

---

# A HISTORY OF BOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE<sup>1</sup>

---

Dan H. Nicolson<sup>2</sup>

## ABSTRACT

I divide botanical nomenclature into three partly overlapping periods: the schismatic period (1840–1930), the dark ages (1915–1950), and the IAPT renaissance (1950–date). The schisms began with the 1843 British Association for the Advancement of Science approval of zoological rules and became manifest with the 1867 Paris Congress approval of Alphonse de Candolle's botanical "laws." Reunification efforts, such as those by Dall (1877.12), failed. The contemporary rise of "Darwinism" added to the divisiveness. By the late 1800s, various botanical centers had or were evolving modified or different Codes from the Candollean, not to mention fully formed Codes from "outsiders" like Saint-Lager (1880.03?, 1881.04) and Kuntze (1891.10). The 1905 Vienna Congress eliminated all but the Brittonian (American) schism, which continued until the 1930 Cambridge Congress compromises. A nomenclatural "dark age" descended when the 1915 London Congress was cancelled because of a subsequent engagement, World War I. The next congress (Ithaca, 1926) declared itself incompetent due to insufficient international representation. The 1930 Cambridge Congress revised the 1912 Brussels Code but, largely because of the death of Briquet in 1931, its Code appeared only a few months before the 1935 Amsterdam Congress that amended it. Again a World War struck and no official Amsterdam Code was ever produced. The 1950 Stockholm Congress saw the establishment of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy, its journal, *Taxon*, in which all Code amendment proposals now appear, and its serial publication, *Regnum Vegetabile*, in which all subsequent Codes appear at the remorseless six-year pace of the congresses.

---

The Linnaean aphorisms (1737.07) concerning nomenclature basically concern generic nomenclature (the first part of the binary system of nomenclature). Few seem to have realized that the species names Linnaeus discussed are the diagnostic phrase names, not the species epithets, called *nomina trivialia*, that Linnaeus later, for plants (1753.05.01), adopted in his revolutionary binomial (or biverbal) system.

The Linnaean nomenclature (binomial) system has two facets: divorcing the name from the diagnosis and minimizing classification. Systems that totally eliminate classification, such as uninomial systems, are unwieldy. Systems that try to diagnose, such as phrase names, are unstable. Bergeret devised the worst of all possible systems, called *phytonomatotechnie*, a 15-letter uninomial system with each letter expressing a descriptive characteristic, such as *leglyabiajisbey* for *Belladonna*. Du Petit Thouars added a bit of the family name to each generic name (such as *Habenorchis* to replace *Habenaria*). Fossil nomenclature is still troubled by mixing generic nomenclature with morphology.

Priority had no part of the early schemes of nomenclature. Their authors, including Linnaeus, were focused on replacing the past. Linnaeus was

the winner of this competition but contemporary and subsequent workers continued to devise new nomenclatural schemes and rules to overturn the past.

## EARLY RECOGNITION OF MODIFIED PRIORITY (1813)

Augustin Pyramus de Candolle (1813), about to initiate the great *Prodromus*, gave a nice discussion of nomenclature of what might be termed good practices with examples. He (p. 250) favored priority except in the following five cases: (1) if the name was false and contradicted the characters of the plant, such as *Lunaria annua* (a biennial); (2) if the name was contrary to Linnaean practices such as pre-Linnaean or common names or if named by travelers who were not naturalists; (3) if the name was a later homonym of a name already published, be it in the plant or animal kingdom; (4) if the name was a later homonym or a tautonym created in the process of maintaining the epithet of an early name; (5) if the name was a *nomen nudum*, lacking at least a phrase sufficient to make recognition possible, such as "in a simple catalogue of a garden." De Candolle did not use such modern words as epithet, homonym, tautonym, or *nomen nudum* but that is what he talked about. This was

---

<sup>1</sup> I thank Krister Karttunen (Helsinki) and Ronald Stuckey (Columbus, Ohio), who shared their bibliographies on nomenclature. I also thank Werner Greuter, director, and the staff (Berlin) for access to and all facilities at their quickly regrowing library.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Botany NHB-166, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.



still a biological code, revealed by the avoidance of homonymy with earlier names in zoology.

There undoubtedly are earlier authors who had the idea of trying to maintain usage, unlike reformers such as Linnaeus. The general idea was to maintain usage from Linnaeus by the principle of priority with certain modifications. It is the modifications that have caused most of the disagreements.

#### BEGINNING OF THE BREAK WITH ZOOLOGY (1843)

The approval of Strickland's 1843 Code by a committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science officially began what I call a split. However, they were not thinking in terms of a split, as is clear from the second of the following quotations:

The first quote concerns the evil that they wish to address. "It consists in this, that when naturalists *are* agreed as the characters and limits of an individual group or species, they still disagree in the appellations by which they distinguish it." Further on they discuss the sins that create this evil.

Finally, so all will know how botanical nomenclature was perceived by zoologists (including Charles Darwin, a member of the Strickland Committee): "... we conceive that the botanical nomenclature of the present day stands in much less need of distinct enactment than the zoological. The admirable rules laid down by Linnaeus, Smith, Decandolle, and other botanists . . . , have always exercised a beneficial influence over their disciples. Hence the language of botany has attained a more perfect and stable condition than zoology and . . . its present backward and abnormal state. . . ."

One of the subsequently liveliest issues was the question of author citation in new combinations. This work recommended (for the first time?) citing only the author first publishing a name for the species (optionally in parentheses), irrespective in what genus the epithet was now used. Peter F. Stevens has suggested (in litt.) "that the development of this convention is associated with changes in the philosophy that species are created, fixed and immutable, and placed in similar genera; what came to be important in priority was who first discovered the unknown species, not who finally put it in the 'right' genus."

#### CANDOLLEAN LAWS OF 1867

On 1 August 1867 Alphonse de Candolle finished the cornerstone work of botanical nomenclature for the meeting of the International Botanical

Congress of 16 August 1867 in Paris. This 60-page paper has 11 pages of introduction, 19 pages of "laws" in 68 articles, and 28 pages of commentary. The commentary is particularly valuable because it comments on past usage with examples. One of the main issues (one-third of the commentary) concerns author citation, favoring the old way (only the name of the transferring author) but noting that others had introduced the new way (only the name of the author first publishing the basionym) in botany. The issue is exemplified by how to cite Robert Brown's *Matthiola tristis*, previously known as Linnaeus's *Cheiranthus tristis*; the old way is *Matthiola tristis* R. Br., and the new way is *Matthiola tristis* L.

According to Bentham (1878.12), it was the nomenclatural objections to J. Müller's treatment of Euphorbiaceae in the *Prodromus* that occasioned de Candolle's producing his *Lois*. See Seemann (1866.12.01), Gray (1867.01), and A. L. de Candolle (1867.05.01) for contemporary discussion. De Candolle indicated that Karl Koch's proposals (1866) to the London International Horticultural Exhibition and Botanical Congress provided the inspiration. Alphonse de Candolle was president of the London 1866 Congress and might have been stimulated to start thinking about codifying rules. However, I found little in Koch's proposals or the proceedings that would have been as inspiring as the nomenclatural novelties that Jean Müller slipped into de Candolle's *Prodromus*. Müller's major sin was to credit names, such as *Croton*, to himself when he redefined the taxon.

Apparently between 1 and 16 August 1867, a commission, composed of Du Mortier, Weddell, Cosson, J.-E. Planchon, Eichler, Bureau, and de Candolle (representing France, England, Germany, Belgium, and Switzerland), went over the proposed articles and suggested modifications in the form of motions to the Congress. At the Congress (cf. de Candolle, 1867.11) there were the first discussions of vital questions such as Order vs. Family, Cohort as a rank between Class and Order, long discussions about how to name hybrids, more debate on author citation for new combinations, even a mention of types in discussions. Otto Kuntze, who later will make himself famous in nomenclature, made a proposal about pleonasms and it passed. Eichler argued for replacing -ae- with -i-, as in *hederaefolia*, but was finessed by Alphonse de Candolle who said this was a matter of latinity and grammar, not nomenclature.

It is worth noting that the Code (1867.09.12) was not enforced like the current Code(s). It was "adopted by the assembly as the best guide to follow



for botanical nomenclature" (A. L. de Candolle, 1867.11: 208).

Within 18 months de Candolle (1869.06) felt compelled to address the questions and criticisms raised by "his" Code, including approbation. He gently demanded permission not to speak of the vexing question of author citation, pointing out that he seemed to have involuntarily provoked a kind of polemic and antipathy that rarely contributes to progress in science. He continued to avoid discussion of Greek and Latin because it doesn't involve nomenclature. I mention most of the issues that he addressed in his quiet and civil fashion (with my summary): (1) retroactivity of laws (pro); (2) saving the name when a taxon is subdivided (pro); (3) effective publication; (4) citation of unpublished names (ex favored over in); (5) names contrary to fact (con); (6) hybrids and cultivated plants.

Dall (1877.12) released an important survey of American zoologists with another Code, including the Candollean laws, for botanists and zoologists. This was not a unified (biological) Code because, when there were real differences (as the different endings for family names) then there were separate but contiguous articles. Otherwise an article pertained to both botany and zoology. For those interested, an excellent discussion of the differences between the two Codes was published in 1944 (see bibliography).

Saint-Lager was peeved by the Candollean efforts to maintain status quo, characterized as "continuation of disorder and anarchy." In 1880 he released his reform, aiming to overhaul all the "bad" spelling. This substantial treatment (155 pages, supplemented by 50 more pages the following year) covered most orthography questions (some that continue to vex us), applying pure classicism or peculiar conventions to change an astounding number of names or epithets. His ideas included (1) replacing *Panax* (p. 109) with *Panaxus* (at least we wouldn't argue about its gender) and (2) replacing genitive (p. 118) substantives (*nemorum*, *segetum*, *sepium*) with corresponding adjectives (*nemoralis*, *segetalis*, *sepicola*). The major effect was to make botanists aware that correctness could overturn usage and to strengthen support for the Candollean laws.

In 1883 Alphonse de Candolle published his "New remarks" (commented on by Asa Gray, 1883.12). De Candolle reviewed what happened over the past 16 years. His introduction commented on the Codes and Reports of nonbotanical groups. The opening part surveyed ongoing discussions article by article. The second part dealt with new matters, such as nomenclature of organs

and fossils. The third part (61–76) included the 1867 Code with an indication of the changes proposed.

#### KEW RULE

The first mention of what will be known as the "Kew Rule" was by Henry Trimen (1877.06). This was objected to by de Candolle (1877.08). Hiern (1878.03) stoutly defended it. The first formal definition was by Trimen (1878.06: 171). Bentham (1878.12) protested "... creating a new name in order to combine an old specific with a new generic one." Jackson (1887.03) discussed his problems with what was to become *Index Kewensis*. The Kew Rule: "Our practice is to take the name under which any given plant is first placed in its true genus as the name to be kept up, even though the author of it may have ignored the proper rule of retaining the specific name [epithet], when transferring it from its old genus to the new." The Kew Rule was opposed again by Alphonse de Candolle (1888.10), but supporters perceived it as applying the principle of priority by maintaining the oldest applicable (binomial) name.

In January 1888 Asa Gray, the monarch of American botany, died, having supported the Kew Rule in one of his last papers (1887.12). Within months Nathaniel Lord Britton (Joseph Ewan assured me that the accent is on "Lord") began to show the first inklings of a drastic "new" nomenclature, shocking the Old Guard. The Candollean Code was under attack and promised to flood the new Index with unnecessary names. Many new combinations appeared in Poggenberg et al.'s (1888.04) *Preliminary Catalogue*, hailed by Greene (1888.06) as the "opening of a new era," but attacked by James Britten (1888.09) and Alphonse de Candolle (1888.10) as "mischievous," despite a spirited defense by Britton (1888.10).

#### KUNTZE STRIKES (1891)

Late October 1891, Kuntze's new *Revisio* with 1,074 replacement genera and 30,000 new combinations appeared, a nomenclatural schism of the first order. Kuntze had a very broad view of what constituted homonymy, treated 1737 as the starting point, and that claimed he was only actually applying the Candollean Code.

Kuntze's work is, like Saint-Lager's, essentially forgotten, but is full of examples and repays study. It is worth trying to realize what an impact his work had at that point. Geneva (Alphonse de Candolle) discontinued the great *Prodromus* in 1874,



Kew (Bentham and Hooker) finished the *Genera Plantarum* in 1883 and (Jackson) had just sent *Index Kewensis* to press, Berlin (Engler) began *Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien* in 1888. Suddenly thousands of names were thrown into question, most perhaps challengeable (say by locking on 1753 rather than 1737) but many were not.

The major attack came from German botanists. In April 1892 the German Botanical Society appointed a committee to prepare a supplement to the *Lois* of four propositions (theses). This was mailed to 706 botanists, requesting support and comments on each proposal (called "pamphleteering" by Weatherby in 1949.01). The four were: (1) priority of generic names from 1752; (2) rejection of *nomina nuda* and *seminuda*, including generic names based on simple figures and *exsiccata* without description; (3) retention of generic names differing only by the last syllable or inflection, even if they differ only by one letter; and (4) conservation of listed generic names.

The results of this poll, with comments received, appeared in Paul Ascherson's report to the Society (1892.07) and again at the September Botanical Congress in Genoa (400th anniversary of Columbus). Dall (1877.12) also had used a poll but was more interested in principles than in what to my eye appears to be "damage control." Also included was the first published list of generic names to be conserved, another effort to maintain usage threatened by Kuntze who (1895.11, if not before) termed the list an "Index inhonestans."

There was what in retrospect can be seen as a passing of baton by the nomenclatural leader. Briquet, who had included nomenclatural observations in his 1891 treatment of mints for Burnat's *Flore des Alpes Maritimes*, published (1892.02.04) his comments on what Kuntze had done to the mints. Briquet's evidence was cited by Alphonse de Candolle (1892.05) in one of his last nomenclatural papers before his death (1893.04.04).

#### ROCHESTER RESOLUTION OF 1892

In the meantime a botanical club (with N. L. Britton) held a meeting within the American Association for the Advancement of Science (A.A.S.) in Rochester, New York, in August 1892. Their proceedings (Fairchild, 1892.09) included the Rochester Resolutions (later called the Rochester Code), which accepted the Paris Code of 1867 with eight exceptions: (1) priority was fundamental; (2) starting point was 1753 for genera and species; (3) the original specific name [epithet] was to be

retained unless a tautonym or later homonym; (4) no later homonyms; (5) publication of generic names either by distribution of printed description or by citation of one or more species as examples or types, with or without diagnosis; (6) publication of species names either by printed description or with reference to previously published species as a type; (7) later similar generic names are not to be rejected on account of slight differences, except in spelling; (8) in case of transfer of a species to another genus, the original author must be cited in parentheses, followed by the author of the new binomial. They also approved sending Lucien Underwood to the Genoa Congress to deliver their resolution.

The September 1892 Botanical Congress in Genoa was obviously the place where a rousing battle could be expected.

Underwood (1892.11) reported on the polyglot sessions. Ascherson presented the substance of his recently published report concerning Kuntze with four proposals. The Rochester platform was presented. After the discussion the first three Berlin propositions were approved with 1753 (a Rochester resolution) for both genera and species. All else (conserved names and the Rochester resolution) was referred to a committee (Penzig 1893.04?: 439), which was to report to the next International Congress (Paris, 1900).

#### MADISON RULES OF UNMODIFIED PRIORITY (1893)

In August 1893 a group of American botanists, meeting at Madison, Wisconsin, decided to amend what now are now being called the "rules of nomenclature" adopted at Rochester (1892) and voted to change "Section III" of the Rochester Code by striking out all after the word "retained." This meant that a species epithet must be retained (restored) even if it involved a tautonym or a later homonym. They also approved "that precedence in the same volume be regarded as priority," a modification of the first section. Although the Rochester/Madison resolution (1893.09) did not mention types, the idea of page (and place on the page) priority, i.e., first listed species or specimen, was used for typification by practitioners of the new school until the (1907.04) Brittonian (American) Code provided ways around the first "listed." Indeed, the major point of these rules, aside from astounding brevity, clarity, consistency, and positiveness, was that they admitted no exceptions. If you found the earliest name, your troubles were over for all time. Also, practitioners had the moral



high ground in that you recognized the earliest proposer and nothing could be fairer.

Note that what Saint-Lager, Kuntze, Britton, and others (as radicals) emphasized are the rules themselves, never mind upsetting usage, which was only a short-term consequence (cost). The Candollean (conservative) concept was to try to maintain the status quo, never mind some complexity of rules, which are really of no importance. Both concepts would agree that stability is the goal of nomenclature, but one wonders if the interaction of these two schools doesn't result in a Code with the worst of both worlds: a complex and constantly changing Code (trying to maintain past usage) and constant conservations (to set aside rules that, despite complexity, are not maintaining the past).

#### KUNTZE STRIKES BACK

In July 1893 Kuntze published a second dose (first part of the third volume) of his *Revisio*. It had two features, a detailed comment on each publication (> 50!) that commented on his first dose and his *Codex Nomenclature Botanicae Emendatus* in German, French, and English in three columns with parallel text. Nothing was too fine to escape his caustic and withering comments, including the Rochester Resolutions, which were far closer to him than any other.

