

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

MINUTES of the First Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Friday, 23rd July, 1948, at 0900 hours.

(Meeting held concurrently with the Eighth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
M. H. Berthet (France)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
Mr. J. Delacour (U.S.A.)
Mr. C. F. Dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

Procedure to be adopted by the Section on Nomenclature during Paris Meeting

1. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING)
recalled that at former meetings of the Congress the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had normally completed its deliberations shortly after the opening of the Congress the Commission having assembled for this purpose some days before the Congress opened. This procedure had certain advantages but it suffered from the objection that it rendered it impossible for the Commission to work closely with the members of the Congress, few of whom arrived at the seat of the Congress until the

eve of the opening day. On the present occasion the Commission had not been able to hold preliminary meetings of this kind. On the other hand, exceptionally far-reaching measures had been taken to prepare the Agenda for the meeting of the Commission, a large series of important papers having been prepared for the consideration of the Commission on the important questions awaiting consideration. To facilitate that consideration the Commission had agreed to suspend their By-Laws for the duration of the present Session. These measures, coupled with a high sense of responsibility on the part of the members of the Commission regarding the importance and urgency of many of the nomenclatorial questions awaiting decision, had enabled the Commission to make rapid progress during the seven meetings which had already been held. In large part this result had been secured as the result of a decision taken on the opening day that all the meetings of the Commission should be held in public. This decision represented a complete break with the former practice of the Commission but had been fully justified both by the opportunity which it had afforded to the Commission to bring other specialists into consultation and by the fact that it had enabled members of the Congress who were interested in questions of zoological nomenclature actively to participate in the preparation of the proposals which would in due course be submitted by the Commission to the Section. Most of the members of the Congress attending the present meeting had participated in the work of the Commission in this way and were thus thoroughly conversant with the issues involved.

The Section on Nomenclature of the present Congress had received notice from a considerable number of members of the Congress of their intention to present communications on a variety of interesting aspects of zoological nomenclature. He (the President) proposed that each meeting of the Section should be devoted partly to the consideration of reports from the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the progress of its work and partly to receiving from members of the Congress the communications of which notice had been given. The Commission were anxious to work in the closest relations with the Section and to this end it was proposed that meetings of the Section should be held concurrently with meetings of the Commission. As President of the Section, he intended to permit a wide latitude of discussion at the meetings of the Section, but if disagreement were to arise on any particular question calling for action, it would be necessary to reserve the position of the Commission in order to prevent the recurrence of events such as those which had marred the

harmony of the proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature at Padua in 1930. There was every reason, however, to expect that this reservation would be of a purely formal character, for the discussions at the public meetings of the Commission encouraged the hope that the Section, like the Commission, would approach its task in a constructive spirit and with a desire to secure practical results through mutual understanding and common effort.

Continuing, the President said that, if it were found, as the result of discussion, that there was a likelihood that the Commission, given the opportunity, would be able to return an immediate answer on some of the questions raised in the communications which were to be made to the Section by individual members of the Congress, it was his intention to propose a brief adjournment of the meeting of the Section in order to permit of the necessary discussions between the members of the Commission.

Discussions at meetings of the Section would be either in French or English, the official languages respectively of the Congress and the Commission.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the statement by the President regarding the procedure to be adopted during the present Session of the Section.

**Emendation of
Psodos Treitschke,
1827, to *Psolos*
(Class Insecta,
Order Lepidoptera)**

2. M. H. BERTHET (FRANCE) presented a communication entitled "Un point de nomenclature. Doit-on dire '*Psodos*' et non '*Psolos*' Tr. ? (Lep. Geometridae)"¹. M. Berthet explained that this communication, which had been published by him before the outbreak of the recent war (1938, *Bull. Soc. ent. France*, 43 : 151-152), was concerned with the orthography of the generic name which, when published by Treitschke (1827, in Ochsenheimer, *Schmett. Europa*, 6 (1) : 254), was spelt *Psodos*. Treitschke had added at the end of his description of this genus that this name was derived from the Greek word Πσόδος which, like the word σποδιος, had the meaning ash-coloured. It should be noted that the use for the first of these words of the initial letters pi and sigma, instead of the letter Psi, was a horrible barbarism which could only be due to a slip of the pen, a printers' error or to an error of transcription. Treitschke stated in his definition of this genus that the ground colour of the species which he referred to it was black. There was no such Greek word as that cited by Treitschke, but there was a very similar word, namely ψολος, which had the meaning "smoke" or "soot", a meaning which was entirely consistent both with Treitschke's diagnosis and with the appearance of the alpine species

¹ For the text of M. Berthet's communication, see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3 : 157.

concerned, which were very well figured in Volume 4 of Culot's "Noctuelles et Géomètres d'Europe". The name, as published by Treitschke, differed from *Psolos* only by the last letter but two, which in the Greek alphabet was the letter delta instead of the letter lamda. He (M. Berthet) had no doubt that the substitution of the letter "d" for the letter "l" in the transliteration of this word was due to an error. Such an error could easily occur in view of the great similarity of the two Greek letters, especially when these were written in capitals. He accordingly considered that the present was a case to which Article 19 of the *Règles* applied and was of the opinion that the spelling of this generic name should be emended from *Psodos* to *Psolos*.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the question of the interpretation of Article 19 of the *Règles* raised questions of difficulty, everything depending in any given case on whether a "faute d'orthographe", a "faute de transcription" or a "faute d'impression" was or was not "évident". The whole of the group of problems raised by this Article required, in the opinion of the International Commission, very careful examination with a view to the substitution in the *Règles* of a more readily workable provision for that embodied in the present Article. The present case was much simpler than many which arose under this Article owing to the fact that the author of the generic name in question had attempted to indicate the origin of the word selected by specifying the Greek word from which it was derived. The issues involved had been stated by M. Berthet and it might be possible for the Commission to come to an immediate decision in view of the close similarity between the present case and that dealt with by the Commission in their *Opinion* 36 (1911, *Smithson. misc. Coll.*, 2013:84). In that case the Commission had had to consider whether three names (*Trioxocera*, *Dioxocera*, *Pentoxocera*) should be emended by the substitution of one letter for another (the letter "z" for the letter "x") in the light of a partially incorrect statement by the original author of these names regarding their derivation from the Greek. He accordingly proposed that the meeting of the Section should be adjourned for a short time to enable the members of the Commission to consider the case submitted by M. Berthet.

