedly spurious specific epithet *P. hybrida* (which would imply the presence of a natural species), would be transferred to the category of ‚grex’ (‚gr.’), signifying a group of garden hybrids with a presumed common set of ancestors [see paragraph (3) for ‚grex’].

„(2) Essentially uniform material derived from a single individual and propagated entirely by vegetative means, as by cuttings, divisions, grafts, etc. The epithet should be prefixed by the word ‚clone’ (occasionally spelled ‚clon’), abbreviated as ‚cl.’

Examples: *Pelargonium zonale* cl. Mrs. Pollock; *Syringa vulgaris* cl. Decaisneor, for brevity, *Syringa* cl. Decaisne; *Rhododendron* cl. Flamboyant; *Lilium longiflorum* cl. Easter Erabu (not *L. longiflorum* var. *erabu*).

„(3) A group of hybrids originating from the same parents or series of parents, but whose individuals vary in appearance; the group would be delimited by the potential variations inherent in the parental stocks. The epithet would be prefixed by the word ‚grex’ (pl., greges; literally a ‚flock, herd, or drive’ —a group), abbreviated as ‚gr.’

Examples: *Rhododendron* gr. Ghent [the ‚Ghent hybrid azaleas’, sometimes listed as *R. gandavense* and recorded as the highly variable back-crosses and segregates of *R. luteum* × (*calendulaceum* × *nudiflorum*) × *viscosum* × *arborescens*]; for greater precision a particular clone of this group would be listed as *Rhododendron* gr. Ghent cl. Flamboyant; *Rosa* gr. Hybrid Tea; *Dahlia* gr. Double Decorative.

„Note: The category of ‚class’ should not be encouraged in semipopular horticultural literature as it is sometimes used at present (e.g. the

„Double Decorative class of dahlias'). As defined in Art. 10 ,class' is a category intermediate between ,order' and ,division.'

„4) A predictably uniform group derived by repetitive hybridization from a series of two or more constantly maintained breeding stocks, these parental ,lines' being maintained either by continued inbreeding or as clones. The epithet should be prefixed by the hyphenated words ,line-hybrid' (Latin, *linea-hybrida*), abbreviated without the hyphen as ,lh.'

„Examples: This is the standard practice in the 'hybrid seed corn' industry; e.g. United States Department of Agriculture, hybrid seed corn No. 13 (usually abbreviated as 'hybrid corn, US-13'); which, for greater precision in formal, international literature where the word 'corn' has various applications, might be listed as *Zea mays* lh. US-13. It is also an increasingly common practice in the production of ornamentals; e.g. the so-called named 'races' and 'varieties' of *Lilium* offered for sale in large lots while yet seedlings (which, biologically, are neither races nor varieties but artificially produced hybrids derived from particular combinations between clonally maintained parental lines), the lots presumably virusfree and predictably uniform in ultimate color of flower and plant habit, including season of bloom."

PROP. 8 (1950 — 62; CAMP and STYER)

Art. 35. Further consideration and suggestion.

The insertion of the foregoing text in completeness might encumber the main body of the Rules; therefore following suggestion is made: Retain the first two paragraphs of the proposal in the main body of the Rules and add the following paragraph:

„For special categories and examples see Appendix VII, Section II." Change the title of Appendix VII to read as follows:

„Appendix VII. Nomenclature of Plants Originated or Maintained in Cultivation.

„Section I. General considerations."

[This to contain the Rendle text which, although not completely satisfactory to horticulturists using modern breeding methods, contains various useful items which could be retained.]

„Section II. Special categories."

„As applied in horticultural writings ... etc. [This is the third paragraph of the foregoing proposal; then continue through numbered paragraphs (1) to (4) and the Examples to the end.]

PROP. 9 (1950 — 72; CAMP)

Delete the present Art. 35 and substitute the following:

Plants brought into cultivation from the wild through indiscriminate transplanting or collection of seed, and which differ in no fundamental way from the parental stock, receive the same epithets as are applied to the same species and subdivisions of species in nature.

„Plants in cultivation arising through selection, hybridization, mutant „sports," or other processes which tend to establish recognizable

differences from the parental stock, receive vernacular („fancy”) epithets preferably in common language, as different as possible from the Latin epithets of species or varieties. When they can be attached to the name of a species, a subspecies, or a botanical variety, this may be indicated by a succession of names. Because of the often complicated or obscure ancestry of many cultivated plants, in actual practice in horticultural literature, catalogs, lists, etc., the fancy epithet may and often should be attached directly to the generic name.

„For particular details see Appendix VII.”

PROP. 10 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Transfer the Art. to Appendix VII.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See under Art. 31.

Proposals 7 and 8 were accepted by the American Botanists.

SECTION 5. CONDITIONS OF EFFECTIVE PUBLICATION

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Read „valid” instead of „effective”.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 5; DE WIT)

To read: „Conditions and dates”.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Furtado): is not recommended.

Proposal 2 (De Wit): is recommended for acceptance.

ART. 36

Publication is effected, under these Rules, by sale to the general public or to botanical institutions, of printed matter or indelible autographs, or by distribution of these to specified representative botanical institutions¹⁾. No other kind of publication is accepted as effective: communication of new names at a public meeting, or the placing of names in collections or gardens open to the public, does not constitute effective publication.

When separates from periodicals or other works placed on sale are issued in advance, the date on the separate is accepted as the date of effective publication.

(I suggest the addition of the words: „provided that the separates themselves are placed on sale” — T. A. Sprague).

Examples: Effective publication without printed matter: *Salvia oxyodon* Webb et Heldr. was published in July 1850 in an autograph catalogue placed on sale (Webb et Heldreich, *Catalogus Plantarum hispanicarum* ... ab A Blanco

lectarum, Paris, Juli 1850, folio). Non-effective publication at a public meeting: Cusson announced his establishment of the genus *Physospermum* in a memoir read at the Société de Médecine de Paris, but its effective publication dates from 1787 in the Mémoires de la Société Royale de Médecine de Paris. V, Ire partie, p. 279.

1) The preparation of a list of representative botanical institutions is referred to the Executive Committee (see App. VI).

PROP. 1 (1940 — 1; WHEELER)

Paragraph 1, delete: „or indelible autographs.”

Paragraph 2, add: Through Dec. 31, 1951 publication by indelible autograph is accepted. Offer for sale of material which does not exist does not constitute publication.

Add Note: For purposes of this article handwritten material, even though reproduced by some process such as lithography, offset, or metallic etching is still considered autographic.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Read „validated” for „effected”, „valid” for „effective”.

Revise the 1935 amendment concerning the separates thus: „The issue of advance separates is not valid unless their distribution satisfies the conditions required in Art. 36A concerning the sale or the private distribution of independent works.”

Add: „From 1942 no work published independently and offered for sale can be valid unless the author (or its publisher) either conforms with the requirements for books not placed on sale, or announces the work previous to, or simultaneously with, its issue in three botanical periodicals of international circulation to be specified under this rule, and unless he makes not less than 100 copies available to the botanical public.

„From 1942 new nomenclatural entities and new taxonomic descriptions will not be valid unless published in monographs or botanical periodicals and appropriately indicated as new.

PROP. 3 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Vorher verschickte Sonderdrucke gelten nur dann, wenn ihr Datum darauf angegeben ist. Eine mit falschem, insbesondere früherem, Erscheinungsdatum künftighin erscheinende Arbeit gilt nicht als wirksam veröffentlicht.

PROP. 4 (1940 — 12, '50 — 62; FOSBERG)

Add as a fourth paragraph:

„Seedsmen's and nurserymen's catalogs or other obvious commercial advertisements, whether in a periodical or privately distributed, are not to be considered effective means of publication, even though the names in them are accompanied by descriptions.”

PROP. 5 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)

Replace the words „or by distribution of these to specified representative botanical institutions” by „or by general distribution of these to important botanical institutions.” Delete the footnote.

PROP. 6 (1950 — 5; DE WIT)

Modify as follows:

Publication is effected, under these Rules, by sale to the general public or to botanical institutions, of printed matter or multiplied indelible autographs in a reasonable number of copies, or by distribution of these or by giving notice of their being available to specified representative botanical institutions. (1)

If circumstances of a general nature beyond the control of the author or the publishing instance, contrary to the intention, prevent temporarily a sale or distribution of printed matter or multiplied undelible autographs, the publication is regarded as effective under the Rules provided that sale or distribution in a normal manner is effected at the earliest possible moment. Separates from periodicals or other works placed on sale or distributed or given notice of to the specified representative botanical institutions, when issued in advance, are accepted as effectively published.

Examples: To be added:

Of a Catalogue of the Botanic Gardens at Buitenzorg (Java) written by J. E. Teysmann and S. Binnendijk and printed in 1854, the stock was deliberately withdrawn from circulation by the publishing instance though it has been proved that one copy prematurely was used by a visitor to Java.

1). The preparation of a list of representative botanical institutions is referred to the Executive Committee (see App. VI).

PROP. 7 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)

Read for „these Rules”, „these Rules of Nomenclature”.

PROP. 8 (1950 — 20, '50 — 52; WEHMEYER and STEVENSON)

Amend the second paragraph to read as follows:

No other kind of publication is accepted as effective; communication of new names at a public meeting, or the placing of names in collections or gardens open to the public, or *deposit of manuscripts in libraries or other institutions with microfilm or similar reproduction permitted*, does not constitute publication.

PROP. 9 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Publication is effected under these Rules by distribution, by sale, by exchange, or otherwise of printed matter.

Printed matter is here defined as written or illustrative matter reproduced in indelible form by mechanical means, typewriting (original or carbon copies) specifically excepted.

No other kind of publication is accepted as effective: communication

of new names at a public meeting, or the placing of names in collections or gardens open to the public, does not constitute effective publication.

Ex. unchanged.

From January 1, 1952, the publication of a new name, even if accompanied by a Latin diagnosis, in tradesmen's catalogues or in newspapers is not considered as effective publication.

From January 1, 1952, the publication of a new taxon of specific or lower rank merely on a ticket issued with a dried plant is not considered effective even if the ticket contained a printed diagnosis.

Note. The printing and distribution of the schedae of a set of dried plants in form of a special publication (as, e.g., Schedae operis ... Plantae Finl. Exsicc. or Fungi Exsicc. Suec. ... ed. Lundell & Nannfeldt) will even after that date constitute effective publication.

PROP. 10 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Art. 36A bis: Subject to Art. 20A bis, literature shall be valid only if it is printed or indelibly autographed and made available to the botanical public by sale, exchange, or distribution.

Note 1: From 1950 no publication shall be valid unless one hundred (100) copies at least are made available to the botanical public by sale, exchange, and/or distribution.

Note 2: Publication by issue of separates is not valid unless their distribution satisfies the general conditions for valid publication (see Note 1).

Note 3: From 1950 no systematic papers issued in non-botanical works or periodicals shall be valid unless they are also available to the botanical public in the form of separates.

Note 4: From 1950 seed-lists, indexes, herbarium-labels, nomenclators, garden-catalogues, floras for schools and colleges, plant introduction lists, and journals and books dealing with economic botany, shall be deemed as non-botanical works or periodicals for the purpose of this rule.

Note 5: The botanical public means institutions and botanists interested in systematic botany.

(The use of different terminology in different Articles to mean the same thing is often confusing. The present revision conforms with the terminology in Arts. 20 A and 37 A. See also remarks under Art. 36 A in 1939 and Discussion 27).

PROP. 11 (UTRECHT CONFERENCE)

Modify the first paragraph as follows:

„Publication is effected, under these Rules, by distribution, by sale, by exchange, or otherwise of printed matter.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Wheeler): Accepted by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Furtado): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 3 (Handel-Mazzetti): Rejected by the Utrecht Conf.

Proposal 4 (Fosberg): This proposal was accepted by the Utrecht Conference and rejected by the American Botanists.

Proposal 5 (Sprague): Not recommended for acceptance, See under Prop. 11.

Proposal 6 (De Wit): It was recommended at the Utrecht Conference to add De Wit's example to those quoted under this article, but that for the rest the latter should be left unaltered.

Proposal 7 (Japanese Botanists): Seems a superfluous addition.

Proposal 8 (Wehmeyer and Stevenson): Any attempt to be more precise will increase the possibility of omissions. Acceptance is not recommended.

Proposal 9 (Hylander): The second paragraph is an attempt to define the term „printed matter”. I hardly believe it can be useful.

Proposal 10 (Furtado): This too is an attempt to be more precise; even „botanical public” has been defined. Not recommended for acceptance.

Proposal 11 (Utrecht Conference): This motion was proposed at the Utrecht Conference by Rickett and Chatterjee, and accepted.

NEW RECOMMENDATION XX bis

PROP. (1950 — 62; FOSBERG)

„Botanists and others are urged to avoid scrupulously the publication of new species, names, or combinations in ephemeral publications such as newspapers or popular periodicals; in any publication unlikely to reach the general botanical public; or in duplications by mimeograph, hectograph, or other devices that use either a poor quality of paper or an ink that is likely to fade.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposed new Rec. was accepted in principle, the precise wording being left to the Editorial Committee.

The proposal was rejected by the American Botanists, most of whom apparently preferred the proposed new Rec. XXter. The difference between the two proposals is but slight, and if the principle is accepted the wording might perhaps better be left to the Editorial Committee.

NEW RECOMMENDATION XX ter

PROP. (1950 — 62; AMERICAN TAXONOMISTS)

„Botanists and others are urged to avoid scrupulously the publication of new names or combinations in publications unlikely to reach botanical taxonomists generally (see Art. 36), or in those produced by such methods that their permanence is unlikely.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Accepted by the American Botanists. See the comment under XX bis.

NEW RECOMMENDATION XX quater

PROP. (1950 — 36; CHATTERJEE)

From 1950 onward, botanists are recommended to discontinue the practice of validating new binomials solely by reference to descriptions or plates in pre-1753 literature. This modification shall not affect binomials which are already published and validated by such reference.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This is in my opinion a matter of minor importance. However, acceptance of this new Rec. can do no harm.

NEW RECOMMENDATION XX quinquies

PROP. (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Botanists are advised to publish new nomenclatural entities in botanical monographs or periodicals, and are further recommended to indicate by means of special signs and types all new nomenclatural entities in the index or in an abstract accompanying the paper.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The first part of this proposal has already been incorporated in the proposed New Rec. XX ter; the second part does not concern nomenclature.

NEW ARTICLE 36 bis

PROP. (1950 — 5; DE WIT)

The date of effective publication is the moment of its being available as defined in Art. 36.

In the absence of proof establishing some other date, the date given in the work must be accepted as that moment.

If circumstances of a general nature beyond the control of the author or the publishing instance, contrary to the intention, prevent regular distribution or giving notice, the date given in the work is regarded as the moment of effective publication.

If a work issued as one whole bears two (or more) dates, the latest date is regarded as the moment of effective publication.

When separates from periodicals or other works, placed on sale or distributed, or given notice of to the specified representative botanical

institutions, are issued in advance, the date *printed* on the separate is accepted as the moment of effective publication, which date from January 1, 1951 should be mentioned in the periodical or other works from which these separates are issued.

Examples: Vol. 17, part 2, of the Bulletin of the Botanic Gardens, Buitenzorg, was printed and placed on sale in occupied territory. The date of effective publication is accepted as indicated „April 1942”, though regular distribution was only possible in 1945.

The „Contribution to the knowledge of the Melastomataceae occurring in the Malay Archipelago etc.” by R. C. Bakhuizen van den Brink Jr. was printed and distributed in 10 copies in occupied territory, May 1943, which is the date of effective publication though regular distribution (in Rec. trav. bot. néerl., vol XL) was only possible in Dec. 1946.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

At the Utrecht Conference it was agreed that the principle of this proposal was already included in the Rules, and that it was desirable that the examples should be added, their wording being left to the Editorial Committee.

In my opinion it might be advisable to add a new article 36 bis to this Section of the Rules, in which are incorporated paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 of the present proposal.

NEW ARTICLE 36 ter

PROP. (UTRECHT CONFERENCE, HUMBERT)

From Jan. 1:st 1951 onwards, the distribution of an exsiccata relative either to a new species or to a taxon of infraspecific rank, accompanied by the original diagnosis, even if printed, will not be considered effective publication.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This new article was supplied by Humbert during the discussion at the Utrecht Conference. It was accepted by the Conference, but it seems to me that it would be simpler to change in Art. 37, paragraph 2, the word „without” in „even when accompanied by”. See the proposal by Wheeler, Paragraph 2.

SECTION 6. CONDITIONS AND DATES OF VALID PUBLICATION OF NAMES

PROP. 1 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Delete: „and dates” from the title of this Section.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Delete: „of names” from the title of this Section.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

To be referred to the Editorial Committee.

ART 37.

A name of a taxonomic group of recent plants is not validly published unless it is both (1) effectively published (see Art. 36) and (2) accompanied by a description of the group or by a reference to a previously and effectively published description of it.

Mention of a name on a ticket issued with a dried plant without a printed or autographed description does not constitute valid publication of that name.

Note. In certain circumstances a plate or figure with analyses is accepted as equivalent to a description (see Art. 43, 44).

Examples of names not validly published. *Egeria Néraud* (*Bot. Voy. Freycinet*, 28 : 1826) published without description or reference to a former description. *Sciadophyllum heterotrichum* Decaisne et Planch. in *Rev. Hortic.* sér. 4, II, 107 (1854), published without description or reference to a previous description under another name. The name *Loranthus macrosolen* Steud. originally appeared without a description on the printed tickets issued about the year 1843, with Sect. II. nn. 529, 1288 of Schimper's herbarium specimens of Abyssinian plants; it was not validly published however, until A. Richard (*Tent. Fl. Abys.* I, 340 : 1847) supplied a description. *Nepeta Sieheana* Hausskn. was not validly published by its appearance without a description in a set of dried plants (W. Siehe, *Bot. Reise nach Cicilien*, No. 521 : 1896).

PROP. 1 (1940 — 1; WHEELER)

Paragraph 1.

A name of a taxonomic group is not validly published unless it is (1) both effectively published (see Art. 26), and (2) accompanied by a description of the group or by reference to a previously and effectively published description of it. A name proposed provisionally (*nomen provisorium, alternativum, seu eventuale*) in anticipation of the eventual acceptance of a given group, or of a particular circumscription, nomenclatural position, or rank of a given group, or merely mentioned incidentally, is not validly published.

Paragraph 2, change to: From Jan. 1, 1952 publication of names of vascular plants cannot be made by issue of a ticket, even with a diagnosis, with a herbarium specimen. Names of non-vascular cryptogams may be published by issue of a ticket bearing a printed diagnosis with a herbarium specimen.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 9, '50 — 83; FURTADO)

Revise as follows:

A name of a taxonomic group is not valid unless it is (1) correctly formed, (Sect. 4), (2) published in valid literature (Arts. 20 A & 36 A), and (3) accompanied by (a) a valid description of the group (Notes 1—3), or by reference to a previously published valid description of a co-ordinate group (Note 4). See also Arts. 40 A—B and 41 A).

Note 1. Names in Linnaeus's *Species Plantarum* eds. 1 & 2, and in other books adopted as the starting points of valid botanical literature for different groups of plants cannot be rejected as invalid merely on the grounds of absence, or invalidity, of either description or reference. (see Art. 20 A).

Note 2: The indication of the type locality, the peculiar habitat, or parentage or ancestry of a taxonomic group shall not be sufficient to establish a name under this rule. If descriptive characters are given, the type locality or the habit indicated shall become a part of the description and so shall form an important element in determining the identity of the taxonomic group. However, economic uses, vernacular names, parentage or phylogeny (individually or together) shall not become a part of the description of the new entity, even when this entity be of cultural or hybrid origin.

(Characters mentioned in the last category are not observed in the field. Often information given by guides is erroneous, as also speculation regarding parentage, phylogeny or ancestry).

Note 3. In this Article by the word description is meant a botanical description published in valid literature printed in any European language written in Roman characters if before 1935, or in Latin only if published after 1934, the two exceptions to this being the following:—

(A) In the case of *bacteria* and *fossil* plants, a description in any above-mentioned European languages is admitted. But from January 1st, 1912, no description of *fossil* plants can be valid unless it is accompanied (a) by illustrations or figures showing essential characters, or (b) by a reference to such illustrations or figures published previously in valid literature; if the required illustrations or figures are published after the description, then the later date alone must be taken into consideration for the purposes of the validity of the description or of its simultaneously published name.

(B) In the case of other (*recent*) plants, a *plate* or *figure with analyses showing essential characters* can take the place of a description provided it was published *before 1908*.

Note 4: (a) The *reference* must be made in the form of a conventional formula or expression intelligible to systematists in general, a full reference to the text and page being necessary when the citation is to a valid description published under an invalid name.

Note 4 (b): „For the purpose of this rule, the members in each of the following groups shall be considered as being coordinate: (i) *Divisio*

and its Subdivisions; (ii) Class and its Subdivisions; (iii) Order and its Subdivisions; (iv) Family and its Subdivisions; (v) Genus and its Subdivisions; (vi) Species and Subspecies; (vii) Variety and Sub-varieties within the same Species and (viii) Formae and Subformae within their immediate superior group.

Note 4 (c): In the case of a new monotypic genus, reference shall be allowed to the generic description invalidating the name of its species, it being also permitted to give the description of the genus under the binomial of the species (Descriptio generico-specifica).

Note 4 (d): In validating the name of a variety, subvariety, forma or subforma, reference shall be allowed to the description of any species or subspecies, but the converse shall not be allowed. Reference to the description of a variety and other subordinate groups shall not be allowed to validate a subordinate group of equal or lower rank outside the species, except when this species or its subspecies is the isonym or the basynym of the one under which the varietal or infra-varietal epithet are to be instated or were instated. (Disjunctive groups being subordinate deviations from the standard receiving a superior name, are not easily fitted in as similar deviations of another standard unless defined again. Furthermore, varietal and specific differences are not co-ordinate. (See Discussions 4, 5, 8, 9 and 10).