John Isaac Briquet, who was to dominate nomenclature for more than 30 years (like Alphonse de Candolle), readdressed (1894.02) the imbroglio with a discussion of eight questions and a conclusion involving Kuntze's impact on the generic names of Labiatae. This work was important for the comments on, among other things, nomina nuda and seminuda [subnuda], Patrick Browne, Rumphius, recycling names fallen into synonymy, still-born names, the role of pre-Linnaean documents, and infraspecific nomenclature. He also proposed 10 modifications of the *Lois*.

Kuntze (1894.07) discussed several recent attacks, expounding on Thourar's orchid names and other positions of Pfitzer, page priority (against the Madison amendments), an obligatory register for plant names, "once a synonym always a synonym," and so on.

By 1895 Ascherson and Engler were all that were left of the 30-member international commission recognized at the 1892 Genoa Congress. They put forward six propositions (1895.01), of which the last two involved avoiding names that have not been used for 50 years, which would become an element of the Berlin Rules.

Americans were showing an increasing disarray concerning their Code(s); the Harvard Code appeared on June and August 1895 with five conservative points. The latter (Anderson et al., 1895.08) was signed by 74 American botanists "of various degrees of repute," a comment made earlier about the signers of the Rochester/Madison resolutions.

#### BERLIN RULES (1897, 1902)

Engler and his staff signed 14 rules for the Berlin Garden and Museum that appeared in June 1897. This was translated immediately into English (1897.08) and French (1897.09), often with comments. The Rules: (1) Priority was usually to be maintained (species from 1753, genera from 1754). (2) Generic names could be dropped if not in general use for 50 years from establishment unless restored because of the 1867 *Lois*. (3) Series were to end in -ales, families in -aceae, with exceptions for Coniferae, Cruciferae, etc. (4) For gender one must follow classical designations or, for later names, usage in *Nat. Pflanzenfam*. Changes ought not be made except for notorious errors in designations from proper names. (5) Generic synonyms were not to be applied in an altered sense for new genera or even sections. (6) Priority was to rule in species names unless objections were raised by monographers. (7) Parenthetical citation of authors was to be used for new combinations, unless the author himself placed the species in another genus. (8) Linnaean capitalization of species names was to be used (for epithets derived from personal names or names of former genera). (9) Rules were given for forming generic names from personal names. (10) One must change -ae- to -i-, as *menthifolia*, not *menthaefolia*. (11) One must avoid tautonymy (incl. *Elvasia elvasioides*) and depart from priority in case of gross geographic errors (North American *Asclepias syriaca* L.). (12) Hybrids must appear as a formula of both parents (in alphabetic order) with multiplication sign between (binomial nomenclature unsuitable). (13) Manuscript names, horticultural names, designations in trade catalogs had no rights; a printed diagnosis was required. (14) No changes permitted to a generic or specific name unless moved by weighty reasons such as Rule 11.

A supplement to the Berlin Nomenklatur-Regeln was published by Engler et al. (1902.08.29).

#### KUNTZE STRIKES AGAIN

In September 1898 Kuntze released the last two parts of the third volume of his *Revisio*. One sig-



nificant document included is a *Supplement* to his *Codex Nomenclaturae Botanicae Emendatus*.

PARIS CONGRESS OF 1900  
(STYLED THE 1ST INTERNATIONAL  
BOTANICAL CONGRESS)

By October 1900 the stage was set for fireworks but the Congress unanimously decided to put someone in charge (John Briquet) and revise the Code at the next Congress. This was the beginning of the office of rapporteur général. Hua (in Perrot, 1900: 475–486) made a detailed proposal to establish an international periodical for publication of new names, a forerunner of a proposal referred to a subcommittee for registration of publications.

Kuntze struck again, this time (1903.12) with Thomas Erik von Post in the *Lexicon Generum Phanerogamarum*, including his *Codex Brevis Maturus*. The work applied Kuntze's Code to phanerogam generic names, had a bunch of cryptogam generic names and, in the second part, dealt with names above generic rank, all warranting a look by those interested in such.

Kuntze was given little recognition. Stafleu (in TL-2 under Post) excerpted Barnhart's (1904.04) comment about Kuntze, "Possibly the vituperation poured upon all who disagree with him has prevented his ideas from receiving as serious consideration as they deserve. It is certainly unfortunate that he should regard himself as an infallible referee upon all points in dispute and hurl anathemas at all who refuse to acknowledge his authority, characterizing their propositions as 'dishonest,' 'inexecutable,' 'false' and 'lawless.'"

BRITTONIAN (AMERICAN) CODE (1907)  
AND ITS PRECURSOR (1904)

The Americans were divided and criticisms were being published, such as that by Fernald (1901.11), pointing out instability (actually inconsistencies) of practitioners of the Rochester resolutions. In early 1903 the Botanical Club of the American Association for the Advancement of Science appointed a Nomenclature Commission. They produced a "Code of Botanical Nomenclature" (1904.05) with four principles, 19 canons, and separate sections on orthography and citations. This came with a simple proposal to the Vienna Congress, "the laws of 1867 be amended by abandonment of all its articles and substitution of the appended Code." This proposal failed at Vienna in 1905, leading to the Philadelphia "American Code of Botanical Nomenclature" of 1907.04, which should be called

Brittonian rather than American. The basic text was mostly unchanged from the originally proposed Code (1904.05), but there were changes in Canon 15 (application of generic names) as well as inconspicuous additions elsewhere. I mention three definitions of now obscure terms (metonym, typonym, hyponym, respectively taxonomic synonym, nomenclatural synonym, and name of an unidentifiable taxon).

Weatherby (in Sherff, 1949.01) pointed out that this Code had at least one large crack compared to the ancestral Rochester/Madison resolutions' iron-clad insistence on priority: it gave an elaborate series of directions for choosing types other than the previous implicit recognition of the first listed. Apparently the practitioners of the Rochester/Madison resolutions were upsetting more usage than they felt necessary and were willing to compromise their simple and brief Code with exceptions that took up more space than the original resolutions in toto.

VIENNA CONGRESS OF 1905  
(2ND CONGRESS, 1ST CODE)

Briquet tracked down all reasonably explicit proposals since 1867 to change the code, translated them into French, and devised an organization. Thirty-eight publications were accepted as having specific proposals. This is a remarkable document, a key to the past. After all was compiled and organized (Nov. 1904), he sent it to the 39 members of the commission with his comments as rapporteur. They were to vote and return all by 20 January 1905 (31 did). Briquet (1905.03.15) laid out all in four columns: (1) original (1867) text, (2) proposed change(s), (3) the rapporteur's observations to the Commission, and (4) text recommended by the Commission.

The Congress convened in June 1905 in Vienna, capital of the flourishing Austro-Hungarian empire. This was the first meeting devoted solely to the vexing "problem of nomenclature." They had an immense amount of business with potential to end or descend deeper into chaos. It is fascinating to read how the proceedings were laid out (order of business), who had votes, and who did what. For example, N. L. Britton nominated Wettstein for president of the Bureau and proposed that French be the official language of nomenclature. Both were approved. Those wanting to speak had to submit a slip with their name and position (nom et qualité) to the president. Speakers were given five minutes (ten by exception) and only could speak twice on



the same subject. In fact, this Congress provided the model still followed by our nomenclature sessions.

The proceedings (Briquet, 1906) were also well spelled out, with a concordance of the 1867 *Lois* with the Rules and Recommendations of the 1905 Congress, the Code (principally for vascular plants) in French, English, and German with the now conserved generic names.

Among the many accomplishments of the Vienna Congress were the establishment of the first imposed international Code (the 1867 *Lois* was only recommended as the best guide to follow). It did not satisfy Kuntze, but he died in early 1907. The Brittonian Americans, although they had won some victories, were not happy that names still were not applied according to types and were allergic to the new requirement that Latin had to be used for publishing names of new taxa, considered arbitrary. The Americans, at least those supporting N. L. Britton, therefore settled more firmly into the Brittonian (American) Code, a rupture that would continue for twenty-five years.

#### THE BRUSSELS CONGRESS OF 1910 (3RD CONGRESS, 2ND CODE)

Aside from the nomenclature section, there was also an important section on bibliography and documentation. The paleontologists, phycologists, and mycologists made many proposals. Harms's proposals on conserving fern names passed. Briquet tendered his resignation but, when everyone was upset, got what he really wanted, help. Harms was elected vice-rapporteur, the beginning of that office.

The 1915 London Congress was never held, because of the outbreak of World War I in 1914.

Two people were particularly important in the years soon after World War I: Albert Spear Hitchcock (US) and Thomas Archibald Sprague (K). Each published initiatives that would ultimately mesh. In April 1919 Hitchcock presented some rules for fixing types of generic names that would (1921.04) become the "type-basis" Code. Did you realize that conservation of generic names, passed at the 1905 Vienna Congress, still did not involve listed types?

Sprague's initiative was to publish (1921.06) a thoughtful paper on plant nomenclature titled "Some suggestions." This appeared in the *Journal of Botany* with the editor's (James Britten) invitation for comments. The paper stimulated a series of pleasant and unpolemic contributions from

(mostly) Americans and British botanists that strongly signaled compromise and recognition that unity in nomenclature was better than ongoing strife.

In July 1924, Alfred Barton Rendle presided over a discussion at the Imperial Botanical Congress of 13 points about the Code published by a committee convened by T. A. Sprague (1924.03). One point still seems current, "The Rules are too long and complicated." The conference resolved several interesting points: that Latin descriptions should not be required, all later homonyms should be rejected, the type method should be adopted, and duplicate binomials (tautonyms) should be restored.

In Hitchcock's reliquia at US I found two unpublished circulars worth mentioning. One is Hitchcock's circular (six pages, not counting cover letter) to American botanists interested in nomenclature dated 15 October 1924 concerning the practicality of compromise. The other is by Fernald and Weatherby dated 8 December 1924, apparently also widely circulated in America, which discussed the 12 proposals made by Hitchcock. These underlie Hitchcock's compromises (1926.05).

#### ITHACA CONGRESS OF 1926 (4TH CONGRESS)

In August 1926, Sprague, Hitchcock, and Briquet showed up at the Ithaca Congress. Sprague's paper was extremely erudite and offered the basis for a world-wide agreement on nomenclature, combining the best features of the International Rules and the Brittonian (American) Code. It is sad that these important proceedings were not published until 1929 (in Duggar).

Hitchcock also made concrete proposals, arguing vigorously for a "standard list of accepted generic names, each with the species that shall direct its application." This would begin with conserved names "but would be gradually extended to include also all generic names in use." This sounds like a precursor of the "names in current use" effort, which is still divided on whether types should be included.

A roundtable discussion was held with papers read by Briquet (review since 1910 with suggestions for the upcoming 1930 Cambridge Congress), Marshall Howe ("I don't feel so irreconcilable as I may have"), and Merritt Lyndon Fernald ("keep Latin"). A paper from N. L. Britton was read for him ("nothing is constant but change"). The report (in Duggar, 1929: 1782) by Karl McKay Wiegand, secretary of the taxonomy section, noted the



approval of an International Interim Committee with John Briquet as chairman, H. Harms, vice-chairman, with more than 20 named members from all over the world. All nomenclatural resolutions were referred to this committee.

#### CAMBRIDGE CONGRESS OF 1930 (5TH CONGRESS, 3RD CODE)

The synopsis of proposals cited 20 documents, most typewritten. One of the most important was a 203-page document (1929.08?) by "British botanists." It included Hitchcock and/or Green's lists of generic names (then 458 currently conserved and 1,159 Linnaean) proposing that the application of these names be controlled by means of the specified "standard-species." Sprague's list of proposed conserved names is the first truly documented approach to proposing names for conservation, hitherto a matter of citing competing names and places of publication (both in proposals and in the Code) and nothing more.

Briquet's synopsis was, as before, a model of clarifying confusion. The multicolumn approach continued, but now with only two columns. The first column had the original text of the Brussels (1912) Code and, in italics in the second column, the rapporteur's comments on the proposed new text. The votes of the Commission on the proposals appeared in a second document "Avis préalable" that was handed out at the Congress (apparently rare).

I will not attempt to summarize or highlight the debates from proceedings beyond saying that the idea of using types to determine the application of names (rather than the original circumscription) was accepted, and the Latin requirement (regarded as arbitrary by Britton) was moved forward from 1908 to 1932. This ended the American schism. There was an interesting discussion (cf. Brooks & Chipp, 1931: 544–553) about matters that since have come to pass or remain needed, such as Harvey Hall's proposed "International Bureau of Plant Taxonomy," making and distributing photographs of types, and producing an index to collections in different herbaria (Ramsbottom).

Unfortunately, John Isaac Briquet died in late October 1931, and the task of producing the third edition of the Code (in three languages) fell to Harms, Rendle, Mangin, Hochreutiner, and Sprague. Sprague (1933) published the main provisions of the amended Code with examples from the British flora. Rendle (1934.06) published an English text (without appendices). The official Cambridge Code appeared about February 1935, only months before the September Amsterdam Con-

gress. The Cambridge Code, despite its extremely short life, was the first completely international Code.

#### AMSTERDAM CONGRESS OF 1935 (6TH CONGRESS)

Briquet's death had delayed the Cambridge Code which, in turn, shortened the lead time for revisions at the next Congress. In September 1934 an announcement appeared in several journals (*J. Bot.* and *Bull. Misc. Inform.*) that proposals to amend the (still unpublished) Code had to be submitted in 100 copies by 1 January 1935. (That should slow things down!) Nonetheless, indefatigable botanists produced 14 submissions and, by July 1935, Sprague sent the synopsis of proposals to the seven members of the Executive Committee of Nomenclature elected at Cambridge and to seven others, obtaining 10 votes. These were used to compile the Preliminary Opinions distributed at the Congress in September.

Among the submissions processed by Sprague, I have had most occasion to consult the 43 collected proposals "by twelve botanists" that appeared in 1935.03. I would draw attention to Wilmott's *Index Purgatio*, listing works that should be rejected for various cited reasons, and Sprague and Green's provisional list of institutions in 20 geographical areas to get copies to validate names.

English now became the official language, replacing French, which had been official since Britton's proposal to the 1905 Vienna Congress was approved. The preceding Brussels and Cambridge proceedings had been reported in French, but problems arose with the unexpected death of Briquet. Harms, the vice-rapporteur, asked Rendle to prepare the English text since most of the proposals had been in English. The French and German texts were generated by translation from Rendle's English text. Sprague thanked Miss Mary Letitia "Manna" Green for her collaboration (in fact, he married her).

Sprague asked that the 1935 Cambridge Code be recognized as a faithful record of the 1930 Cambridge decisions. This was wise in view of the great difficulties after Briquet's death, and it would have been even more futile than usual for nomenclaturalists to argue whether or not a proposal had been implemented correctly. He did ask that the Latin requirement date be moved forward again, from 1932 (when the Code had been expected) to 1935 (when the Code came out). He also proposed automatic rejection of proposals with less than 20% support in the preliminary (Commission) vote.

Probably the major battle of this Congress concerned the application of a combination when mis-



applied, the classic example being *Tsuga mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr. Carrière based his name on Bongard's *Pinus mertensiana* but applied it to an excellent illustration that was not Bongard's species. This is a classic problem of the old circumscription method tangling with the new type method (just introduced), not to mention the whole question of whether or not parenthetic authors should be cited that had so vexed nomenclaturalists of the preceding century.

Hitchcock died on shipboard while returning from the Amsterdam Congress.

Now World War II interposed. Not only was there no Stockholm Congress in 1940, there never was an official Amsterdam Code. Until the next Congress (Stockholm in 1950) people had to make do with 1935 (Cambridge) Code and what they could find about the Amsterdam Congress (fortunately not too drastically changed, but the type method was new to many) mostly from Sprague's summary in 1936 and the Congress proceedings. Approved conserved names were listed by Sprague (1940.06).

#### BRITTONIA CODE (UNOFFICIAL)

In the late 1940s steps were taken to revive things, just as after World War I. The word went out in 1946 that there would be a Congress in Stockholm in 1950. In March 1946 the Council of the American Society of Plant Taxonomists appointed a committee (Camp, Rickett, and Weatherby) to prepare for the Congress. They produced the unofficial "Brittonia" Code (1947.04), followed by a symposium on botanical nomenclature in December 1947 at St. Louis (published 1949.01). Weatherby's paper, "Botanical nomenclature since 1867," said everything that should be said.

Meanwhile, in February 1947, Professor Lanjouw (Utrecht) wrote to several botanists and, having gotten support, invited taxonomists to a June 1948 conference on preparing a new Code. The results were not published until August(?) 1950 but they had dramatic consequences before. Among the Americans at the Utrecht Conference were Merrill and Rickett, who were already involved in the American initiative. Ray Fosberg was there (and attended the thesis defense of Frans A. Stafleu). Lanjouw agreed to be acting rapporteur général, succeeding Sprague.

#### STOCKHOLM CONGRESS OF 1950 (7TH CONGRESS, 4TH CODE)

Lanjouw's synopsis of proposals was large (255 pages) and was mailed with the first voting form,

requesting return by 1 June 1950. I note that A. C. Smith received his copy on 5 June, so he did not return it. There were *only* 540 proposals to process in 40 hours (4 minutes each). Two hundred mail ballots were received and anything with less than 25% support was automatically rejected.