THE SECTION accordingly agreed to adjourn to enable the Commission to consider this case.

(On resumption)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the case submitted by M. Berthet had been considered by the Commission which was unanimously of

the opinion that the case for the emendation of the name *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827, to *Psolos* under the provisions of Article 19 of the *Règles* had been established. A formal *Opinion* to this effect would be rendered by the Commission in due course and at the same time this generic name would be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology". The Section were indebted to M. Berthet for having brought forward this interesting case.

Stability in nomenclature versus rigid priority: Proposed extension and incorporation in the "Règles" of the plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

3. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) had given notice of his wish to submit on behalf of a large number of Scandinavian zoologists two proposals, each having as its object the promotion of stability in nomenclature at the expense of rigid priority. The first of these proposals was concerned to secure an extension of the plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in cases where the Commission considered that the strict application of those *Règles* would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity. The second proposal aimed at the recognition in the *Règles* of a Law of Prescription which would safeguard from change names in current use from being upset under the Law of Priority by names published before 1850 but not used in scientific literature since that date. Although these proposals were closely inter-related, it would, in his (the President's) view, be convenient for the Section to discuss each separately, though naturally it would be open to the Section, if it so desired, to consider the two proposals in relation to one another after it had considered each in isolation. He added that he had received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) a proposal very similar to the second of Dr. Lemche's proposals. He invited Dr. Lemche to place the first of his proposals before the Section.

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) said that the proposal which he now brought forward was submitted on behalf of a large and representative group of Scandinavian zoologists actively engaged in systematic or economic work, largely in the field of entomology². He had furnished the text of his proposal to the President of the Section in advance of the meeting of the Congress, and additional copies were available for any member of the Section who desired to have a copy for his personal use. This proposal was designed to extend the plenary powers now possessed by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature both by speeding up and by simplifying the procedure prescribed by the Congress in 1913. The changes proposed were: (1) the period of notice required to be given by the Commission before taking action on an application for the use of the

² For the text of Dr. Lemche's communication, see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3: 158-159.

plenary powers to be reduced from 12 months to 6 months ; (2) the deletion of the existing provision under which the Commission were bound to give the prescribed notice in two or more of five specified journals, none of which were commonly consulted by systematic zoologists and the substitution for this provision of one requiring the publication of notices in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and granting the Commission discretion to select other appropriate journals in which to publish these notices, these journals naturally varying according to the subject matter of the individual application concerned ; (3) the repeal of the provision requiring absolute unanimity in the Commission as a condition for the acceptance by the Commission of a proposal for the suspension of the *Règles* under the plenary powers, and the substitution for the existing *Liberum Veto* of a provision authorising the Commission to use its plenary powers in any case where there was a two-thirds majority in the Commission in favour of so doing ; (4) the repeal of the existing provision under which, when two-thirds or more but not all of the Commissioners voting were in favour of the suspension of the *Règles*, the case was referred to the President of the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress who thereupon appointed a special Board of Three Members, whose decision, either unanimous or by a majority, was final, and the substitution for this provision of one under which, when the voting on a proposal for the suspension of the *Règles* shows neither a two-thirds majority in favour nor a majority of two-thirds against suspension of the *Règles*, the case should be referred to the Section on Nomenclature, which, after discussion, would be free to authorise the Commission to re-examine the case and reach a decision thereon by a simple majority ; (5) the insertion of a provision placing on an equal footing every type of application where it could be shown that confusion rather than uniformity is likely to result from the strict application of the *Règles*, the special case of applications relating to the transfer of a name from one species to another being dealt with in future under the procedure suggested in (7) below ; (6) the insertion of an express direction to the Commission to reach decisions on applications for the suspension of the *Règles* as rapidly as is consistent with a proper study of the issues involved in each case ; (7) the insertion of a *Recommandation* urging that, in cases involving the transfer of a name from one species to another, the problem should be brought to the attention of the Commission as soon as possible after it was discovered that a strict application of the *Règles* would lead to a transfer of this kind and that, pending a decision by the Commission on that application, the customary name should be retained for the species

concerned, in preference to the name which should strictly be used under the *Règles*.