Examples: (1) *Glossopetalum pungens* Brandg. var. *glabra* (Ensign) H. St. John in Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash. LV (1942) is valid because the basynym of the variety was instated under *Forsellesia pungens* (Brandg.) Heller which is an isonym of *G. pungens* Brandg., the basynym of the variety being *F. pungens* var. *glabra* Ensign in Amer. Midl. Nat. xxvii (1942) 503.

(2) *Hemigramma Zollingeri* var. *major* Christ in Philipp. Journ. Sc. II (1907) 170 shall not be considered as the isonym of *Hemionitis gymnopteroides* forma *major* Copel., though the latter was considered as the basynym. The protologue of the variety therefore is the description and the syntype cited by Christ. See also examples under Notes 6 and 8 under Art. 51 A.

Note 4 (e): Reference to a description a defect of which rendered its name invalid shall not be able to validate the same or another name; for such a name to be valid a new description must be given.

Example 1: The names *Neurotecoma* Schum. and *Spirotecoma* Baill., were invalid when published, the former because it was provisional and the latter because it was undescribed. Dalla Torre et Harms (1905) considered both these names as valid and listed the former in the synonymy of the latter which was earlier; this listing shall not be taken as the valid publication of *Spirotecoma* by reference to *Neurotecoma*, since the description of the latter was so defective as to render it invalid. (For discussion of this case see Furtado Provisional Names, in Gard. Bull. Straits Settl. IX, 1937, pp. 230—232.

Example 2: *Leopoldia* was proposed as a provisional name by Herbert in Bot. Mag. (1820) t. 2113, p. 5 footnote, to be adopted should certain circumstances prove true. The name did not become valid when it was mentioned in a letter in Trans. Hort. Soc. London IV (1821) 181 indicating that the plants of the group required certain cultural conditions.

(It is also invalid under the existing rule 37 A (3) = Art. 42 (2) which interdicts references to the description under the same name.

Note 5 (a): Transfer here Art. 40A and add: „However names of subspecies published before 1930 shall be a special case of alternative names where the isonyms and the basonyms are of unequal rank; they shall be the names of subdivisions (= subspecies) of a species sensu amplissimo and at the same time specific names of the micro-specific groups.

Note 5 (b): Where Note 5 (a) applies, the alternative specific binomial for the subspecies shall be obtained by omitting the intercalating epithet between the generic name and the subspecific epithet; and if published as a specific binomial, an alternative subspecific trinomial shall be obtained by joining the epithet denoting the subspecies to the binomial denoting the metrospecies.

Note 5 (c): Where Note 5 (a) applies, the varieties and other subordinate groups published under a subspecies shall become ipso facto varieties and subvarieties under the alternative specific name.

Note 5 (d): Since in all cases the intercalating epithets denoting the subdivisionary groups may be omitted, the varieties and subvarieties instated under a subspecies shall also be varieties and subvarieties under the species sensu amplissimo. This does not apply to formae and subformae which remain under the special group in which they are instated, the epithet var. *typica* or its equivalent being omissible.

Note 6: A name proposed provisionally (nomen provisorium) to be adopted by future investigators in case certain possible circumscription, position or rank be accepted, or merely mentioned incidentally, is not valid.

Note 7: A group is not characterized, and the publication of its name is not validated, merely by mention of the subordinate groups included in it: thus the publication of the name of an order is not validated by mention of the included families; that of a family is not validated by mention of the included species.

An exception is made for the generic names published in *Linnaeus's Species Plantarum* ed. 1 (1753) and ed. 2 (1762—1763) and in other books which have been adopted as the starting points of valid botanical literature for the different kinds of plants, so that the taxonomic groups in these books are treated as having been validly characterized.

(see Art. 37A: Note 1).

Examples. — The family name *Rhaptopetalaceae* Pierre (in *Bull. Soc. Linn. Par. II*, 1926: maio 1897), which was accompanied merely by mention of constituent genera, *Brazzeia*, *Scytopetalum* and *Rhaptopetalum*, was not validly published, as Pierre gave no description; the family bears the later name *Scytopetalaceae* Engl. (in Engl. u. Prantl, *Nat. Pflanzenfam. Nachtr. I*, 242: 1897, *serius*), which was accompanied by a description. — The generic name *Ibidium* Salisbury (in *Trans. Hort. Soc. I*, 291: 1812) was published merely with the mention of four included species: as Salisbury supplied no generic description, the publication of *Ibidium* was invalid.

PROP. 3 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Add to the article:

Der Hinweis, dass eine Art in eine bestimmte Gattung gehöre, ist als Ueberstellung derselben in diese Gattung unter dem gleichen Artnamen anzusehen (viele Fälle in Bentham u. Hooker, Gen. Pl., die grösstenteils im Index Kew. als Kombinationen aufgenommen sind). Ebenso gilt z. B. die Bemerkung Gáyers „*Aconitum album* Ait. is eine weissblütige Form von *A. variegatum*“ als Aufstellung der Kombination *A. variegatum* f. *album* (Ait.) Gáy. Nomina descripta gelten nur für Farbenvarietäten: Eine f. *albiflora* ist auch ohne Diagnose „flores albi“ gültig aufgestellt. Der Name f. *hirsuta* z. B. kann aber nicht als nomen descriptivum betrachtet werden, da er nicht erkennen lässt, welche Teile der Pflanze rauhaarig sind. Ein mit einer Beschreibung oder Bemerkung oder durch Hinweis auf eine solche für den Fall des Zutreffens einer bestimmten Voraussetzung vorgeschlagener Name (nomen provisorium) ist gültig veröffentlicht. Ein solcher, gleichzeitig mit einem anderen für dieselbe Pflanze gebildeter und veröffentlichter Name (nomen alternativum) ist ungültig veröffentlicht.

Anmerkung: Eine Tafel oder Abbildung mit Analysen wird einer Beschreibung gleichgesetzt, wenn sie vor 1. Januar 1908 veröffentlicht wurde.

PROP. 4 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)

Insert the words „(direct or indirect)” after „reference,” and add the following example:

„Example. The publication of the new combination *Cymbopogon Martini* by W. Watson in Atkinson's Gazetteer N.-W. Prov. India, X, 392 (1882) is validated by the addition of the number '309' which, as explained at the top of the same page, is the running-number of the species (*Andropogon Martini* Roxb.) in Steudel's Syn. Pl. Glum. I, 388 (1855). Although the reference to the synonym, *Andropogon Martini*, is indirect, it is perfectly unambiguous.”

PROP. 5 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

A name of a taxon is not validly published unless it is effectively published (art. 36).

PROP. 6 (1950 — 62; ST. JOHN)

Paragraph 3. Proposal for reaffirmation.

„A name of a taxonomic group is not validly published unless it is *definitely accepted* by the author who publishes it. A name proposed provisionally (*nomen provisorium*) in anticipation of the eventual acceptance of a group or of a particular circumscription, position or rank of a given group, or merely mentioned incidentally, is not validly published.

„Examples: *Conophyton* Haw. Rev. Pl. Succ. 82 (1831) [‘If this section proves to be a genus, the name of *Conophyton* would be apt.’] was not validly published

since Haworth did not then adopt that name. *Andropogon Bequaerti* De Wild. 'nom. nov.' Bull. Jard. Bot. Bruxelles 6: 8 (1919), given as a sort of alternative or synonym under *Cymbopogon Bequaerti*, is invalid and must be validated by a later author to be used.

Paragraph 3. Additional proposal.

At the end of the third paragraph, after the words „validly published,” insert the following: „This provision concerning definite acceptance does not apply to names or epithets published with a question mark or some other indication of taxonomic doubt, yet published and accepted by the author.”

„Example: *Melicope? elliptica* A. Gray, U. S. Expl. Exp. 15: 353 [official ed.; Phan. 353, unofficial ed.]. 1854 The question mark was used to indicate uncertainty as to the correct generic assignment of the species, due to lack of complete flowers. Yet Gray was certain that the plant was a new species and he published it in *Melicope*. The question mark did not mean that he did not accept his own species, but was a sign indicating some uncertainty as to the genus, as was further elaborated in his discussion.”

PROP. 7 (1950 — 62; FOSBERG)

Add as an additional paragraph:

„Beginning with January 1, 1953, new transfers or new combinations will be considered validly published only when the basonym (name-bringing synonym) is clearly indicated with its author, date, and place of publication.”

PROP. 8 (1950 — 62; AMERICAN TAXONOMISTS)

Add as an additional paragraph:

„A binomial or other combination is not validly published unless the author definitely indicates that the epithets are to be used in a certain combination.

„Examples: In Linnaeus' *Species plantarum* the placing of the epithet in the margins opposite the name of the genus clearly indicates the combination intended. The same result is attained in Miller's *Gardeners dictionary*, ed. 8, by the inclusion of the epithet in parenthesis immediately after the name of the genus, in Steudel's *Nomenclator botanicus* by the arrangement of the epithets in a list headed by the name of the genus, and general by any typographical device which indicates that an epithet is associated with a particular generic or other name.

„On the other hand, Rafinesque's statement that '*Monarda ciliata* must form a new genus, which we will call *Blephilia*' does not constitute publication of the combination *Blephilia ciliata*. We cannot infer Rafinesque's intent since he often changed the epithet when he transferred a species to another genus. Similarly the combination *Eulophus peucedanoides* may not be ascribed to Bentham and Hooker on the basis of the listing of *Cnidium peucedanoides* H.B.K. under *Eulophus* in the *Genera plantarum*.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Wheeler): The first part of this proposal belongs under Art. 37bis. (See proposal 3 under that article); the principle of the second part is recommended for acceptance, see under art. 36 ter.

Proposal 2 (Furta do): This lengthy article cannot be recommended for acceptance.

Proposal 3 (Handel-Mazzetti): Not recommended for acceptance.

Proposal 4 (Sprague): Acceptance is recommended. It is a useful addition.

Proposal 5 (Hylander): Not recommended for acceptance. The provision (2) of Art. 37 is essential.

Proposal 6 (St. John): The first part of this proposal belongs under Art. 37 bis. It was accepted by the American Botanists. The Utrecht Conference accepted the version given under Art. 37 bis proposal 3.

The second part of the proposal also belongs under Art. 37 bis. It is recommended for acceptance. (See proposal 3 under Art. 37 bis).

Proposal 7 (Fosberg): Accepted both by the Utrecht Conference and by the American Botanists. A definition of „basonym” is to be added to Chapter 1.

Proposal 8 (American Botanists): Accepted both by the Utrecht Conference and the American Botanists.

ART. 37 bis

A name which is not accepted by the author who published it, but is merely proposed in anticipation of the *future* acceptance of the group concerned, or of a particular circumscription, position or rank of the group (nomen provisorum) is not validly published.

Note. This Article does not apply to alternative names such as *Andropogon Bequaerti* De Wild., which was proposed by De Wildeman (Bull. Gard. Bot. Brux. VI, p. 8:1919) as an alternative name for *immediate* use by those who accepted the wider circumscription of the genus *Andropogon* previously in use.

Examples. — The generic name *Conophyton* Haw. — suggested by Haworth (Rev. Gen. 82:1821) for *Mesembryanthemum* sect. *Minima* Haw. 1. c. 81 in the following words: „If this section proves to be a genus, the name of *Conophyton* would be apt” — was not validly published since Haworth did not adopt that generic name nor accept that genus: the correct name for the genus is *Conophytum* N. E. Brown in Gard. Chron. Ser. 3, LXXI, p. 198 (1922).

The name *Himantandra* F. Muell., incidentally mentioned in remarks on *Eupomatia Belgraveana* F. Muell. (Australas. Journ. Pharm., Jan. 1887; Bot. Centralbl. XXX. p. 325) — „The anther appendage is analogous to that of *Doryphora*; consequently this *Eupomatia* might or perhaps even generically, subgenerically be separated (as *Himantandra*)” — is not thereby validly published: valid publication as a generic name dates from 1912, when Diels (Engl. Jahrb. p. 164) actually adopted *Himantandra* and supplied a generic description. In 1891, Baillon (Hist. Pl. X, 49) suggested that *Tecoma spiralis* Wright might perhaps present a new genus intermediate between *Radermachera* and *Tecoma*, or a new section. Three years later K. Schumann suggested independently (Engl. et Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfamilien iv. Abt. 3 b, 238) that *Tecoma spiralis* Wright might be treated as the type of an independent genus *Neuroteca*, but stated that the material available was insufficient for a thorough investigation of the question. Neither *Spirotecoma* Baill. nor *Neuroteca* K. Schum. was validly published by its author. The name *Spirotecoma* Baill. was however, validly published by Dalla Torre et Harms (Gen.

Siphonog. 467, n. 7734: 1904) as a generic name, with a reference to the previously published diagnoses in Engl. et Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 1. c.

Cotema Britton et P. Wils. (Mem. Torr. Bot. Club, XVI. 107: 1920) being also based on *Tecoma spiralis*, is a synonym.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 34; PICHON)

Delete the article.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

A name which was only proposed in anticipation of the *future* acceptance of the taxon concerned or of a particular circumscription, position or rank of the taxon (*nomen provisorium*), or a name merely mentioned incidentally, i.e. without the author's intention of publishing it as a new name, is not considered validly published. On the other hand, an author has the right to make alternative binary combinations (*nomina alternativa*) for *immediate* use in cases where a species may be placed under different generic names according to different circumscription or disputable nomenclature of genera, or to point out with a question mark or other indication of doubt that he is uncertain as to the right generic position of a new species; such names are considered validly published.

Ex. should be supplied.

PROP. 3 (UTRECHT CONFERENCE — FOSBERG)

A name which is not accepted by the author who published it, but is merely proposed in anticipation of the *future* acceptance of the group concerned, or of a particular circumscription, position or rank of the group (*nomen provisorium*), or a name merely mentioned incidentally, is not validly published.

The provision concerning acceptance by the author does not apply to names or epithets published with a question mark or other indication of taxonomic doubt, yet published and accepted by the author.

By „incidental mention” of a new name or combination is meant mention by an author who does not intend to introduce the new name or combination concerned.

„Note. This Article applies to alternative names of unequal rank, but it does not apply to alternative names of equal rank.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Pichon): I do not think it is advisable to delete the article.
Proposal 2 (Hylander): Acceptance of this proposal is not recommended.

Proposal 3 (Utrecht Conference — Fosberg): This proposal is recommended for acceptance. It was carried unanimously at the

Utrecht Conference. The „note” was supplied by H y l a n d e r. It seems better to omit it, as it is not sufficiently clear what is meant by „alternatives of equal rank”.

ART. 38

From January 1, 1935, names of new groups of recent plants the Bacteria excepted, are considered as validly published only when they are accompanied by a Latin diagnosis.

Note. This article validates the publication of names of new groups effectively published from 1908 to 1934 inclusive with diagnoses in modern languages.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 2; DE TONI)

Modify as follows:

„Vom 1. Januar 1942 an wird ein Name für eine neu aufgestellte Gruppe nur dann als gültig veröffentlicht angesehen, wenn ihm eine Diagnose in lateinischer Sprache beigegeben ist, und in einer qualifizierten Zeitschrift, oder in einem geeigneten Sammel-Werk in lateinischer Sprache veröffentlicht ist.”

Bemerkung: „Für qualifizierte Zeitschrift versteht man jene fortlaufende Veröffentlichung, deren Redaktion sich verpflichtet hat, die neuen Namen nur dann zu drucken, wenn dieselben mit entsprechender Beschreibung in lateinischer Sprache begleitet sind. Für Sammelwerk versteht man jenes sämtliche oder einzelne Werk, dessen Zweck ist, die Diagnose der botanisch-systematischen Gruppen in lateinischer Sprache zu sammeln”.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Delete the Art. as it is incorporated in the proposed Art. 37.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 6; LUND)

Add to the article:

The diagnoses of all algal varieties, species, genera or higher classificatory groupings shall be given in two languages, one of which shall be French, German or English. The diagnosis of every alga new to science shall be accompanied by an adequate illustration or illustrations and by the pertinent dimensions.

PROP. 4 (1950 — 20, '50 — 44; SHAW)

Change the *note* to read as follows:

„This article legitimizes names of new groups effectively published from 1908 *through* 1934 with diagnoses in modern languages.”

PROP. 5 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Modify: A name of a *new*¹ taxon among recent plants published on

or after January 1, 1935, is not validly published unless it is accompanied by a Latin diagnosis or by a reference to such a diagnosis previously and effectively published; from this rule names of Bacteria are excepted as well as binary names of hybrids and chimaeras.

1 (Footnote.) A *new* taxon in the sense of this art. is a taxon which has not previously got a validly published name in the same or another rank.

Ex. Nannfeldt published in 1939 (in Lundell & Nannfeldt, *Fungi suec. exs. fasc. XVII—XVIII*, nr. 896) the new species *Plasmopara Peucedani* Nannf. without description but with a reference to an earlier description by Wartenweiler (in *Ann. Myc.* 16, 19., 292) of *Plasmopara nivea* (Ung.) Schroet. „Form auf *Peucedanum palustre*”. Nannfeldt's name should, however, not be considered validly published, since the fungus had not previously got a validly published name and Wartenweiler's description was not in Latin.

COMM. RAPPOREUR

Proposal 1 (De Toni): This proposal was rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Furtado): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 3 (Lund): Acceptance is not advisable.

Proposal 4 (Shaw): To be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal 5 (Hylander): Not recommended for acceptance.

To define terms such as „new” seems superfluous.

ART 39

From Januari 1, 1912, the name of a new taxonomic group of fossil plants is not considered as validly published unless it is accompanied by illustrations or figures showing the essential characters, in addition to the description, or by a reference to a previously and effectively published illustration or figure.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Delete the Art. as it is incorporated in the proposed Art. 37.

COMM. RAPPOREUR

The proposal is not recommended for acceptance.

NEW ARTICLE 39 bis

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

A name of a taxon is not validly published unless it is based on a plant known to exist in the living or fossil state; an anticipating name of a presumptive plant is not validly published.

Note. According to this article a specific name based on an imperfect state of a pleomorphic fungus before its perfect state is known but containing the generic name designating that perfect state is not considered validly published. The same applies to names based on

sterile mycelia (e.g. *sclerotia*) in cases where such sterile states have got provisional „generic” designations (e.g. *Sclerotium*).

Ex. In 1893, Schoeter, presuming the perfect state of the *Fungi imperfecti Monilia cinerea* and *M. fructigena* to belong to the genus *Sclerotinia*, published the names *Sclerotinia cinerea* and *S. fructigena* without having seen apothecia. Such were not described until 1905 by Aderhold & Ruhland, also using the names *Sclerotinia cinerea* and *S. fructigena*, which should accordingly be cited from the lastmentioned authors. — In 1894 Maul described a sterile sclerotium as *Sclerotinia Alni* Maul, anticipating that its perfect state would belong to the lastmentioned genus but without having seen apothecia. Such were not detected until 1897 by O. Rostrup, who described them under the name given by Maul. The first validly published name of the fungus as a whole is thus *Sclerotinia Alni* O. Rostr., as Maul was not allowed to use the name *Sclerotinia* for the sterile mycelia, which should have been described under the generic name *Sclerotium*. If the fungus is transferred to the genus *Ciboria*, its correct name is *Ciboria Alni* (O. Rostr.) Buchwald 1947; the citation *C. Alni* (Maul) Whetzel 1945, which has also been used, is incorrect, as Maul's name should not be used as namebringing synonym (cfr art. 57, footnote) and Whetzel's name, published without description (or citation of a description) of the perfect state, must be considered as a *nomen nudum*.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This article seems superfluous.

Whether Schroeter was right in referring these *Monilia* species to *Sclerotinia*, is a question of taxonomy, not of nomenclature, but it can hardly be doubted that the names were validly published, cf Art. 37 (reference to a previously and effectively published description).

ART. 40

A name of a taxonomic group is not validly published when it is merely cited as a synonym.

Examples. — *Acosmus* Desv., cited as a synonym of the generic name *Aspicarpa* Rich., was not validly published thereby. — *Ornithogalum undulatum* Hort. berol. ex Kunth (*Enum. Pl. IV*, 348: 1843) cited as a synonym under *Myogalum Boucheanum* Kunth, was not validly published thereby; when transferred to *Ornithogalum* this species must be called *Ornithogalum Boucheanum* (Kunth) Aschers. (in *Oesterr. Bot. Zeitschr. XVI*, 192: 1866). — Similarly *Erythrina micropteryx* Poepp. was not validly published by being cited as a synonym of *Micropteryx Poeppigiana* Walp. (in *Linnaea. XXIII*, 740: 1850) the species in question, when placed under *Erythrina*, must be called *Erythrina Poeppigiana* (Walp.) O. F. Cook (in *U.S. Dept. Agric. Bull. no. 25*, p. 57: 1901).

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Add: But it is permissible to validate alternative names (simultaneous isonyms) provided the alternative name is a combinatio nova equal in rank to its simultaneous basonym.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

Complete the sentence as follows and add the following example: „... or if it is published in an index unless it is obvious that the author actually intended to use the index as a proper place for publishing the name of this particular taxonomic group.

„Example: *Hedysarum Mackenzii* f. *canescens* 1902 published in a periodical was listed in the index as var. *canescens* without any indication that the author had actually changed his opinion as to the proper rank to assign to this entity. The latter is not validly published and does not render illegitimate the later *H. Mackenzii* var. *cinerascens* 1940 although the former name was listed in the synonymy of the latter.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

A name of a taxon is not validly published when it is merely published as a synonym; an exception is made for binary names of interspecific hybrids or chimaeras proposed as alternatives to formulae as mentioned in art. 32—33.

Note. A binary name given in this way to a putative hybrid which later on turns out to be a species must not be used as specific name unless it was accompanied by a description in accordance with art. 44.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Acceptance not recommended.

Proposal 2 (Boivin): In my opinion a name in an index can never be regarded as a „publication” in the sense of the rules, and I cannot see the necessity for a special provision.

Proposal 3 (Hylander): A decision on this proposal depends on what the Congress will decide with regard to Art. 31—35.

ART. 41

A group is not characterized, and the publication of its name is not validated, merely by mention of the subordinate groups included in it: thus the publication of the name of an order is not validated by mention of the included families; that of a family is not validated by mention of the included species.