An important event occurred on 18 July 1950 at what Stafleu (1988.08: 795) called "an informal session" (attended by 130 taxonomists). Lanjouw's proposals for an association with an office (bureau) in Utrecht was accepted and became Resolution 10 of the Congress (pp. 67, 68). This was the official beginning that turned into things like the *Taxon* and *Regnum Vegetabile*. *Taxon*, being the official journal of the new International Association for Plant Taxonomy, became the vehicle for proposals to amend the Code so that they no longer were scattered through the literature. I would be astonished if any working taxonomist does not consult something in *Regnum Vegetabile* almost every day, be it *Index Herbariorum*, *TL-2*, *ING*, or even the *Code*.

The first issue of *Taxon* appeared in September 1951. The first issue of *Regnum Vegetabile* (actually numbered 3) was the Stockholm Code, which appeared in September 1952, barely in time for the Paris Congress. The editing of the Stockholm Code was described by Merrill (1952.01). The Stockholm Congress proceedings came out in 1953.

#### PARIS CONGRESS OF 1954 (8TH CONGRESS, 5TH CODE)

This was the first Congress to have all proposals published in a single journal. The Geneva Conference of 25–30 January 1954 was a precursor event, as the Utrecht Conference of June 1948 before the Stockholm Congress. Its report appeared in April 1954, soon after the synopsis. Stafleu's report on the proceedings appeared in August 1955. A feature of the 1956 (Paris) Code was the appearance of a fourth language, Spanish. Another was a concordance of Article and Recommendation numbers among the latest Paris Code and the two preceding Codes (Stockholm and Cambridge).

It would be useful to extend this concordance back through the three preceding Codes, Brussels (1912), Vienna (1906), and Paris (1867). Somehow this should then weave in all proposals to the same text (including rejected ones) and the examples proffered. I am convinced we would find we are constantly reinventing the wheel, if not repeatedly raising the same examples discussed before.

There is neither time nor space to continue since



we are only half way through and have six more Codes to go, the products of the subsequent Congresses: Montreal (1959), Edinburgh (1964), Seattle (1969), Leningrad (1975), Sydney (1981), and Berlin (1987). Montreal was my first Congress and I was somewhat distracted by being on my honeymoon. My best memory of Edinburgh was the "Bloody Donk" speech. At Seattle I made my first motion on the floor (defeated) and have been told that this was the last "decent" Code. Leningrad passed my orthography proposals, probably assisted by my absence when discussions started, for the first time, with proposals pertaining to the last articles of the Code. This was the first Code to number paragraphs within articles, making it easier to cite. Sydney was the first Congress most of us experienced without Stafleu in the chair and "mice will play when the cat is away." Stafleu rejoined us for Berlin (1987), but said that he will not go to Tokyo (1993).

We must end on an upbeat, and I can do no better than repeat Weatherby's (1949.01: 7) translated quotation from Alphonse de Candolle's introduction to his 1867 *Lois* (with a few minor changes since nomenclaturalists can't even quote each other without making "improvements"): "There will come a time when all the plant forms in existence will have been described; when herbaria will contain indubitable material of them; when botanists will have made, unmade, often remade, raised or lowered, and above all, modified several hundred thousand taxa ranging from classes to simple varieties, and when synonyms will have become much more numerous than accepted taxa. Then science will have need of some great renovation of its formulae. This nomenclature which we now strive to improve will then appear like an old scaffolding, laboriously patched together and surrounded and encumbered by the debris of rejected parts. The edifice of science will have been built, but the rubbish incident to its construction not cleared away. Then perhaps there will arise something wholly different from Linnaean nomenclature, something so designed as to give certain and definite names to certain and definite taxa.

"That is the secret of the future, a future still very far off.

"In the meantime, let us perfect the binomial system introduced by Linnaeus. Let us try to adapt it better to the continual, necessary changes in science . . . drive out small abuses, the little negligences and, if possible, come to agreement on controversial points. Thus we shall prepare the way for the better progress of taxonomy."

#### CHRONOLOGIC BIBLIOGRAPHY ON BOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE, WITH SOME ANNOTATIONS

The entries in this bibliography are arranged chronologically to better reflect the subject, history. The bibliography's purpose is not just to support text references as conventional Literature Cited, and it has unexpected entries such as the death date of some critical workers.

All citations appear with the date in the format year.month.day, i.e., in increasing degrees of accuracy. Incompletely dated publications are usually cited after more completely dated publications. Some publications give only a spread of months, such as (06-07), or days 10-17. The query (?) was used when there is more than usual uncertainty. Dates were mostly determined from evidence in the publications or from other sources, such as Stafleu and Cowan's *Taxonomic Literature II*.

- 1737.07. LINNAEUS, C. *Critica Botanica*. 270 pp. Lugduni Batavorum. [Arthur Hort's translation, revised by M. L. Green, published 1938 by the Ray Society, was questioned by Heller (1964.04). Note: As Miss Green said, when Linnaeus spoke of specific names, he meant the diagnostic phrases in the binary system of his predecessors and himself, not the trivial epithets later adopted in his binomial system.]
- 1753.05.01. LINNAEUS, C. *Species Plantarum* . . . Holmiae.
- 1798.11. LAMARCK, J. B. A. P. MONNET DE. *Nomenclature*. Pp. 498-499 in *Encycl. Meth. Bot.* Volume 4. H. Agasse, Paris. [Complained of abuses, such as Linnaeus's converting *Syringa* into *Philadelphus*, opposing the replacement of names familiar to botanists. "These two kinds of names [generic and specific] ought to be subject to rules that cannot be set aside without prejudicing the science that they aim to facilitate." He particularly objected to the generic names of the Forsters. He objected to specific epithets that are untrue and those derived from names of places or scholars (the latter were OK for genera).]
1813. CANDOLLE, A. P. DE. *De la nomenclature*. Pp. 221-252 in *Théorie Élémentaire de la Botanique* . . . Paris.
- 1821.01. SMITH, J. E. *Respecting Nomenclature* . . . Pp. 51-54 in *A Grammar of Botany*. Longman et al., London. Reprinted by Prakash Publishers, Jaipur, in 1973. [Objected to corrupt names. "Future general writers on Botany, of competent authority, must reform these abuses."]
- 1832.10. LINDLEY, J. *An Introduction to Botany* . . . Longman et al., London. [Chapter IV of *Nomenclature and Terminology* (pp. 454-459) and V Of *Synonyms* (pp. 460-462). DC. uses asteriks (\*) in synonymy = good description. "Mark of admiration" (!) indicates inspection of authentic specimen—thus, "Linn.! sp. pl. 427."]
1843. STRICKLAND, H. E. (REPORTER), J. PHILLIPS, J. RICHARDSON, R. OWEN, L. JENYNS, W. J. BRODERIP, J. S. HENSLOW, W. E. SHUCKARD, G. R. WATERHOUSE, W. YARRELL, C. DARWIN & J. O. WESTWOOD. *Series of propositions for rendering the nomenclature of zoology uniform and permanent*. Report of the 12th Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science held at Manchester in June 1842, pp. 105-121.
- 1843.07. GOULD, A. A. *Notice of some works, recently*



- published, on the nomenclature of zoology. *Amer. J. Sci. Arts* 45: 1–12.
1860. STIMPSON, W. On botanical and zoological nomenclature. *Edinburgh New Philos. J.* 12: 321–324.
- 1864.03. GRAY, A. Nomenclature. *Amer. J. Sci. Arts*, ser. 2, 37: 279–281. [Commented on the newly reprinted zoological rules (*Edinburgh New Philos. J.* 1863: 260–).]
- 1866.06.01. KOCH, K. Some propositions with respect to systematic botany. *J. Bot.* 4: 201. [Abstract, translated from German.]
- 1866.?? KOCH, K. Einige die Systematik betreffende Vorschläge. Pp. 188–195 in [Secretary?], *Int. Hort. Exhib. Bot. Congr. London 22–31 May 1866 Rep. Proc.* [total pagination?] Truscott, Son & Simon, London. [English summary appeared on pp. 21–22.]
- 1866.12.01. [SEEMANN, B.?] [Review of] *Prodromus Naturalis Regni Vegetabilis*. Editore A. de Candolle. Pars. XV., Sectio Posterior, Fasc. II. Sistens Euphorbiaceas. Auctore J. Müller, Argoviensi. Paris. 1866. *J. Bot.* 4: 387–388. [Objection: "... because he includes forms that had before been excluded, he displaces the name of the author of the species, and attaches his own to it."]
- 1867.01. GRAY, A. An innovation in nomenclature in the recently-issued volumes of the "Prodromus." *Amer. J. Sci. Arts*, ser. 2, 43: 126–128. [Objected to J. Mueller changing the authorship of generic names when changing the circumscription.] [Reprinted by Seemann: *J. Bot.* 5: 81–84. 1867.03.01.]
- 1867.05.01. CANDOLLE, A. L. DE. [Correspondence concerning criticisms of] Dr. Mueller's Monograph of the Euphorbiaceae. *J. Bot.* 5: 151–152.
- 1867.08.01. CANDOLLE, A. L. DE. *Lois de la Nomenclature botanique rédigées et commentées . . .* 60 pp. V. Masson et fils, Paris. [Basis for discussion.]
- 1867.09.12. CANDOLLE, A. L. DE. *Lois de la Nomenclature botanique adoptées par le Congrès . . . a Paris en Août 1867 . . .* 64 pp. H. Georg, Genève et Bâle, J. B. Baillié et fils, Paris.
- 1867.11. CANDOLLE, A. L. DE (RAPPORTEUR). Discussion des Lois de la Nomenclature botanique. Pp. 177–208 [and] *Lois de la Nomenclature botanique*. Pp. 209–255 in E. Fournier (Secrétaire), *Actes du Congrès International de Botanique . . .* Paris.
- 1867.12. CRÉPIN, F. *La Nomenclature botanique au Congrès internationale de Botanique*. 28 pp. [The author citation argument ad nauseam.]
1868. DES MOULINS, C. *Lettre à Monsieur François Crépin*. 10 pp. Bordeaux. [Reprinted from *Actes Soc. Linn. Bordeaux* 26(4).]
- 1868.?? CANDOLLE, A. L. DE. *Laws of Botanical Nomenclature*. [English translation] by H. A. Weddell. 72 pp. L. Reeve & Co., London.
- 1868.07. GRAY, A. Editorial remarks and suggestions [on the laws of botanical nomenclature.] *Amer. J. Sci. Arts*, ser. 2, 46: 74–77. [Preceded (pp. 66–74) by a copy of Weddell's English translation.]
- 1869.06. CANDOLLE, A. L. DE. Réponse à diverses questions et critiques faites sur le Recueil des *Lois de Nomenclature botanique*, tel que le Congrès international de 1867 l'a publié. *Bull. Soc. Bot. France* 16: 64–81.
- 1870.01? CARUEL, T. & A. L. DE CANDOLLE. [Correspondence.] Una questione di nomenclatura botanica. *Nuovo Giorn. Bot. Ital.* 2: 146–149. [Names published with a query.]
- 1874.02–04. MÜLLER, J. *Nomenclatorische Fragmente* [with six parts.] *Flora* 57: 89–94; 119–126; 156–159. [Motion 1 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 7).]
- I. Ueber die Gültigkeitsbedingungen der systematischen Namen. Pp. 89–94.
- II. Ueber das Citiren der Autoren bei generisch neu gestellten Arten. Pp. 119–121.
- III. Ueber die Autorität bei verwendeten Zettelnamen. Pp. 121–123.
- IV. Ueber das Autorschema bei umgeänderten Gattungsbegriffen. Pp. 123–126.
- V. Ueber das Ableiten der Speciesnamen von Varietätsnamen. P. 156.
- VI. Verliert ein systematischer Name seinem Rang so verliert er zugleich sein Prioritätsrecht. Pp. 156–159.
- 1875.01. ČELAKOVSKY, L. Zwei Fragen der botanischen Nomenclatur. *Flora* 58: 2–6; 21–31. [Priority right of species epithets and generic names.]
- 1876.12? COGNIAUX, C. A. & A. L. DE CANDOLLE. [Correspondence.] Quelques points de nomenclature botanique. *Bull. Soc. Roy. Bot. Belgique* 15: 477–485. [First appearance of the principle "Never attribute to an author what he didn't say."]
- 1877.06. TRIMEN, H. Some points in botanical nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 15: 189–190. [Supports de Candolle's position in the published Cogniaux correspondence (1876.12?). First mention of what will be known as Kew Rule on p. 190.]
- 1877.08. CANDOLLE, A. L. DE. [Letter & response by editor, Trimen.] *J. Bot.* 15: 242–243. [Opposing the Kew Rule; defended by Trimen.]
- 1877.09. CARUEL, T. Botanical nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 15: 282. [Supported Kew Rule as espoused by Trimen's response to de Candolle (1877.08).]
- 1877.10. CARUEL, T. *Divisiones plantarum propositae*. *Nuovo Giorn. Bot. Ital.* P: 280–281. [Phanerogamae, Schistogamae, Prothallogammae, Bryogamae & Gymnogamae.]
- 1877.12. BALL, J. On some questions of botanical nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 15: 357–360. [Supported de Candolle (1877.08), opposing the Kew Rule.]
- 1877.12. DALL, W. H. Nomenclature in zoology and botany. A report to the American Association for the Advancement of Science at the Nashville Meeting, August 31, 1877. 56 pp. (A.A.A.S., Volume XXVI). [Important survey of zoologists and Code with elements for botanists.]
- 1878.03. HIERN, W. P. On a question of botanical nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 16: 72–74. [Supports the Kew Rule.]
- 1878.05. BALL, J. On disputed questions of botanical nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 16: 140–142. [Balanced discussion of Kew Rule, basically opposing it.]
- 1878.06. TRIMEN, H. On a point in botanical nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 16: 170–173. ["... the framing of a fixed rule . . . This practice is, to employ the earliest published name the generic half of which is the name of the genus adopted, and thus avoid making a new [binomial] name by the resuscitation of the specific half of an older combination."]
- 1878.09. MATHEWS, W. Botanical nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 16: 260–262. [Advocated the zoological method of author citation.]