Continuing, DR. LEMCHE said that he hoped that the Section on Nomenclature and also the Commission would give the most serious and sympathetic consideration to the proposal which he had just outlined. It was a very moderate proposal and, in the view of the zoologists by whom it was submitted, represented the minimum change necessary to meet the present situation. The Scandinavian zoologists who put forward this proposal were deeply concerned at what appeared to be the unduly strict way in which the Law of Priority was too often followed. This concern was heightened by the conviction that, in spite of its efforts, the Commission was unable to deal satisfactorily with this class of case under the limited powers at present conferred upon it.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, as those of the members of the Section who had attended the recent meetings of the Commission were aware, the problem raised by Dr. Lemche's proposal had received the most detailed consideration by the Commission during the last few days. The Commission agreed that the present situation was unsatisfactory from a number of points of view and that it was essential that during the present Congress adequate remedies should be devised. In the choice of the remedies to be recommended, the Commission felt bound, however, to give due weight to the views of all types of zoologist. He asked the Section to believe that, if the recommendations submitted by the Commission appeared timid and lacking in vision, this was due not to any faint-heartedness on the part of the Commission or to any failure to recognise the profound dissatisfaction felt by many zoologists at the numerous changes in scientific names which were still taking place as the result of a strict application of the Law of Priority. The Commission was, however, the trustee for all zoologists and it was its duty therefore to steer a middle course in this matter between, on the one hand, the views held by those zoologists who believed that an adequate degree of stability in nomenclature could be secured only by placing some limitation upon the Law of Priority and on the other hand the views of those zoologists who regarded the Law of Priority as the sheet anchor of zoological nomenclature and were opposed therefore to any curtailment in the vigour of that Law. In pursuing this policy the Commission would, no doubt, be criticised by the hotheads in either camp, but, in view of the importance of securing the maximum degree of agreement regarding the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles*, the policy of the

Commission in this matter was, he was convinced, the one most likely to serve the common interest.

The proposals which he (the President) had now to lay before the Section on behalf of the Commission were general in character, being concerned not only with the special problem of the scope of the plenary powers entrusted to the Commission by the Congress but also with the reform of the procedure of the Commission in relation to applications of other kinds and with the reform of the Commission as a body. As the Section would see, the Commission looked upon this entire group of proposals as forming a single closely-integrated plan of reform. The adoption of the plan now submitted would, the Commission believed, secure for it a higher degree of efficiency and, in particular, a much greater speed in operation than that ever previously achieved. In approaching this problem the Commission had been inspired by a desire both to make the Commission as a body more genuinely representative and more genuinely international in character and also to secure the maximum degree of reform in the procedure of the Commission that could be achieved. The proposals now submitted followed the general lines set out in Commission Papers **I.C.(48)3** and **4**, copies of which had already been distributed. Additional copies were available for any member of the Section who desired to have a copy for his or her personal use.

On the question of the composition of the Commission as a body, the Commission felt that, having regard to the heavy responsibilities with which the Commission was charged, every possible measure should be taken to broaden the basis of the membership of the Commission and thereby to enhance its authority. The Commission accordingly proposed that the existing upper limit of the membership of the Commission should be abolished, but a lower limit of 18 retained. Under this system it would be possible for zoologists of any country in which any considerable volume of zoological work was being carried on to secure direct representation upon the Commission, if they so desired. As regards the mode of electing members of the Commission, it was proposed that nominations should be made by or through the leading scientific bodies in the countries concerned; the election would be made either by the Congress (in Congress years) or by the Commission itself (acting through its Executive Committee) at other times. In this respect the procedure would follow existing practice. It would be the duty of the Executive Committee to secure a proper balance in the membership of the Commission both of different types of knowledge in systematic and applied zoology and also of geographical representation. As at

present, one-third of the total membership of the Commission would retire automatically at each meeting of the Congress. This system would, by its flexibility, secure both a high degree of direct representation of the zoologists of the various countries and also an adequate degree of control by the Congress over the membership of the Commission. In addition, it was proposed that the Commission should be free to summon to its membership specialists of outstanding distinction in a particular field, irrespective of their nationality. From the indications already received by the Commission both before and since the opening of the present Congress, it was evident that the reforms described above were assured of a wide welcome from zoologists in many countries which, through the limitation hitherto imposed on the membership of the Commission, had till now been excluded from representation.

The Commission hoped also that the Congress would take the present opportunity to institute certain minor reforms in the regulations governing the membership of the Commission. It was desirable (1) that the Executive Committee, acting on behalf of the Commission, should be empowered to grant leave of absence to a member of the Commission in certain circumstances and to appoint an Alternate Member to act in his place, an Alternate Member so appointed to have full voting rights in exactly the same way as Alternate Members appointed by the Commission to take the place, during meetings held at the Congress, of members of the Commission who were unable to be present; (2) that Commissioners who failed to vote on proposed *Opinions* or *Declarations* on five successive occasions should be liable to be removed; (3) that, on incurring any of certain specified disabilities (imprisonment, bankruptcy, insanity), a member of the Commission should vacate his position as such; (4) that a member of the Commission should be free to resign his membership on giving notice in writing.

Turning to the question of the procedure of the Commission, which was dealt with in detail in Commission Paper I.C.(48)4, the President said that the members of the Commission were very conscious of the fact that, as a body, the Commission was open to criticism on the ground of the long period commonly required to obtain decisions on applications submitted to it. In part, these long delays were due to the inevitable difficulties which confronted any organisation which met only at long intervals and had therefore to conduct most of its business by correspondence. To a considerable extent, however, the slow-moving character of the Commission was due to faulty and inadequate machinery. In some respects the remedy lay

in the hands of the Commission itself, but in others the Commission needed the assistance of the Section on Nomenclature and the Congress before suitable remedies could be found. Under the first of these heads, the most serious stumbling-block to efficiency was the *Liberum Veto* gratuitously imposed by the Commission on itself in 1910, so far as concerned proposals affecting the reform of the *Règles*. At the present Session the Commission had agreed to annul the vote taken by themselves on this subject nearly 40 years ago and had adopted a much more business-like system, under which in future any proposal for the amendment or alteration of the *Règles* could, after the expiry of a period of six months from the date on which it was submitted by the Secretary to all the members of the Commission, be adopted as the recommendation of the whole Commission and would be incorporated in a *Declaration* for submission to the next meeting of the Congress, if at least one fourth of the members of the Commission had recorded their votes, and at least two out of every three votes cast were affirmative votes, votes cast by Commissioners who signified their willingness to support whatever view was held by the majority of the Commission being calculated as affirmative votes. In all other cases, except cases involving the use by the Commission of its plenary powers, the procedure would be similar, except that a proposed decision would be adopted as the decision of the whole Commission and incorporated in an *Opinion* if the number of affirmative votes exceeded the number of negative votes, if any. By these and other means the Commission hoped to be able to secure that, as soon as the present arrears of work had been cleared off, it would normally be possible for them to reach a decision on an application within 18 months of its receipt. The Commission proposed to publish an announcement on this subject for the information of the zoological public. It would readily be recognised how great would be the importance of this reform if it could be achieved, in view of the fact that in the past it had commonly taken from 5 to 10 years to obtain a decision from the Commission and not infrequently much longer.