Examples. — The family name *Rhaptopetalaceae* Pierre (in *Bull. Soc. Linn. Par. II*, 1926: maio 1897), which was accompanied merely by mention of constituent genera, *Brazzeia*, *Scytopetalum* and *Rhaptopetalum*, was not validly published, as Pierre gave no description; the family bears the later name *Scytopetalaceae* Engl. (in Engl. u. Prantl. *Nat. Pflanzenfam. Nachtr. I*, 242: 1897, *serius*), which was accompanied by a description. — The generic name *Ibidium* Salisbury (in *Trans. Hort. Soc. I*, 291: 1812) was published merely with the mention of four included species: as Salisbury supplied no generic description, the publication of *Ibidium* was invalid.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 1; WHEELER)

Add: New combinations and new names made prior to Jan. 1, 1942 will be accepted if the basynym with its author is given, or if a definite bibliographical reference to the place of publications of the basynym is given. Beginning with Jan. 1, 1942 new combinations and new names are validly published only when both the basynym with its author and place of publication including page and date of publication are supplied.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 9, '50 — 83; FURTADO)

Transfer the article to Art. 37, Note 7.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

A name of a taxon is not validly published merely by mention of the subordinated taxa included in it; in fossil plants, however, a name of a genus or a taxon of higher rank published in this way is considered validly published if the publication took place before January 1, 1936.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Wheeler): This belongs to Art. 37. See there under proposal 7.

Proposal 2 (Furtado): It might indeed be better to let Art. 41 follow immediately after Art. 37.

Proposal 3 (Hylander): In principle recommended for acceptance. „A group is not characterized” as the present article reads, is certainly not the correct wording in a rule of nomenclature.

ART. 42

A name of a genus of recent plants is not validly published unless it is accompanied (1) by a description of the genus, or (2) by the citation of a previously and effectively published description of the genus under another name; or (3) by a reference to a previously and effectively published description of the genus as a subgenus, section or other subdivision of a genus.

An exception is made for the generic names published by Linnaeus in *Species Plantarum*, ed. 1 (1753) and ed. 2 (1762—63), which are treated as having been validly published on those dates (see Art. 20).

Note. In certain circumstances, a plate with analyses is accepted as equivalent to a generic description (see Art. 43).

Examples of validly published generic names: *Carphalea* Juss. (*Gen. Plant.* 198: 1789), accompanied by a generic description; *Thuspeinantha* Th. Dur. (*Ind. Gen. Phanerog.* p. x.: 1888), accompanied by a reference to the previously described genus *Tapeinanthus* Boiss. (non Herb.); *Aspalathoides* (DC.) K. Koch (*Hort. Dendrol.* 242: 1853), based on a previously described section, *Anthyllis* sect. *Aspalathoides* DC.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Delete the article as it is incorporated in the proposed Art. 37.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)

Paragraph 1. Omit the words „under another name.” Add the following example: „The publication of the generic name *Epipogium* R. Br. Prodr. 330, 331 (1810) is validated by Robert Brown’s implicit reference to the excellent description of *Epipogum* in Gmelin, Fl. Sibir. I, 11 (1747). He attributed the name *Epipogium* to Gmelin.”

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

A name of a taxon belonging to a category above genus is (with the exception for certain fossil plants mentioned in Art. 41 bis) not validly published unless it is accompanied (1) by a description of the taxon, or (2) by a reference (in accordance with the regulations in art. 45) to a previously and effectively published description of it as a genus or as a subdivision of a genus.

Ex. Unchanged; add: Example of names not validly published. — *Egeria* etc. as under the present Art. 37. ex. 1.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Not recommended.

Proposal 2 (Sprague): Accepted by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 3 (Hylander): In my opinion this is superfluous.

The matter is dealt with in Art. 37 and 41.

NEW ARTICLE 42 bis

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

A name of a „hybrid genus” is not validly published unless it is accompanied (1) by a description of a hybrid belonging to it, or (2) by reference to such a previously and effectively published description, or (3) by mention of the parents of such a hybrid or of the genera concerned. This holds also for the „generic” name of an intergeneric chimaera.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See comment under Art. 31.

NEW ARTICLE 42 ter

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

A binary name of an interspecific hybrid or chimaera is not validly published unless it is accompanied (1) by a description of it, or (2) by reference to a previously and effectively published description of it, or (3) by mention of the parents or components.

Note. A binary name given in accordance with mom. 3 above to a putative hybrid which turns out to be a species is not considered validly published as a name of a species.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See comment under Art. 31.

NEW ARTICLE 42 quater

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

A name of a nothomorph or a mixomorph is not validly published

unless it is accompanied (1) by a description of it, or (2) by reference to a previously and effectively published description of it.

Note. This description may be given in another nomenclatural status, e.g. as a binarily designated interspecific hybrid or chimaera, or as a species, or as a subdivision of a species.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See comment under Art. 31.

ART. 43

The publication of the name of a monotypic new genus of recent plants based on a new species is validated: either (1) by the provision of a combined generic and specific description (*descriptio generico-specifica*); or (2) by the provision of a plate with analyses showing essential characters, but the latter alternative applies only to plates and generic names published before January 1, 1908.

Examples. — The generic name *Sakersia* Hook. f. (*Hook. Ic. Pl. Ser. III*, i. 69, t. 1086: 1871) was validly published, being accompanied by a combined and specific description of *S. africana* Hook. f. (nov. gen. et spec.), the only known species. — The generic name *Philgamia* Baill. (in Grandidier, *Hist. Madag., Pl., Atlas III*. t. 265: 1894) was validly published, as it appeared on a plate with analyses of *P. hibbertioides* Baill. (nov. gen. et sp.), published before January 1, 1908.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Delete the article as it is incorporated in the proposed Art. 37.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)

The first phrase to read as follows:

„The publication of the name of a monotypic new genus based on a new species is validated. ...:”

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

The name of a monotypic *new*¹ genus of recent plants based on a *new* species is considered validly published if it was accompanied (1) by a combined generic and specific description (*descriptio generico-specifica*), or (2) by a plate with analyses showing the essential characters, provided that the description or plate was published before January 1, 1908.

1 (Footnote.) A genus or a species are considered new in the sense of art. 48 bis — quater if they have not previously got a validly published generic, resp. specific name.

Ex. The ex. from the present art. 43.

PROP. 4 (UTRECHT CONFERENCE)

Add the following note: A description of a species of a monotypic new genus or of the genus only is regarded as a combined generic and specific description, if the genus and species are published together and the genus or the species is not described.

Example: *Strophoblachia fimbriicalyx* Val. is a monotypic new genus, published with combined description of the genus and species.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Acceptance not advisable.

Proposal 2 (Sprague): Accepted by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 3 (Hylander): Not recommended. The present text is in my opinion preferable.

Proposal 4 (Utrecht Conference): Unanimously agreed on at the Utrecht Conference. The redaction does not seem quite happy and might be referred to the Editorial Committee.

NEW RECOMMENDATION XX sexes

PROP. BREMEKAMP

It is desirable that a combined generic and specific description mentions the points in which the new genus differs from its allies.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Recommended for acceptance.

NEW ARTICLE 43 bis

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

The name of a monotypic *new* genus of fossil plants is considered validly published if it was accompanied by a combined generic and specific description together with a figure showing the essential characters, provided that the description and figure were published before January 1, 1936.

Note. An exception is made for the generic names published by Linnaeus in *Species Plantarum*, ed. 1 and 2, which are treated as having been validly published in these works, in May 1753 and in the years 1762—63, respectively (cfr art. 38, note 1).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This new Art. should be judged by the Spec. Committee for Palaeobotany.

NEW ARTICLE 43 ter

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Names of species and their subdivisions (and of interspecific hybrids and chimaeras and their subdivisions) are not considered validly published unless the generic name which makes part of them was before or at the same time validly published.

Ex. The specific names *Eragrostis minor* and *E. major* were published 1809 by Host (Gram. Austr. IV, resp. 15 and 14) as substitutes for *Poa Eragrostis* L. and *Briza Eragrostis* L., respectively; these two names were cited as synonyms. As, however, the generic name *Eragrostis* was not validly published until 1812 (Palisot de Beauvois, Essai), the names by Host cannot be considered validly published.

In 1880, Müller Argoviensis (Lichen. Beitr. 220, in Flora. .) published the new genus *Phlyctidia* with the species *Ph. Hampeana* n.sp., *Ph. boliviensis* (= *Phlyctis boliviensis* Nyl.), *Ph. sorediiformis* (= *Phlyctis sorediiformis* Krmph.), *Ph. brasiliensis* (= *Phlyctis brasiliensis* Nyl.) and *Ph. andensis* (= *Phlyctis andensis* Nyl.). These specific names are, however, not validly published in this place, because the generic name *Phlyctidia* is here a nomen nudum: Müller gave no generic diagnosis but only a description of the new species, *Ph. Hampeana*. This description cannot validate the generic name as a descriptio generico-specifica in accordance with art. 48 bis, since the new genus was not monotypic. The first valid publication of the name *Phlyctidia* was made by Müller in 1895 (in Hedwigia 34, 141), where a short generic diagnosis is given. The only species mentioned here are *Ph. Ludoviciensis* n.sp. and *Ph. boliviensis* (Nyl.). The latter combination should be considered validly published in this place by the reference, although in second hand, to the basonym, *Phlyctis boliviensis* Nyl., but should not be dated from 1880 (Lichen. Beitr. 220), as done by Müller himself in 1895.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This new article seems superfluous. The questions that are brought forward, can be solved by means of the existing rules. It cannot be doubted that the genus *Eragrostis* was validly published in 1812, and that the combinations published under this name before that date are invalid.

In the second case *Phlyctidia* is to be regarded as validly published in the form of a monotypic genus in 1880, for in that year a combined generic and specific description was given under the binomial *Phlyctidia Hampeana*. The other combinations given at the same place are invalid because the generic character had not yet been published. Such a description was given in 1895, and at that occasion one of the names published in 1880 was validated.

NEW ARTICLE 43 quater

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Names of species and lower taxa are not considered validly published if they were published in works in which the Linnaean system of binary nomenclature for species was not consistently employed.

A list of such works is given in App. . . /In this list should, i.a., the following works be included: Gilibert, Flora Lithuanica (1781) and Exercitia Phytologica (1792)./

Ex. The present ex. under art. 68 : 4.

Note. *Generic* names which were published in accordance with the Rules are considered validly published even if they were published in works in which the Linnaean system of univocal generic names was not consistently employed.

Ex. Many generic names were first validly published in various editions of

Miller's Gard. Dict. between 1753 and 1768 where many genera were designated by verbal names of pre-Linnaean type (e.g. *Centaurium minus* for *Centaurium* and *Centaurium majus* for *Centaurea*).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This new article seems superfluous. The matter has been dealt with in Art. 68 sub 4, as amended by Boivin, where it belongs. A reference to this article might be inserted in Art. 44.

NEW ARTICLE 43 quinquies

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

A name of a natural or provisional genus of fossil plants published on or after January 1, 1936, is not validly published unless it is accompanied by a description together with figures showing the essential characters or with the reference to such figures previously and effectively published.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

To be judged by the Spec. Committee on Palaeobotany.

ART. 44

The name of a species, or of a subdivision of a species of recent plants is not validly published unless it is accompanied: either by (1) a description of the group or citation of a previously and effectively published description of the group under another name; or (2) by a plate or figure with analyses showing essential characters, but the latter alternative applies only to plates or figures and specific or subdivisional names published before January 1, 1908.

Examples of validly published names of species. — *Onobrychis eubrichidea* Boiss. (*Fl. Or. II*, 546: 1872), published with a description. — *Hieracium Flahaultianum* Arv. - Touv. et Gaut., published on a label with a printed diagnosis in a set of dried plants (*Hieraciotheca gallica*, nos. 935—942: 1903). — *Cynanchum nivale* Nyman (*Syll. Fl. Eur.* 108: 1854—55), published with a reference to *Vincetoxicum nivale* Boiss. et Heldr. previously described. — *Panax nossibiensis* Drake (in Grandidier, *Hist. Madag., Bot., Atlas III*, t. 406: 1896) published on a plate with analyses.

Examples of names of species not validly published are given under Art. 36 and 40.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Delete the article as it is incorporated in the proposed Art. 37.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)

Omit the words „under another name.”

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Modify as follows: A name of a species or lower taxon among recent

plants is not validly published unless it is accompanied (1) by a description of the taxon, or (2) by the reference to a previously and effectively published description of it, or (3) by a figure with analyses showing the essential characters, provided that the figure with the name was validly published before January 1, 1908.

Ex. The present ex. of validly published names unchanged; after these add: Examples of names of species not validly published: The name *Loranthus macrosolen*. (= ex. 2 under the present art. 37). — *Nepeta Sieheana*. (= do., ex. 3).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Sprague): Accepted by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 3 (Hylander): In my opinion an unnecessary alteration of the wording of the present article.

NEW ARTICLE 44 bis

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

The epithet of a *new* species of recent plants that was published without specific description but in connection with a description of a monotypic *new* genus is considered validly published, provided that the description was published before January 1, 1908.

Ex. Ellis in 1761 raised the new genus *Gardenia* and gave a generic description. Only one species was known, which he at the same time gave the name *G. jasminoides*, and this name should be retained although Ellis gave no special description of the species.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended for acceptance. This has been provided for in Art. 43 (See proposal 4).

NEW ARTICLE 44 ter

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

A name of a species or a subdivision of a species of fossil plants is not considered validly published unless it is accompanied by a description together with figures showing the essential characters or with reference to such figures previously and effectively published.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposal is referred for advise to the Spec. Committee for Palaeobotany.

ART. 45

The date of a name or of an epithet is that of its valid publication (see

Art. 19, 37). For purposes of priority, however, only legitimate names and epithets published in legitimate combinations are taken into consideration¹⁾ (see Art. 60). In the absence of proof to the contrary, the date given in the work containing the name or epithet must be regarded as correct.

On and after January 1, 1935²⁾, only the date of publication of the Latin diagnosis can be taken into account for new groups of recent plants.

For new groups of fossil plants, on and after January 1, 1912 the date is that of simultaneous publication of the description and figure (or if these are published at different dates, the later of the two dates).

Examples. — Specimens of *Mentha foliicoma* Opiz were distributed by Opiz in 1832, but the name dates from 1882, when it was validly published by Déséglise (*Menth. Op.* in *Bull. Soc. Etud. Scient. Angers*, 1881—'82, 210); *Mentha bracteolata* Opiz (*Seznam*, 65 : 1852, without description), takes effect only from 1882, when it was published with a description (Déséglise *loc. cit.* 211) — There is some reason for supposing that the first volume of Adanson's *Familles des Plantes* was published in 1762, but in the absence of certainty the date 1763 on the title-page is assumed to be correct. — Individual parts of Willdenow's *Species Plantarum* were published as follows: vol. I, 1798; vol. II, 2, 1800; vol. III, 1, 1801; vol. III, 2, 1803; vol. III, 3, 1804; vol. IV, 2, 1806; and not in the years 1797, 1799, 1800, 1800, 1800 and 1805 respectively, which appear on the title-pages of the volumes; it is the former series of dates which takes effect.

1) A *legitimate* name or epithet is one that is strictly in accordance with the Rules.

2) See note to Art. 38.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9, '50 — 83; FURTADO)

Delete the article as it is transferred to the proposed Art. 52 ter.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Der erste Satz in Art. 45 zu ändern in:

Das Datum eines Namens oder eines Epithetons ist das seiner wirk-samen Veröffentlichung.

In der Fussnote 1: gültiger (valid) Name (oder ein gültiges Epitheton) ist ein solcher, der bei seiner Aufstellung genau den Regeln entsprach.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 22; SCHOPF)

Delete the third paragraph and replace it by the following:

For fossil plants in all groups, on and after the starting point of their nomenclature (1820), the date is that of the simultaneous publication of description and figure (or if these are published at different dates, the later of the two dates).

PROP. 4 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

In the examples, change the sentence regarding Willdenow's *Species Plantarum* to read as follows:

„Individual parts of Willdenow's *Species Plantarum* were published as follows: vol. I, part 1, 1797; vol. I, part 2, 1798; vol. II, part 1, 1799; vol. II, part 2, 1800; vol. III, part 1 (to page 850), 1800; vol. III, part 2 (to page 1470), 1802; vol. III, part 3 (to page 2409), 1803 (and later than Michaux's *Flora Boreali-Americana*); vol. IV, part 2, 1806; and not in the years 1797, 1799, 1800 and 1805, respectively, which appear on the title-pages of the volumes, it is the former series of dates which takes effect. (Vide: *Rhodora* 44 : 147-150. 1942).

PROP. 5 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Modify as follows: The date of a name or of an epithet is that of its valid publication (see art. . .). In the absence of proof to the contrary, the date given in the work containing the name or epithet must be regarded as correct. Where separates from periodicals or other works placed on sale or distributed by exchange are issued in advance, the date on the separate is, under the same condition, accepted as the date of valid publication.

On and after January 1, 1935, only the date of publication of the Latin diagnosis can be taken into account for such new taxa of recent plants for which such a diagnosis is required according to art. 48. For such new taxa of fossil plants as mentioned in art. 44, 46 and 48 ter, the date of valid publication is that of the simultaneous publication of the description and figure (or, if these are published at different dates, the later of the two dates).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Handel-Mazzetti): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 3 (Schopf): To be judged by the Spec. Committee for Palaeobotany.

Proposal 4 (Boivin): Acceptance recommended.

Proposal 5 (Hylander): The question belongs under Section 5. See the new Art. 36 bis.

NEW ARTICLE 45 bis

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

When a taxon of specific or lower rank gets a new name in connection with a change of its rank (with or without transfer under another name of the subsequent higher taxon), e.g. when a variety or subspecies is raised to specific rank or vice versa, this new name is considered validly published by reference to the name of the taxon in its former rank together with its author.

Ex. In 1944, Haglund (ap. Lid, Norsk flora), raising *Taraxacum cornutum* var. *pruinatum* Dt. to specific rank, published it as „*T. aleurodes* Hagl. n. nom. (*T. cornutum* Dt. v. *pruinatum* Dt.; *T. pruinatum* Dt. non M. P. Christ.)”; *T. pruinatum* Dt. is a nom. nudum in sched. Later (in Nytt. Mag. f. naturvid. 86, 1948), Haglund replaced this substitute name by *T. aleurophorum* Hagl., citing „*T.*

aleurodes Hagl. ap. Johannes Lid 1944, pag. 555. nom.) and with a fuller bibliographical reference for the name *T. cornutum* var. *pruinatum* also cited. *T. aleurophorum* must, however, be considered superfluous and thus illegitimate, as the name *T. aleurodes* was validly published by the reference to *T. cornutum* var. *pruinatum* Dt. although this reference was incomplete.

In the same way a new name, intended as a substitute name for an illegitimate name to be rejected (e.g. as a later homonym or synonym), is considered validly published even in cases where the reference is made merely by mentioning the name to be replaced together with its author.

From January 1, 1952, this type of publication is not considered validly published unless the resp. name to be replaced is cited together with its author and the date and place of publication.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This new article is superfluous. The matter has been dealt with in Art. 37.

NEW ARTICLE 45 ter

PROP. (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

New combinations made by transfer of an epithet under another generic name or (as to infraspecific taxa) under another specific name or under another name of the subsequent higher infraspecific taxon without change of rank are considered validly published by reference to the basynym (the name from which the epithet is taken) together with its author or if a definite bibliographical reference to the place of publication of the basynym is given.

Ex. In 1936 Nannfeldt (in Svensk Bot. Tidskr. 30 : 3, 304) published the name *Pyrenopeziza urticicola* (Phill.) as a new combination, based on *Mollisia urticicola* Phill. (Brit. Discomyc. 1887, 177). This combination should, however, be ascribed to Boudier (Hist. et Classif. d'Eur. 1907, 135), where the species is cited as „*Pyrenopeziza urticicola* Phill. Disc. p. 177. — Sacc. Syll. VIII, p. 323”; this should be considered as a legitimate transfer made by Boudier l.c., though he did not mention the basynym itself, only its author and place of publication, and did not explicitly declare the name as a new combination.

A new combination is not considered validly published if merely the author of the basynym is mentioned within parenthesis, but neither the basynym itself, nor the place of its publication is given.

Ex. The combination *Arctium Palladinii*, based on *Lappa Palladini* Marcovicz (in Acta h. bot. Jurjev. 1, 1900, 141) was made in 1923 by R. E. Fries & E. Söderberg (in Del. spor. . . h. bot. Berg. 1922) but cannot be considered validly published there, since they referred to the basynym only by citing the abbreviated name of Marcovicz within parenthesis but without mentioning the basynym itself or the place of publication. Under *Arctium*, the species should be cited as *A. Palladinii* (Marc.) Grossh. (Fl. Kavk. IV, 1934, 164, ut *A. Palladinii*).

From January 1, 1952, a transfer is not considered validly published unless the basynym is cited together with its author and the date and place of publication.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

In my opinion this new article is superfluous.

Under the present Rules the new combination made by Boudier was in my opinion legitimate. The new combination made by Fries and Söderberg, has also to be treated as validly published, though the reference to the literature was omitted. We should always try to read in a publication what the author had in mind, and in the given case there is in my opinion no reason to doubt the authors intention.

RECOMMENDATION XXI

Not to publish a new name without clearly indicating whether it is the name of a family or a tribe, a genus or a section, a species or a variety; briefly, without expressing an opinion as to the rank of the group to which the name is given.

Not to publish the name of a new group without indicating its type (see Recommendation IV).

PROP. 1 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

After „indicating its type” add: „and where it is preserved.”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 62; AMERICAN TAXONOMISTS)

Delete this and substitute an Article:

„Art. 45 bis. A new name published without a clear indication of the group, whether family, tribe, genus, section, species, variety, etc., is invalid if published after Jan. 1, 1953.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 2 (American Taxonomists) is recommended for acceptance. It was accepted both by the Utrecht Conference and by the American Botanists. At the Utrecht Conference it was proposed to read instead of „invalid” the words „not validly published”.

RECOMMENDATION XXII

To avoid publishing or mentioning in their publications unpublished names which they do not accept, especially if the persons responsible for these names have not formally authorized their publication (see Recommendation XV, e).