- 1878.11. CANDOLLE, A. L. DE. Botanical nomenclature. J. Bot. 16: 345–346. [Drew attention to his upcoming Supplément (1883.07?), subsequently excerpted in English by Britten (1888.10).]
- 1878.12. BENTHAM, G. Nomenclature. Pp. 189–198 [in his] Notes on Euphorbiaceae. J. Linn. Soc., Bot. 17: 185–267. [Objected to those who have abandoned “the rules that long-established custom amounts to prescription . . .,” i.e., when priority should be set aside, as for Patrick Browne, but accepted Adanson. Opposed “correcting” original spellings. Supported what will be the Kew Rule. Excerpted by J. Bot. 17: 45–48. 1879.01.]
- 1879.04. GRAY, A. Review of Bentham’s “Notes on Euphorbiaceae.” Amer. J. Sci. Arts [Extracted by: Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 4: 158–161. 1879.05; J. Bot. 18: 186. 1880.06.]
- 1879.07. COULTER, J. M. & M. S. COULTER. Honorary names in scientific nomenclature. Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 3: 61–64. [Provoked by *Gilia parreyae*: discriminates between possessive (in genitive) and dedicative (adjectival) epithets. Worshipful of Asa Gray.]
- 1879.08.01. MÜLLER, F. VON. Einige Worte über die erste Ausgabe von Linné’s Species Plantarum in Bezug auf Vorzugsrecht. Bot. Zeig. (Berlin) 37: 490–491.
- 1879.08.01. DRUDE, O. Über Nomenclaturfragen. Bot. Zeit. (Berlin) 37: 492–494.
- 1880.03? SAINT-LAGER, J. B. Réforme de la nomenclature botanique. Ann. Soc. Bot. Lyon 7: 1–154.
1. Origines de la Nomenclature [incl. Nomenclature des Grecs.]. Pp. 1–37.
  2. Réforme des épithètes spécifiques qui ne s’accordent pas avec le nom générique. Pp. 38–60.
  3. Réforme des épithètes spécifiques qui forment pléonasmes avec le nom générique. Pp. 61–66.
  4. Réforme des noms composés d’un radical grec associé à un radical latin. Pp. 67–72.
  5. La Nomenclature botanique est formée de noms grecs et latins. Pp. 73–75.
  6. De la désinence des noms génériques. Pp. 76–111. [With lists of ancient Greek names kept without change of inflection, with changes, modern names with two Greek stems of which the last is masculine, neuter, and feminine.]
  7. De la désinence des épithètes spécifiques. Pp. 112–138.
  8. Des épithètes spécifiques barbares [or based on a person’s name, or banal, geographic or recalling industrial or medicinal properties]. Pp. 139–150.
  9. Conclusions. Pp. 151–154.
- 1881.04. SAINT-LAGER, J. B. Nouvelles remarques sur la nomenclature botanique. Ann. Soc. Bot. Lyon 8: 149–203.
1. Du genre grammatical des mots “Lotos et Melilotos.” Pp. 149–156.
  2. De la désinence des noms de genre. Pp. 156–163.
  3. Remarques sur le genre grammatical des noms génériques d’origine grecque. Pp. 164–169.
  4. Des noms de genre tirés d’un nom d’homme. Pp. 170–178.
  5. Orthographe de quelques noms de genre. Pp. 179–183.
  6. Des pléonasmes. Pp. 184–188.
  7. Des noms composés. Pp. 188–190.
  8. L’adjectif s’accorde avec le substantif auquel il se rapporte. Pp. 191–203.
  9. “Medice, cura te ipsum.” [Corrections to this and preceding work.] P. 203.
- 1881.03. JACKSON, B. D. On some recent tendencies in botanical nomenclature. J. Bot. 19: 74–83. [Objected to parenthetic author citations, “corrections,” faulty capitalizing of species epithets, and mischievous author abbreviations.]
- 1882.06. GRAY, A. The citation of botanical authorities. J. Bot. 20: 173–174. [Advocated crediting names in Aiton’s Hort. Kew. to Aiton, not Solander, R. Brown, etc.]
- 1883.07? CANDOLLE, A. L. DE. Nouvelles remarques sur la nomenclature botanique . . . Supplément au commentaire du même auteur qui accompagnait le texte des lois. 79 pp. H. Georg, Genève. [Motion 2 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 7); Motion 1 in Briquet (1910.04?: 1).]
- 1883.10.31. BUBANI, P. Su di alcune divergenze intorno la nomenclatura botanica . . . ed il compilatore delle proteste Leggi Prof. Alf. de Candolle. 15 pp. Bologna. [Objected to the tyranny of laws.]
- 1883.12. GRAY, A. Some points in botanical nomenclature; a review of “Nouvelles Remarques sur la Nomenclature Botanique, par. M. Alph. de Candolle,” Geneva. 1883. Amer. J. Sci. Arts, ser. 3, 26: 417–437.
- 1887.03. JACKSON, B. D. A new “Index of plant-names.” J. Bot. 25: 66–71 (Jan.); 150–151 (May). [Kew Rule spelled out on p. 69. Statement from J. Hooker about the origin of the Index.]
- 1887.06. WITTMACK, L. Règles à suivre pour la nomenclature des plantes en général, et des Orchidées en particulier (5<sup>e</sup> question au Congrès de 1887). J. Soc. Natl. Hort. France ser. 3, 9: cvii–cxxxiii. [Seen as 16 pp. reprint.]
- 1887.10. GREENE, E. L. The permanency of specific names. J. Bot. 25: 301–303. [Objected to the Kew Rule.]
- 1887.12. GRAY, A. Botanical nomenclature. J. Bot. 25: 353–355. [Attacked Greene by quoting Bentham and supported the Kew Rule.]
- 1888.01. Asa Gray died at 78.
- 1888.04. POGGENBERG, J. F., N. L. BRITTON, E. E. STERNS, A. BROWN, T. C. PORTER & A. HOLLICK (COMMITTEE OF TORREY BOTANICAL CLUB). Preliminary catalogue of Anthophyta and Pteridophyta reported as growing spontaneously within one hundred miles of New York City. 90 pp. [Nomenclature by Britton, Sterns & Poggenberg (subcommittee), beginning of the Brittonian (American) schism.]
- 1888.06. GREENE, E. L. Botanical literature, old and new. Pittonia 1: 176–194. [177–183 reviews a Ray 1660 publication with 48 binomials. 184–194 reviews the new preliminary catalogue by Poggenberg et al.]
- 1888.09. BRITTON, J. Recent tendencies in American botanical nomenclature. J. Bot. 26: 257–262. [Objected to Britton, Sterns & Poggenberg overturning the Kew Rule.]
- 1888.09. STERNS, E. E. The nomenclature question and how to settle it. Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 15: 230–235.
- 1888.10. CANDOLLE, A. L. DE. [Letter concerning] Botanical nomenclature. J. Bot. 26: 289. [Agreed with Britten’s (1888.09) protest about Britton et al. and



- complimented Asa Gray, about whom Americans ought to be proud and follow. Opposed the Kew Rule.]
- 1888.10. BRITTON, J. Translation of Art. 48 discussion in A. L. de Candolle's "Nouvelles Remarques." J. Bot. 26: 290-292.
- 1888.10. BRITTON, N. L. [Response to Britten's protest of 1888.09.] J. Bot. 26: 292-295. [Argued that he only did what Elias Fries, Boissier, Richard Spruce, and a host of others have done (he was wrong about Boissier, who was strictly Candollean).]
1891. NORDSTEDT, O. Om original exemplars betydelse vid prioritetsfrågor. Bot. Not. 1891: 76-82.
- 1891.10. KUNTZE, O. Revisio Generum Plantarum . . . Volume 1-2. 1011 pp. (+ 155 introduction). [A bomb with thousands of new names and combinations. The chapter "Abänderungsvorschläge nebst Motiven zu den internationalen botanischen Nomenclatur-Regeln von 1867," pp. lxxvi-cxxii, accepted as Motion 3 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 7) and as Motion 2 in Briquet (1910.04?: 1).]
- 1891.11.27. DRUDE, O. Bemerkungen zu Dr. Otto Kuntze's Aenderungen der systematische Nomenclatur. Ber. Deutsch. Bot. Ges. 9: 300-306.
- 1892.02.04. BRIQUET, J. Zur generischen Nomenclatur der Labiaten. Bot. Centralbl. 49: 106-111. [Briquet's maiden nomenclatural paper, what Kuntze did to mints.]
- 1892.05. CANDOLLE, A. L. DE. A note on nomenclature. J. Bot. 30: 135. [Noted Briquet's evidence against Kuntze's changes of Labiates and avowed great pleasure "dans mes vieux jours" with the support of principles he had always espoused.]
- 1892.07? MALINVAUD, E. Quatre propositions relatives a la nomenclature émises par un Comité de botanistes de Berlin; lettre d'approbation de M. Alphonse de Candolle. Bull. Soc. Bot. France 39: 137-142. [De Candolle's letter was dated 6 July 1892, one of his last published comments on nomenclature.]
- 1892.07. ASCHERSON, P. Vorläufiger Bericht über die von Berliner Botanikern unternommenen Schritte zur Ergänzung der "Lois de la nomenclature botanique." Ber. Deutsch. Bot. Ges. 10: 327-359. [Four Resolutions. English J. Bot. 30: 241-242. 1892.08. Motion 4 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 7).]
- 1892.08? GREENE, E. L. Dr. Kuntze and his reviewers. Pittonia 2: 263-281. [Reprinted in Chron. Bot. 12: 249-257. 1951.09. Statement by one of Kuntze's strongest supporters.]
- 1892.09. FAIRCHILD, D. G. (SECR.). Proceedings of the Botanical Club of the Forty-first Meeting of the A.A.A.S., Rochester, New York, August 18-24, 1892. Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 19: 281-297. [Pp. 290-292 have the Rochester resolutions signed by N. L. Britton, J. M. Coulter, H. H. Rusby, W. A. Kellerman, F. V. Coville, L. M. Underwood & L. F. Ward (Committee on Botanical Nomenclature). Motion 5 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 7).]
- 1892.11.15. UNDERWOOD, L. M. The nomenclature question at Genoa. Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 19: 324-330.
- 1892.11. UNDERWOOD, L. M. The International Congress at Genoa. Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 17: 341-347.
- 1893.07?-10? KUNTZE, O. Die Bewegung in der botanischen Nomenclatur von Ende 1891 bis Mai 1893. Bot. Centralbl. 54: 353-361; 385-408.
- 1893.04.04. Alphonse de Candolle died at 86.
- 1893.04? PENZIG, O. (SECR.). Quarta adunanza, Martedì 6 Settembre alle 2 pom. Atti del Congresso Botanico Internazionale di Genova 1892. 81-126 [International Commission to consider four proposals of Berlin botanists announced on 9 Sep. pp. 439-440. Pp. 117-121 accepted as Motion 7 by Briquet (1905.03.15: 7). Holmes's emendations in botanical terminology (pp. 121-124) accepted as Motion 8 by Briquet (1905.03.15: 7).]
1893. ASCHERSON, P. Die Nomenclaturbewegung von 1892. Bot. Jahrb. 15(Beibl. 38): 20-28. [Also in Ber. Pharmac. Ges. 4: 35-45. 1894.]
- 1893.06. JACKSON, B. D. Index Kewensis. 1st fascicle [2nd fascicle in December.]
- 1893.07. KUNTZE, O. Revisio Generum Plantarum 3(1): clx-ccccxxii. [Codex nomenclaturae botanicae emendatus (pp. cclxxxv-cccxi) accepted as Motion 9 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8) and as Motion 3 in Briquet (1910.04?: 1).]
- 1893.09. SWINGLE, W. T. (SECR.). Proceedings of the Botanical Club, A.A.A.S., Madison meeting. Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 18: 342-349. [Pp. 342-343 accepted as Motion 10, without Art. II, by Briquet (1905.03.15: 8), also Britton's report of same date.]
- 1893.09. BRITTON, N. L. Proceedings of the Botanical Club, A.A.A.S., Madison meeting, August 18-22, 1893. Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 20: 360-365. [Pp. 360-361 accepted as Motion 10, without Art. II, by Briquet (1905.03.15: 8), also Swingle's report of same date.]
- 1893? Om en fälles Nomenclatur i systematik Botanik for Skandinavien. Förh. Skand. Naturf. 14 Moede 1892: 240-255. [Motion 6 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 7). Not seen.]
1893. Fraen Botaniska Sällskapet i Stockholm förhandlingar. Bot. Not. 1893: 158-161. [Motion 11 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8). Not seen.]
- 1894.02. BRIQUET, J. Questions de nomenclature. Bull. Herb. Boissier 2: 49-88. [Motion 12 by Briquet (1905.03.15: 8).]
- 1894.07. KUNTZE, O. Nomenclatur-Studien. Bull. Herb. Boissier 2: 456-498.
- 1894.12.28. KNOBLAUCH, E. Die Nomenclatur der Gattungen und Arten. Bot. Centralbl. 61: 1-6. [Motion 13 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8).]
- 1895.01.15. BARNHART, J. H. Family nomenclature. Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 22: 1-24. [Important document (see author's mature comment 1922.09). Motion 14 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8).]
- 1895.01. ASCHERSON, P. & A. ENGLER. Erklärung der Geschäftsleitung der vom internationalen botanischen Congress zu Genua (1892) eingesetzten Nomenclatur-Commission. Oesterr. Bot. Z. 45(1): 27-35. [Motion 15 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8 as pp. 327-335). Also in Verh. Ges. Deutsch. Naturf. 2: 153-159. 1894?]
- 1895.03. ROBINSON, B. L. On the "List of Pteridophyta and Spermatophyta of Northeastern America," prepared by the Nomenclature Committee of the Botanical Club. Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 20: 97-103.
- 1895.04. COVILLE, F. V. A reply to Dr. Robinson's criticism of the "List of Pteridophyta and Spermatophyta of Northeastern America." Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 20: 162-167.
- 1895.04.13. PFITZER, E. Beiträge zur Systematik der Orchideen. I. Zur Nomenclatur. Bot. Jahrb. 19: 1-28. [What Kuntze did to orchids.]
- 1895.05? KUNTZE, O. Bemerkungen zum künftigen bo-



- tanischen Nomenclatur-Congress. 5 pp. [Reprinted from Oesterr. Bot. Z. 1895(5): ??-??, not seen.]
- 1895.06. ROBINSON, B. L. On the application of "once a synonym always a synonym" to binomials [with a circular letter extract: Recommendations regarding the nomenclature of systematic botany.] Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 20: 261-263.
- 1895.07. COVILLE, F. V. Dr. Robinson and homonyms. Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 20: 320-322.
- 1895.07? SMITH, E. F. The Botanical Club CheckList: A protest. [Published by author?] 16 pp.
- 1895.07. WARD, L. F. The nomenclature question. Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 22: 308-329. [Survey of history of nomenclature and plea for peace.]
- 1895.08. ANDERSON, C. L. & 73 OTHER AMERICAN BOTANISTS. Recommendations regarding the nomenclature of systematic botany. Bot. Jahrb. 21 (Beibl. 52): 12-15. [The Britton school's loyal opposition, called the Harvard Code.]
- 1895.08. ROBINSON, B. L. A further discussion of the Madison rules. Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 20: 370-371.
- 1895.09. ORCUTT, C. R. Nomenclature. Out of Doors for Women 3(22): 1-2. [*Mam(m)illaria* vs. *Cactus*.]
- 1895.11. KUNTZE, O. Les besoins de la nomenclature botanique. Monde Pl. [Seen only as 6-page reprint: lays out what Congress should do and hopes to complete a "Nomenclator plantarum omnium correctus" by 1905.]
- 1895.11. THISTLETON-DYER, W. Nomenclature. Bull. Misc. Inform. 1895: 278-281. [P. 280, "To me the botanists who waste their time over priority are like boys who, when sent on an errand, spend their time in playing by the roadside."]
1895. MALINVAUD, L. J. E. La loi de priorité dans la nomenclature botanique. Congrès de Bordeaux. Assoc. Franç. l'Advancem. Sci. 4 pp. [Seen as reprint. Gave examples in *Alyssum* and *Carex* that seem unexceptional by today's standards.]
- 1896.02. VARIOUS AUTHORS. The nomenclature question. Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 21: 82-91.
1. KNOWLTON, F. H. Some inconsistencies in plant nomenclature. pp. 82-85.
  2. DAVENPORT, G. E. Botanical nomenclature. Pp. 85-88.
  3. KUNTZE, O. Some remarks on nomenclature. Pp. 88-90.
  4. MEEHAN, T. Dates and references, and priority in nomenclature. Pp. 90-91.
1896. LE JOLIS, A. Lettre . . . a M. Malinvaud. Bull. Soc. Bot. France 42: 661-663.
- 1896.04.12. BUCHENAU, F. G. P. [Untitled.] Bot. Jahrb. 24: 648-668. [Comment on nomenclatural issues.]
- 1896.06. LEVIER, É. La pseudo-priorité et les noms a béquilles. Bull. Herb. Boissier 4: 369-406. [Attack on Kuntze's work.]
- 1896.08. BRIQUET, J. Questions de nomenclature. 14 pp. [Reprinted from Observations préliminaires. In: É. Burnat's Flore des Alpes maritimes. 2: v-xvi.]
- 1896.12.01. GARCKE, A. Einige nomenclatorische Bemerkungen. Bot. Jahrb. 22(Beibl. 55): 1-10.
- 1897.05. HARMS, H. Die Nomenclaturbewegung der letzten Jahre. Bot. Jahrb. 23(Beibl. 56): 1-32.
- 1897.06 [separate says 8 Mai]. ENGLER, A., I. URBAN, A. GARCKE, K. SCHUMANN, G. HIERONYMUS, P. HENNINGS, M. GÜRKE, U. DAMMER, G. LINDAU, E. GILG, H. HARMS, P. GRAEBNER, G. VOLKENS & L. DIELS. Nomenclaturregeln für die Beamten des Königlichen Botanischen Gartens und Museums zu Berlin. Notizbl. Königl. Bot. Gart. Berlin 1: 245-250. [The Berlin Code. Motion 16 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8). Also in Gartenflora 46: 304-308. 1897.06.01, which Robinson (1897.08) translated into English.]
- 1897.08. BRITTON, N. L. [Translation and comments on] Nomenclaturregeln für die Beamten . . . zu Berlin. Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 24: 415-419.
- 1897.08. ROBINSON, B. L. The official nomenclature of the Royal Botanical Garden and Museum of Berlin. Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 24: 107-110.
- 1897.08. BRITTON, J. The Berlin Rules for nomenclature. J. Bot. 35: 305-307.
- 1897.08.25. KUNTZE, O. Levier's Verdrehung von Artikel 49 des Pariser Codex. Bot. Centralbl. 71: 302-305. [Protests twisting of the Code.]
- 1897.09. BRIQUET, J. "Règles de Nomenclature pour les botanists attachés au Jardin et au Musée royaux de Botanique de Berlin" traduites et suivies d'observations critiques. Bull. Herb. Boissier 5: 768-779.
- 1898.02. ENGLER, A. Anacardiaceae africanae. II. Bot. Jahrb. 24: 493-502. [Provoked Britten, 1898.03.]
- 1898.03. BRITTON, J. The fifty years' limit in nomenclature. J. Bot. 36: 90-94. [*Odina* vs. *Lannea* vs. *Calesiam* vs. *Haberlia*.]
- 1898.06. ROBINSON, B. L. Some reasons why the Rochester Nomenclature cannot be regarded as a consistent or stable system. Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville) 25: 437-445.
- 1898.08.12. COOK, O. F. Stability in generic nomenclature. Science n.s. 8: 186-190. [Comments on Robinson, 1898.06.]
- 1898.09. KUNTZE, O. Revisio Generum Plantarum. [Last two parts of 3rd volume. Part 2: 163-167, 180-201, "Codex nomenclaturae emendatus, supplementum" accepted as Motion 17 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8) and in Briquet (1910.04?: 1).]
- 1898.10.29. LE JOLIS, A. Protestation contre le Revisio generum plantarum III<sup>a</sup>. 11 pages. J. Mersch imp., Paris. [Reprinted from J. Bot. (Morot) 12.]
1898. GREENE, E. L. Bibliographical difficulties in botany. Catholic Univ. Bull. 4: 62-75. [Presentation of the circumscription method for determining the application of names.]
1898. LEVIER, E. Le cas du Docteur Otto Kuntze. 12 pp. Florence. [Satiric, pungent, and delightful criticism of Kuntze's arguments and efforts.]
- 1899.02.08. KUNTZE, O. Protest gegen die Schweinfurth'sche Erklärung. Bot. Centralbl. 77: 259-262.
- 1899.05.10-17. ČELAKOVSKY, L. J. Das Prioritätsgesetz in der botanischen Nomenclatur. Bot. Centralbl. 78: 225-234, 258-268.
- 1899.09.15. ENGLER, A. ET AL. Erklärung. Bot. Jahrb. 27 (Beibl. 63): 7. [In reference to Engler et al. (1897.06). Motion 18 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8).]
- 1899.09.20. KUNTZE, O. Ueber neue nomenclatorische Aeusserungen. Bot. Centralbl. 79: 405-412.
- 1899.12. UNDERWOOD, L. M. Review of the genera of ferns proposed prior to 1832. Mem. Torrey Bot. Club 6: 247-283. [Not seen, generic typifications?]
1899. KUNTZE, O. 250 Gattungsnamen aus den Jahren 1737 bis 1763, welche im Kew Index fehlen oder falsch identifiziert sind. Deutsche Bot. Monatsschr. 17: 55-59. 89-91, 107-110. [Seen as unpagged reprint.]
1899. VOSS, A. Nomenklatur und Pflanzenkunde. 8 pp.