Every effort would be made to live up to this programme but it must be realised that the whole position of the Commission must remain precarious, so long as the despatch of its day-to-day work depended upon the amount of time—either at night or at week-ends—which could be given to it by a spare-time honorary Secretary, who had to earn his living during the day in some other occupation. A substantial grant had been received by the Commission from U.N.E.S.C.O. to defray the cost of technical assis-

tance and office expenses, but, valuable as that was, it provided no solution to the central problem, namely how to secure that a sufficient number of hours of work should be devoted regularly to the direction of the affairs of the Commission. The situation would never be satisfactory until the Commission possessed an income sufficiently large and secure to enable it to employ a highly qualified whole-time salaried official responsible for discharging the bulk of the duties which at present had to be performed by the honorary Secretary.

There remained the special problem of the procedure to be followed by the Commission in dealing with applications for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in particular cases. This was the problem to which the proposal submitted by Dr. Lemche and his colleagues was specially directed. As Dr. Lemche and those members of the Section who had attended the recent meetings of the Commission were aware, this subject had received most careful consideration at the hands of the Commission who had had before them both Dr. Lemche's proposals and also certain less far-reaching proposals submitted by the Secretary. As a result, the Commission had reached conclusions which, though they did not go so far as Dr. Lemche and his colleagues had suggested, nevertheless went some distance in that direction. These conclusions had been reached unanimously by the Commission and had had the full support also of the other members of the Congress who had attended the meeting of the Commission. He (the President) hoped therefore that these conclusions would meet also with the full approval and support of the Section on Nomenclature.

The proposals in regard to the modification of the provisions of the Plenary Powers Resolution of March, 1913 (the text of which was embodied in the Commission's *Declaration* 5), which he now laid before the Section were as follows:—(1) the period of notice to be reduced from 12 months to 6 months; (2) the grant to the Commission of discretion to choose the most appropriate journal in which to give notice of proposals involving the use of the plenary powers, subject to the condition that in every case such notice should be given by the Commission in its own journal, the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, and that, of the other journals in which notice should be given, at least one should be a journal published in Europe and one a journal published in America; (3) the obsolete and objectionable *Liberum Veto* to be abolished and in its place a rule adopted under which a proposal for the use of the plenary powers would require a two-thirds majority of the

votes cast in the same way as proposals affecting the text of the *Règles*; (4) consequent upon this change, provisos (b) and (c) to Article 1 of the Resolution of March, 1913, to be repealed, together with Article 2 of that Resolution (which related to the setting-up of Boards of Three Members to consider cases where the Commission was not unanimously in favour of the use of the plenary powers in any given case but two-thirds of the members of the Commission favoured that course), other than the portion relating to the final character of decisions taken by the Commission under the plenary powers. Finally, the Commission recommended that the provisions relating to the use of the plenary powers should be incorporated in the *Règles* as a substantive Article, for those provisions formed as much a part of the international law relating to zoological nomenclature as any of the provisions already included in the *Règles*.

THE PRESIDENT added that the Commission looked upon their proposals for the reform of the membership of the Commission and the proposals for the reform of its procedure as intimately connected with one another. The Commission considered that these proposals constituted a balanced programme, each part of which was as necessary as any other. The Commission asked that the Section should regard these proposals in this light. Finally, the Commission asked also that the proposed reforms in procedure should enter into force forthwith.

The Commission proposed that, if the Congress approved their proposals for the reform of the rules governing the composition and procedure of the Commission, the Commission's By-Laws should be thoroughly revised, both to make them complete and also to distinguish between the organic provisions prescribed by the Congress (and therefore capable of being altered only by the Congress) and the remaining provisions, not being inconsistent with the organic provisions, which had been adopted by the Commission itself and which could be altered by that body.

DR. LEMCHE said that, while the proposals submitted by the Commission for the reform of the plenary powers procedure did not go so far as he and his colleagues had advocated, he recognised that the reformed procedure now proposed was a great improvement on that laid down in 1913. He had taken part in the discussions in the Commission which had led up to the present proposals and he was prepared to accept them on behalf both of himself and of the Scandinavian zoologists for whom he was acting.

After other members of the Section had signified their concurrence in the proposals put forward by the Commission, MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM

submitted a motion that the proposals in regard to the reform of the rules governing the membership and procedure of the Commission which had been laid before the Section by the President on behalf of the Commission be approved and adopted and that the Section should submit a recommendation to the International Congress of Zoology that they should approve those proposals at the final *Concilium Plenum* of the present meeting of the Congress. The motion proposed by MR. RILEY was thereupon seconded by PROFESSOR E. BELTRÁN (MEXICO). After an opportunity had been given to any member of the Section, who might so desire to move an amendment to this proposal and no such amendment having been brought forward, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) added that a reference to this subject would be included in the Report which would in due course be submitted by the Commission to the Section for approval and transmission to the Congress for presentation at the final *Concilium Plenum*.