NO PROPOSALS

NEW RECOMMENDATION XXII bis

PROP. (1950 — 62; FOSBERG)

„To avoid adoption of names or epithets which have been previously published illegitimately or as *nomina nuda*.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This new Rec. was unanimously accepted by the Utrecht Conference. It was rejected by the American Botanists with a vast majority. In my opinion it is a useful suggestion and I recommend it for acceptance. It should be noted that it is not a Rule but a Recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION XXIII

When publishing names of new groups of plants, in works written in a modern language (floras, catalogues, etc.) to publish simultaneously the Latin diagnoses of recent plants (Bacteria excepted) and the figures of fossil plants, which will validate the publication of these names.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 78; HERTER)

Zu streichen, dafür zu setzen: Beim Beschreiben neuer Gruppen lasse man die Verwandtschaft deutlich erkennen.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposal is not recommended for acceptance. It has nothing to do with nomenclature.

RECOMMENDATION XXIV

In describing new groups of lower Cryptogams, especially among the Fungi or among microscopic plants, to add to the description a figure or figures of the plants, with details of microscopic structure, as an aid to identification.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 46; BOTANISTES BELGES)

— Les botanistes belges proposent de remplacer le texte actuel de la recommandation XXIV, par le texte suivant:

„Lorsqu'on décrit des groupes nouveaux, il est bon d'ajouter à la description dans la mesure du possible, des figures, avec les détails de structure qui aideront à leur identification. Dans la légende des figures, il conviendrait d'indiquer le(s) échantillon(s) sur lesquels elles sont basées et de se conformer à la recommandation XLIX.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 78; HERTER)

Zu streichen, dafür zu setzen: Beim Beschreiben neuer Gruppen füge man nach Möglichkeit Abbildungen bei, um das Wiedererkennen zu erleichtern.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The two proposals are the same in principle. The text of proposal 1 is preferable. That proposal is recommended for acceptance.

RECOMMENDATION XXV

The description of parasitic plants should always be followed by the indication of the hosts, especially in the case of parasitic Fungi. The hosts should be designated by their Latin scientific names and not by popular names in modern languages, the significance of which is often doubtful.

NO PROPOSALS

RECOMMENDATION XXVI

To give the etymology of new generic names, and also of new epithets when the meaning of these is not obvious.

NO PROPOSALS

RECOMMENDATION XXVII

To indicate precisely the date of publication of their works and that of the placing on sale or the distribution of named and numbered plants when these are accompanied by printed diagnoses. In the case of a work appearing in parts, the last published sheet of the volume should indicate the precise dates at which the different fascicles or parts of the volume were published as well as the number of pages each.

NO PROPOSALS

RECOMMENDATION XXVIII

When works are published in periodicals, to require the publisher to indicate on the separate copies the date (year and month, if possible the day) of publication and also the title of the periodical from which the work is extracted.

NO PROPOSALS

RECOMMENDATION XXIX

Separate copies should always bear the pagination of the periodical of which they form a part; if desired they may also bear a special pagination.

NO PROPOSALS

SECTION 7. CITATION OF AUTHORS' NAMES AND OF LITERATURE FOR PURPOSES OF PRECISION

ART. 46

For the indication of the name (unitary, binary, or ternary) of a group

to be accurate and complete, and in order that the date may be readily verified, it is necessary to cite the author who first published the name in question.

Examples: *Rosaceae* Juss., *Rosa* L., *Rosa gallica* L., *Rosa gallica* L. var. *eriostyla* R. Keller.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Modify as follows: For the indication of the name of a taxon to be accurate and complete, and in order that the date of publication may be readily verified, it is necessary to cite the author who first legitimately published the name in question.

Note. The authors names should, except in cases where the contrary is desirable from a bibliographical standpoint, be cited in an abbreviated form which must be in accordance with the regulations given in App. ...

When it is desirable also to cite the title of the work where the valid publication took place, this should follow the author's name immediately, only preceded by a comma, when the author of the name also stands as author of the work, but preceded by an 'in' if the work cited is a periodical or another anonymous work, or a work of another author (cfr infra).

Where a name and description by one author are published by another author, the word *apud* (ap.) is used to connect the names of the two authors except where the name of the second author is immediately followed by the title of a book or periodical, in which case the connecting word *in* is used instead.

When the name of a taxonomic unit has been proposed but not validly published by one author, and is subsequently validly published and ascribed to him (or her) by another author, the name of the latter author must be appended to the citation with the connecting word *ex*. The same holds for names used by horticulturists (hortulani, abbreviated hort.) before validly published and at the subsequent valid publication ascribed to hort. If it is desirable to abridge a citation, the name of the publishing author, being the more important, must be retained.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The addition of the word „legitimately” (Proposal 1 first paragraph) is recommended for acceptance. The first paragraph of the Note is not a Rule and has already been included in Rec. XXX. A Special Appendix for that purpose seems superfluous.

The remainder of the note belongs under Art. 48.

For particulars see there.

ART. 47

An alteration of the diagnostic characters or of the circumscription of a group without exclusion of the type does not warrant the citation of

an author other than the one who first published its name. Where the changes have been considerable, an indication of their nature, and of the author responsible for the change is added, the words: *mutatis charact.*, or *pro parte*, or *excl. gen.*, *excl. sp.*, *excl. var.*, or some other abridged indication being employed.

Examples: *Phyllanthus* L. em. (emendavit) Müll. Arg.; *Myosotis* L. pro parte, R. Br.; *Globularia cordifolia* L. excl. var. (em. Lam.).

PROP. 1 (1950 — 20, '50 — 44; ROGERS)

Delete the words: „without exclusion of the type”.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 22; SCHOPF)

Add as an additional paragraph after the first sentence:
When diagnostic characters are altered and/or circumscription is changed in groups of fossil plants, the type is determined by reference to the original specimen figured in validation of the name of the group. If more than one figure applies in validation of this name, the author of the character alteration or emended circumscription shall indicate from the specimens originally figured the one he regards as constituting the type.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 62; AMERICAN TAXONOMISTS)

Modify the second paragraph, the text of the article to read as follows:
„An alteration of the diagnostic characters or of the circumscription of a group without the exclusion of the type does not warrant the citation of an author other than the one who first published the name.

„However, when this alteration has been considerable it is advisable to indicate the nature of the change and author responsible by adding suitably abbreviated words such as *mutatis charact.*, *pro parte*, *excl. gen.*, *excl. spec.*, *excl. var.*, etc.

„Examples: [the present examples may be retained]”.

PROP. 4 (1950 — UTRECHT CONFERENCE)

Make the second paragraph of this Art. a recommendation.

PROP. 5 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Modify as follows: An alteration of the diagnostic characters or of the circumscription of a unit without exclusion of the type does not warrant the citation of an author other than the one who first legitimately published its name.

When the changes have been considerable, the name of the author responsible for the change is added, preceded by the word em. (emendavit, amended). If a more detailed indication of the nature of the change is desired, this may be designated by an abbreviated

indication such as p.p. (pro parte), p.p. min., p.p. maj., excl. var., etc. after the name of the original author.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Rogers): This is recommended for acceptance, as the words mentioned are superfluous and might lead to confusion.

Proposal 2 (Schopf): To be judged by the Spec. Committee on Palaeobotany.

Proposal 3 (American Botanists): This proposal was accepted by the American Botanists. At the Utrecht Conference (Proposal 4) it was decided to make the last paragraph of this article a new Recommendation. This will indeed be better as the whole paragraph is written and meant more as a Recommendation than as a Rule.

Proposal 5 (Hyllander): Not recommended for acceptance.

NEW ARTICLE 47 bis

PROP. (1950 — 62; AMERICAN TAXONOMISTS)

„Retention of a name in a sense which excludes the type can be effected only by conservation (and this only for names above the rank of species; see Arts. 12 and 21).

„When a name is conserved so as to exclude the type of the original author, it should not be ascribed to him with such expressions as *emend.*, *mutatis charact.*, etc.; but the name of the author whose concept is conserved should be cited as authority.

„Note: In monographs and other critical works it is advisable to append the expression 'nom. conserv.' to the citation; when even greater precision is desirable, the earlier application of the name against which conservation was effected should also be cited.

„Example: Suitable forms of citation would be: *Protea* R. Br.; *Protea* R. Br., nom. conserv. (non *Protea* L. 1753). This should not be cited as *Protea* L. emend. R. Br., since Brown's concept and circumscription excluded the Linnaean type.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This new article was accepted both by the Utrecht Conference and by the American Botanists.

ART. 48

When a name of a taxonomic group has been proposed but not published by one author, and is subsequently validly published and ascribed to him (or her) by another author who supplied the description, the name of the latter author must be appended to the citation with the connecting word *ex.* The same holds for names of garden origin cited as „Hort.”. If it is desirable or necessary to abbreviate such a citation the name of the publishing author, being the more important, must be retained.

Examples: — *Havetia flexilis* Spruce ex. Planch. et Triana; *Capparis lasiantha* R. Br. ex DC.; *Gesneria Donklarii* Hort. ex Hook., or *Gesneria Donklarii* Hook.

Where a name and description by one author are published by another author, the word *apud* is used to connect the names of the two authors, except where the name of the second author forms part of the title of a book or periodical, in which case the connecting word *in* is used instead.

Examples: *Teucrium charidemi* Sandwith apud Lacaïta (in *Cavanillesia*, III, 38 : 1930), the description of the species being contributed by Sandwith and published in a paper by Lacaïta. *Viburnum ternatum* Rehder (in Sargent, *Trees and Shrubs*, II, 37 : 1907) — in this latter example the second author's name, Sargent, forms part of the title of a book.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 6, '50 — 62; REHDER)

Modify the third paragraph as follows:

Where a name with a description or reference to a description by one author is published by another author, the word *in* is used to connect the names of the two authors (or if preferred *apud* may be used in the same sense).

Examples: *Teucrium charidemi* Sandwith in Lacaïta (in *Cavanillesia*, 3 : 38, 1930), the description of a species contributed by Sandwith and published in a paper by Lacaïta printed in *Cavanillesia*; or *Teucrium charidemi* Sandwith in *Cavanillesia*, 3 : 38 (1930). *Viburnum ternatum* Rehder in Sargent, *Trees & Shrubs* 2 : 37 (1907).

PROP. 2 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Änderung des Art.

Wenn ein Name einer systematischen Gruppe von einem Autor vorgeschlagen, jedoch nicht oder nicht gültig veröffentlicht worden ist, dann aber von einem anderen Autor gültig veröffentlicht und dem ersten zugeschrieben wurde, so muss beim Zitieren der Stelle der Name des zweiten Autors mit beigefügt werden, wobei man sich des verbindenden Wörtchens „apud“ bedient. Veröffentlicht ein Autor einen vorher nicht gültig veröffentlichten Namen, unter Anerkennung seines ursprünglichen Autors, in einer anderen Gattung, wird der eingeklammerten Abkürzung des ursprünglichen Autors „ined.“ beigetzt. Veröffentlicht ein Autor in einem Buche oder einer Zeitschrift eines anderen, so werden die beiden Namen durch „in“ verbunden. Kann der Autor nur kurz zitiert werden, so kann der zweite Autorname wegbleiben.

Als Autoren können nur bestimmte Personen, die seit 1753 die binäre Nomenklatur anwendeten, oder solche Werke, deren Verfasser bekannt sind (z. B. *Bryol. eur.*) genannt werden. „Anonym.“ oder „Hort.“ sind keine Autoren.

Beispiele: *Havetia flexilis* Spruce ap. Planch. et Triana; *Capparis lasiantha* R. Br. ap. DC., oder *Havetia flexilis* Spruce, *Capparis lasiantha* R. Br.; *Genista Donklarii* Hook.; *Teucrium charidemi* — (unverändert); *Anaphalis adnata* (Wall. ined.) DC. Ebenso in *Empf.* XXXI.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

Change Art. 48 to read as follows and delete Rec. XXXII quater:
„When a name of a taxonomic group has been proposed by one author and is published by or in the works of another author, or editor, the name is credited to the first author followed by *ex* (or *in*, or *apud*) and the name of the second author or editor. The same holds for names of horticultural origin credited to „Hort.”

„If it is desirable or necessary to abbreviate such a citation, the name of the original author must be retained, except that for names of garden origin, cited as „Hort.,” only the publishing author need be cited.

„Examples: *Capparis lasiantha* R. Brown ex DC. or *Capparis lasiantha* R. Brown; *Gesneria Donklarii* Hort. ex Hooker or *Gesneria Donklarii* Hooker. *Thalictrum microgynum* Lecoyer in Hook. Ic. Pl. 18 : 1766. 1888; *Pittosporum viridiflorum* Sims in Curtis Bot. Mag. 41 : 1684. 1815”.

PROP. 4 (1950 — 62; AMERICAN TAXONOMISTS)

Second paragraph. Amend to read:

„If it is desirable or necessary to abbreviate such a citation, the name of the original author must be retained, except that for names of garden origin, cited as 'Hort.' only the publishing author need be cited.”

PROP. 5 (1950 — 62; AMERICAN TAXONOMISTS)

For paragraph 3 of this article substitute:

„Where a name and description or a new combination by one author are published by another, the word 'in' is used to connect the names of the two authors. In such a case if only one author may be cited the first one must be cited. There must be clear evidence that the material was supplied by the first author in substantially the form published, or that it existed in that form in manuscript, or else the names must be connected by 'ex' as provided in the first part of this article.

„Examples: *Zantoxylum semiarticulatum* St. John & Hosaka in Degener, Fl. Haw. [Fam. 179. 12/15/'32]. *Bidens glandulifera* M. L. Grant in Sherff, Field Mus. Publ. Bot. 16 : 105. 1937.”

PROP. 5 (1950 — 62; AMERICAN TAXONOMISTS)

Delete paragraph 3 and replace it by:

„When a name and description by one author are published by another author in the latter's article or book, the word *in* is used to connect the names of the two authors.”

In the examples, change as follows:

„Examples: *Teucrium charidemi* Sandwith in Lacaita, etc.”

PROP. 7 (1950 — 62; AMERICAN TAXONOMISTS)

Change to read as follows:

„When a name of a taxonomic group has been proposed but not published by one author, and is subsequently validly published and ascribed to him by a second author, the names of both authors should be cited. The same holds for names of garden origin cited as 'Hort.' „A semicolon may be placed between the names of the two authors; or a preposition may be used instead to convey more definite information on their relative contributions. For this purpose *ex* indicates that the second author supplied the description associated with the name proposed by the first author; *in* should be used only if an author (or editor) whose name appears on the title page of a book includes in his pages names and descriptions of another author, properly ascribed to the latter; *apud* may be used for a similar relationship when publication is effected in an article in a periodical.

„Examples: *Centropogon coccineus* Regel *ex* F. E. Wimmer, Ann. Naturh. Mus. Wien 46 : 421. *Lobelia pectinata* Engelm.; Wislitz. Tour. Northern Mex. 108. *Sium pusillum* Nutt.; T. & G. Fl. N. Am. 1 : 611. *Teucrium charidemi* Sandwith *apud* La-caita, Cavanillesia 3 : 38. *Viburnum ternatum* Rehder in Sarg. Trees & Shrubs 2 : 37.”

Rec. XXXII quater should be rejected.

PROP. 8 (1950 — 70; FOSBERG)

For paragraph 3 of this article substitute:

„Where a name with description or reference to a description, or a new combination provided by one author is published in an article or book by another the word 'in' is used to connect the names of the two authors. In such a case if only one author may be cited the first one must be cited. There must be clear evidence that the material was supplied by the first author in substantially the form in which it was published, or that it existed in that form in manuscript, or else the names must be connected by 'ex' as provided for in the first part of this article.

„Examples: *Zanthoxylum semiarticulatum* St. John & Hosaka in Degener, Flora Hawaiiensis 179: Zs, 12/12/'32. *Bidens glandulifera* Grant in Sherff, Field Mus. Pub. Bot. 16 : 105, 1937.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

All these proposals apparently agree with the principle of the first part of this article. They disagree about the second part. That need not to be wondered as in that case the second author has himself nothing to do with the new name. The new name appears there only in his article or book. I should prefer to take the second paragraph out of the article and to make it a new Recommendation with the following wording:

„Where a name with a description or reference to a description by one

author is published in a work by another author, it is recommended to use the word *in* to connect the names of the two authors.”

ART. 49

When a genus or a group of lower rank is altered in rank but retains its name or epithet, the original author must be cited in parenthesis, followed by the name of the author who effected the alteration. The same holds when a subdivision of a genus, a species or a group of lower rank, is transferred to another genus or species with or without alteration of rank.

Examples: *Medicago polymorpha* L. var. *orbicularis* L. when raised to the rank of species becomes *Medicago orbicularis* (L.) All. *Anthyllis* sect. *Aspalathoides* DC. raised to generic rank, retaining the name *Aspalathoides*, is cited as *Aspalathoides* (DC.) K. Koch. *Sorbus* sect. *Aria* Pers., on transference to *Pyrus*, is cited as *Pyrus* sect. *Aria* (Pers.) DC. *Cheiranthus tristis* L. transferred to the genus *Matthiola* becomes *Matthiola tristis* (L.) R. Br.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 6; REHDER)

Modify as follows:

When a genus or a group of lower rank is altered in rank but retains its name or epithet, the author who first used the name *legitimately* must be cited in parenthesis followed by the name of the author who effected the alteration. The same holds when a subdivision of a genus, a species or a group of lower rank is transferred to another genus or species with or without alteration of rank.

Additional examples: *Syzygium lineatum* (DC.) Merrill & Perry, the transfer being based on the legitimate name *Jambosa lineata* DC., not on the earlier illegitimate *Myrtus lineata* Bl., not Sw. — *Lithocarpus polystachya* (Wall. ex A. DC.) Rehd. or *L. polystachya* (A. DC.) Rehd.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Antrag zu Art. 49:

Wenn ein Autor eine Kombination bildet und dabei dasselbe namengebende Epitheton nicht dem ältesten Autor, sondern einem späteren zuschreibt, ist als Klammerautor der älteste zu zitieren.

Beispiel: *Akebia quinata* (Houtt.) Decne., obwohl Decaisne *Rajania quinata* Houtt. 1779 nicht kannte, sondern diesen Namen Thunberg 1783 zuschrieb.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)

Line 2: for „the original author” read „the name of the original author”.

PROP. 4 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

When a genus or a taxon of lower rank is placed in another rank but retains its name or epithet, the original author must be cited in parenthesis, followed by the name of the author who effected the

alteration. The same holds when a subdivision of a genus, a species, or a taxon of lower rank, is transferred to another genus or species with or without alteration of its rank or when a variety or lower taxon is placed under another subspecific epithet. The name of the original author must be cited in parenthesis even if he has himself effected the alteration, except in the case where a subspecies is placed in a lower rank (e.g. as a variety) under the same specific name, or vice versa, when the name in parenthesis may be dropped. If an epithet designating the *typical* subspecies of a species is intercalated between the specific epithet and the epithet of a variety of lower taxon which was originally placed { immediately after the specific epithet } directly under the species } this does not warrant an alteration of the author citation after the epithet of the variety or lower unit. The same holds for an author's name cited after an epithet of a plant described as a species if this turns out to be an interspecific hybrid or chimaera but retains its binary name; it is, however, recommendable in this case to add the words *pro specie* (abbr. pro sp.). In the corresponding way the name of the author who first created the epithet of a species or an interspecific chimaera as that of an interspecific hybrid should be followed by the words *pro hybrida* (pro hybr.).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Rehder): This was accepted by the Utrecht Conference and rejected by the American Botanists. I see no objection against the addition of the word „legitimate”; it is no change in the principle of the rule, but merely a textual improvement.

Proposal 2 (Handel-Mazzetti): This addition seems superfluous.

Proposal 3 (Japanese Botanists): Referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposal 4 (Hylander): Not recommended for acceptance.

The last part of the proposal dealing with interspecific hybrids and chimaeras (cf. the proposed new article 49 bis) to be referred to the Special Committee.

NEW ARTICLE 49 bis

PROP. (1940 — 14; M. L. SPRAGUE)

When the status of a group bearing a binary name is altered from species to hybrid or vice versa, the original author must be cited, followed by an indication of the original status in brackets.

„Examples: *Stachys ambigua* Sm. Engl. Bot. XXX, t. 2089 (1810), was published as a species. If regarded as a hybrid, it must be cited as × *Stachys ambigua* Sm. (pro sp.). The binary name × *Salix glaucops* Anderss. in DC. Prodr. XVI, pt. II, 281 (1868) was published as the name of a hybrid. Later, Rydberg in Bull. N. Y. Bot. Gard. I, 270 (1899) altered the status of the group to that of a species.

If this view is accepted, the name must be cited as *Salix glaucops* Anderss. (pro hybr.).”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposal was accepted by the Utrecht Conference.
It is to be referred to the Special Committee.

NEW ARTICLE 49 ter

PROP. (1950 — 69; ASSOCIATION OF APPLIED BIOLOGISTS)

To avoid changes in specific names of plants where these would cause unnecessary confusion or inconvenience, earlier specific names (synonyms or homonyms) may be rejected. Such names for rejection, after having been agreed upon at an International Congress, should be published as a supplement to the Rules. The names should be regarded as illegitimate and consequently without any effect on botanical nomenclature. It should be emphasised that the standing of the generic name is in no way influenced.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This new article means to introduce „epitheta specifica conservanda”. I do not think it advisable to accept this article. If accepted it should be placed in section 3 after Art. 21.

RECOMMENDATION XXX.

Authors' names put after names of plants are abbreviated, unless they are very short. For this purpose preliminary particles or letters that, strictly speaking, do not form part of the name, are suppressed, and the only are given (Br. for Brown); if the name has two or more syllables is long enough to make it worth while to abridge it, the first consonants only are given (Br. for Brown); if the name have two or more syllables the first syllable and the first letter of the following one are taken, or the two first when both are consonants (Juss. for Jussieu, Rich. for Richard). When it is necessary to give more of a name to avoid confusion between names beginning with the same syllables the same system is to be followed. For instance two syllables are given together with the one or two first consonants of the third; or one of the last characteristic consonants of the name is added (Berto. for Bertolini, to distinguish from Bertero; Michx. for Michaux, to distinguish from Micheli).