- [Reprinted from Gärtn. Zentral-B1. 2. Kuntze supporter. Attack on 1735 starting date used by Index Kewensis. English translation by Kuntze 1900.01.]
- 1900.01 KUNTZE, O. The advantages of 1737 as a starting-point for botanical nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 38: 7–11. [Translation of Voss's 1899 paper. With J. Britten's editorial "generous" comments on pp. 10–11.]
- 1900.02.20. KUNTZE, O. Offene Antwort an den Vorstand des Botanischen Vereins der Provinz Brandenburg. 2 pp. San Remo.
- 1900.02. KUNTZE, O. A plea for my 1737 proposal. *J. Bot.* 30: 47–50. [With J. Britten's editorial comments on pp. 49–50.]
- 1900.03? KUNTZE, O. Nomenklaturanfang und Reform internationaler Kongresse. *Deutsche Bot. Monatsschr.* 18: 33–47. [Reprint seen, 4 pp.]
- 1900.09? WETTSTEIN, R. VON. Der internationale botanische Congress in Paris und die Regelung der botanischen Nomenclatur. 5 pp. [Reprinted from *Oesterr. Bot. Z.* 1900 (9): ??–??]
- 1900.06–09. KUNTZE, O. & T. VON POST. Nomenklatorische Revision höherer Planzengruppen und über einige Tausend Korrekturen zu Englers Phaenogamen-Register. 39 pp. [Reprinted from *Allg. Bot. Z. Syst.* 1900: 110–120. 1900.06; l.c.: 150–164. 1900.07; l.c.: 179–191. 1900.09. Accepted as Motion 19 In Briquet (1905.03.15: 8).]
- 1900.08.15. KUNTZE, O. Exposé sur les Congrès pour la Nomenclature Botanique et six Propositions pour le Congrès de Paris en 1900. 15 pp. Genève. [Proposed putting things off until 1905 in Vienna.]
- 1900.09.28. COOK, O. F. The method of types in botanical nomenclature. *Science* n.s. 12: 475–481.
- 1900.12.30. KRAUSE, E. H. L. Reductio generum plantarum. *Naturwiss. Wochenschr.* 15: 613–614.
1900. PERROT, ÉMILE (SECR.). Actes du 1<sup>er</sup> Congrès International de Botanique tenu à Paris à l'occasion de l'Exposition Universelle de 1900. Lons-le-Saunier.
1900. HALLIER, H. Das proliferierende persönliche und das sachliche, konservative Prioritätsprinzip in der botanischen Nomenklatur. *Jahrb. Hamburg. Wiss. Anst.* 17: 55–64.
1900. KUNTZE, O. Additions aux Lois de Nomenclature Botanique (Code Parisien de 1867) d'après le Codex Emendatus. 15 pp. [Reprinted from *J. Bot. (Morot)* 14: .]
- 1901.03. FERNALD, M. L. Some recent publications and the nomenclatorial principles they represent. *Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville)* 31: 183–197.
- 1901.11. FERNALD, M. L. The instability of the Rochester Nomenclature. *Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville)* 32: 359–366. [Literature citations.]
1901. BELLI, S. Observations critiques sur la réalité des espèces en nature au point de vue de la systématique des végétaux. [Motion 20 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8). Not seen.]
- 1902.03. SHEAR, C. L. Generic nomenclature. *Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville)* 33: 220–229.
- 1902.04. COOK, O. F. Types and synonyms. *Science* n.s. 15: 646–656. [Caconyms.]
- 1902.08.29. ENGLER, A. ET AL. Zusätze zu den Berliner Nomenclatur-Regeln. *Bot. Jahrb.* 31(Beibl. 70): 24–25. [Additions to the 1897.06 Berlin rules. Accepted as motion 21 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8).]
- 1902.12. CLEMENTS, F. E. Greek and Latin in Biological Nomenclature. University [of Nebraska] Studies 3(1): 1–85. [Excellent exposition of classical practices involving word formation, examples, and corrections.]
1902. KRAUSE, E. H. L. Die Autornamen. *Allg. Bot. Z. Syst.* 7/8: ?–?. [Unpaged reprint of two unnumbered pages: advocated "*Rubus fruticosus* (O. Kuntze Ref. d. Bromb.)."]
- 1903.05.22. HITCHCOCK, A. S. A note on nomenclature. *Science* n.s. 17: 827–828. [Objected to a recent case of an author (Scribner) giving preference to an epithet in other than the accepted rank.]
- 1903.12. POST, T. VON & O. KUNTZE. *Lexicon Generum Plantarum*. lviii + 714 pp. Stuttgart. [Based on Kuntze's *Codex Brevis Maturus*, pp. ix–xli, the latter accepted as Motion 22 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8) and Motion 5 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2).]
1903. BORRÁS, V. Zur Nomenclatur. *Magyar Bot. Lapok* 2?: ?–?. [2 unnumbered; separate seen in Hungarian and German: concerns author citation of Linnaean binomials with pre-1753 epithet-bringing synonyms.]
1903. MAIDEN, J. H. The principles of botanical nomenclature. *Proc. Linn. Soc. New South Wales* 27: 683–720. [Excellent survey of then current issues.]
1903. NOLL, F. Vorschlag zu einer praktischen Erweiterung der botanischen Nomenclatur. *Bot. Centralbl.* 14 (Beihefte): 374–380.
- 1904.01.15. AMANN, J. ET AL. (Un Groupe de Botanistes Belges et Suisses). Propositions de changements aux lois de la nomenclature botanique. i–iv, 1–45. Georg & Co., Genève, Bâle et Lyon. [Motion 23 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8).]
- 1904.03. SACCARDO, P. A. De diagnostica et nomenclatura mycologica. *Admonita quedam. Ann. Mycol.* 2(2): 195–198. [French (1904.07.31), English (1904.05).]
- 1904.04. BARNHART, J. H. [Review of Post and Kuntze's] *Lexicon Generum Phanerogamarum*. *Torreya* 4: 42–44.
- 1904.05. CLEMENTS, F. E. Saccardo: De diagnostica et nomenclatura mycologica; admonita quaedam. Translated. *J. Mycol.* 10: 109–112.
- 1904.05. ARTHUR, J. C., J. H. BARNHART, N. L. BRITTON, S. BROWN, F. E. CLEMENTS, O. F. COOK, J. M. COULTER, F. V. COVILLE, F. S. EARLE, A. W. EVANS, T. E. HAZEN, A. HOLLICK, M. A. HOWE, F. H. KNOWLTON, G. T. MOROE, E. L. MORRIS, W. A. MURRILL, H. H. RUSBY, C. L. SHEAR, W. TRELEASE, L. M. UNDERWOOD, D. WHITE & W. F. WIGHT (members and alternates of the Nomenclature. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club* 31: 249–261 (English); 263–276 (French); 277–290 (German). [Motion 25 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8).]
- 1904.05.31. WILLE, N. & V. WITTRICK. Motion au Congrès international de Botanique Deuxième Session. Vienne 1905. *Nyt Mag. Naturvidensk.* 42: 217–220. [Motion 26 in Briquet (1905.03.15) and Motion 7 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2).]
- 1904.06.09. AMES, O. ET AL. Propositions de changements aux Lois de Nomenclature botanique de 1867 . . . par les botanistes . . . d'Université Harvard. 32 pp. [French 1–11, English 12–21, German 22–32. Motion 27 in Briquet (1906.07?: 8).]
- 1904.06.20. HARMS, H. Vorschlag zur Ergänzung "Lois de la nomenclature botanique de 1867," dem in Wien 1905 tagenden Nomenclatur-Kongreß zur Annahme empfohlen. *Notizbl. Königl. Bot. Gart. Berlin Appendix* 13: 1–37. [Introduced the use of Dalle Torre & Harms numbers for conserved generic names]



- of flowering plants. Motion 30 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 9).]
- 1904.06.25. MALINVAUD, E. Motion présentée au Congrès international de Botanique de Vienne. 1 [handwritten] page. [Motion 36 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 9).]
- 1904.06. SACCARDO, P. A. Motions supplémentaires présentées au Congrès International de Botanique de Vienne. 1 p. [Motion 35 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 9) and Motion 8 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2).]
- 1904.06.23. ARCANGELI, G. ET AL. Adjonctions au Code de Paris 1867, proposées par quelques botanistes italiens. 12 pp. [Motion 33 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 9). French pp. 1–3; Italian pp. 5–8; German pp. 9–12.]
- 1904.06? Additions et modifications aux Lois de la Nomenclature botanique de 1867, approuvées par les membres de la Société de France. 12 pp. [Motion 34 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 9). Not seen.]
- 1904.06. ROUY, G. Additions et modifications aux Lois de la Nomenclature botanique de 1867. 4 pp. [Motion 37 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 9). Preprinted from longer article (12 pp.) in *Rev. Bot. Syst. Géogr. Bot.* 2: 1904.07.01.]
- 1904.06. SACCARDO, P. A. Des Diagnoses et de la nomenclature mycologique. Propositions. 6 pp. [French translation by Levier of Saccardo's Latin (1904.06). Preprinted from *Boll. Soc. Bot. Ital.* 1904: 281–286. 1904.07.31. Motion 28 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 9).]
- 1904.06. JACZEWSKI, A. DE (RAPP.). Projet de la revision des Lois de Nomenclature présenté par la Société Imperiale des Naturalistes de Moscou. 10 pp. Moskva. [Motion 24 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 8) and Motion 6 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2).]
- 1904.06. HAYEK, A. VON. Anträge zur Regelung der botanischen Nomenklatur. 10 pp. [Reprinted from *Verh. Zool.-Bot. Ges. Wien* 54: 341–351. 1904. Motion 32 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 9).]
- 1904.06. BRUNNTHALER, J. Motion présentée au Congrès international de Botanique, Vienne 1905. 1 p. [Reprinted from *Verh. Zool.-Bot. Ges. Wien* 54: 351–353. 1904. Motion 31 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 9).]
- 1904.06. CARRUTHERS, W. ET AL. Amendments to the Paris Code of Botanical Nomenclature suggested for consideration of the Vienna Congress of 1905 by the botanists of the British Museum and others. 3 pp. [Motion 29 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 9).]
- 1904.07. HOCHREUTINER, G. Observations et propositions présentées au Congrès de Vienne . . . par un groupe de botanistes belges et suisses. 8 pp. [Motion 38 in Briquet (1905.03.15: 9). Not seen.]
1905. HITCHCOCK, A. S. Nomenclatural type specimens of plant species. *Science* 21: 828–832.
- 1905.03.15. BRIQUET, J. Texte synoptique des documents destinés à servir de base aux débats du Congrès International de Nomenclature Botanique de Vienne 1905. 166 pp. R. Friedländer & Sohn, Berlin.
- 1905.03.21. BRIQUET, J. Résumé du travail du Rapporteur général et de la Commission internationale de nomenclature botanique. 2 pp. Genève. [Outlined what he did since his appointment 17 Nov. 1900.]
- 1905.05. PAU, C., J. SECALL & L. NAVÁS. Observaciones sobre nomenclatura botánica para ser presentadas al 2.º Congreso internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica de Viena. 13 pp. [Reprinted from *Bol. Soc. Aragonesa Ci. Nat.* 4: ?.]
- 1905.12.10. HARMS, H. Die Nomenklaturbewegung und der Internationale botanische Kongreß in Wien 1905. *Naturwiss. Wochenschr.* 20: 785–789.
1905. SCHWERIN, F. VON. Bericht und Betrachtungen über die Resultate des Wiener Nomenklatur-Kongresses. *Ber. Deutsch. Dendrol. Ges.* 1905: 93–102. [Motion 9 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2). Not seen.]
1905. HALLIER, H. Neue Vorschläge zur botanischen Nomenklatur. *Jahrb. Hamburg. Wiss. Anst.* 22 (Beih. 3): 33–46. [French pp. 43–45; English pp. 45–46.]
1906. BRIQUET, J. Compte rendu des débats du Congrès international de Nomenclature botanique. Pp. 81–164 and more in R. von Wettstein, J. Wiesner & A. Zahlbruckner, *Verhandlungen des Internationalen Botanischen Kongresses in Wien 1905*.
- 1906.04.10. GREENE, E. L. An unwritten law of nomenclature. *Leaf. Bot. Obs.* 1: 201–212. [Objected to using personal names as part of generic names. Motion 9 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2).]
- 1906.08? BRIQUET, J. (RAPP. GÉN.). Règles internationales de la nomenclature botanique adoptées par le Congrès International de Botanique de Vienne 1905. 99 pp. G. Fischer, Jena.
1906. NORDSTEDT, O. The starting-point of the nomenclature of Desmids. *Bot. Not.* 1906: 96–106. [Not seen. Extracted in *J. Bot.* 45: 128. 1907.03.]
- 1907.01.28. Otto Kuntze died at 54.
- 1907.02.04. SCHINZ, H. & A. THELLUNG. [On still-born names, pp. 101–102] in *Begründung vorzunehmender Namensänderungen an der zweiten Auflage der "Flora der Schweiz" von Schinz und Keller*. *Bull. Herb. Boissier*, ser. 2, 7: 97–112. [Motion 12 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2).]
- 1907.03. ROBINSON, B. L. On the rules of botanical nomenclature adopted by the Vienna Congress. *Rhodora* 9: 30–55.
- 1907.04. ARTHUR, J. C., J. H. BARNHART, N. L. BRITTON, F. CLEMENTS, O. F. COOD, F. V. COVILLE, F. S. EARLE, A. W. EVANS, T. E. HAZEN, A. HOOLICK, M. A. HOWE, F. H. KNOWLTON, G. T. MOORE, H. H. RUSBY, C. L. SHEAR, L. M. UNDERWOOD, D. WHITE & W. F. WIGHT. American Code of botanical nomenclature. *Bull. Torrey Club* 34: 167–178. [Motion 11 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2).]
- 1907.12.10. SCHINZ, H. & A. THELLUNG. (Circulaire) du 10 décembre 1907 relative à la question des noms mort-nés. 4 pp. [Motion 13 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2). Not seen.]
- 1907.12. RENDLE, A. B. & J. BRITTEN. Notes on the "List of British seed-plants" II. *J. Bot.* 45: 433–445. [Still-born names discussion.]
- 1908.12? JANCHEN, E. Zur Nomenklatur der Gattungsnamen. *Oesterr. Bot. Z.* 58(12): 466–470. [Long list to conserve/reject with names and dates only, no citations, no types, no discussion of cases.]
1908. HAYEK, A. VON. (Sur la question des noms mort-nés). *Mitt. Naturwiss. Vereins. Univ. Wien* 6: 57–65. [Motion 14 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2). Not seen.]
- 1909.03.11. ATKINSON, G. F. Motions proposant des articles additionnels sur la nomenclature des champignons, présentés au III<sup>e</sup> Congrès international de botanique à Bruxelles. 13 pp. Ithaca? [Motion 20 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). English pp. 9–13.]
- 1909.06.21. HARMS, H. Proposition d'un Index nominum genericorum Pteridophytorum conservandorum, présentée au Congrès international de Botanique de Bruxelles 1910. 3 pp. Berlin. [Motion 35 in Briquet (1910.04?: 4).]