4. THE SECTION turned next to consider the second of the two proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* in the interest of securing greater stability in nomenclature of which notice had been received from Dr. Lemche³.

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) said that the object of the proposal which he now laid before the Section was to prevent the upsetting, on grounds of priority, of well-established names which had been in common use for upwards of a century. The Law of Priority was of great value, in so far as it served the purpose for which it had originally been adopted, namely, the promotion of uniformity in nomenclature, but it was a defect of that Law that it could be employed to upset well-known names by substituting for them long-forgotten names of earlier date dug up for the purpose from obscure books or journals which had long since passed into oblivion. It was to remedy this defect of the Law of Priority that he and his colleagues in the Scandinavian countries proposed that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* which would afford protection to names which had been in general use since the beginning of the year 1850. They accordingly proposed the incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision in the following terms: "A name of a genus or species, given before the year 1850 and not used in scientific literature since 1st January 1850, is to be rejected in favour

Proposed
incorporation in the
"Règles" of a
provision
establishing a Law
of Prescription
limiting the scope
of the Law of
Priority

³ For the text of Dr. Lemche's communication, see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 159-161.

of such other name which has been in general use for the genus or species in question since that date."

MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) said that he was thoroughly in agreement with the object of the proposal brought forward by Dr. Lemche. Although himself a professional museum worker, he had no sympathy with those who spent their time in unearthing old names and substituting them for well-known names in current use. It was much to be regretted that time should be wasted in unfruitful work of this kind, which contributed nothing to the knowledge of systematics, when there were so many urgent and important problems awaiting study. Personally, he would like to see also a great development of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and the grant of absolute protection against the Law of Priority to names once placed upon that List. He would like, for example, to see the generic nomenclature of the Class Mammalia stabilised by the grant of official approval to the names used in the admirable list published by Dr. G. G. Simpson, of the American Museum of Natural History, New York. If action of this kind could not be taken under the *Règles* as they stood, then let the *Règles* be changed as soon as possible to enable this to be done. Zoologists were tired of endless disputes on questions of priority. What they wanted was stability of nomenclature so that they could get on with their proper work. He urged both the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Congress not to allow themselves to be too timid in this matter. They should keep abreast of the current sentiment of zoologists and, in deference to that sentiment, adopt a statesmanlike and progressive view in this matter.

MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that he was strongly opposed to the digging-up of old names and the unearthing of old books containing forgotten names, and the substitution of those names for well-known names in common use. He suggested that the Section should invite the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to consider the best means to be adopted for banning the upsetting of well-established names in this way, and to submit a report on this subject to the next meeting of the Congress. If this course were to be agreed upon by the Section, Dr. Lemche would, he hoped, be prepared not to press for an immediate decision on the proposal which he had himself laid before the Section.

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) said that, if the Section so preferred, he would be prepared to fall in with the alternative course suggested by Mr. Riley, and in that event he would himself second Mr. Riley's proposal. What

he and his colleagues were anxious to secure was that an end should be put to the use of the Law of Priority as an instrument for upsetting current nomenclature. Any well-founded proposal to this end would receive the support of his colleagues and himself.

MR. JEAN DELACOUR (U.S.A.) said that he was in thorough agreement with the views which had been expressed. He considered it important that an effective settlement should be reached. If this could not be achieved during the present Congress, he would not offer objection to the proposal made by Mr. Riley, provided that it was made clear that the Congress regarded this question as a matter of urgency and that it was intended that the question should be brought to a definite issue at the next meeting of the Congress.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the proposal brought forward by Dr. Lemche dealt with a matter of great importance and it was evident that a growing body of zoologists felt that the present provisions in the *Règles* were not sufficient to secure stability in nomenclature. Dr. Lemche's proposal, as also a similar proposal which had been received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (France), had the same object as that which the Congress had set itself when at Monaco in 1913 they had granted the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in cases where they were satisfied that greater confusion than uniformity would otherwise occur. The present proposal went considerably further than the Congress had then thought it prudent to go, for it contemplated the automatic rejection of names published before a certain date, where those names had not been used in scientific literature subsequent thereto.

He agreed with the suggestion that this question should be referred to the International Commission for investigation, for the problems involved in working out practicable provisions which would secure the desired object without at the same time giving rise to anomalies were probably greater than appeared on the surface. If the survey to be undertaken by the Commission were to produce the best possible results, it should cover the whole field, and the terms of reference to be given to the Commission should be general in character. He suggested therefore that the Commission should be invited: "to consider generally the problem of how to secure greater stability in zoological nomenclature and to submit a Report thereon, with proposals, to the next (Fourteenth) International Congress of Zoology." The Commission would thus be able to take

into account all relevant factors, including the whole problem of the adequacy of the plenary powers granted to the Commission and the principles which should govern the use of those powers. This subject, which clearly deserved consideration, had been raised in a document which just before the opening of the present Congress he had received from a group of specialists in the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, who, unlike the zoologists attending the present meeting, were in favour of a narrower rather than a wider use of those powers.

MR. JEAN DELACOUR (U.S.A.) said that, if no change was to be made in the mandatory portion of the *Règles* until the next meeting of the Congress five years hence, it was, he thought, important that the present Congress should at least indicate its view on the question raised by Dr. Lemche by adding a *Recommandation* to Article 25 of the *Règles* urging authors who discovered that a well-known name was invalid to refer the case at once to the Commission and to refrain from changing the name in question until a decision on the question had been reached by the Commission.

MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) agreed that, if a decision on the general issue was to be deferred until the next meeting of the Congress, it became all the more important that the limited action proposed by Mr. Delacour should be taken by the present Congress. He accordingly seconded Mr. Delacour's proposal.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he was in sympathy with the views expressed by Mr. Delacour and Mr. Morrison-Scott. The insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* of the kind proposed would be in harmony with the general view of the International Commission that it was desirable that the *Règles* should indicate, by means of non-mandatory *Recommandations*, the ideal standard of procedure in cases where, without such guidance, some zoologists might follow courses which were at variance with the general will. A *Recommandation* of the kind proposed would be of still greater value if it were to draw special attention to the need for avoiding the upsetting, on technical grounds of priority, of names which were of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science and other applied fields of biology. Nothing had done more to bring zoological nomenclature into discredit with men of science who were not systematists than the failure of the *Règles* to prevent changes on narrow technical grounds of the names of animals of importance outside the field of systematic zoology.

PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) said that in the case of generic names it was not only priority which led to the discarding of well-known names, for rectifications in the designations of type species had exactly the same effect. He suggested therefore that words should be added to the proposed *Recommandation* to cover this point.

After further discussion the PRESIDENT said that the Section appeared to be unanimous as to the general line of action to be taken. He proposed therefore to ask the Section to adjourn for a short time to enable him to draw up a form of words giving effect to what appeared to be the general wish, so that the Section might have a concrete proposal on which to continue their discussion. As the action proposed included the addition of a new, though non-mandatory, provision to the *Règles*, it was his duty, as President of the Section, to ascertain the views of the Commission before he formally put the question to the Section. He would take advantage of the proposed adjournment to consult the members of the Commission on this question.

THE SECTION accordingly agreed to adjourn for a short time to enable the President both to prepare for its consideration a form of words embodying the substance of the preceding discussion and also to consult the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

(On resumption)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the members of the International Commission were unanimously in favour of the course advocated in the discussion which had taken place in the Section immediately prior to the adjournment. He suggested that effect would be given to that discussion if the Section were now to adopt a resolution on the following lines :—

Proposed Resolution

THE SECTION agree :—

- (1) to take note (a) of the proposal put forward by Dr. H. Lemche (Denmark) for the incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision recognising a Law of Prescription which would prohibit the replacement, on grounds of priority, of well-known names by names published prior to 1850 where those names had not subsequently been used in scientific

- literature and (b) of the similar proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) ;
- (2) to invite the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to study the question of how to secure greater stability in zoological nomenclature and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, to the next (Fourteenth) International Congress of Zoology ;
 - (3) to recommend that, without prejudice to the recommendations to be submitted under (2) above, there should at once be inserted at an appropriate point in the *Règles* a provision :
 - (a) that, where a worker discovers that a well-known name in common use, particularly a name of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science or other applied fields of biology, is invalid under either the Law of Priority or the Law of Homonymy or, in the case of a generic name, has as its type species a species other than the species commonly accepted as such, that worker should at once report the case to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for such action as the Commission may deem to be proper ;
 - (b) that in such a case neither the worker by whom the error in accepted practice is discovered nor any subsequent worker should change that practice by substituting some other name for that in common use until such time as the decision on the future status of the name in question is made known by the said Commission.

THE PRESIDENT next enquired whether the Section were of the opinion that a resolution in the foregoing terms adequately covered the field traversed in the preceding discussion. On the Section indicating their agreement on this point, the President suggested that some member of the Section should now formally bring forward a proposal that the Section adopt a resolution in this sense. As the action now contemplated owed its inspiration to the initiative taken by Dr. Lemche and his Scandinavian colleagues, it would be particularly appropriate if he were to move the proposed resolution.

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) then proposed, and MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) seconded, a motion that the Section adopt a Resolution in the terms drafted by the President of the Section. After an opportunity had been given for any member of the Section, who might so desire, to move an amendment to the foregoing motion and no such amendment had been proposed, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

**Nomenclature of
Protozoan and
other parasites of
Man**

5. PROFESSOR ENRIQUE BELTRÁN (MEXICO) then presented his paper on "Les Protozoaires de l'Homme". Professor Beltrán said that at the present time many of the Protozoa parasitic to Man were known by names possessing only a *de facto* basis.⁴ If the *Règles* were to be strictly applied, many of those names would be found to be invalid and in need of replacement. The older literature was highly involved and the solution of the numerous and complicated taxonomic questions required the active co-operation of specialists. He therefore suggested the appointment of a committee of protozoologists charged with the duty of studying the nomenclature of Protozoa, with a view to the submission of recommendations to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for the addition to the "Official List" of the names of genera, in those cases where it was found that the names in question were available under the *Règles* for use in the sense in which they were commonly employed, and, in the case of names not found to be so available, for validation by the Commission as a preliminary to their being also placed on the "Official List".

Continuing, Professor Beltrán expressed the view that the greatest care should be taken by the International Commission, when rendering *Opinions*, to confine themselves strictly to nomenclatorial questions. Sufficient attention had not always been paid in the past to this important principle. For example, *Opinion* 99, which dealt with the relative status of the names *Endamoeba* Leidy, 1879, and *Entamoeba* Casagrandi & Barbagello, 1895, contained much matter of a taxonomic character which was totally out of place in a discussion on nomenclature. On the other hand, Professor Beltrán welcomed the policy adopted by the Commission in *Opinion* 104, in which, when stabilising the nomenclature of the human malaria parasites, the Commission had made express provision both for those protozoologists who regarded the quartan and aestivo-autumnal parasites as congeneric and also for those who took the opposite taxonomic view. For the benefit of the former, the Commission had placed on the "Official List" the generic

⁴ For the text of Professor Beltrán's communication, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* 3: 162-163.