Christian names or accessory designations, serving to distinguish two botanists of the same name, are abridged in the same way (Adr. Juss. for Adrien de Jussieu, Gaertn. fil. for Gaertner filius).

When it is a well established custom to abridge a name in another manner, it is best to conform to it (L. for Linnaeus, DC. for De Candolle, St.-Hil. for Saint-Hilaire).

In publications destined for the general public and in titles it is preferable not to abridge.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)

Insert at the end of the first sentence: „(F. Muell. for Baron Ferdinand von Mueller, not F. v. M. or F. v. Muell.)”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)

Read for „are abbreviated”: „may be abbreviated”.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

Change to read as follows:

„XXX Author's name placed after plant names may be abbreviated as follows if convenient:

„(1) Preliminary letters and particles, such as *de, du, von, van,* etc. are omitted.

„(2) Titles such as *Baron, Doctor,* etc. are equally omitted.

„(3) Names of one or two syllables are not generally abbreviated.

„(4) Names of three or more syllables are generally abbreviated to the first syllable plus the consonants at the beginning of the second syllable.

„Examples: Cham. (for Adalbert von Chamisso), Desf. (for R. L. Desfontaines).

„(5) In cases of joint authorship, each name may be abbreviated to its first syllable and the consonants at the beginning of the second syllable. Sometimes each name may be abbreviated to its first letter. Compound names may be abbreviated in the same way.

„Examples: Fern. & Weath. (for Fernald and Weatherby), C. & S. (for Chamisso and Schlechtendal), R. & S. (for Roemer and Schultes), HBK. (for Humboldt, Bonpland & Kunth), BSP. (for Britton, Sterns and Poppenberg), H.-M. or Hand.-Mazz. (for Handel-Mazetti).

„(6) Two authors with the same family name may be distinguished by their initials or, if one is the son of the other by the abbreviation f. (for filius), etc. If the earlier author is the better known one, only the later author or authors need diacritic initials or abbreviations.

„Examples: D. Don and G. Don., L. and L.f., DC. and A. DC., Gray and S.F. Gray

„(7) Well established abbreviations may be retained even if not in agreement with the above.

Examples: DC. (for A. P. de Candolle), L. (for C. Linnaeus), Br. (for R. Brown), Sm. (for J. E. Smith), W. (for Willdenow), Mx. (for A. Michaux).

„(8) In titles and in publications intended for the general public it is preferable not to abridge.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Sprague): Recommended for acceptance. It was accepted by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Japanese Botanists): I recommend to read: „should be abbreviated”.

Proposal 3 (Boivin): Acceptance not recommended, as this text is not really superior to the original one.

RECOMMENDATION XXXI

When citing a name published as a synonym, the words „as synonym” or *pro synonym.* should be added to the citation.

When an author published as a synonym a manuscript name of another author, the word *ex* should be used to connect the names of the two authors.

Example: *Myrtus serratus* Koenig *ex* Steudel *Nomencl.* 321 (1821), *pro synonym.*, a manuscript name of Koenig's published by Steudel as a synonym of *Eugenia laurina* Willd.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Read for „*ex*”: *apud.*

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended as „*ex*” is in accordance with Art. 48.

NEW RECOMMENDATION XXXI bis

PROP. 1940 — 6. 1950 — 62; REHDER

„When citing a published name as a synonym, it should be cited as published, without alteration of gender, spelling, designation of categories or of a parenthetical author if given. When citing a nomen nudum, this should be indicated by adding *nom.* or *nom. nud.*”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The first part of this proposal has already been included in the Rules as Rec. XXXII septies. The second part is recommended for acceptance.

RECOMMENDATION XXXII

The citation of authors, earlier than the starting point of the nomenclature of a group, is indicated when considered useful or desirable, preferably between brackets or by the use of the word *ex*. This method is especially applicable in mycology when reference is made to authors earlier than Fries or Persoon.

Examples: *Lupinus* (Tournef. *Inst.* 392, t. 213 : 1719) *L. Sp. Pl.* ed. 1, 721 (1753) and *Gen. Pl.* ed. 5, 332, or *Lupinus* Tourn. *ex. L.*; *Boletus piperatus* (Bull. *Hist.*

Champ. Fr. 318, t. 451, f. 2 : 1791—1812) Fries. *Syst. Myc.* I, 388 (1821). or *Boletus piperatus* Bull. ex Fries.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Empf. XXXII fällt, wenigstens, was das erste Beispiel betrifft, weg.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 47, 1950 — 78; HERTER)

Delete the second sentence.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Handel-Mazzetti): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Herter): Not recommended.

RECOMMENDATION XXXII bis

When citing in synonymy a name invalidated by an earlier homonym the citation should be followed by the name of the author of the earlier homonym preceded by the word „non”, preferably with the date of publication added. In some instances it will be advisable to cite also any later homonym or homonyms.

Examples: *Ulmus racemosa* Thomas in *Am. Journ. Sci.* XIX (1831) 170; non Bork. (1800). — *Lindera* Thunb. *Nov. Gen.* III (1773) 44; non Adans. (1763). — *Bartlinga* Brogn. in *Ann. Sci. Nat. sér. I, X* (1827) 373; non Reichenbach (1824), nec. F. Muell. (1877).

NO PROPOSALS

RECOMMENDATION XXXII ter

Misapplications of names should not be included in synonymy. Misapplied names may be mentioned in notes appended to the synonymy but distinct from it, or to the description where there is no synonymy.

(Wording left to Editorial Committee — vide Rep. 364. The expression „mentioned in notes” seems preferable to „included in notes” originally proposed by me (Rep. 363). T. A. Sprague).

PROP. 1 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Empf. XXXII ter. Wird eine falsche Anwendung eines Namens in der Synonymie zitiert, so geschieht es in der Form: *Pinus inops* sensu Bongard in *Mém. Ac. Sc. St. Péterb.*, sér. 6, II, 163 (1883), non Ait. 1789. — *Quercus rubra* sensu Duroi, *Observ. Bot.* 35 (1771), non L. 1743. — *Alepyrum* sensu Hook. f. p. p., emend. Hieronymus in *Abh. Nat. Ges. Halle*, XII, 217 (1873), non R. Br. 1810.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 62; WEATHERBY)

Add as follows:

„When it becomes necessary to refer to a name applied in such a

way as to exclude the type of the original author, and conservation does not intervene, both the original author of the name and the author who misapplied it are to be cited, in such a manner as to make clear what has occurred.

„Examples: Nuttall mistakenly applied the name *Lycopodium tristachyum* Pursh to a form of *L. clavatum*; the citation „*L. tristachyum* sensu Nutt. Gen. 2 : 247 (1818), non Pursh” indicates this. The citation „*Carex oligocarpa* Schkuhr’ Muhl. Descr. Gram. 242 (1817)” similarly indicates that Muhlenberg misapplied Schkuhr’s name. On the other hand, the citation „*Mertensia* Willd. Sv. Vet. Akad. Nya Handl. 1804: 163 (1804), non Roth (1797)” indicates that Willdenow’s name is a later homonym; and this form of citation is to reserved for such cases.”

PROP. 3 (1950 — 46; BOTANISTES BELGES)

Le texte suivant est soumis à l’examen du congrès:

„Les erreurs de détermination ne seront pas incluses, mais ajoutées après la synonymie. Tout nom mal appliqué sera indiqué par les mots „Auct. non” suivis du nom de l’auteur original et des citations des erreurs de détermination.”

Exemple: *Ficus stortophylla* Warb. in Warb. et de Wild., Ann. Mus. Congo Belge, Bot., Sér. VI, I, p. 32 (1904).

F. irumuensis De Wild., Pl. Bequaert., I, p. 341 (1922).

F. exasperata Auct. non Vahl; De Wild. et Th. Dur., Ann. Mus. Congo Belge, Bot., Sér. II, I, p. 54 (1899); De Wild., Plant. Laur., p. 27 (1903); Th. et H. Durand, Syll. Fl. Congol., p. 505 (1909).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The Proposals 1, 2, and 3 differ but slightly. I would recommend acceptance of Proposal 3, which is in my opinion the clearest solution of the problem.

Proposal 1 (Handel-Mazzetti): In principle accepted by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Weatherby): Accepted by the Utrecht Conference and by the American Botanists.

RECOMMENDATION XXXII quater

In citation of literature „in” should be inserted after the name of the author if the citation refers to a periodical or other serial publication, or if it is a work by another author.

Examples: *Quercus lobata* Née in *Anal. Ci. Nat.* III (1801), 277. *Faxonanthus* Greenman in Sargent, *Trees and Shrubs*, I (1902) 23.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

Delete Rec. XXXII quater and transfer its text complete with examples to Art.48.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended for acceptance.

RECOMMENDATION XXXII quinquies

If a name cited in synonymy applies only in part to the group under which it is cited, it should be made clear whether the synonym includes the type, and in that case the words „pro parte typica” (p.p.typ.) should be appended; in more exact citations the parts excluded or those belonging to the group in question should be cited, or the name of the author who changed the circumscription of the group should be added, preceded by „emend”.

Examples: *Bradlea* Adans. II (1763), 324, quoad synonym. — *Apios* Cornut (cited a synonym of *Apios* Med.), — *Acer laxiflorum* var. *longilobum* Rehd. in Sarg. *Pl. Wilson.* 1 (1911), 94, p.p. typ., excl. specim. Wilson no. 4108 (cited under *A. taronense* Hand.-Mazz.). — *Sorbus sikkimensis* Wenzig in *Linnaea*, XXXVIII (1874), 59, quoad specim. „*Pyrus* (a) Khasia, 5000 alt.” (cited under *S. verrucosa* (Dene.) Rehd.). — *Cleyera* Thunb. emend. Sieb. et Zucc *Fl. Jap.* (1835) 151.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

After the words „should be appended”, add:
”, or if the type is excluded the words typo excluso, (typo excl.) should be appended;”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 62; FOSBERG)

Add as a second paragraph:

„It is, however, to be regarded as much better practice and less likely to cause confusion not to include in synonymy the parts of concepts from which the type of the name has been excluded. These are much better referred to in discussion instead of in formal synonymy.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

In my opinion the whole Recommendation might be deleted as it does not deal with nomenclature sensu stricto.

If it is retained acceptance of Boivin's proposal is recommended. Fosberg's proposal was in principle accepted by the Utrecht Conference; it was rejected by the American botanists. Its acceptance is not recommended, as it contradicts the main idea of the recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION XXXII sexies

If a generic name antedated by one of its synonyms or by a homonym is valid on account of being a nomen conservandum, the words „nom. conserv.” should be added to the citation, e.g. *Protea* R. Br. in *Trans. Linn. Soc.* X (1810) 74, nom. conserv.; non L. (1753).

NO PROPOSALS

RECOMMENDATION XXXII septies

When citing names in synonymy, the names or combinations of names should be cited exactly as published by their author. If any explanatory words are required, these should be inserted in brackets. If a name is adopted as valid with alterations from the form as originally published, it is desirable that in full citations the exact original form should be appended.

Examples: *Pyrus Calleryana* Decne. (*Pyrus Mairei* Léveillé in Fedde, Rep. XII. 189 : 1913) or (*P. Mairei* Léveillé in Fedde Rep. XII. 189 : 1913: „*Pyrus*”). Not *Pyrus Mairei*. — *Evonymus alata* Regel, Fl. Ussur. (1861) 40, „*alatus*” (*Euonymus Loeseneri* Makino in Bot. Mag. Tokyo, XXV. 229 : 1911). Not *Evonymus Loeseneri*. — *Zanthoxylum cribrosum* Spreng. Syst. I (1825) 946, „*Xanthoxylon*”. (*Xanthoxylon*” *Caribaeum* var. *Floridanum* A. Gray in Proc. Am. Acad. n.s. XXIII. 225 : 1888). Not *Z. caribaeum* var. *floridanum* (Nutt.) A. Gray. — *Quercus bicolor* Willd. (*Q. Prinus discolor* Michaux, Hist. Arb. For. II. 46 : 1812). Not *Q. Prinus* var. *discolor* Michaux. — *Spiraea latifolia* (Ait.) Borkh. (*Spiraea salicifolia latifolia* Aiton Hort. Kew. II. 198 : 1789). Not *S. salicifolia latifolia* Aiton or *S. salicifolia* var. *latifolia* Aiton. — *Juniperus communis* var. *montana* Aiton (*J. communis* (var.) 3 *nana* Loudon, Arb. Brit. IV. 2489 : 1838). In this case „var.” may be added in brackets, since Loudon classes this combination under „varieties”. — *Ribes tricuspis* Nakai in Bot. Mag. Tokyo XXX, (1916) 142, „*tricuspe*”.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 62; WEATHERBY)

Amend to read:

„In all citation of names, especially in synonymy, rank and method of indicating rank should be given exactly as published by the author. Spelling and gender should be those correct under the Rules; variant spellings may be recorded in parentheses or in quotes.”

(Note to Editorial Committee: If so amended, the first example should be changed to read: „*Pyrus Calleryana* Decaisne [*P. Mairei* Lev. (as *Pyrus*).” Examples of *Quercus discolor*, *Spiraea latifolia* and *Juniperus communis* var. *montana* should be retained, the others omitted.)

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposal was rejected by the Utrecht Conference and by the American Botanists.

NEW RECOMMENDATIONS to follow REC. XXXII septies

PROP. 1950 — 83; FURTADO

Rec. XXXII B: Transfer here Rec. IV after deleting „The subdivision which is” in the first sentence and after adding „or type-specimen” after „type-species” and substituting the word „type” for „type-variety or” in the second line.

Rec. XXXII C: Transfer here Rec. V after substituting „When subdividing or splitting a genus” for „When revising a genus”, and adding „or specimen” after „species”.

(The word „revised” is used in a different sense in taxonomy, and revisers do not usually have opportunities to indicate lectotypes. Except in

splitting or subdividing a group, revisers should not attempt to select lectotypes for fear of misdirecting future investigations.
Rec. XXXII D: Transfer here Rec. VI.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended for acceptance.

**SECTION 8. RETENTION OF NAMES OR EPITHETS OF GROUPS
WHICH ARE REMODELLED OR DIVIDED**

PROP. 1 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Add „Typification and” before the existing title.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended.

ART. 50

An alteration of the diagnostic characters, or of the circumscription of a group, does not warrant a change in its name, except in so far as this may be necessitated (1) by transference of the group (Art. 53—55), or (2) by its union with another group of the same rank (Art. 56—57), or (3) by a change of its rank (Art. 58).

Examples: The genus *Myosotis* as revised by R. Brown differs from the original genus of Linnaeus, but the generic name has not been changed, nor is a change allowable, since the type of *Myosotis* L. remains in the genus. — Various authors have united with *Centaurea Jacea* L. one or two types which Linnaeus had kept distinct; the group thus constituted must be called *Centaurea Jacea* L. sensu ampl. or *Centaurea Jacea* L. em. Cosson et Germain, em. Visiani, or em. Godron etc.: the creation of a new name such as *Centaurea vulgaris* Godr. is superfluous.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 62; AMERICAN TAXONOMISTS)

Delete the last sentence of the examples and substitute the following:

„Various authors have united with *Centaurea Jacea* L. one or two species which Linnaeus had kept distinct; the group so constituted must be called *Centaurea Jacea* L.; the creation of a new name such as *Centaurea vulgaris* Godr. is superfluous.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposal was accepted both by the Utrecht Conference and by the American Botanists.

The term „superfluous” might perhaps be changed in „not allowed”.

NEW ARTICLE 50 bis

PROP. 1950 — 83; FURTADO

„The type of the name of an Order or Suborder is a Family, that

of the name of a Family, Tribe or Subtribe is a Genus, and that of the name of a Genus, a Species, or a group of lower rank, is usually a specimen or preparation. Where a new species includes the type-specimen of a simultaneously published genus, the type of the genus and the type of the species shall be identical; the name of the species shall then be retained to the generic type. Where the name of the species that includes the type of a new genus is an isonym of a previous name, the type of the new genus and the type of the isonym may not be identical; and so the genus may be so split as not to retain the specific isonym under it. Where permanent preservation of a specimen or preparation is impossible, the application of the name of a genus and other subordinate groups is determined by means of an original description or figure.

Note: No name may be used for a supra-generic group if it is taken from the name of a genus not retained under the group even as a synonym.

(This combines the second part of Art. 18, and Art. 66. Other changes were required because in many cases the so-called „type” species is not the type of the genus).

Examples: Transfer here the example under Art. 18 but delete „and description” in the third line. Transfer here also the examples from Art. 66.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended for acceptance. It is mainly dealt with under Art. 18.

ART. 51.

When a genus is divided into two or more genera, the generic name must be retained for one of them, or (if it has not been retained), must be reestablished. When a particular species was originally designated as the type, the generic name must be retained for the genus including that species. When no type was designated, a type must be chosen according to the regulations given (Appendix I).

Examples: The genus *Glycine* L. *Sp. Pl.* ed. I, 753 (1753) was divided by Adanson (*Fam. Pl.* II, 324, 327, 562:1763) into the two genera *Bradlea* and *Abrus*; this procedure is contrary to Art. 51; the name *Glycine* must be kept for one of the genera, and it is now retained for part of *Glycine* (1753). — The genus *Aesculus* L. contains the sections *Eu-Aesculus*, *Pavia* (Poir.), *Macrothyrsus* (Spach) and *Calothyrsus* (Spach), the last three of which were regarded as distinct genera by the authors cited in parenthesis: in the event of these four sections being treated as genera, the name *Aesculus* must be kept for the first of these, which includes the species *Aesculus Hippocastanum* L., as this species is the type of the genus founded by Linnaeus (*Sp. Pl.* ed. I, 344:1753; *Gen. Pl.* ed. 5, 1754); Tournefort's name *Hippocastanum* must not be used as was done by Gaertner (*Fruct.* II, 1735; 1791).

PROP. 1 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Revise: „When an author has included under one taxonomic group two or more different elements (a mixtum compositum) and no

holotype has been indicated, the first subsequent author who recognizes the mixed composition of the group and selects a lectotype on adequate botanical reasons (Art. 22 B and Note I below), or transfers the discordant elements to another taxonomic group, shall be followed, provided the name is retained to one of the original elements (see Art. 20A bis Note 1 and Art. 50B bis). If the name has not been retained to any of the original syntypes, it must be reestablished to one of them. Where the holotype has been indicated even indirectly the name must be retained to it except in cases indicated in the notes below.

Note 1: If two or more interpretations are possible, and if no syntypes are available or when available are inadequate for the correct interpretation of the taxonomic group (a negative mixtum compositum), the neotype shall be so selected as to defend the earliest interpretation that agrees with the general plant-geographical and descriptive considerations and keeps the major group in the position assigned by the author. (See Art. 22 B).

Example: Transfer here examples from Arts. 51 and 52, and Add: *Rhus filicina* DC. (1825) was based on two unpublished drawings (Ic. 189 and 217) and on two manuscript species based on these drawings (*R. filicina* and *R. tetlaziam*), both of which were regarded by De Candolle as conspecific. The manuscript species and the drawings were all by Sessé and Moçino. About 50 years later, Ic. no. 189 was printed and published as being the type of *R. filicina*. This drawing is not well made and appears to be of a plant with bi- and tri-pinnate leaves. On this character the species has been regarded as conspecific with *Amyris bipinnata* Sessé et Moçino, Ic. 197 ex DC. (1825) (the basynym of *Bursera bipinnata* (DC.) Engl., 1881), the implication being that De Candolle had made a mistake in describing the leaves. Others, however, disagree with this reduction and suppose that the leaf characters may have been badly drawn by De Candolle's artist, who had to copy hurriedly from Sessé and Moçino's original drawings. These maintain that the clear description of the leaves and of the fruits admit no doubt as to its identity as a species of *Rhus* as understood by De Candolle, and not *Bursera bipinnata*. (For controversy cf. Barkley in Ann. Miss. Bot. Gard. XXIV, 1937, pp. 1—10 et 3 pl.; Barkley and Reed in Am. Midl. Nat. XXI, 1939, pp. 368—377; Bullock in Kew Bull. 1937, pp. 440—441 and 1939, pp. 337—339).

In Ic. 189 no fruit is represented, and flowers are too poor for any generic identification. The facts that De Candolle described the fruit of the species, mentioned the vernacular name Tetlaziam, and stated that the species had simple imparipinnate leaves with pinnatifid sessile leaflets, lead one to typify *R. filicina* DC. (1825) on the second syntype, namely, *R. tetlaziam* Sessé et Moçino msc Ic. 217 (ined.); for this syntype agrees well with all the characters mentioned by De Candolle, and it is also the one that has a fruit. Hence this syntype must be the lecto-type of *R. filicina* (Barkley has indicated a neo-type cf. example 3 under Note 3 below).

(N.B. Those who typify the species on Ic. 189, alleging that the species was based „primarily” on Ic. 189, and not Ic. 217, overlooked the fact that *R. filicina* as published in 1825 was not *R. filicina* Sessé et Moçino in vel apud DC., but *R. filicina* Sessé et Moçino ex DC., the latter expression being equivalent to *R. filicina* DC. Hence in typifying the species, De Candolle's syntypes, and not Sessé and Moçino's holotype, should be considered. In 1874 only Ic. 189 was published, apparently because it was the type of the manuscript name, but unfortunately it is the syntype that had to be excluded from the mixtum compositum. This is a good instance of a misdirection of studies by publishing in

1874 only one drawing (instead of two) as the type of *R. filicina*, and justifies my protest „against unnecessary alterations being made in the status of the syntype even when the changes made are by the author of the species himself.” (Gard. Bull. Straits Settl. IX, 1937, pp. 296—299).

Note 2: Notes left by the author on herbarium-sheets shall not be used to discredit a typification previously made. Such notes, however, may be employed to supplement the published data and in selecting a lectotype if none has been previously indicated (either directly or indirectly). This lectotype may be chosen only when the current interpretation is not clear and does not accord with the general plant-geographical and descriptive considerations.

Note 3: If a new genus is based on new specimens but an old species has been indicated as the type and if it is found that the indicated type-species is generically or specifically different from the new type-specimens studied, the new genus shall then be typified on the new specimens on which the generic description was based.