- 1909.06. RENDLE, A. B. ET AL. Motion proposing an additional clause to the rules of 1905 concerning the nomenclature of algae, suggested for consideration of the Brussels Congress of 1910 by the botanists of the British Museum and others. [Motion 24 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Not seen but proposed C. A. Agardh as algal starting point teste TL-2 no. 9067.]
- 1906.06? POTONIÉ, H. Vorschläge zur Regelung der paläobotanischen Nomenklature. *Jahrb. Preuss. Geol. Landesanst* 30: 533–537.
- 1909.07. JANCHEN, E. Proposition d'une Amplification de la List de Noms génériques de Phanérogames, qui doivent être conservés en tous ca. 9 pp. Vienne. [Motion 36 in Briquet (1910.04?: 4).]
- 1909? DRUCE, G. C. Proposition. 2 pp.? [Replaced six names in the conserved names list. Saw only 1 page.]
1909. SCHINZ, H. & A. THELLUNG. Bericht über eine Enquete betr. die "totgebornen Namen" in der botanischen Nomenklatur. *Vierteljahrsschr. Naturf. Ges. Zürich* 53: 493–514. [Motion 15 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2). Not seen.]
1909. JANCHEN, E. Zur Frage der totgebornen Namen in der botanischen Nomenklatur. 28 pp. Wien. [Motion 16 in Briquet 1910.04?: 2). Not seen.]
1909. ARTHUR, J. C., E. G. BRITTON, F. E. CLEMENTS, F. S. EARLE & A. W. EVANS. Propositions relatives à l'amendement et au complément des Règles internationales de la Nomenclature botanique, adoptées par les Congrès international de Botanique de Vienne en 1905. 9 pp. [Motion 17 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2).]
1909. RENDLE, A. B. ET AL. Amendments to the international rules for botanical nomenclature, suggested for consideration of the Brussels Congress of 1910 by the botanists of the British Museum and others. 3 pp. London. [Motion 18 in Briquet (1910.04?: 2). Not seen.]
1909. NORDSTEDT, O. Motion au Congrès international de Botanique. Troisième session. Bruxelles 1910. 2 pp. Lund. [Motion 19 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Not seen.]
1909. STOCKMAYER, S. Motion au Congrès international de Botanique à Bruxelles 1910, relative à la nomenclature des Algues. 4 pp. Wien. [Motion 21 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Not seen.]
1909. SACCARDO, P. A. Da quale anno debba cominciare la validatà della nomenclatura scientifica delle Critogame. 4 pp. [Motion 22 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Reprinted from *Ann. Mycol.* 7: 339–342. Not seen. Proposed 1753 as starting point for Cryptogams teste TL-2 no. 9946.]
1909. RÖLL, J. Anträge, betr. Aenderungen und Zusätze zu internationalen botanischen Regeln in Bezug auf die Nomenklatur der Sphagna. 12 pp. Darmstadt. 12 pp. [Motion 23 in Briquet 1910.04?: 3). Not seen but see TL-2 no. 9391 for summary.]
1909. STOCKMAYER, S. Motion au Congrès international de Botanique à Bruxelles en 1910, relative à la nomenclature des Cytomorpha 4 pp. Vienne. [Motion 25 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Not seen.]
1909. ERIKSSON, J. Comment nommer les formes biologiques des espèces de champignons parasites? Motion présentée au Congrès international de botanique à Bruxelles 1910. Lund. [Motion 26 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Not seen.]
1909. FISCHER, E. & P. MAGNUS. Vorschläge zur Nomenklatur der parasitischen Pilze zu Handen des internationalen Kongress von 1910. 1 p. Berne. [Motion 27 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Not seen.]
1909. BOTTINI, A. ET AL. Motion proposant un article additionnel aux Règles de 1905 sur la nomenclature des Mousses, présentée par un groupe de bryologues anglais, français et italiens. 1 p. [Motion 28 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Not seen.]
1909. DURAND, E.-J. A discussion of some of the principles governing the interpretation of pre-personian names, and their bearing on the selection of a starting-point for mycological nomenclature. 13 pp. [Reprinted from *Science* n.s. 29: 670–676. Not seen. Motion 29 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3).]
1909. NATHORST, A.-G. Motions préliminaires proposant des articles additionnels sur la nomenclature des plantes fossiles présentées au III<sup>me</sup> Congrès international de Botanique à Bruxelles, 14–22 mai 1910. 3 pp. Lund. [Motion 30 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Not seen.]
1909. POTONIÉ, H. Propositions pour le règlement de la nomenclature paléobotanique. 7 pp. Berlin. [Motion 31 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Not seen.]
1909. TUZSON, J. Vorschläge zur Regelung de Palaeobotanischen Nomenklatur, zur Beratung auf dem Brüsseler Kongress 1910 vorgeschlagen. 6 pp. Budapest. [Motion 32 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Not seen.]
1909. BØRGESEN, F., L. KOLDERUP-ROSENVINGE & O. NORDSTEDT. Motion au Congrès international de Botanique à Bruxelles 1910 (concernant la nomenclature des Chlorophycées, Phaeophycées, et Rhodophycées). 6 pp. Copenhagen. [Motion 33 in Briquet (1910.04?: 3). Not seen.]
1909. SCHIFFNER, W. Motion au Congrès international de Botanique à Bruxelles 1910 (concernant la nomenclature des Hépatiques). 4 pp. Vienne. [Motion 34 (Briquet 1910.04?: 4). Not seen.]
- 1910.04? BRIQUET, J. (SECR.). Recueil des documents destinés à servir de base aux débats de la Section de nomenclature systématique du Congrès International de Nomenclature Botanique de Bruxelles 1910, présenté au nom du Bureau permanent de nomenclature et des Commissions de nomenclature cryptogamique et paléobotanique. 59 pp. [Recognized numbered 36 motions.]
- 1910.07.22. FARLOW, W. G. & G. F. ATKINSON. The Botanical Congress at Brussels. *Science* n.s. 32: 104–107. [Also in *Bot. Gaz. (Crawfordsville)* 50: 220–225. 1910.09.]
1911. COGNIAUX, C. A. Nomenclature horticole. Rapport préliminaire présenté au Congrès international d'Horticulture de Bruxelles (1910). *Bull. Soc. Roy. Bot. Belgique* 47: 364–424. [First Horticultural Code (pp. 419–424) with 16 Articles, criticized by Briquet as contrary to the Brussels Code just passed (1910) but not yet published (1912).]
1912. BRIQUET, J. (SECR.). Compte rendu des travaux de la Section de nomenclature botanique. Pp. 43–116 (with annexes) in É. Wildeman (SECR.), *Actes du III<sup>me</sup> Congrès International de Botanique Bruxelles 1910. Volume 1.* Albert de Boeck, Bruxelles.
- 1912.09? BRIQUET, J. (RAPP. GÉN.). Règles internationales de la nomenclature botanique . . . deuxième Édition mise au point d'après les décisions du Congrès International de Botanique de Bruxelles 1910. 110 pages. G. Fischer, Jena.



1912. CHOATE, HELEN A. The origin and development of the binomial system. *Pl. World* 15: 257–263.
- 1914.05. COOK, O. F. Terms relating to generic types. *Amer. Naturalist* 48: 308–313. [Orthotype, haplotype, logotype, pseudotype, cited usage of monobasic for “monotypic.”]
- 1919.01. PENNELL, F. W. Concerning duplicate types. *Torreyia* 19: 13–14. [Credited by J. Ewan (1942.01) with the invention of “isotype” but term used before, see O. F. Cook (1914.05: 309), who cited two previous usages in a different sense.]
- 1919.04. HITCHCOCK, A. S. Committee on generic types. *Science* 49: 333–336. [Rules and recommendations for fixing the types of generic names.]
- 1921.04. HITCHCOCK, A. S. Report of the Committee on Nomenclature of the Botanical Society of America. *Science* 53: 312–314. [The “type-basis” Code.]
- 1921.05. HITCHCOCK, A. S. The type concept in systematic botany. *Amer. J. Bot.* 8: 251–255.
- 1921.06. SPRAGUE, T. A. Plant nomenclature: some suggestions. *J. Bot.* 59: 153–160. [Opening of an important discussion: 12 points to change, many examples.]
- 1921.08. BRITTEN, J. The Vienna Code. *J. Bot.* 59: 233–234. [Defended legality of Vienna Code recently attacked by N. Britton, *Torreyia* 1919: 244–246. 1919.]
- 1921.10. REHDER, A. [Letter with more suggestions to Sprague 1921.06.] *J. Bot.* 59: 289–294.
- 1921.10. GROVES, J. [Comments opposing Sprague 1921.06.] *J. Bot.* 59: 294–296.
- 1921.10. BRITTON, N. L. [Comments opposing Sprague 1921.06.] *J. Bot.* 59: 296–297.
- 1921.12. SPRAGUE, T. A. Notes on nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 59: 345–349. [Important discussion on orthography (*Gluta reinghas/benghas* example, latinizing French names ending in -ier and -ière to -erius).]
- 1922.03. SPRAGUE, T. A. The nomenclature of plant families. *J. Bot.* 60: 69–73.
- 1922.04. HITCHCOCK, A. S. [Suggestions regarding generic names.] *J. Bot.* 60: 111–112. [Advocating types.]
- 1922.04. PENNELL, F. W. [Comments on plant nomenclature.] *J. Bot.* 60: 112–118. [Expresses pleasure at Sprague’s reopening the subject.]
- 1922.05. SPRAGUE, T. A. Plant nomenclature: a reply [to Pennell & Hitchcock]. *J. Bot.* 60: 129–138.
- 1922.09. BARNHART, J. H. Plant nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 60: 256–263. [Fascinating commentary on the ongoing discussion.]
- 1922.07. WILMOTT, A. J. Some remarks on nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 60: 196–201. [Attack on Schinz & Thellung, advocating a “loose” Code.]
- 1922.09. BARNHART, J. H. Plant nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 60: 256–263. [Response to Sprague.]
- 1922.11. SPRAGUE, T. A. [Response to Barnhart.] *J. Bot.* 60: 313–316.
- 1922.11. HITCHCOCK, A. S. [Type-basis code.] *J. Bot.* 60: 316–318.
- 1923.01. FRITZ, E. A. Plea for common sense in changes of botanical nomenclature. *J. Forestry* (Washington) 21?: . [Not seen, ref. by Dayton, 1943.05.]
- 1923.11. HITCHCOCK, A. S. Type species for the first 100 genera of Linné, *Species Plantarum*. *Amer. J. Bot.* 10: 510–514.
1924. SHEAR, C. L. The failure of the principle of priority to secure uniformity and stability in botanical nomenclature. *Science* 60: 254–258.
- 1924.03. BRITTEN, J., J. RAMSBOTTOM, T. A. SPRAGUE (CONVENER), E. M. WAKEFIELD & A. J. WILMOTT. Interim report on nomenclature [to Imperial Botanical Conference]. *J. Bot.* 62: 79–81.
- 1924.07. JACKSON, B. D. History of the compilation of the Index Kewensis. *J. Roy. Hort. Soc.* 49: 224–229.
- 1925.04. GREEN, M. L. Standard species of the Linnean genera of Tetradymania. *Bull. Misc. Inform.* 1925: 49–58.
1925. RENDLE, A. B. (CHAIRMAN). Rules of nomenclature. Pp. 300–307 and 384 in F. T. Brooks (Secr.), Imperial Botanical Conference London, 7–16 July 1924. Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- 1925.07. HANSON, H. E. Codes of nomenclature and botanical congresses. *Amer. Botanist* 31: 114–120. [Summary history.]
- 1926.03. SPRAGUE, T. A. Standard species. *Bull. Misc. Inform.* 1926: 96–100. [Residue vs. type method.]
- 1926.05. HITCHCOCK, A. S. A basis of agreement on nomenclature. *Amer. J. Bot.* 13: 291–300. [An important document.]
- 1926.06.30. GREEN, M. L. Standard-species of nomina conservanda. 70 pp. Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. [Distributed softbound 30 June 1926—seen on transmittal note attached to BM copy. Cited reasons for “types” that were omitted in 1929 Proposals of British Botanists. Stafleu (1956.07: 87) noted that this “was circulated among botanists and botanical institutions before and at the Cambridge Congress.”]
- 1927.12. GREEN, M. L. History of plant nomenclature. *Bull. Misc. Inform.* 1927: 403–415.
- 1928.03.I. SURINGAR, J. V. Personal ideas about the application of the international Rules of Nomenclature, or as with the Rules themselves, international deliberation? Some denominations of I. Coniferous [species.] *Meded. Rijks-Herb.* 55: 1–76. [Published simultaneously with Part II, Volume 56.]
- 1923.03.II. SURINGAR, J. V. Personal ideas about the application of the international Rules of Nomenclature, or as with the Rules themselves, international deliberation? II. Some denominations of dicotyledonous trees and shrubs species. With a retrospection and a set of propositions on the Nomenclature-Rules. *Meded. Rijks-Herb.* 56: 1–77. [Published simultaneously with Part I, Volume 55. The 30 nomenclature proposals are on 67–75, including submission of names (prop. 24), The Office of Index Kewensis as the standard herbarium (prop. 29).]
- 1929.03.24. ERIKSSON, J. Question présentée au Congrès International de Botanique à Cambridge (England) 1930. 1 P. Stockholm. [Motion 7 in Briquet (1930.07: iii). Capitalize some species epithets or not.]
- 1929.03. MCKENZIE, K. K. Proposals for modifications of the Vienna-Brussels (so-called International Rules of Nomenclature. 5 pp. (multigr.) New York. [Motion 12 in Briquet (1930.07: iii). A last gasp in the best style, brief and clear, of the Brittonian school.]
- 1929.03. REHDER, A. Proposed amendments to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. *J. Arnold Arbor.* 10: 46–65. [Motion 16 in Briquet (1930.07: iii). Completed by “16B,” A note on names of horticultural variations. *J. Arnold Arbor.* 10: 66–68.]
- 1929.06.07. SHEAR, C. L. Proposed amendments to the International Rules for Botanical Nomenclature. *Science* 69: 601–602. [Motion 18 in Briquet (1930.07: iii).]



- 1929.07.05. GUNDERSON, A. An international list of genera of vascular plants. *Science* 70: 15–16.
- 1929.07.22. EWART, A. J. Additional nomina conservanda. 3 pp. (typewritten). Melbourne. [Motion 8 in Briquet (1930.07?: iii). 47 names, mostly species names.]
- 1920.07. ADAMS, J. Suggested modifications of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. 4 pp. (typewritten). Ottawa. [Motion 1 in Briquet (1930.07: ii).]
1929. DUGGAR, B. M. (EDITOR). Proceedings of the International Congress for Plant Sciences, Ithaca, New York, August 16–23, 1926, Volume 2. George Banta Publishing, Menasha, Wisconsin. [Including:]
  1. SPRAGUE, T. A. Principles and problems of plant nomenclature. Pp. 1422–1426.
  2. HITCHCOCK, A. S. The relation of nomenclature to taxonomy. Pp. 1434–1439.
  3. HITCHCOCK, A. S. (CHAIRMAN). Round-Table discussion: Botanical Nomenclature. Pp. 1556–1570. [Papers by Briquet, Howe, Fernald & Britton.]
- 1929.08?. BRITISH BOTANISTS. Nomenclature Proposals. 203 pp. London. [The titles in the contents (p. 2) differ from the titles of the works. Motion 5 in Briquet (1930.07?: ii), using titles from contents. Comprises seven works with these titles:]
  1. RAMSBOTTOM, J., T. A. SPRAGUE, A. J. WILMOTT & E. M. WAKEFIELD [Britten died 1924.]. Proposals by the sub-committee on nomenclature, appointed by the Imperial Botanical Conference, London, 1924. Pp. 3–45. [See Rendle (1925).]
  2. SPRAGUE, T. A. Proposal for the conservation of 90 additional generic names. Pp. 46–96.
  3. GREEN, M. L. Proposed standard-species of Nomina Generica Conservanda. Pp. 97–109. [This is a truncation of the original (Green, 1926.06.30), now omitting the stated reason for each choice.]
  4. HITCHCOCK, A. S. & M. L. GREEN. Standard-species of Linnean genera of Phanerogamae (1753–1754). Pp. 110–199.
  5. WAKEFIELD, E. M. Proposals. P. 200.
  6. WILMOTT, A. J. Proposal. Pp. 201–202.
  7. BURKILL, I. H. Proposal. P. 203.
1929. CIFERII, R. Proposte di modificazioni alle Regole di Nomenclatura Botanica. 1 p. [Motion 2 in Briquet (1930.07?: ii).]
1929. ARTHUR, J. C. Proposed amendments to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. 4 pp. [Page 1 is reset from *J. Bot.* 67: 258–259. 1929.09 Motion 3[A] in Briquet (1930.07?: ii). Pp. 2–4 Motion 3[B] is typed.]
1929. AUDAS, J. W. ET AL. Nomina conservanda. 3 pp. (typewritten). [Motion 4 in Briquet (1930.07?: ii). The Committee on Australian Botanical Nomenclature was “appointed at a meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science in 1924.”]
1929. SEWARD, A. C. ET AL. [Memorandum.] 1 p. (typewritten). [Motion 6 in Briquet (1930.07?: iii). Forsters and botanists favoring species conservation and a judiciary to solve questions of nomenclature.]
1929. FERNALD, M. L. & C. A. WEATHERBY. Proposed amendments to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. 6 pp. Boston. [Motion 9 in Briquet (1930.07?: iii). Not seen.]
1929. GUNDERSON, A. Proposed amendments to the International Rules of Nomenclature. 2 pp. (typewritten). Brooklyn. [Motion 10 in Briquet (1930.07?: iii). Completed by: “10A” An international list of genera of vascular plants. *Science* 70: 15–16. 1929.07.05, and “10B” Genera Pteridophytorum et Spermatophytorum Variationes Nomenclaturae. 13 pp. (typewritten) and dated March 1929.]
1929. HITCHCOCK, A. S. Proposed amendments to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. 3 pp. (multigr.). Washington. [Motion 11 in Briquet (1930.07?: iii).]
1929. OLIVER, W. R. B. Additional articles and amendments to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. 2 pp. Wellington, New Zealand. [Motion 13 in Briquet (1930.07?: iii).]
1929. PENNELL, F. W. Some proposals for modification of the “International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature.” 1 p. (typewritten). Philadelphia. [Motion 14 in Briquet (1930.07?: iii).]
1929. PFEIFFER, H. Ueber 70 neue Namencombinationen in einer einzigen Cyperaceengattung oder Aufnahme eines Gattungsnamens in den Index der “Nomina conservanda?” 7 pp. Berlin. [Motion 15 in Briquet (1930.07?: iii).]
1929. SHEAR, C. L. Proposed additions to the list of Nomina conservanda of the Rules for Botanical Nomenclature. 1 p. (typewritten). Washington. [Motion 17 in Briquet (1930.07?: iii).]
1929. SURINGAR, J. V. Propositions on the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature in regard to the International Botanical Congress in London. 1930. 27 pp. Wageningen. [Motion 19 in Briquet (1930.07?: iii). Completed by “19A” Supplementary remarks. 1 p. Wageningen and “19B” Literature to be added in Appendix of propositions on the Intern. Rules of Bot. Nomenclature (London Congress 1930). 1 p. Wageningen. 60 species names for conservation.]
1929. WHERRY, E. T. A plea for the conservation of *Shortia* as a generic name. 2 pp. (typewritten). Washington. [Motion 20 in Briquet (1930.07?: iv).]
1929. SURINGAR, J. V. The American Code, The Vienna Code and the resolutions of the Imperial Botanical Conference in London. Will agreement be possible in 1930? *Meded. Rijks-Herb.* 57: 1–[43].
- 1930.07? BRIQUET, J. (RAPP. GÉN.). Recueil synoptique des documents destinés à servir de base aux débats de la sous-section de nomenclature du V<sup>me</sup> Congrès International de Botanique Cambridge (Angleterre) 1930. 142 pp. R. Friedländer & Sohn, Berlin.
- 1930.08. BRIQUET, J. (RAPP. GÉN.). Avis préalable du Bureau Permanent des Commissions de nomenclature sur les motions soumises aux débats de la sous-section de nomenclature du V<sup>me</sup> Congrès International de Botanique Cambridge (Angleterre) 1930. 25 pp. R. Friedländer & Sohn, Berlin.
- 1931.07. GREEN, M. L. Rules of botanical nomenclature . . . *Empire Forest. J.* 10(1): 54–72.
1931. BRIQUET, J. Compte rendu des débats de la sous-section de nomenclature botanique. Pp. 554–654 in F. T. Brooks & T. F. Chipp, Report of the Proceedings [of the] Fifth International Botanical Congress Cambridge, 16–23 August 1930. University Press, Cambridge.
- 1931.10.26. John Isaac Briquet died at 62.
- 1932.03. MOLDENKE, H. N. A discussion of tautonyms. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club* 59: 139–156. [Updated Huth.]
1933. SPRAGUE, T. A. Plant nomenclature. *Bot. Soc. Exch. Club Brit. Isles* 1932: 300–313. [Chief pro-