name *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, while for the benefit of the latter they had added also the name *Laverania* Grassi & Feletti, 1890. In this way the Commission had succeeded in stabilising the nomenclature of these important genera, without expressing any view on the taxonomic relationships of the species concerned.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at their meeting held at Lisbon in 1935 the International Commission had adopted a resolution (subsequently embodied in *Declaration* 10) welcoming the formation of groups of specialists for the study of the nomenclature of particular groups of the Animal Kingdom. Professor Beltrán's proposal for the appointment of a committee of protozoologists to study the nomenclature of the Phylum Protozoa was assured, therefore, of the hearty support of the Commission. That there was a real need for such a committee was evident from the difficulties which had been encountered in regard to the generic names *Plasmodium* and *Laverania*, to which Professor Beltrán had referred, for, although the entries in regard to these names made in the "Official List" were in complete harmony with the universal practice of protozoologists, investigations undertaken recently both by Professor Robert L. Usinger and Dr. Curtis W. Sabrosky in the United States and by himself had shown that under the *Règles* those entries were incorrect in almost every particular. In that particular case proposals for validating existing practice would be laid before the Commission later during its present Session, and it was to be hoped therefore that the position as regards these names would shortly be regularised. It was naturally not possible for the Commission itself or for its Secretary to undertake such investigations except in special cases such as the present which had been necessitated by the need to correct the erroneous entries already inadvertently made in the "Official List". In this field therefore the assistance of a committee of specialists such as had been suggested would be of particular value.

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
6th meeting,
Minute 8).

Professor Beltrán had alluded to the need for the Commission to exclude taxonomic considerations when deciding whether to include generic names on the "Official List". In making this observation, Professor Beltrán had raised a point the importance of which was not always sufficiently understood. The object of the "Official List" was to stabilise the use of the names of certain genera for their respective type species. The decision taken in such cases was purely nomenclatorial, though it inevitably carried with it the corollary that the names so stabilised, and no other names, should also be used for any species

which specialists might regard on taxonomic grounds as being congeneric with the type species of the genera concerned. It was no part, however, of the function of the Commission to decide, or for the "Official List" to imply, any view as to the taxonomic limits of genera. He, therefore, welcomed the approval expressed by Professor Beltrán of the action taken by the Commission when in *Opinion* 104 they had placed on the "Official List" not only the oldest generic name (*Plasmodium*) for any of the human malaria parasites but also the name *Laverania* for the benefit of those protozoologists who regarded the aestivo-autumnal parasite (which was the type of that genus) as referable to a different genus from that to which the quartan parasite was assigned. It would be very helpful to the Commission when considering proposals for further additions to the "Official List" if the Congress were now expressly to place on record their approval of the policy of placing two or more generic names on the "Official List" in cases where specialists were agreed on the importance of stabilising the nomenclature of a particular group but were not unanimous on the purely taxonomic question of whether more than one genus was involved.

MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) said that the appointment of the proposed committee had his support, for the object underlying that proposal was to secure that, if well-established nomenclatorial practice and the Law of Priority were to come into conflict with one another, it should be the Law of Priority and not well-established nomenclatorial practice which should go to the wall.

The view was expressed in subsequent discussion that, while it was certainly important to stabilise the names of genera in the Phylum Protozoa containing species which were parasitic to Man, it was equally important to stabilise the names of genera in other Phyla containing such species. It was accordingly suggested that the proposal before the Section should be modified to take account of this consideration. It was realised that the literature involved might be so specialised that it might be found desirable either to divide the proposed committee into panels, each of which would concentrate upon the nomenclature of parasites belonging to a particular Phylum, or to appoint separate committees to undertake such studies.

PROFESSOR ENRIQUE BELTRÁN (MEXICO) said that his object in bringing forward the proposal which he had laid before the Section was to secure that a start should

be made in the stabilisation of the nomenclature of the parasites of Man. In that proposal he had specified the Phylum Protozoa, for that was the group in which he was specially interested, but he agreed that it would be of advantage to consider the nomenclature of all parasites of Man, irrespective of the Phyla to which they belonged. He accordingly supported the extension of his proposal which had been suggested.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) asked the Section to adjourn for a short time both to permit the members of the Commission to confer together and to enable him to draft a form of words to give effect to the general sense of the discussion.

THE SECTION accordingly agreed to adjourn for a short time for the purposes indicated by the President.

(On resumption)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the members of the Commission were unanimously in favour of the course which had been advocated in the discussion which had taken place in the Section immediately prior to the adjournment. He suggested that effect would be given to that discussion if the Section were now to adopt a resolution on the following lines:—

Proposed Resolution

THE SECTION agree:—

- (1) to invite the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to concert with specialists for the appointment of a committee or committees to study the nomenclature of the Phylum Protozoa and other Phyla containing species parasitic to Man and to make proposals to the Commission for the addition to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", whether under the plenary powers or otherwise, of the names of leading genera in those Phyla, particularly genera containing species parasitic to Man, for the purpose of promoting the stabilisation of the nomenclature of the species concerned;
- (2) to place on record, for the guidance of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, their view that, in order to eliminate taxonomic problems from consideration when names are added to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", it is desirable that two or more generic names should be placed on that List, in cases where specialists are agreed on the importance

of stabilising the nomenclature of a particular group but are not unanimous on the purely taxonomic question of whether more than one genus is involved.

THE PRESIDENT next enquired whether the Section were of the opinion that a resolution in the foregoing terms adequately covered the field traversed in the preceding discussion. On the Section indicating their agreement on this point, the President suggested that some member of the Section should now formally bring forward a proposal that the Section adopt a resolution in this sense.

PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) then proposed, and Mr. C. F. DOS PASSOS (U.S.A.) seconded, a motion that the Section adopt a Resolution in the terms drafted by the President of the Section. After an opportunity had been given to any member of the Section, who might so desire, to move an amendment to the foregoing motion and no such amendment had been proposed, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in the "Règles"

6. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next item to be considered was the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" (binary nomenclature) as used in the *Règles*. The Section would recall that the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Lisbon in 1935 had charged the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to examine, and to submit to the present Congress a Report on, the meaning of the foregoing expression as used in the *Règles*. This action had been taken in the hope that an objective study of this subject, undertaken in consultation with leading specialists, would provide a means for bringing to an end the deplorable controversy which for so long had centred round this subject and which had come to a head in 1930 as the result of hasty and ill-considered action taken in the Section on Nomenclature at the Eleventh International Congress of Zoology. In the interval which had elapsed since the Lisbon Congress, this problem had been the subject of extensive discussions carried out on behalf of the Commission by their Secretary by correspondence with leading specialists in different parts of the world on the basis of a paper published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in which he had set out the issues involved and by extensive personal discussions at meetings held both in America and in Europe. It was extremely gratifying to find that, as the result of these discussions, the ground had

been cleared for a solution of this problem on terms which would be mutually acceptable to zoologists of all shades of opinion. A draft Report had been prepared for the consideration of the Commission on the basis of these discussions. Copies of this document had been distributed under cover of Commission Paper I.C.(48)5 and additional copies were available for any member of the Section who desired to have a copy for his or her personal use. The Commission had unanimously approved and adopted this Report and had authorised and requested the Secretary to sign it on their behalf and submit it to the President of the Section in discharge of the duty committed to the Commission by the Lisbon Congress.

The Commission pointed out in this Report that two distinct questions were involved : (1) What was the meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as actually used in Articles 25 and 26 of the *Règles* ? (2) Is that meaning the meaning which it is the general wish of zoologists should be conveyed by those Articles, and, if not, what change in the wording of those Articles is desirable ? The examination carried out into the first of these questions had shown conclusively that, as used in the two Articles of the *Règles* concerned, the expression " nomenclature binaire " bore a meaning identical with that which would have been conveyed if, instead of that expression, the expression " nomenclature binominale " had been employed. As regards the second of the two questions involved, it was evident from the consultations which had been held that the foregoing meaning was also the meaning which the general body of zoologists desired should be conveyed by Articles 25 and 26, provided that suitable safeguards were introduced to protect certain generic names in common use which had been published subsequent to 1757 by authors who, while accepting the proposition that the name of a species should convey two concepts, that of the genus and that of the species, did not give effect to that proposition by using the Linnean system of binominal nomenclature. Accordingly, in the Report now submitted, the Commission recommended that both in Article 25 and in Article 26 the expression " nomenclature binominale " should be substituted for the expression " nomenclature binaire " and that the plenary powers should be used to protect the special class of generic names to which reference had just been made. It was further agreed that there should be attached to the *Règles* a schedule, to be known as the First Schedule (in contrast to the existing *Appendice*, which it was proposed should in future be known as the " Second Schedule "), in which should be inserted particulars of every decision taken by the Commission under their plenary powers. A record

would therefore be found in this Schedule of every decision taken by the Commission to validate generic names published by non-binominal authors or to validate books containing such names. Further, the Commission proposed that the Article which (earlier in the present meeting) the Section had agreed should be inserted in the *Règles* to incorporate the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913, subject to certain amendments agreed upon by the Section, should contain a provision exempting applications for the validation of generic names or of books of the kind specified above from the regulations prescribing the giving of specified notice required in other cases involving the use by the Commission of their plenary powers. In one case of outstanding importance to ornithologists, namely, the generic names published by Brisson in 1760 in his "Ornithologia", the Commission had agreed to take action at once by placing that book in the proposed First Schedule to the *Règles*, thereby securing the immediate availability of the names in question. Consequential upon the foregoing conclusions, the Commission had agreed to cancel *Opinion* 20 (which contained an incorrect interpretation of the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire") and *Opinion* 37 (which stated—incorrectly—that under the existing *Règles* the generic names in Brisson's "Ornithologia" were nomenclatorially available) and to modify (in a manner which the President then explained) the wording of the "summary" of *Opinion* 24 and the title of *Opinion* 35.

In submitting the present Report to the Section and, through the Section, to the Congress, the Commission were happy to record that they had been able to achieve the unanimous settlement of a problem which had baffled every previous attempt to secure general agreement.

MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that the Commission was to be congratulated on the way in which they had discharged the duty imposed upon them by the Lisbon Congress. The task had been one of great difficulty, and the successful outcome of the labours of the Commission would, he felt sure, be warmly welcomed by the Section. He had pleasure in proposing the adoption of the Report of the Commission and its submission to the Congress.

PROFESSOR ENRIQUE BELTRÁN (MEXICO) said that he wished to associate himself with the tribute just paid to the work of the Commission in this matter. He seconded the motion proposed by Mr. Riley.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) then enquired whether any other member wished to comment on the Report and in particular whether any member

wished to move an amendment to the motion which had just been proposed. No such amendment was, however, proposed. THE PRESIDENT then put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

**Second Meeting
of the Section on
Nomenclature :
date and time
appointed**

7. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he did not propose to lay any further business before the Section at its present meeting. Good progress had been made by the Section in the important task before them, and there was every reason to hope that before the end of the Congress the Section would have completed the whole of their programme. The next meeting of the Section would be held at the same place on the morning of the following day, Saturday, 24th July, at 09.00 hours.

(The Section thereupon adjourned at 12.05 hours)



Hemming, Francis. and Shorey, J. H. 1950. "Thirteenth international congress of zoology." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 5, 1-26.

<https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.11376>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44284>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.11376>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/11376>

Holding Institution

Natural History Museum Library, London

Sponsored by

Natural History Museum Library, London

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.