Example 1: The genus *Binghamia* Britt. and Rose in Cactaceae II (1920) 167 was created to receive two old species, *Cephalocereus melanostele* Vaupel (1913) and *Cereus acranthus* Vaupel (1913). The two isonyms instated under the new genus were *B. melanostele* and *B. acrantha*, the former being indicated as the type-species of the new genus. But, as pointed out by Bullock in Kew Bull. (1938) 454—458 there is no evidence that the authors actually saw the type of the species indicated as the type of the genus; and it is evident that the genus was based on newer material which, because of the similarity of habit and also because of its occurrence in the type-locality was mistaken for *C. melanostele* Vaupel. The latter, being a species of *Epostoa* Britt. et Rose in Cactaceae II (1920) 60, has yielded the new isonym *E. melanostele* (Vaupel) Bullock (1938). But, despite this transference of the indicated type-species of *Binghamia*, the latter genus does not become a synonym of *Epostoa*; for *Binghamia* is to be typified on the actual material on which the generic description was based, though mistaken for *C. melanostele*. This material has been shown to be conspecific with *Cereus* (sect. *Binghamia*) *pseudomelanostele* Werdermann et Backeberg in Neue Kakteen (1931) 74—75 (quoted by Bullock), and so the new combination has been rightly instated by Bullock as *Binghamia pseudomelanostele* (Werdermann et Backeberg) Bullock (1938). The type-specimens of this species and those of the genus, though conspecific are not identical.

Example 2: In instating *Goniophlebium* Presl (1836), an original generic description was given, and two out of the five species were figured. These two species (the only ones seen by Presl) were from America. Presl also cited under the genus, *Polypodium* sect. *Goniophlebium* Bl. (1830); but all three of Blume's species were cited with some doubt, and with the following explanatory note: „Species Blumeanas non vidi et solummodo ex auctoritate clar. Blume huc retuli”. The fact that Presl referred all the syntypes of Blume's section doubtfully to his genus is important because no genus can be typified on the species or specimens which have been referred doubtfully to it. Presl was free to use any name for his genus, and the fact that he typified his genus on the specimens studied by him is an important point to bear in mind. Had he also included the specimens and the species of Blume without expressing any doubt, the genus would have had to be typified as in the case of example 1. But, as it is, the case is quite clear: the genus must be typified on the American syntypes studied and described by Presl.

(In genera *Filicum* (1947) pag. 181 Copeland writes that Presl could not take the name from Blume without also taking „whatever type of Blume properly went with the name”. Yet in discussing *Anapausia* Copeland (op. cit. 132) writes: „In general, when the status of a group is changed as from a section to a genus, its type goes with it. But in this particular case, in publishing *Anapausia* as a genus

Presl cited „*Gymnopteris* par. 2 *Anapausia* Presl (excl. speciebus)”. So Copeland does not accept the type of the Section as the type of the Genus *Anapausia*. What is allowed in one case should also be allowed in the other).

Example 3: In establishing the monotypic genus *Actinocheita*, Barkley (Ann. Miss. Bot. Gard. XXIV, 1937, pp. 1—10 and 3 pl.) supposed, that the syntype Ic. 189 of *Rhus filicina* DC. (1825) was somewhat misdrawn by the artist, but, because of the description of the leaves and the fruit typified the species on Pringle 4752 (a neo-type). From this neo-type Barkley drew the principal characters of the genus. Hence the genus must be typified on Pringle 4752, and the „type” species should include that specimen.

(Bullock in Kew Bull. 1937, 440—441 and 1939, 337—339 has advocated that the type of this genus should be *Rhus potentilifolia* Turcz. with Galeoti 4006 A as the type, and, therefore, he has made a new combination *A. potentilifolia* (Turcz.) Bullock. Against this Barkley (l.c.) and Barkley and Reed (Am. Midl. Nat. XXI 1939, 368—377, quoted by Bullock) have argued that the genus should be typified on *Rhus filicina* DC. with Ic. 189 as the type, suggesting that if this type is not retained, the genus should receive another name. Hence the type-species is called *R. filicina* (DC.) Barkley. But in the example discussed under the foregoing Note 1, it has been shown, that *R. filicina* DC. should be typified on Ic. 217, the manuscript-type of *R. Tetlaziam* Sessé et Moçino msc. Thus typified *R. filicina* DC. becomes conspecific with Pringle 4752. The correct name for the species that includes the type of *Actinocheita* is, therefore, *A. filicina* (DC.) Barkley emendavit Furtado).

Example 4: *Hemigramma* Christ in Philipp. Jour. Sc. II (1907) was established as a monotypic genus with *H. Zollingeri* (Kurz) Christ (*Heminiotis Zollingeri* Kurz) as the species, and with *H. Zollingeri* var. *major* (Copel.) Christ as a variety. Christ excluded from the genus *Leptochilus latifolius* (Meyen) Christ (*Gymnopteris taccaefolia* Sm. and *G. latifolia* Meyen). Now it is maintained that *G. latifolia* is identical with *H. Zollingeri* and that therefore the type species of *Hemigramma* should be *H. latifolia* (Meyen) Copel. (1907) (*G. latifolia* Meyen), that is, precisely the species that was explicitly excluded from the genus.

Actually the genus was described from new specimens studied by Christ, namely: (1) from „Batavia, Java, ex Herb. Hort. Bot. Bogor., and from Celebes, leg. Sarasin” with which Kurz’s figure was compared and (2) from the Philippines cited under the var. *major*. In typifying the genus all these specimens must be considered, and not only those cited under the variety, as has been suggested by Copeland in Science LXIX (1939) 328. Under certain circumstances *H. latifolia* may be the legitimate (correct) name for the species that includes the lectotype of the genus, but the genus must not be typified on the type of this species (cf. also Copeland, Gen. Filicum, 1947, p. 131).

Note 4: In Fungi Caeteri all the genera and the species instated validly for the first time in Fries Systema Mycologicum (1831—32) shall be typified on the descriptions given, and the specimens and the figures cited or implied by Fries, the discoverer of a mixtum compositum being free to chose anyone of these as a lectotype. However, a genus or species validly instated for the first time by another author after the issue of the first part of Systema (1821), but taken up subsequently by Fries in another part of his Systema shall be typified on the types and description given by the original author, disregarding the newer circumscriptions and types given by Fries.

Note 5: If in instating a new name there was cited an equivalent priorable synonym of which the new name may be taken as a new combination under Arts. 53A bis and 56A bis, then the new name

shall be taken as the isonym of the cited synonym and typified accordingly, even though the instatement was accompanied by a new description and by an indication of a new holotype. If two or more synonyms have equal claim to be the basynym and no clue has been given by the author to discriminate between the rival claims, then the earliest of the synonyms shall be taken as the basynym. If the cited synonym was impriorable, the new name shall be typified (that is, when no holotype has been indicated) on any of the syntypes; the lectotype thus chosen may or may not be the type of the cited synonym.

Example 1: In Example (d) under Art. 56 A (1939), *Petunia minima* Reiche (1910) is a priorable isonym of *Nicotiana minima* Phil. (1864) non Molina (1782). Hence *Combera minima* Sandw. (1939) must be taken as a new combination of *P. minima* Reiche (1910), though Sandwith regarded the former as a new name and had indicated a new type.

Example 2: *Cratoxylon formosum* Dyer (Fl. Brit. Ind. I, 1874, p. 258) was instated by a new description accompanied by the citation of two synonyms: *Elodea formosa* Jack (1822) and *Tridemis formosa* Korth. (1839). These synonyms are not typonymous, and Dyer did not indicate which of these two should be taken as the basynym of his name. Hence *E. formosa*, being earlier of the two, must be taken as the basynym of *C. formosum* Dyer, and the latter must be typified accordingly.

Example 3: Under *Ixora affinis* Don var. *arguta* Craib comb. nov. (1934) no description was given, but the two following synonyms were cited: *Ixora arguta* King (1904) and *Ixora nigricans* Wight et Arn. var. *arguta* Hk. (1880). Since no varietal description can validate a species, and since a specific description can validate a variety (Art. 37 A bis-4 d), it is obvious that Craib's variety must be typified on the type of *I. arguta* King, and not on the variety cited in the synonyms. (See also the example in Note 8 below).

Note 6: If a new combination has been based on a priorable synonym of equal rank against the priority rule (Art. 56A bis), this new combination shall be typified on its basynym.

Example 1: *Shorea costata* Presl., Rostlinei II (1825) 66 was published by citing *Pterigium costatum* Correa (1806) and *Dryobalanops aromatica* Gaertn. f. (1805). Though *D. aromatica* Gaertn. f. was older and priorable, and Preslem had violated the rule of priority, *S. costata* Presl. must be typified on *P. costata* Correa. Under *Shorea*, *S. costata* (Correa) Presl. must be used whenever the synonyms are regarded as taxonomically different.

(Symington states that the two synonyms are taxonomically different: Gard. Bull. Straits Settl. X (1939) 368-369 in Observ. sub *Shorea submontana*).

Note 7: If a synonym that appears like a basynym is merely an expression to denote its misapplication, then the new name shall be typified on the new description and its syntypes; if no such new description was made available under the new name, the question of typification does not arise, since the new name is invalid (Art. 37A bis Note 4-f).

Example 1: See the discussion of *Goniophlebium* Presl. in Note 3, Example 3.

Example 2: *Heleocharis capitata* R. Br. (1810) was based on a new description and citation of a misapplication of *Scirpus capitatus* L. sensu Willd., with a clear indication that the types of the latter species were excluded. Hence the species

must be typified on the description and the syntypes given by R. Brown, and not on the types of *Scirpus capitatus* L.

(Much confusion has been caused by typifying *H. capitata* R. Br. on *S. capitatus* L. For fuller detail see Furtado in Gard. Bull. Straits Settl. IX, 1937, pp. 293-294).

Note 8: If a name is intended to be a new combination based on a synonym not admissible under Art. 37A bis, the name shall be typified on the new description and its syntypes; if no such new description was given under the name, the question of typification does not arise, since the name cannot be valid.

Example 1: *Ixora arguta* King in Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal LXXII (1904) 74 was instated by a description, accompanied by a citation, in the synonyms, of *L. nigricans* R. Br. var. *arguta* Hk. f. (1889). Since under Art. 37 A bis-4(d), a varietal description cannot be cited to establish a species, *I. arguta* King must be typified on the types indicated by King, and not by Hooker.

(In Gard. Bull. Straits Settl. IX (1937) 294-296, I gave a different typification, since the rules admit references to a varietal description in validating a species. Amendments have now been proposed to prohibit this procedure, as it causes serious complications in plant taxonomy and nomenclature.

Example 2: *Hoya esculenta* (Rumphius) Tsiang comb. nov. in Sunyatsenia III (1936) 176 was instated by citing *Sussuela esculentum* Rumph. Herb. Amb. V (1747) 467 t-175 f. 2 (an invalid name with non-validable description-see Art. 20 A), *Hoya diversifolia* Bl. (1826) and *H. orbiculata* Wight (1832), the last two being priorable synonyms. The epithet in the invalid synonym has been used in the mistaken belief that it had the right to priority; but since its description cannot validate *H. esculentum*, this new binomial must be regarded as invalid. cf. Example in Note 9).

Note 9: If a new name (nomen novum) has been instated by citation of a valid synonym, and by a new description, and no holotype has been indicated, all the syntypes of the description shall be included in the typification of the new name. If no new description was given, than the isonym shall be typified on the basynym.

Example 1: *Anodendron manubriatum* (Wall.) Merr. comb. nov. in Philipp. Journ. Sci. VII (1912) 333 was created by citing the following synonyms: *Echites manubriata* Wall. Cat. (1829) n. 1663 (a nomen nudum); *E. paniculata* Roxb. (1832) (a later homonym of *E. paniculata* Poir.); *E. coriacea* Wall. Cat. n. 4464 (a misinterpretation of *E. coriacea* Bl.); *A. paniculata* (Roxb.) DC. (1884) (a priorable name).

No new description was given. The epithet *manubriata* was adopted for the new name on the mistaken belief, that *A. paniculatum* DC. was impriorable and that the Wallichian combination supplied the earliest epithet „that is tenable, although originally a nomen nudum.” Since Merrill intended *A. manubriatum* to be a new name for *A. paniculata* (Roxb.) DC., which he considered mistakenly to be impriorable, Merrill's new name should be valid with reference to the description of *A. paniculata*. (*E. manubriatum* was clearly recognized as a nomen nudum unable to validate a new combination. Wallich had intended it to be a new name for *E. paniculata* Roxb., but unfortunately the publication of the latter was delayed and rendered the former name invalid).

Note 10: If a specific name has been instated as a „new combination” with the generic name of the basynym as the specific epithet in the combination, the new name, though unsatisfactory under the priority rule, shall be typified on the basynym, disregarding a new description and new types.

Examples: *Artocarpus polyphemia* Pers. (1807) was based on *Polyphemia Champeden* Lour. (1790) and the description; the former, which was a legitimate isonym under the old custom, must be typified on the type of the latter (basinym). (It should not be possible to typify this isonym differently so as to permit its being considered not synonymous with *Artocarpus Champeden*).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This proposal is not recommended. It is partly dealing with typification, which belongs under Art. 18.

It must again be emphasized that the only result of such elaborate attempts for greater precision would be that hardly anybody would consult the Rules. Part of the huge material collected by the proposer, may perhaps be of use to the Editorial Committee.

Many of Furtado's proposals, of which the above is a very typical specimen, have the character of a scientific interpretation of the Rules, but this is out of place. What we need are concise and easily comprehensible Articles.

ART. 52

When a species is divided into two or more species, the specific epithet must be retained for one of them, or (if it has not been retained) must be re-established. When a particular specimen was originally designated as the type, the specific epithet must be retained for the species including that specimen. When no type was designated, a type must be chosen according to the regulations given (Appendix I).

The same rule applies to subdivisions of species, for example, to a subspecies divided into two or more subspecies, or to a variety divided into two or more varieties.

Examples: *Lychnis dioica* L. *Sp. Pl.* ed. I, 437, was divided by Philip Miller (*Gard. Dict.* ed. 8, nn. 3, 4; 1768) into two species, *L. dioica* L. em. Mill. and *L. alba* Mill. — G. F. Hoffmann (*Deutschlands Flora*, 1800, I, 166) divided *Juncus articulatus* L. (1753) into two species, *J. lamprocarpus* Ehrh. and *J. acutiflorus* Ehrh. The name *J. articulatus* L. ought, however, to have been retained for one of the segregate species, and has been re-established in the sense of *J. lamprocarpus* Ehrh. (see Briq. *Prod. Fl. Corse*, I, 264, 1910). — *Genista horrida* DC. (*Fl. Franç.* IV, 500, 1805) was divided by Spach (in *Ann. Sci. Nat. Bot.* sér. 3, II, 253: 1844) into three species, *G. horrida* (Vahl) DC., *G. Boissieri* Spach; the name *G. horrida* was rightly kept for the species including the plant from Jaca in Arragon originally described by Vahl (*Symb.* I, 51: 1790) as *Spartium horridum*. — Several species (*Primula cashmiriana* Munro, *P. erosa* Wall.) have been separated from *Primula denticulata* Sm. (*Exot. Bot.* 109, tab. 114: 1805), but the name *P. denticulata* has been rightly kept for the form which Smith described and figured under this name.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Delete the Art. as it is incorporated in Art. 51.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

See under Art. 51.

NEW ARTICLE 52 bis

PROP. (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Transfer here Art. 61 Note 2; and Add:

Note 1: All valid names of the necessary groups of the same rank must be included in priority considerations, subject to the notes below and to Arts. 52 D—F.

Note 2: Conserved names or *Nomina Praecedenda* take precedence over all other names for the groups for which they are conserved, even when they are later homonyms or later synonyms, provided the conservation is made explicitly for the purpose (Art. 21 B—D).

Note 3: When the starting-point of nomenclature for a group of plants is a book issued in parts at different dates, and when, in the intervening periods, names have been validly published in another book, or periodical, these latter names, unless taken up in the starting-point book, shall yield their precedence both in priorability and homonymy in the names published in the book fixed as the starting-point. (cf. also Art. 51 A Note 4).

Note 4: Specific epithets instated under a valid but impriorable genus are priorable in the same way as those established under a priorable genus.

Note 5: The priorability of the names of Fungi with pleiomorphic life-cycle is guided by Art. 57 which prescribes that only the names given to the perfect state are to be admitted in priority considerations, the generic name including at least one specific name for a perfect form being also illegible for inclusion in priority considerations. The names of other states are only of temporary value, and cannot claim priority over the names of perfect groups.

Note 6: The priorability of the names of subdivisionary and disjunctive groups is restricted as follows: —

(a) Priorability of names or epithets denoting varieties and infravarietal groups shall be restricted within their immediately superior group. When however a specific or subspecific name has become the basynym for a new name for the group, names of the subordinate groups under the basynym shall have priority claim under the isonym also, and conversaly the name of the subordinate groups under the isonym shall claim priority right under the basynym.

(b) The priorability of the epithets of groups of the subdivisionary class shall be restricted within the same necessary group and under the same name, and this although when the basis of the classification is the same. If the name of the necessary group is the basynym or isonym of another name, then the subdivisionary epithets will have priority claim under both the basynym and isonym of the necessary group, provided the basis of the classification is the same.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended for acceptance.

NEW RECOMMENDATION to follow Art. 52 bis

PROP. (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Replace Art. 53 by the following Rec.

Whenever a genus or its subdivision is transferred as a subdivision to another genus, botanists are advised, when possible, to retain, for the subdivision, the generic or subdivisional epithet, provided no priorable epithet is already available for it in the new position.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended for acceptance. (cf. Art. 53).

NEW ARTICLE 52 ter

PROP. (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

The date of a name or a combination is that of its valid publication (see Arts. 19 A & 37 A), or in some cases from its earliest valid transfer (Note 1). In the absence of proof to the contrary, the date given in the work containing the name must be regarded as correct.

Note 1: The priorability of names or epithets of organisms transferred from the animal to the vegetable kingdom, shall date from the earliest valid instatement in the vegetable kingdom. Mere citation of the names in the synonymy of botanical names shall not constitute a valid instatement under this rule.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended for acceptance. The matter belongs under Art. 45.

NEW ARTICLE 52 quater

PROP. (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

When there are two or more *simultaneous homonyms* (that is, when the same name is validly published simultaneously for more than one taxonomic group of equal rank), the first reviser who adopts one of them, or substitutes another name for one of them, must be followed, provided that a new priorable combination having an older, or the oldest, priorable basynym of equal rank is given precedence.

Note 1: A *homonym* is a valid name identical with another valid name, or an orthographic variant which is regarded as identical. A

homonym that has been validated earlier is an *earlier homonym*; while one validated later is a *later homonym*. When the same name or its orthographic variant has been simultaneously applied to more than one taxonomic group, each valid publication of the name constitutes a *simultaneous homonym*.

Note 2: Later and simultaneous homonyms discarded under this rule are impriorable.

Note 3: When a homonym is typonymous with an earlier homonym, it is permissible to consider the former as either distinct from, or identical with, the latter (see also Arts. 46 & 47); but neither treatment makes the later homonym priorable.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended. It belongs to Section 12, and not in this part of the Rules.

NEW ARTICLE 52 quinquies

PROP. (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

A name of a taxonomic group whose type is not extant, or if extant is inadequate for any decisive interpretation, must not be used in priority considerations if, owing to its use with different meanings, it has become a permanent source of confusion or error. A list of names to be abandoned for this reason (*Nomina ambigua*) will form Appendix IV.

Examples as in Art. 62 but delete the examples concerning *Alsine* L.

Note 1.—A *nomen confusum* is a special instance of a *nomen ambiguum* whose description, being based on a type composed of two or more discordant elements pertaining to different species, genera or orders, was supposed to be of the same species or even of the same individual, and is moreover incapable of a certain typification. A list of names to be abandoned for this reason will form Appendix V. (see also Art. 21B—6).

Examples as in Art. 64.

Note 2.—A *nomen monstrositatis* is another special case of a *nomen ambiguum* whose description, being based on a monstrosity, cannot give any certain clue to the identity of the taxonomic group to which the monstrous type specimen belongs. A list of names to be abandoned for this reason will form Appendix V *bis*.

Examples as in Art. 65.

Note 3.—If a *nomen confusum* or *nomen monstrositatis* has, subsequently to its publication, been typified on any one part of the original specimens and the error excluded, and moreover, if the new

typification is accompanied by an amended description and by a citation of one or more new specimens agreeing with the new typification, then the name becomes priorable from the latter date.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended. Nomina ambigua are dealt with in Art. 62.

NEW ARTICLE 52 sexies

PROP. (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

A name of uncertain application (*nomen dubium*) must not be included in priority considerations until its application has been made quite precise on botanical grounds. (see also Art. 22 B).

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Not recommended.

**SECTION 9. RETENTION OF NAMES OR EPITHETS OF GROUPS
BELOW THE RANK OF GENUS ON TRANSFERENCE TO
ANOTHER GENUS OR SPECIES**

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Revise the wording: Naming and interpreting taxonomic groups on transference to another position of the same rank.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Revise „Dates, Priorability and Legitimacy of Names”.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Read for: „To another genus or species.”: „Under another generic or specific name.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The proposed alterations are not recommended.

ART. 53

When a subdivision of a genus is transferred to another genus (or placed under another generic name for the same genus) without change of rank, its subdivisional name must be retained, or (if it has not been retained) must be re-established unless one of the following obstacles exists: (1) that the resulting association of names has been previously published

validly for a different subdivision, or (2) that there is available an earlier and validly published subdivisional name of the same rank.

Example: *Saponaria* sect. *Vaccaria* DC., transferred to *Gypsophila*, becomes *Gypsophila* sect. *Vaccaria* (DC.) Godr.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 6, '50 — 62; REHDER)

Modify as follows:

When a subdivision of a genus is transferred to another genus (or placed under another generic name for the same genus) its subdivisional name must be retained or (if it has not been retained) must be re-established unless one of the following obstacles exists: (1) that the resulting association of names has been previously published validly for a different subdivision or (2) that there is available an earlier and validly published subdivisional name of the *same grammatical form* (either substantive or adjective in the plural number).