- visions as amended illustrated by examples from British flora.]
- 1933.11. FRIZZELL, D. L. Terminology of types. *Amer. Midl. Naturalist* 14: 673–668. [Alphabetic listing of 233 kinds of types with usage references.]
- 1934.06. RENDLE, A. B. International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature adopted by the Fifth International Botanical Congress, Cambridge, 1930. *J. Bot.* 72(Suppl.): 1–29.
- 1934.10. MOLDENKE, H. N. A supplementary list of tautonyms and miscellaneous nomenclatural notes. *Torreya* 34: 5–10.
- 1934.12.12. DODGE, C. W. Proposals for amendment of Art. 20 of the International Rules of Nomenclature. *Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard.* 21: 709–712. [Proposal 9 in Sprague 1935.07: 2].
- 1934.12. SAMPALIO, A. J. DE. La méthode de types et la nomenclature analogique. *Ann. Acad. Brasil. Sci.* 6(4): 173–179. [Proposal 13 in Sprague 1935.07: 2]. Series of examples formed in accordance with Rec. X & XI. Not seen.]
1934. ADAMS, J. Some amendments to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. 8 pp. (typewritten). Ottawa. [Proposal 1 in Sprague (1935.07: 1). Not seen.]
1934. HOCHREUTINER, B. P. G. Proposals for the modification of Art. 35, Rec. xxx, and Art. 72. Remarks concerning Art. 38. 2 pp. (typewritten). Genève. [Proposal 10 in Sprague (1935.07: 2). Not seen.]
1934. REHDER, A. Amendments to the International Rules of Nomenclature, 3rd edition. 4 pp. Arnold Arboretum. [Proposal 12 in Sprague (1935.07: 2). Not seen.]
- 1935? ARTHUR, J. C. Proposed amendments to the International Rules of Nomenclature. 1 p. Lafayette. [Proposal 2 in Sprague (1935.07: 1). Not seen.]
- 1935? AUSTRALIAN BOTANISTS. Motion for conservation of the generic name *Haussmannia* . . . four specific names . . . 1 p. (typewritten). [Proposal 3 in Sprague (1935.07: 1). Not seen.]
1935. BECHERER, A. Vorschläge für die Nomenklatur-Kommission des Botaniker Kongresses in Amsterdam. 3 pp. (typewritten). Genf. [Proposal 4 in Sprague (1935.07: 2). Not seen.]
1935. DANSER, B. H. Proposals concerning the formation, spelling and gender of botanical names. 3 pp. (typewritten). [Proposal 7 in Sprague (1935.07: 2). See also Danser, 1935.04.]
1935. DIXON, H. N. Proposals concerning bryological nomenclature. *Rev. Bryol. Lichénol.* 7: 137–141. [Proposal 8 in Sprague (1935.07: 2). Not seen.]
1935. TROUP, R. Motions submitted on behalf of various Forestry Institutions and Societies. 3 pp. Oxford. [Proposal 14 in Sprague (1935.07: 3). Not seen.]
- 1935.01. JONGMANS, W., T. G. HALLE & W. GOTHAN. Proposed additions to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. 15 pp. Haarlem. [Proposal 11 in Sprague (1935.07: 2). Not seen.]
- 1935.02. "Briquet, J." (deceased). International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature . . . revised by the International Botanical Congress of Cambridge, 1930 [as compiled by the Editorial Committee for Nomenclature from the Report of the Subsection of Nomenclature prepared by John Briquet (deceased). 152 pp. G. Fischer, Jena. [English by A. B. Rendle, French by B. P. G. Hochreutiner, German by H. Harms.]
- 1935.03. SPRAGUE, T. A. (EDITOR). [12 botanists'] Ad-
- ditions and amendments to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature, 3rd edition. *Bull. Misc. Inform.* 1935: 65–92. [Proposal 5 in Sprague (1935: 07: 2).]
- 1935.04.11. LOOSER, G. Motion pour déclarer "nomen conservandum" le genre *Cryptocarya* R. Br. et "nomen rejiciendum" le genre *Peumus* Mol. (Lauraceae). 1 p. (typewritten). Santiago, Chile. [Proposal 17 in Sprague (1935.09.01: 3). Not seen.]
- 1935.04. DANSER, B. H. Grammatical objections to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature, adopted at Cambridge in 1930. *Blumea* 1: 295–304. [Proposal 15 in Sprague (1935.09.01: 2). Orthography—"leave this question to a committee of botanists who are more or less competent . . ."; see Sprague rebuttal (1935.08).]
- 1935.04. MOLDENKE, H. N. Additional notes on tautonyms. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club* 59: 139–156.
- 1935.04. SPRAGUE, T. A. Survey of nomenclature (1930–1935). *Chron. Bot.* 1: 34–35.
- 1935.04. RENDLE, A. B. A short history of the International Botanical Congresses. *Chron. Bot.* 1: 35–40. [Excellent summary from 1864 Brussels *Congrès International d'Horticulture* to the 1930 Cambridge Congress, including issues discussed.]
- 1935.04. THOMAS, H. H. Proposed additions to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. *J. Bot.* 73: 111–113. [Proposal 6 in Sprague (1930.07: 2).]
- 1935.05.20. KOSTERMANS, A. Motion to . . . [conserve] . . . *Endlicheria* & *Emeorrhiza*. . . 1 p. (typewritten). Utrecht. [Proposal 16 in Sprague (1935.09.01: 3). Not seen.]
- 1935.07. SPRAGUE, T. A. (EDITOR). Synopsis of proposals concerning nomenclature submitted to the Sixth International Botanical Congress Amsterdam 1935. 80 pp. University Press, Cambridge. [Known as the Red Book by its wrapper.]
- 1935.08. REHDER, A., C. A. WEATHERBY, R. MANSFELD & M. L. GREEN. Conservation of later generic homonyms. *Bull. Misc. Inform.* 1935: 341–544. [Major source of conserved homonyms, presented with documentation. See Sprague (1940.06) for committee decisions.]
- 1935.08. SPRAGUE, T. A. The gender of generic names: a vindication. *Bull. Misc. Inform.* 1935: 545–556. [Proposal 18 in Sprague (1936.09.101: 3). Rebuttal of Danser, 1935.04: important for principles of orthography, Greek compounds, etc.]
- 1935.09.01. SPRAGUE, T. A. Preliminary opinions concerning nomenclature proposals submitted to the Sixth International Botanical Congress Amsterdam 1935. 28 pp. University Press, Cambridge. [Known as the Grey Book by its wrapper.]
- 1935.12.16. Alfred Spear Hitchcock died of heart attack on SS. City of Norfolk after remaining in Europe to study grasses following the 6th International Botanical Congress in Amsterdam.
- 1936.04. BECHERER, A. Conservation d'homonymes génériques dans les fougères. *Candollea* 7: 137–139. [Proposal 1940–18 in Lanjou (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1936.05. SPRAGUE, T. A. Principle discussions concerning nomenclature made by the Sixth International Botanical Congress. *Bull. Misc. Inform.* 1936: 185–188.
- 1936.10.30. MARTIN, G. W. The application of the generic name *Guepinia*. *Amer. J. Bot.* 23: 627–629. [Proposal 1940–24 in Lanjou (1950.04?: xiii).]



1936. SPRAGUE, T. A. (RAPP. GÉN.). Subsection for nomenclature. Pp. 333–383 in M. J. Sirks, Zesde International Botanisch Congres Amsterdam, 2–7 September, 1935 Proceedings, Volume 1. E. J. Brill, Leiden.
1936. BURTT-DAVY, J. Forestry 10: 166–168. [Proposal 1940–22 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii). Not seen.]
- 1937.04. FURTADO, C. X. Validity or effectiveness of publication. Chron. Bot. 3: 336–339. [Cf. Hochreutiner, 1938.10.]
- 1937.06. BOLLE, F. "Varietas typica." Notizbl. Bot. Gart. Berlin-Dahlem 13: 524–530. [Proposal 1940–13 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1937.10. FURTADO, C. X. A commentary on the laws of botanical nomenclature. Gard. Bull. Straits Settlement. 9: 223–284. [Although sometimes dismissed, the author was ahead of his time (invented terms basynym, isonym).]
- 1937.10. FURTADO, C. X. The nomenclature of types. Gard. Bull. Straits Settlement. 9: 285–309. [Three kinds of primary types, eight kinds of secondary types, and six kinds of "duplicate" types.]
1937. WERDERMANN, E. Kakteenkunde 3: ?. [Proposal 1940–19 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii). Not seen.]
- 1938.02.15. PFEIFFER, H. *Dichromena* oder *Rhynchospora*? Zwei Anträge an den VII Internationalen Botaniker-kongress zur Stabilisierung der Cyperaceen-nomenklatur. Report. Spec. Nov. Regni Veg. 43: 258–262. [Proposal 1940–23 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1938.07.14. REHDER, A., E. J. PALMER & L. CROIZAT. Seven binomials proposed as nomina ambigua. J. Arnold Arbor. 19: 282–290. [Proposal 1940–20 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1938.09. MELVILLE, R. Is *Ulmus campestris* L. a nomen ambiguum? J. Bot. 76: 261–265. [Proposal 1940–16 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1938.10. HOCHREUTINER, B. P. G. Validité des publications (à l'occasion d'un article de M. Furtado dans *Chronica Botanica*). Candollea 7: 509–517.
1938. CLAUSEN, R. T. On the citation of authorities for botanical names. Science 88: 299–300.
- 1939.01. FURTADO, C. X. Validating botanical names by referring to invalid literature. Gard. Bull. Straits Settlement. 10: 162–172. [Objected to recent treatments of *Epipogium* and *Pterocarpus*.]
- 1939.02.16. WHEELER, L. C. *Pedilanthus* and *Cnidoscylus* proposed for conservation. Contrib. Gray Herb. 124: 47–52. [Proposal 1940–21 by Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.02. WHEELER, L. C. Additions and amendments to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. Amer. Midl. Naturalist 21: 526–529. [Proposal 1940–1 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.04.28. REHDER, A. Proposed amendments to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. J. Arnold Arbor. 20: 269–279. [Proposal 1940–6 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.04. FOSBERG, F. R. Nomenclatural proposals for the 1940 Botanical Congress. Amer. J. Bot. 26: 229–231. [Proposal 1940–12 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.05. ALM, C. G. ET AL. Amendment of Art. 68. 1 p. Göteborg. [Proposal 1940–3 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.05. FURTADO, C. X. Amendments proposed to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature (1935). Gard. Bull. Straits Settlement. 11: 1–30. [Proposal 1940–9 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.06.15. PATRICK, R. A suggested starting point for the nomenclature of diatoms. 2 pp. Philadelphia. [Proposal 1940–7 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.06.17. DE TONI, G. Vorschläge für dem Internationalen botanischen Kongress in Stockholm 1940 betreffend den Art. 38 der Internationaler Regeln der botanischen Nomenklatur. 1 p. Brescia. [Proposal 1940–2 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.06. HANDEL-MAZZETTI, H. Über Mängel und Unklarheiten in den botanischen Nomenklaturregeln. Repert. Spec. Nov. Regni Veg. 46: 82–94. [Proposal 1940–10 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.06. DIXON, H. H. International bryological nomenclature. J. Bot. 77: 176–178. [Proposal 1940–17 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.07? ALLAN, H. H. The nomenclature of hybrids. Chron. Bot. 5(2/3): 205–209. [Proposal 1940–4 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.07?. SPRAGUE, T. A. The nomenclature of hybrids. Chron. Bot. 5(2/3): 209–212.
- 1939.10.06. BULLOCK, A. A. *Actinocheita*. Bull. Misc. Inform. 1939: 337–339. [Proposal 1940–28 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939.10. SPRAGUE, T. A. (EDITOR). Proposed additions and amendments to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature [by eight British botanists.] Bull. Misc. Inform. 1939: 317–334. [Proposal 1940–14 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii). Binary combinations under *Anonymos* published by Walter (1788).]
1939. GLEASON, H. A. Proposed amendments to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature as adopted at Cambridge, 1930. 1 p. New York. [Proposal 1940–11 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939? HARA, H. Reject *Heleniopsis* as nomen confusum. 1 p. [Proposal 1940–25 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939? HOUTZAGERS, G. Nomina ambigua proposals about the botanical names of some poplars. 10 pp. (type-written). Arnhem. [Proposal 1940–26 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
- 1939? HOUTZAGERS, G. Proposal [to reject *Populus canadensis* Moench as a nomen ambiguum]. 1 p. (type-written). Arnhem [Proposal 1950–27 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii).]
1939. HOCHREUTINER, B. P. G. [Typewritten] [Proposal 1940–8 in Lanjouw (1950.04?: xiii). Not seen.]
- 1940.05. MANSFELD, R. Probleme der Nomenklaturregeln. Repert. Spec. Nov. Regni Veg. Beih. 121: 4–13.
- 1940.06. SPRAGUE, T. A. Additional nomina generica conservanda (Pteridophyta and Phanerogamae). Bull. Misc. Inform. 1940: 81–134. [Approved conserved names scheduled for the Amsterdam (4th edition) Code.]
- 1941.09? SMITH, A. C. The principle of priority in biological nomenclature. Chron. Bot. 9: 114–119.
- 1942.01. EWAN, J. Isotype vs. co-type as designators for duplicate type. Chron. Bot. 7: 8–9. [A definitive statement in favor of isotype.]
- 1942?.12. HARLOW, ?. Scientific names and their vagaries. J. Forest. (Washington) 40: [Not seen, addressed by Dayton, 1943.05.]
1943. BLAKE, S. F. Cotype, syntype, and other terms referring to type material. Rhodora 45: 481–485.
- 1943.05. DAYTON, W. A. Should plant taxonomists be controlled by an open season or otherwise, or alto-



- gether suppressed? J. Forest. (Washington) 41: 369–373. [Comment on Harlow, 1942? 12, and Fritz, 1923.]
- 1943.12. BEETLE, A. A. Specific decapitalization. Chron. Bot. 7: 380–381. [In favor.]
- 1944.12. A discussion on the differences in observance between zoological and botanical nomenclature. Proc. Linn. Soc. London 156: 126–146.
1. SPRAGUE, M. L. (M. L. GREEN). The case for the botanists. 126–134.
  2. HEMMING, F. The case for the zoologists. Pp. 134–137.
  3. WILMOTT, A. J. A criticism. Pp. 138–140.
  4. TREWAVAS, E. Comments. Pp. 141.
  5. SPRAGUE, T. A. Comments. Pp. 141–142.
  6. NEAVE, S. Comments. p. 142.
  7. LASZLO, P. DE. A summing-up. Pp. 142–146.
- 1945.10? SMITH, A. C. The principle of priority in biological nomenclature. Chron. Bot. 9: 114–119. [Opposed *nomina specifica conservanda*. "If it were not for this list of about 850 conserved [generic] names thousands upon thousands of specific binomials would be invalidated."]
1945. HYLANDER, N. Nomenklatorische und systematische Studien über nordische Gefäßpflanzen. Uppsala Univ. Årsskr. 7: 1–337.
- 1946.07. BAILEY, L. H. Species names with capital letters [and] observations on binomials. Gentes Herbarum 7: 168–174. [For capitalizing, explains that the comma between binomial and author means "of," opposes infraspecific names.]
- 1947.04.01. CAMP, W. H., H. W. RICKETT & C. A. WEATHERBY. International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature . . . revised by the International Congress of Amsterdam, 1935. Brittonia 6: 1–120. [The Brittonia Code.]
- 1947.04. GLEASON, H. A. On the preservation of well-known binomials. Phytologia 2: 201–213. [*Parthenocissus vitacea*, not *inserta*; *Nelumbo lutea*, not *pentapetala*; *Lathyrus maritimus*, not *japonicus*; *Acer saccharum*, not *saccharophorum*.]
- 1947.10. AIRY SHAW, H. K. Typification of new names derived from persons or places. Kew Bull. [1]: 35–39. [How would author deal with *Asclepias syriaca*?]
- 1948.03. BUCHANAN, R. E., R. ST. JOHN-BROOKS & R. S. BREED. International Bacteriological Code of Nomenclature. J. Bacteriol. 55: 287–306.
- 1948.03. RICKETT, H. W. Citation of author's names in taxonomy. Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 75: 172–174. [In vs. ex vs. apud.]
- 1948.04. LITTLE, E. L. A proposal to stabilize plant names. Phytologia 2: 451–456. [Nomen extinctum—unused for 100 years, upping the ante from the Berlin code (1897.06) of unused for 50 years.]
- 1948.07.15. MERRILL, E. D. *Neolitsea* (Benth.) Merrill, nomen conservandum propositum. J. Arnold Arbor. 29: 198–201. [Proposal 1950–2 in Lanjouw (1950.04? xiv).]
- 1948.07.15. MERRILL, E. D. Nomenclatural notes on Rafinesque's published papers 1804–1840. J. Arnold Arbor. 29: 202–214. [Proposal 1950–3 in Lanjouw (1950.04? xvi).]
1948. LANJOUW, J. (EDITOR). [Proposals of Dutch botanists]. 13 pp. (typewritten). [Proposal 1950–5 in Lanjouw (1950.04? xiv). Lam (p. 1) Introduced the word "taxon," equivalent to German "Sippe."]
- 1949.01. SHERFF, E. E. (CHAIRMAN). Symposium on botanical nomenclature. Amer. J. Bot. 36: 1–32. Comprising:
1. SHERFF, E. E. Introduction. Pp. 1–4.
  2. WEATHERBY, C. A. Botanical Nomenclature since 1867. Pp. 5–7.
  3. BLAKE, S. F. Byways of nomenclature. Pp. 8–9. [Linnaeus, Rafinesque, Saint-Lager, Bubani.]
  4. RICKETT, H. W. An editor's point of view. Pp. 10–13.
  5. MERRILL, E. D. Adventures in locating validly published but unlisted binomials. Pp. 14–19.
  6. PENNELL, F. W. Toward a simple and clear nomenclature. Pp. 19–22.
  7. BAILEY, L. H. Problems in taxonomy. Pp. 22–24.
  8. ROSEDAHL, C. O. The problem of subspecific categories. Pp. 24–27.
  9. JUST, T. The nomenclature of fossil plants. Pp. 28–32.
- 1949.06.25. CAMP, W. H., H. W. RICKETT & C. A. WEATHERBY. Proposed changes in the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. Brittonia 7: 1–51. [Proposal 1950–62 in Lanjouw (1950.04? xv). Sponsored by a group of 55 taxonomists.]
- 1949.10. SMITH, A. C. A legislated nomenclature for species of plants? Amer. J. Bot. 36: 624–626. [Opposed.]
- 1949.12. FURTADO, C. X. A further commentary on the rules of nomenclature. Gard. Bull. Singapore 12: 311–377. [Proposal 1950–83 in Lanjouw (1950.04? xvi). Discriminated between binary and binomial names.]
- 1949.12? MANSFELD, R. Die Technik der wissenschaftlichen Pflanzenbenennung: Einführung in die Internationalen Regeln der botanischen Nomenklatur. 116 pp. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.
1949. TROUPIN, G. La terminologie des types en botanique systématique. Bull. Soc. Roy. Bot. Belg. 82: 57–66.
- 1950.04? LANJOUW, J. (ACTING RAPP. GÉN.). Synopsis of proposals concerning the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature submitted to the Seventh International Botanical Congress, Stockholm, 1950. 255 pp. [550 proposals.]
- 1950.05. POLUNIN, N. Specific and trivial decapitalization. Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 77: 214–221. [Important statement pro decapitalization.]
- 1950.06. HJELMQVIST, H. The conservation of species names [invited responses]. Bot. Not. 1950: 328–347.
1. RICKETT, H. W. Pp. 328–329. [Opposed.]
  2. GRAM, K. Pp. 330–332. [Pro, needed for stability.]
  3. CAMP, W. H. Pp. 332–336. [Unrealistic without staff.]
  4. JANCHEN, E. Pp. 336–340. [Yes but must be limited.]
  5. GILMOUR, J. S. L. Pp. 341–343. [Yes but must be limited.]
  6. BAEHNI, C. Pp. 343–346. [Conservation of species = sea serpent.]
  7. SKOTTSBERG, C. Pp. 346–347. [Fix the rules then no name changes.]
- 1950.07. RICKETT, H. W. & W. H. CAMP. The application and use of botanical names. Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 77: 245–261. [Residue of circumscription method still in Code vs. type method.]
- 1950.07.18. International Association for Plant Taxonomy born by resolution of the Stockholm Congress.



- 1950.08? LANJOUW, J. (EDITOR). Botanical nomenclature and taxonomy, a symposium organized by the International Union of Biological Sciences with support of UNESCO at Utrecht, the Netherlands, June 14-19, 1948. *Chron. Bot.* 12(1/2): 1-87. comprising:
  1. SPRAGUE, M. L. Minutes of the Utrecht Conference. Pp. 9-53.
  2. LANJOUW, J. On the need for an international society of plant taxonomists. Pp. 55-57.
  3. INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR NOMENCLATURE. Pp. 59-62.
  4. SPRAGUE, T. A. International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature Supplement embodying the alterations made at the Sixth International Botanical Congress, Amsterdam, 1935. Pp. 65-77; Appendix II, pp. 79-80; Appendix III, pp. 81-83; Index of plant names, pp. 85-87.
- 1950.11. WIT, H. C. D. DE. Changes in the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature made by the 7th Int. Bot. Congress at Stockholm. An unofficial review. *Fl. Males Bull.* 1(7): 197-231.
- 1951.09. LANJOUW, J. The Stockholm 1950 Rules of Botanical Nomenclature [with] nomenclature committees appointed at Stockholm. *Taxon* 1: 7-11.
- 1952.01. MERRILL, E. D. The Cheltenham Conference on botanical nomenclature. *Taxon* 1: 35-36. [Editorial committee.]
- 1952.09. LANJOUW, J. ET AL. (EDITORS). International Code of Botanical Nomenclature adopted by the seventh International Botanical Congress, Stockholm, July 1950. *Regnum Veg.* 3: 1-228.
1953. LANJOUW, J. (RAPP. GÉN.). Nomenclature [Section] report. Pp. 457-550 in H. Osvald & E. Åberg (editors), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Botanical Congress, Stockholm, July 12-20, 1950*. Almquist & Wiksell, Stockholm. [Reprinted in *Regnum Veg.* 3: 457-550. 1954.01.]
- 1953.07-09. CROIZAT, L. On nomenclature: The "type-method." *Taxon* 2: 105-107; 124-130. [Classic polemic against typification and autonyms.]
- 1953.09. RICKETT, H. W. Expediency vs. priority in nomenclature. *Taxon* 2: 117-124. [Historical survey with bibliography.]
- 1954.03 LANJOUW, J. Recueil synoptique des propositions concernant le Code International de la Nomenclature botanique soumises à la Section de Nomenclature du Huitième Congrès International de Botanique Paris, 1954. *Regnum Veg.* 4: 1-124. [387 proposals.]
- 1954.04. STAFLEU, F. A. Report [on] The Genève Conference on botanical nomenclature and Genera Plantarum organized by the Botanical Section of the International Union of Biological Sciences 25-30 January 1954. *Regnum Veg.* 5: 1-59.
- 1954.06. [STAFLEU, F. A.] Preliminary mail vote. *Taxon* 3: 157-162.
- 1954.09. [STAFLEU, F. A.] [Decisions taken at] VIIIth International Botanical Congress, Paris, 1954, Nomenclature Section. *Taxon* 3: 184-196.
- 1954.11. STAFLEU, F. A. Nomenclature at the Paris Congress. *Taxon* 3: 217-225.
- 1955.08. STAFLEU, F. A. Huitième Congrès International de Botanique, Section Nomenclature. *Taxon* 4: 121-177.
- 1956.07. STAFLEU, F. A. Nomenclatural conservation in the phanerogams. *Taxon* 5: 85-95. [Historical review about conserved generic names.]
- 1956.10? LANJOUW, J. ET AL. International Code of Botanical Nomenclature adopted by the Eighth International Botanical Congress, Paris, July 1954. *Regnum Veg.* 8: 1-338.
- 1957.04. SMITH, A. C. Fifty years of botanical nomenclature. *Brittonia* 9: 2-8. [History.]
- 1959.01. LANJOUW, J. (RAPP.). Synopsis of proposals concerning the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature submitted to the Ninth International Botanical Congress, Montreal—1959. *Regnum Veg.* 14: 1-84. [333 proposals.]
- 1960.12. LANJOUW, J. IXth International Botanical Congress, Nomenclature Section, report presented by the Bureau of Nomenclature. *Regnum Veg.* 20: 1-116. Reprinted from *Proc. IX Int. Bot. Congr. Montreal 1959* 3: 27-116.
- 1961.01. SMITH, A. C. The 1960 meeting of the Editorial Committee of the [Montreal] International Code of Botanical Nomenclature. *Taxon* 10: 8-13.
- 1961.12. LANJOUW, J. ET AL. (EDITORS). International Code of Botanical Nomenclature adopted by the Ninth International Botanical Congress, Montreal, August 1959. *Regnum Veg.* 23: 1-372.
- 1964.02. LANJOUW, J. & F. A. STAFLEU. Synopsis of proposals concerning the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature submitted to the Tenth International Botanical Congress Edinburgh—1964. *Regnum Veg.* 30: 1-68. [337 proposals.]
- 1964.04. HELLER, J. L. The early history of botanical nomenclature. *Huntia* 1: 33-70. [Linnaean period: credited Linnaeus for inventing trivial names [epithets] that led, after his death, to binomial nomenclature. Attributed invention to Linnaeus's struggle to reform book citation.]
- 1964.06. [STAFLEU, F. A. ?] Nomenclature proposals Xth Congress: preliminary vote. *Taxon* 13: 183-187.
- 1964.07. STAFLEU, F. A. (SECR. GEN. COMM.). Preliminary report on the stabilization of names of plants of economic importance. *Regnum Veg.* 36: 1-36.
- 1964.11. STAFLEU, F. A. Nomenclature at Edinburgh. *Taxon* 13: 273-282.
- 1965.05. VOSS, E. G. On citing the names of publishing authors. *Taxon* 14: 154-160. [In vs. ex.]
- 1966.11. STAFLEU, F. A. Tenth International Botanical Congress, Edinburgh, 1964: Nomenclature Section [proceedings.] *Regnum Veg.* 44: 1-75.
- 1966.12. LANJOUW, J. ET AL. (EDITORS). International Code of Botanical Nomenclature adopted by the Tenth International Botanical Congress Edinburgh, August 1964. *Regnum Veg.* 46: 1-402.
- 1967.11. DANDY, J. E. Index of generic names of vascular plants 1753-1774. *Regnum Veg.* 51: 1-130.
- 1968.06. McVAUGH, R., R. ROSS & F. A. STAFLEU. An annotated glossary of botanical nomenclature. *Regnum Veg.* 56: 1-31.
- 1969.02. STAFLEU, F. A. (RAPP. GÉN.) & E. G. VOSS (VICE-RAPP.). Synopsis of proposals on botanical nomenclature, Seattle 1969. *Regnum Veg.* 60: 1-124 (including appendices pp. 42-124). [284 proposals.]
- 1907.02. STAFLEU, F. A. Nomenclature at Seattle. *Taxon* 19: 36-42.
- 1970.02. MOORE, H. E., F. A. STAFLEU & E. G. VOSS. XI International Botanical Congress: final mail vote and Congress action on nomenclature proposals. *Taxon* 19: 43-51.
- 1972.02. STAFLEU, F. A. (RAPP. GÉN.) & E. G. VOSS (VICE-RAPP.). Report on botanical nomenclature, Seattle 1969. *Regnum Veg.* 81: 1-133.



- 1972.03. STAFLEU, F. A. (CHAIRMAN) & E. G. VOSS (SECR.). International Code of Botanical Nomenclature adopted by the Eleventh International Botanical Congress Seattle, August 1969. *Regnum Veg.* 82: 1-426.
- 1975.02. STAFLEU, F. A. (RAPP. GÉN.) & E. G. VOSS (VICE-RAPP.). Synopsis of proposals on botanical nomenclature, Leningrad, 1975, *Taxon* 24: 201-154. [152 proposals.]
- 1978.04? STAFLEU, F. A. (RAPP. GÉN.) & E. G. VOSS (VICE-RAPP.). International Code of Botanical Nomenclature adopted by the Twelfth International Botanical Congress, Leningrad, July 1975, *Regnum Veg.* 97: 1-457.
- 1979.12? VOSS, E. G. Section 1. Nomenclature. Pp. 129-186 in D. V. Lebedev et al. (editors), *Proceedings, XII International Botanical Congress, Leningrad, 3-10 July 1975*. Leningrad, Nauka.
- 1981.02. VOSS, E. G. (RAPP. GÉN.) & W. GREUTER (VICE-RAPP.). Synopsis of proposals on botanical nomenclature, Sydney, 1981. *Taxon* 30: 95-293. [210 proposals.]
- 1982.02. VOSS, E. G. Nomenclature at Sydney. *Taxon* 31: 151-153.
- 1982.06. GREUTER, W. (VICE-RAPP.) & E. G. VOSS (RAPP.-GÉN.). Report on botanical nomenclature—Sydney 1981. *Englera* 2: 1-124.
- 1983.10. VOSS, E. G. (RAPP. GÉN.) & W. GREUTER (VICE-RAPP.). International Code of Botanical Nomenclature adopted by the Thirteenth International Botanical Congress, Sydney, August 1981. *Regnum Veg.* 111: 1-472.
- 1987.02. GREUTER, W. (RAPP. GÉN.) & J. MCNEILL (VICE-RAPP.). Synopsis of proposals on botanical nomenclature, Berlin, 1987. *Taxon* 36: 174-281. [334 proposals.]
- 1987.12. MCNEILL, J. XIV International Botanical Congress: mail vote and final Congress action on nomenclatural proposals. *Taxon* 36: 858-868.
- 1988.07. GREUTER, W. ET AL. (EDITORS). International Code of Botanical Nomenclature adopted by the Fourteenth International Botanical Congress, Berlin, July-August 1987. *Regnum Veg.* 118: 1-328. [English only.]
- 1988.08. STAFLEU, F. A. The prehistory and history of IAPT. *Taxon* 37: 791-800.
- 1989.04. GREUTER, W., J. MCNEILL & D. NICOLSON. Report on botanical nomenclature—Berlin 1987. *Englera* 9: 1-228.





Nicolson, Dan H. 1991. "A History of Botanical Nomenclature." *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden* 78, 33–56. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2399589>.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/89022>

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.2307/2399589>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/35570>

**Holding Institution**

Missouri Botanical Garden, Peter H. Raven Library

**Sponsored by**

Missouri Botanical Garden

**Copyright & Reuse**

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

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>.