Example: *Saponaria* sect. *Vaccaria* Ser. in DC. Prodr. 1 : 365 (1824) transferred to *Gypsophila* becomes *G.* sect. *Vaccaria* (DC.) Godr. in Gren. & Godr. Fl. France, 1 : 227 (1848).

PROP. 2 (1940 — 9, '50 — 83; FURTADO)

Revise as follows:

When a taxonomic group is transferred to another nomenclatural position without change of rank, the epithet denoting the group must be retained or, if it has not been retained, must be re-established unless one of the following obstacles exists: (1) that there is available an epithet having a better claim under the priority rule (Art. 56A); (2) that the original name was not priorable (Art. 61 B); (3) that the resulting combination is an impriorable homonym (Art. 61 A—B). If any of these obstacles occur, then the name or epithet must be adopted which satisfies the rule of priority (Art. 56 A).

Note. The oldest valid name on which the new combination is based is the *basinym* of the combination, and the new combination is the *isonym* of the basinym. All isonyms must be typified on the types adopted which satisfies the rule of priority (Art. 56 A).

Note 2. When the epithet, on transference to another position, has been applied erroneously in its new position to a different type, the new combination must be retained for the type on which the epithet was originally based.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

When a subdivision of a genus is placed under another generic name without change of its rank, the earliest legitimate name of the taxon within the same rank must be retained unless it has been previously and validly published for a different taxon under the same generic name.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Rehder): This proposal was rejected by the Utrecht Conference. It was accepted with a vast majority by the American Botanists. Against the omission of the words „without change of rank” I see no objection. The change of the words „of the same rank” in „of the same grammatical form” I cannot recommend. I propose to omit the words „of the same rank” also.

Proposal 2 (Furtado): This was rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal (Hylander): Not recommended.

ART. 54

When a variety or other subdivision of a species is transferred, without change of rank, to another genus or species (or placed under another generic or specific name for the same genus or species), the original subdivisional epithet must be retained or (if it has not been retained) must be re-established, unless one of the following obstacles exists: (1) that the resulting ternary combination has been previously and validly published for a subdivision based on a different type, even if that subdivision is of different rank; (2) that there is an earlier validly published subdivisional epithet available.

When, on transference to another genus, the specific epithet has been applied erroneously in its new position to a different plant, the new combination must be retained for the plant on which the epithet was originally based, and must be attributed to the author who first published it.

Examples: *Antirrhinum spurium* L. (*Sp. Pl.* 613: 1753) when transferred to the genus *Linaria*, must be called *Linaria spuria* (L.) Mill. (*Gard. Dict.* ed. 8, n. 15: 1768). — *Chaillitia hispida* Oliv. (*Fl. Trop. Afr.* I, 343: 1868) when placed under the generic name *Dichapetalum* (an older name for the same genus), must be called *Dichapetalum hispidum* (Oliv.) Baill. (*Hist. Pl.* V. 140: 1874). — *Lotus siliquosus* L. (*Syst.* ed. 10, 1178: 1759) when transferred to the genus *Tetragonolobus*, must be called *Tetragonolobus siliquosus* (L.) Roth (*Tent. Fl. Germ.* I, 323: 1788) and not *Tetragonolobus Scandalida* Scop. (*Fl. Carn.* ed. 2, II, 87: 1772). — *Spartium biflorum* Desf. (1798—1800), when transferred to the genus *Cytisus* by Spach in 1849, could not be called *Cytisus biflorus*, because this name had been previously and validly published for a different species by L'Héritier in 1789; the name *Cytisus Fontanesii* given by Spach is therefore legitimate. — *Santolina suaveolens* Pursh (1814) when transferred to the genus *Matricaria* must be called *Matricaria matricarioides* (Less.) Porter (1894); the epithet *suaveolens* cannot be used in the genus *Matricaria* owing to the existence of *Matricaria suaveolens* L. (*Fl. Suec.* ed. 2, 297: 1755), an earlier validly published name. — The specific epithet of *Pinus Mertensiana* Bong. was transferred to *Tsuga* by Carrière, who, however, erroneously applied the new combination *Tsuga Mertensiana* to another species of *Tsuga*, namely *T. heterophylla* (Raf.) Sargent, as is evident from his description: the combination *Tsuga Mertensiana* (Bong.) must be retained for *Pinus Mertensiana* Bong. when that species is placed in *Tsuga*; the citation in parenthesis (under Art. 49 of the name of the original author, Bongard, indicates the type of the epithet.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9, '50 — 83; FURTADO)

Delete. Incorporated in Art. 53.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 11; JAPANESE BOTANISTS)

Examples, last line.

(A) To make the expression clearer as in French text, „the type of the epithet” should be changed as „the type which corresponds to the epithet”.

(B) The citation of original literature for „em. Sarg.” (Brittonia Vol. 6 No. 1 P. 20) is necessary to distinguish from *T. heterophylla* (Raf.) Sarg.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

When a species or a binarily designated interspecific hybrid or chimaera is placed under another generic name without change of its rank, its earliest legitimate epithet must be retained unless the resulting binary name is a later homonym (art. 61) or a tautonym (art. 68).

Ex. Delete the ex. *Tetragonolobus*, which is not correct! — The ex. *Tsuga Mertensiana* should be placed under mom. 4 below.

Such a combination is considered illegitimate and must be rejected even if the earlier homonym designates the same species as the combination concerned; in this case the earlier homonym must stand, even if its basonym is of later date than the basonym of the first-mentioned combination.

Ex. In 1902 Lindroth transferred the species *Ovularia Gei* Eliasson (1895) to *Ramularia* as *R. Gei* (Eliasson) Lindr. Later, in 1910, Lindau found that this species must be identical with *Acrotheca Gei* Fuck., described already 1869, and therefore made the new combination *Ramularia Gei* (Fuck.) Lindau, which is, however, a later homonym and thus illegitimate. In this case, the combination made by Lindroth must be retained although based on the later name *Ovularia Gei* Eliasson.

If, on the other hand, the same name has been given to two species and the later (and thus illegitimate) one of these homonyms has been used for an illegitimate combination under another generic name, this combination cannot be used even in the case that the two species are united under the lastmentioned generic name.

Ex. *Aspidium paleaceum* D. Don 1825 is a later homonym of *A. paleaceum* Sw. 1806; its correct name under *Aspidium* is *A. Wallichianum* Spreng. 18.. The combination *Dryopteris paleacea* (D. Don) Hand.-Mazz. 1908 is thus illegitimate and cannot be used even if the two species mentioned are united, as proposed by some authors, under *Dryopteris*. The combination *D. paleacea* (Sw.) C. Chr. is also unusable for this purpose, since it was not made until 1911 and is thus a later homonym and must be rejected according to art. 61. Under *Dryopteris* the correct name for this combined species is *D. Wallichiana* (Spreng.)....

When the specific epithet, on transference under another generic name, has been applied erroneously in its new position to a different plant, the new combination must stand for the plant on which the epithet was originally based. If the combination turns out to cause

permanent confusion, it should be abandoned as a nomen ambiguum according to art. 68 bis.

Ex. *Tsuga Mertensiana*, as in the present rules.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Not recommended.

Proposal 2 (Japanese Botanists): Not recommended.

Proposal 3 (Hylander): Not recommended. The given examples may be submitted to the Editorial Committee.

ART. 55

When a variety or other subdivision of a species is transferred, without change of rank, to another genus or species (or placed under another generic or specific name for the same genus or species), the original subdivisional epithet must be retained or (if it has not been retained) must be re-established, unless one of the following obstacles exists: (1) that the resulting ternary combination has been previously and validly published for a subdivision based on a different type, even if that subdivision is of different rank; (2) That there is an earlier validly published subdivisional epithet available.

When, on transference to another genus or species, the epithet of a subdivision of a species has been applied erroneously in its new position to a different subdivision of the same rank, the new combination must be retained for the plant on which the former combination was based, and must be attributed to the author who first published it.

Examples: The variety *micranthum* Gren. et Godr. (*Fl. France*, I, 171: 1847) of *Helianthemum italicum* Pers., when transferred as a variety to *H. penicillatum* Thib., retains its varietal epithet, becoming *H. penicillatum* var. *micranthum* (Gren. et Godr.) Grosser (in *Engl. Pflanzenreich*, Heft 14, 115: 1903). The variety *subcarnosa* Hook. fil. (*Bot. Antarct. Voy.* I, 5: 1847) of *Cardamine hirsuta* L., when transferred as a variety to *C. glacialis* DC., becomes *C. glacialis* var. *subcarnosa* (Hook. f.) O. E. Schulz (in *Engl. Bot. Jahrb.* XXXII, 542: 1903); the existence of an earlier synonym of different rank (*C. propinqua* Carmichael in *Trans. Linn. Soc.* XII, 507: 1818) does not affect the nomenclature of the variety (see Art. 58). In each of these cases it is the earliest varietal epithet which is retained.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 9; FURTADO)

Delete the Art. as it is incorporated in the proposed Art. 53.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Add to the article:

Der den nomenklatorischen Typus enthaltende Teil einer Spezies darf als systematische Einheit keinen Varietät-namen (oder Form-namen oder Subspezies-namen) führen, sondern wird einfach „Typus“ genannt. Varietät-namen, die sich auf ihn beziehen, werden in der

Synonymie des Typus geführt. Wenn eine Art von Anfang an aus zwei oder mehreren Varietäten besteht, wird bei der Feststellung des Typus so verfahren, wie bei der Aufteilung einer Art in mehrere Arten (Art. 52).

Eventualanträge zu Art. 55:

Jene Varietät einer Art, die den nomenklatorischen Typus derselben umfasst, muss als Varietätswort den Artnamen wiederholen, z. B. *Stachys recta* var. *recta*.

Oder: Nur jene Varietät, welche den nomenklatorischen Typus einer Art einschliesst, darf die Namen *typicus*, *originarius*, *genuinus*, *verus*, *veridicus* oder *primitivus* führen.

Beispiel: C. Schneider durfte in Ill. Handb. Laubhgzkd., 1, 450 nicht die ungefüllte Form von *Spiraea prunifolia* Siebd. et Zucc. var. *typica* nennen, da Siebold und Zuccarini nur eine gefüllte Form beschrieben.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

When a subspecies, variety or other subdivision of a species is placed, without change of its rank, under another specific name, the earliest legitimate epithet in this rank must be retained unless the resulting combination (1) is illegitimate according to art. 29 ter or (2) the epithet must be rejected according to art. 65.

The same holds for nothomorphs and mixomorphs.

When, on transference under another specific name, the epithet of a subdivision of a species has been applied erroneously in its new position to a different subdivision, the new combination must stand for the plant on which the epithet was originally based. If the combination gets a permanent source of confusion it should be abandoned as nomen ambiguum according to art. 68 bis.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Furtado): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Handel-Mazzetti): This has been dealt with under Art. 28 bis.

Proposal 3 (Hylander): Not recommended.

SECTION 10. CHOICE OF NAMES WHEN TWO GROUPS OF THE SAME RANK ARE UNITED OR IN FUNGI WITH A PLEOMORPHIC LIFE-CYCLE

PROP. 2 (1950 — 22; SCHOPF and CAMP)

Delete the title. The Articles go with Section 9.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 22; SCHOPF and CAMP)

Modify the title as follows:

Choice of names when two groups of the same rank are united in Fungi, with a pleomorphic life-cycle, or among Fossil Plants where parts of the same organism have been placed in different „genera.”

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Delete the title and replace it as follows: „Regulations concerning names of pleomorphic Fungi and of diplobiontic Algae.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Modification of the title should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

ART. 56

When two or more groups of the same rank are united the oldest legitimate name or (in species and their subdivisions) the oldest legitimate epithet is retained. If the names or epithets are of the same date, the author who unites the groups has the right of choosing one of them. The author who first adopts one of them, definitely treating another as a synonym or referring it to a subordinate group, must be followed.

Examples: K. Schumann (in Engl. und Prantl, *Nat. Pflanzenfam.* III, Abt. 6, 5: 1890) uniting the three genera *Sloanea* L. (1753), *Echinocarpus* Blume (1825) and *Phoenicosperma* Miq. (1865 — 1866) rightly adopted the oldest of these three generic names, *Sloanea* L., for the resulting genus. — If the two genera *Dentaria* L. (*Sp. Pl.* ed. I, 653: 1753, et *Gen. Pl.* ed. 5, 295, No. 726: 1754) and *Cardamine* L. (*l. c.* 654, et *l. c.* 295, No. 727) are united, the resulting genus must be called *Cardamine* because the name was chosen by Crantz (*Class. Crucif.* 126: 1769), who was the first to unite them. — When H. Hallier (in Engl. *Bot. Jahrb.* XVIII, 123: 1893) united three species of *Ipomoea*, namely, *I. verticillata* Forsk. (1775), *I. rumicifolia* Choisy (1834) and *I. Perrottetii* Choisy (1845), he rightly retained the name *I. verticillata* Forsk. for the resulting species because *verticillata* is the oldest of the three specific epithets. — Robert Brown (in Tuckey, *Narr. Exped. Congo*, App. V, 484: 1818) appears to have been the first to unite *Waltheria americana* L. *Sp. Pl.* ed. I, 673: 1753) and *W. indica* L. (*l. c.*). Since he adopted the name *Waltheria indica* and stated that he considered *W. americana* to be a variety of it, the name *W. indica* must be retained for the combined species.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 1; WHEELER)

Add: In case of simultaneously published homonyms the first author definitely rejecting one in favor of the other fixes the usage. (The above provisions operate only after the provisions of Art. 21, Note 3 have been satisfied.)

PROP. 2 (1940 — 9, '50 — 83; FURTADO)

Revise as follows:

When two or more groups of the same rank are united, the oldest priorable name, or epithet, (Art. 61 B) must be retained. When the epithet is not in the required position, it must be instated in that position provided it does not produce an impriorable homonym; but if, when so placed, it would produce an impriorable homonym, then

the next oldest priorable name or epithet that would not produce an impriorable homonym in the required position must be adopted. If no such name, or epithet is available, then the author is at liberty to adopt any epithet that becomes priorable in the new position, even an epithet from an invalid, or impriorable, name. For the nomenclature of Fungi with a pleomorphic life-cycle, see Art. 57.

If two or more priorable names, or epithets, have equal claim under this rule, precedence must be given to the name, or epithet, that is earlier in the correct position, or to a new combination over a new name (see also Art. 61 A). In other cases the author who unites the groups has the right of choosing one of them as the legitimate name for the group; the author who first exercises the right under this, definitely treating one name as a synonym or a subordinate group of the other, must be followed, so long as the priority of the names is considered under the same position, but not otherwise.

Add the following four examples:

(a) *Monospora grandifolia* Hochst. and *M. rotundifolia* Hochst. were published simultaneously in the same book (Flora, XXIV, 1841, p. 661). The isonyms to these two species under *Trimeria* Harv. (1838) are *T. grandifolia* (Hochst.) Warb. (1893) and *T. rotundifolia* (Hochst.) Gilg (1921) respectively. When these two species are treated as synonymous, *T. grandifolia* (Hochst.) Warb. (1893) is the correct name for the united group under *Trimeria*.

(b) When *Rhizophora conjugata* L. (1753) and *R. gymnorhiza* L. (1753) are united together under *Bruguiera*, precedence must be given to *B. gymnorhiza* (L.) Lam. (1797) over *B. conjugata* (L.) Merr. (1914) and any decisions given concerning the precedence of these two epithets under *Rhizophora* must be ignored.

(c) The combination *Talinum polyandrum* Hook. (in Bot. Mag., 1855, t. 4833), being a later homonym of *T. polyandrum* Ruiz. et Pav. (1798), is impriorable: when Bentham transferred *T. polyandrum* Hook. to *Calandrinia*, he called it *C. polyandra* (Fl. Austral. I, 1863 p. 172). Now *C. polyandra* (Hook.) Benth. itself is not a later homonym, and so it is a priorable name. Since there is no earlier priorable name to the species, *C. polyandra* (Hook.) Benth. becomes also its legitimate name.

(b) *Nicotiana? minima* Phil. (1864) is impriorable because it is a later homonym of *N. minima* Molina (1782). But the name *Petunia minima* [Phil.] Reiche (1910) is priorable although it is based on the impriorable *N. minima* Phil. Hence *Combera minima* Sandw. (Hook. Ic. Pl., 1939, t. 3400) must be not only cited as *C. minima* (Reiche) Sandw. (or as *C. minima* ([Phil.] Reiche) Sandw., but also typified on the holotype of *N. minima* Phil. in the Museo Nacional in Santiago, Chile.

PROP. 3 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Antrag zu Art. 56:

Wenn zwei Arten mit gleichalten Namen, von denen die eine früher in die ihr heute zugewiesene Gattung überstellt wurde, vereinigt werden, so hat der sie zusammenziehende Autor nicht die freie Wahl zwischen den beiden Artnamen, sondern muss jenen der zuerst in diese Gattung überstellten Art verwenden.

Beispiel: *Hedysarum floribundum* D. Don 1825 und *H. sambuense* D. Don 1825 wurden *Desmodium sambuense* (D. Don) DC. 1825 und *D. floribundum* (D.

Don) Sweet 1827. Sie wurden zuerst zusammengezogen von Hooker 1876 unter dem Namen *D. floribundum*. Die Gesamtart muss aber *D. sambuense* heissen.

Sind aber zwei gleichalte Arten in der Gattung, in der sie ursprünglich standen, unter dem Namen der einen zusammengezogen worden, so muss die vereinigte Art auch in einer anderen Gattung diesen Namen behalten, auch wenn inzwischen nur die andere mit ihrem Namen in diese Gattung überstellt wurde.

Ist von zwei gleichalten, auf dieselbe Art bezüglichen Namen der eine bisher als Synonym einer anderen Art betrachtet worden, so darf er den gebräuchlichen Namen nicht verdrängen. Das Beispiel von Koidzumi oben.

PROP. 4 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

When two or more supraspecific taxa of the same rank are united without change of rank, the earliest correct name must be retained unless (one of) the later name(s) is conserved according to art. 17. When two or more species or binarily designated interspecific hybrids or chimaeras or two or more infraspecific taxa of the same rank are united in the same way, the earliest correct epithet within that rank must be retained, provided that, in cases where the uniting is connected with a transfer under another generic name, the resulting combination is not in conflict with art. 61 or 64.

If the names or epithets are of the same date, one of them must be retained. The choice between them is free to the author who first makes the union, retaining one epithet as correct and definitely treating the other as synonyms or referring them to a subordinate taxon, but then this author must be followed.

Ex. Unchanged; add the following: Gaertner in 1791 (Fruct. et sem. plant.) when raising the genus *Lonas* made the combination *L. inodora* (L.) Gaertn., basing on *Achillea inodora* L. 1753 but including also *Santolina annua* L. 1753. As the first union of the two species was, however, made by Linnaeus himself in 1767 (Mant. plant.), where *Achillea inodora* is declared as a variety of *Santolina annua*, the latter epithet must be retained, and the correct name for the combined species under *Lonas* is thus *L. annua* (L.) Vines & Druce 1914.

PROP. 5 (UTRECHT CONFERENCE)

Change the last sentence as follows:

„The author who first unites the taxa and chooses one of the names or epithets concerned must be followed”.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Wheeler): The proposal was accepted in principle by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Furtado): Rejected by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 3 (Handel-Mazzetti): Not recommended.

Proposal 4 (Hylander): Not recommended for acceptance.

Proposal 5 (Utrecht Conference): This proposal was made in a discussion on proposal 3.

NEW ARTICLE 56 bis

PROP. (1940 — 23; PFEIFFER)

A conserved name being enumerated in the list of nomina conservanda is conserved against all other names for the genus, whether these are cited in the corresponding list of rejected names or not, so long as an international botanical congress does not decide the repeal of the conservation of the name.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

This has mainly been provided for under Art. 21, Note 3. The last part of the proposal might perhaps be inserted in Art. 21.

RECOMMENDATION XXXIII

Authors who have to choose between two generic names should note the following recommendations.

- (1) Of two names of the same date to prefer the one which was first accompanied by the description of a species.
- (2) Of two names of the same date, both accompanied by descriptions of species, to prefer the one, which, when the author made his choice, included the larger number of species.
- (3) In cases of equality from these various points of view to prefer the more correct appropriate name.

NO PROPOSALS

RECOMMENDATION XXXIV

When several genera are united as subgenera or sections under one generic name, the subdivision including the type of the generic name used, may bear that name unaltered (e.g. *Anarrhinum* sect. *Anarrhinum*; *Hemigenia* sect. *Hemigenia*) or with a prefix (*Anthriscus* sect. *Eu-Anthriscus*), or a suffix (*Stachys* sect. *Stachyotypus*). These prefixes or suffixes lapse when the subdivisions are raised to generic rank.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 14; AIRY-SHAW and BURTT)

Amend to read:

„When several genera are united under one generic name, under which they are treated as subgenera or sections, the subdivision including the type of the generic name used should bear that name unaltered (e.g., *Anarrhinum* sect. *Anarrhinum*; *Hemigenia* sect.

Hemigenia) or with a prefix (*Anthriscus* sect. *Eu-Anthriscus*) or a suffix (*Stachys* sect. *Stachyotypus*), if no earlier name is available.”

PROP. 2 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

Delete the last sentence.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Airy-Shaw and Burt): This was accepted by the Utrecht Conference.

Proposal 2 (Boivin): This proposal is included in proposal 1. If the latter is rejected, this one is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION XXXV

When several species are united as subspecies or varieties under one specific name, the subdivision which included the type of the specific epithet used may be designated either by the same epithet unaltered (e.g. *Stachys recta* subsp. *recta*) or with a prefix (e.g. *Alchemilla alpina* subsp. *eualpina*) or by one of the customary epithets *typicus*, *originarius*, *genuinus*, *verus*, *veridicus*, etc.) indicating that it is the type subdivision.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 13; BOLLE)

Empfehlung XXXV. Werden mehrere Arten mit dem Range von Unterarten oder Varietäten unter einem gemeinsamen Artnamen vereinigt, so kann die Unterabteilung, zu der der Typus des angenommenen spezifischen Epithetons gehört, dasselbe Epitheton unverändert behalten (z. B. *Stachys recta* subsp. *recta*), oder es kann dem Epitheton ein Präfix vorgesetzt werden (z. B. *Alchemilla alpina* subsp. *eu-alpina*). Der Gebrauch der Epitheta *typicus*, *genuinus*, *originarius*, *verus*, *veridicus* usw. ist zu vermeiden.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 14; SPRAGUE)

Amend to read:

„When several species are united under one specific name, under which they are treated as subspecies or varieties, the subdivision which includes the type of the specific epithet adopted should be designated by the same epithet unaltered, unless an earlier one is available. The customary conventional terms, *typicus*, *originarius*, *genuinus*, *verus*, *veridicus*, etc., where already used in place of epithets should, however, be retained for the groups concerned, unless it is proved that these groups do not include the type of the specific epithet, in which case the terms concerned must be rejected. Such conventional terms are not epithets and cannot serve as the basis of new combinations.

PROP. 3 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

Delete from the word „designated” to the end and substitute as follows:

„designated by repeating the same epithet, as per Art. 30 bis.

Examples: *Stachys recta* ssp. *recta*; *Alchemilla alpina* var. *alpina*.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

All these proposals are dealt with under the new Art. 28 bis.

When that article is accepted, this recommendation will have to be deleted.

ART. 57

Among Fungi with a pleomorphic life-cycle the different successive states of the same species (*anamorphoses, status*) can bear only one generic and specific name (binary), that is the earliest which has been given, starting from Fries, *Systema*, or Persoon, *Synopsis*, to the state containing the form, which it has been agreed to call the perfect form, provided that the name is otherwise in conformity with the Rules. The perfect state is that which ends in the ascus stage in the *Ascomycetes*, in the basidium in the *Basidiomycetes*, in the teleutospore or its equivalent in the *Uredinales*, and in the spore in the *Ustilaginales*.

Generic and specific names given to other states have only a temporary value. They cannot replace a generic name already existing and applying to one or more species, any one of which contains the „perfect” form. The nomenclature of Fungi which have not a pleomorphic life-cycle follows the ordinary rules.

Examples: The names *Aecidium* Pers., *Caeoma* Link, and *Uredo* Pers. designate different states (aecidiosporic with or without pseudoperidium, uredosporic) in the group *Uredinales*: the generic name *Melampsora* Cast. (*Obs.* II, 18: 1843), applied to a genus which is defined by means of the teleutospores, cannot therefore be replaced by the name *Uredo* Pers. (in Roemer, *Neu. Mag.* I, 93: 1794) since the name *Uredo* is already used to designate a state. — Among the *Dothideaceae* (*Ascomycetes*) a species of the genus *Phyllachora* Nitschke, *P. Trifolii* (Pers.) Fuck. (*Symb.* 218: 1869 — 70) has an older synonym, *Polythrincium Trifolii* G. Kunze (*Myk. Heft* i, 13, t. I. f. 8: 1817) based on the conidial state of this species: the name *Polythrincium* cannot displace that of *Phyllachora* because it represents an inferior state. — The name *Phoma* Fries emend. Desm. has been given to a group of *Fungi Imperfecti* (*Deuteromycetes*), several members of which have been recognised as the spermogonial state of species of the genus *Diaporthe* (*Valsaceae, Ascomycetes*): thus *Phoma Ailanthi* Sacc. belongs to *Diaporthe Ailanthi* Sacc., *Phoma alnea* (Nitschke) Sacc. to *Diaporthe alnea* Fuck., *Phoma detrusa* (Fries) Fuck. to *Diaporthe detrusa* Sacc. etc. But the perfect state of many species of the „genus” *Phoma* is not known and in some cases probably does not exist: hence the practical necessity for retaining the name *Phoma* to designate the group of *Fungi Imperfecti* in question.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 20, '50 — 55; BISBY and STEVENSON)

Proposal for modification.

In *Ascomycetes* and *Basidiomycetes* (but not *Phycomycetes*) with pleomorphic life-cycle, the first valid name or epithet applied to the

perfect state (that producing asci or basidia), together with the appropriate associated structures; in the *Uredinales* the teliospore and in the *Ustilaginales* the spore (chlamydospore) takes precedence. Similarly the name or epithet of a spore or conidium-producing state takes precedence over that applied to a mycelial state. The type specimen of a state must bear that state. The author who first describes a perfect state is at liberty to use the specific epithet of the imperfect state, but his binomial of the perfect state is to be attributed to him alone. The provisions of this Article shall not be construed as preventing the use of imperfect state names when studies of or reference to such a state or states rather than the perfect stage is involved. When not already available binomials for imperfect states may be set up at the time of publication of a perfect state binomial or subsequently, using the specific epithet of the perfect stage. This would in no wise invalidate any imperfect state epithets set up subsequent to and differing from the perfect state epithet.

The nomenclature of fungi without a pleomorphic life-cycle follows the ordinary rules.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 19; SHAW)

Add as paragraph 2 to the modification proposed by G. R. Bisby and J. A. Stevenson (see Prop. 1).

„In the *Phycomycetes* the first valid name applied to either the imperfect state (the sporangia and sporangiospores or the conidia and the conidiophores) or the perfect state (the resting spores, the oospores, or the zygosporangia) takes precedence.”

PROP. 3 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

Among *Fungi* many species are pleomorphic, i.e. they occur in different states (status) with different types of reproductive organs, one of which may be the so called perfect state, while the others are called imperfect states. The perfect state is this which ends in the zygo- or oospore in the *Phycomycetes*, in the ascus in the *Ascomycetes*, in the spore type giving rise to the basidium in the *Uredinales* and in the basidium in other *Basidiomycetes*. Many *Fungi* („*Fungi imperfecti*”) are known in one or more imperfect states.

In such cases where special designations for the different imperfect states are required, each of these states of a pleomorphic species or of a *fungus imperfectus* is nomenclaturally treated as a separate taxonomic unit.¹ The imperfect states are taxonomically treated in a way analogous to that of the perfect state, each unit forming a „form species” with its own binary name, in which the „generic” name is the name of a so called „form genus”. A form genus contains all form species which are characterized by the same type of reproductive organs, whether they have been connected with a perfect state or not; they are classified in „form families” and „form orders”.

When such a connection has been established, the fungus species as a *whole* must, however, in pleomorphic *Ascomycetes* and *Basidiomycetes* except *Uredinales* bear the name of the perfect state. An exception is made for some cases (e.g. *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium*) where the generic name was originally given to the imperfect state but has since long, by general convention, been used also for the species as a whole; in order to avoid useless creation of names, this custom is accepted by conserving the name also to include the perfect state. (A list of such names is given in App.)

In the *Uredinales* the name of the species as a whole consists of the generic name of the perfect state in combination with the earliest legitimate epithet given either to the uredo- or to the teleuto-state, irrespective of their generic name, unless the epithet will, after transference under another generic name, be in conflict with art. 61 or 64.

In pleomorphic *Phycomycetes* the different states are considered nomenclaturally equivalent. Thus a genus shall bear the earliest correct generic name given to any of these states (perfect or not). In forming the specific name for the fungus species as a whole, the earliest legitimate epithet given to any state of the species must be used unless it will, after transference under another generic name, be in conflict with art. 61 or 64.

Note. (New.) The regulations above do not apply to Lichens. If, for instance, a binary name is legitimately given to a lichen species without apothecia (resp. perithecia) but with conidia or spermogonia, this name (or its epithet) should be used even since sporebearing organs of the species have been found. If a genus was originally raised for a lichen known only in the sterile state (or with conidia or spermogonia only), the detection of the sporebearing organs does not warrant a change of its name; an exception is made for genera, such as *Lepraria*, which are provisionally raised for sterile thalli, not differentiated enough to reveal the true relationship.

1) This means that an epithet of such a state should not be considered as to priority in the nomenclature of another state of the same fungus or of the fungus as a whole; on the other hand, it *may* be used in such combinations if there is no other objection to its use.

Ex. Ou in 1940 described an Ascomycete as *Mycosphaerella Aleuritidis* and cited as namebringing synonym *Cercospora Aleuritidis* Miyake, belonging to an imperfect state of the same fungus. As there was no legitimate epithet previously published for the perfect state (*Mycosphaerella*) and the epithet *Aleuritidis* had not previously been taken in use in *Mycosphaerella*, Ou had the right to choose the lastmentioned epithet, but Miyake should not be mentioned in the author's citation as the combination should not be founded on *Cercospora Aleuritidis*.

In some cases where the sterile mycelium has a distinctive structure, this may be given a binary name of its own in correspondance with the „form genera“, esp. where it has not been with certainty connected with a fertile (perfect or imperfect) state; such names are nomenclaturally treated as such of form genera, and binary names given in combination with them as such of form species.

Ex. In 1927 Masee described a sterile sclerotium under the name of *Sclerotium Gladioli*, *Sclerotium* being a „generic” name for sterile sclerotia in analogy with a name of a form genus. Later Drayton found the corresponding perfect state and described it as *Sclerotinia Gladioli* (Masee) Drayton, thus citing Masee’s name as namebringing synonym. The parenthesis (Masee) should, however, be dropped as the name of the sterile state (*Sclerotium*) should not be considered in the nomenclature of the perfect state.

Ex. In 1826 Fries described a lichen under the name *Pyrenothea fuscella*, bearing spermogonia, which were, however, by Fries mistaken for „apothecia” (rather perithecia); the real apothecia were not mentioned by him. Later on, Nylander (1869) described the same species as *Opegrapha hapaleoides*, mentioning the apothecia but not the spermogonia. The name given by Fries should however not be rejected; if placed in *Opegrapha*, the species should be called *O. fuscella* (Fr.) Alborn (in Bot. Not. Suppl. 1:2, 1948, 137).

The genus *Siphula*, described by Fries in 18.., was not known with spore-bearing organs until 19.. when Räsänen described its apothecia, but its name should nevertheless be retained.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

All these proposals are referred to the Spec. Committee for Fungi. Part of the new Article proposed by H y l a n d e r is not in the form of Rule.

NEW ARTICLE 57 bis

PROP. (1950 — 22; SCHOPF and CAMP)

The detached organs or parts of individuals of the same species should bear only one generic and specific name (binary). The practice of classifying the dissociated parts of fossil plants under diverse names (organ genera, form genera, etc.), although often required for provisional classification, is a temporary expedient until their botanical union is proved to have existed at some geologic horizon or for some interval of geologic time. Parts of the fossil plants so correlated should be united for purposes of classification under a single binomial.

To facilitate this and to achieve uniformity and nomenclatural stability, in each genus a particular organ or connected organ-grouping shall be designated as „diagnostic.”¹ Legitimate names associated by valid publication with the diagnostic organs have nomenclatural precedence. Generic names applying to imperfectly defined groups (organ genera, form genera, etc.) cannot replace those already existing that apply to similar groups which include the „diagnostic” organs of the group concerned. When it is desirable, however, well-known generic names that otherwise would be discarded may be proposed for conservation, through recommendation of the commission on paleobotanical nomenclature or in the usual manner.

Specific epithets established in legitimate combination with generic names applied to „diagnostic” organs take precedence over specific epithets of other combinations, regardless of date of publication.² Recommendation: Among „genera” whose pertinent diagnostic organs

are as yet not recognized, new specific epithets should be proposed with utmost caution. If possible, relationship should be established³ with affiliated species already named and known from the same geologic horizon. It is preferable that the epithet already available for one of the other parts of individuals of the same species which is the earliest, best known and associated with some critical figure or description, be used in initial publication proposing the diagnostic organ of the genus. Having once been validly established in this application this specific epithet will take precedence over any other names that may be discovered to pertain to the same species.

Tentative example: The following names appear to have been applied to different parts of the same species of lowermost Westphalian age (cf. Arnold, *Introd. Paleob.* 209, 1947; Crookall, *Ann. Bot.* 44, 633, 1930).

FOLIAGE

1. *Sphenopteris hoeninghausi* Brong. 1828.

PETIOLES

2. *Rachiopteris aspera* Will. 1874.

ROOTS AND ROOTLETS

3. *Koloxylon Hookeri* Will. 1875.

„INDUSIA” (seed cupules) on twigs (associated with foliage)

4. *Calymmatotheca stangeri* Stur 1877.

STEMS

5. *Lyginopteris oldhamiana* (Binney) Potonié 1897.
Lyginodendron oldhamium (Binney) Will. 1872.
Dadoxylon oldhamium Binney 1866.

SEEDS AND CUPULES (associated with stems, foliage, etc.)

6. *Lagenostoma lomaxi* Will. ms. ex Oliver and Scott 1903.

MALE FRUCTIFICATIONS (associated with stems, seeds, foliage, etc.)

7. *Telangium scotti* Benson 1904.

Whether the „correct” name for the species should be „*Calymmatotheca hoeninghausi*” (as stated by Arnold) would probably depend on the name indicated by selection of diagnostic organ or connected organ-grouping and the decision to use the name in combination with the oldest available specific epithet as applied to foliage. The name could also be modified, if deemed advisable, by means of regular proposal for conservation.

¹ An International Commission on paleobotanical nomenclature is to be established, advisory to the Rapporteur General and the Sub-Section on Nomenclature of International Botanical Congresses, to assist in designation of „diagnostic” organs in the various plant groups. This commission is authorized (1) to recommend adoption, on a provisional basis, of proposals designating diagnostic organs for stabilization of generic nomenclature as submitted to it by authors, pending final authorization by action of International Congresses, or (2) to return for reconsideration proposals submitted to it with recommendations of modification. The Commission is authorized to publish periodic reports of its deliberations and findings. A list of accepted genera is to be included as an addendum to Appendix III, with subsequent additions as required, in accordance with provisions governing other sections of this Appendix. This section of the Appendix also contains the nomina generica conservanda of fossil plants not dealt with under this article.

² Lacking this provision nomenclatural instability could result through suc-

cessive changes of the specific epithet as additional previously named organs were discovered to be conspecific.

³ If appropriate, a degree of uncertainty can be expressed by „cf”, „affil.”, etc. Much material „named” in the past should have been reported, at best, as „sp. indet.”

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

To be referred to the Spec. Comm. on Palaeobotany.

NEW ARTICLE 57 ter

PROP. 1950 — 48; HYLANDER

Among *Algae* many species are diplobiontic, i.e. they occur in nature in different states representing different caryological phases or generations, each of which has in some cases got its own name. In the case that they have been treated as different species of the same genus, the species as a whole must, when the connection between the phases has been established, bear the earliest correct name of either phase. If, on the other hand, different genera have been raised for the different generations, one of these generic names should be retained, namely the earliest legitimate one, unless it seems desirable to retain the later name by treating it as a *nomen conservandum*. Specific names made under a generic name based on the other generation should not be used for designating the species as a whole, and their epithets should not be considered for purposes of priority in the nomenclature of the whole species.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

To be judged by the Spec. Comm. for *Algae*.

SECTION 11. CHOICE OF NAMES WHEN THE RANK OF A GROUP IS CHANGED

PROP. 1 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Delete this section.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Acceptance not recommended.

ART. 58

When a tribe becomes a family, when a subgenus or a section becomes a genus, when a subdivision of a species becomes a species, or when the reverse of these changes takes place, and in general when a group changes its rank, the earliest legitimate name or epithet given to the

group in its new rank is valid, unless that name or the resulting association or combination is a later homonym (see Art. 60, 61).

Examples: The section *Campanopsis* R. Br. (*Prodr. Fl. Nov. Holl.* 561: 1810) of the genus *Campanula* was first raised to generic rank by Schrader, and as a genus must be called *Wahlenbergia* Schrad. (*Cat. Hort. Goett.*: 1814), not *Campanopsis* (R. Br.) O. Kuntze (*Rev. Gen.* II, 378: 1891). — The var. *foetida* L. (*Sp. Pl.* ed. I, 536: 1753) of *Magnolia virginiana*, when raised to specific rank, must be called *Magnolia grandiflora* L. (*Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, 1082: 1759), not *Magnolia foetida* (L.) Sarg. (in *Gard. and For.* II, 615: 1889). — *Lythrum intermedium* Ledeb. (*Ind. Hort. Dorp.*: 1822), when treated as a variety of *Lythrum Salicaria* L., must be called *L. Salicaria* var. *glabrum* Ledeb. (*Fl. Ross.* II, 127: 1844), not *L. Salicaria* var. *intermedium* (Ledeb.) Koehne (in *Engl. Bot. Jahrb.* I, 327: 1881). In all these cases the name or epithet given to the group in its original rank is replaced by the first legitimate name or epithet given to it in its new rank.

PROP. 1 (1940 — 6, '50 — 62; REHDER)

Change the basic article to read as follows and delete paragraphs (2) and (3) of Rec. XXXVI:

„When a tribe becomes a family, when a subgenus or section becomes a genus, when a subdivision of a species becomes a species, or when the reverse of these changes takes place, the earliest legitimate name or epithet given to the group in its new rank is valid, unless that name or the resulting association or combination is a later homonym (see Arts. 60, 61).

„When no legitimate name exists in the new rank, the earliest existing name or epithet in any rank must be retained, unless the resulting association or combination is a later homonym (see Arts. 60, 61); but this applies only to names published on or after Jan. 1, 1953.

„For purposes of nomenclatural priority, all subdivisions of species are regarded as of the same rank except as provided for subdivisions containing the type of the species.”

Examples may be retained.

PROP. 2 (1940 — 10; HANDEL-MAZZETTI)

Antrag auf Ergänzung zu Art. 58:

Obwohl man also berechtigt ist, eine Varietät ohne Rücksicht auf einen älteren, darauf bezüglichen Artnamen neu zu benennen, darf man jedoch, wenn man dies nicht tut, sondern den Artnamen dafür übernimmt, dessen Schreibweise nicht ändern.

Beispiel: Als Seringe *Potentilla davurica* Nestl. zur Varietät von *P. fruticosa* machte, durfte er die Schreibweise nicht in *dahurica* ändern. Die Kombination heisst *P. fruticosa* var. *davurica* (Nestl.) Ser., denn *dahurica* und *davurica* ist derselbe Name. Ebenso *Aconitum coreanum* (Lévl.) Rap. (nicht *koreanum*).

PROP. 3 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

Replace the following:

„(see Art. 60, 61)”

by:

„(see Art. 61)”

PROP. 4 (1950 — 39; BOIVIN)

Add the following paragraph:

„When, on transference to a different rank, the name of a group has been applied erroneously in its new position to a different group, the new combination or status must be retained for the plant on which the former combination or status was based, and must be attributed to the author who first published it.

„Examples: On their 1815-8 Expedition, Chamisso and Eschscholtz collected a plant on which *Arnica frigida* Meyer 1926 and *Arnica angustifolia* Vahl β *Lessingii* T. & G. 1843 were independently based. In 1900 Greene made the transfer *Arnica Lessingii* (T. & G.) Greene, but the accompanying description applied only to *Arnica Porsildiorum* Boivin 1948. When retained at the specific rank the plant of Chamisso is called *Arnica Lessingii* (T. & G.) Greene and the plant described by Greene is called *Arnica Porsildiorum* Boivin”.

PROP. 5 (1950 — 48; HYLANDER)

When a taxon changes its rank, it must take the name which is in its new rank the correct name according to the regulations in art. 16. In no case has a name or an epithet any claim to priority outside its own rank.

Ex. As present.

PROP. 6 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Delete the article.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Rehder): At the present the principle of the new paragraph 2 is embodied in Rec. XXXVI. There is a proposal to change the latter in a new Art. 58 bis (See there). I recommended to accept this part of Rehder's proposal as well as the proposal for new Art. 58 bis in principle, and to leave it to the Editorial Committee to find the exact wording and to decide whether it has to be included in Art. 58 or to be made a New Art.

The third paragraph of Rehder's proposal I cannot recommend. The whole proposal was accepted by the American Botanists.

Proposal 2 (Handel-Mazzetti): This has to be dealt with under Art. 70.

Proposal 4 (Boivin): Recommended for acceptance; it will bring the case in accordance with that of Art. 54. The example to be revised.

Proposal 5 (Hylander): To simplify the wording of this article would indeed be recommendable. To be judged by the Editorial Committee.

Proposal 6 (Furtado): Not recommended.

NEW ARTICLE 58 bis

PROP. (1950 — 5; LAM and LANJOUW)

Raise Rec. XXXVI to a new article with the following wording:

When a taxon of higher rank than a genus is raised in rank or when the inverse changes occur, the root of the name must not be altered but only the termination (-inae, -eae, -oideae, -aceae, -ineae, -ales etc.) unless the resulting name is rejected under Section 12.

When a section or a subgenus becomes a genus, or the inverse changes occur, the original name must be retained unless it is rejected under Section 12.

When a taxon within a species becomes a species, or the inverse changes occur, the original epithet must be retained unless the resulting combination is rejected under Section 12.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

The first two paragraphs were accepted by the Utrecht Conference. (See also the comment on Proposal 1 under Art. 58).

The third paragraph was rejected. It is now proposed to retain that paragraph as Rec. XXXVI.

RECOMMENDATION XXXVI

(1) When a subtribe becomes a tribe, when a tribe becomes a subfamily, when a subfamily becomes a family, etc., or when the inverse changes occur, the root of the name should not be altered but only the termination (-inae-, -eae, -oideae, -aceae, -ineae, -ales, etc.) unless the resulting name is rejected under Section 12 or the new name becomes a source of error or there is some other serious reason against it.

(2) When a section or a subgenus becomes a genus, or the inverse changes occur, the original name should be retained unless it is rejected under Section 12.

(3) When a subdivision of a species becomes a species, or the inverse change occurs, the original epithet should be retained unless the resulting combination is rejected under Section 12.

PROP. 1 (1950 — 5; LAM and LANJOUW)

Transfer the Rec. to the proposed article 58 bis.

PROP. 2 (1950 — 83; FURTADO)

Read „unless it becomes impriorable” for „unless it is rejected under Section 12”. But delete Rec. XXXVI (3), as this confuses the typification.

COMM. RAPPORTEUR

Proposal 1 (Lam & Lanjouw): See comment under Art. 58 bis.

Proposal 2 (Furtado): Not recommended.