

Who will measure the advantage to American plant pathology could we have had a professional visit of inspection with obligation for counsel from Aderhold, when he was at the height of his understanding of German orchard pathology; or who will estimate the stimulus to our progress upon cereal rust studies could we have brought Ward to America for even a brief sojourn when he was probing deepest into their fundamentals, providing he came commissioned and committed not alone to see but to advise? Surely if exchange professorships are scientifically and economically justifiable in any field, they are in plant pathology.<sup>5</sup>

In closing, then, let me briefly summarize with particular reference to phytopathology. I must leave it for those whose chief interests lie in other fields to dissent if my conclusions are not generally applicable, as I myself believe they are.

The points I would make are:

1. An understanding of the complex interrelations of our subject with the various fields of science is becoming each year more difficult and more imperative.

2. Educational and investigational work,

<sup>5</sup> The American Phytopathological Society after discussion of these points adopted the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the American Phytopathological Society, appreciating the fact that plant diseases do not heed national limits or geographical boundaries and also the evident limitations imposed upon investigations when restricted by national bounds, respectfully recommend that administrators of research institutions, whether state or national, as well as individual investigators, recognize the importance of establishing closer international relations and take such steps as may be practicable from time to time to this end, including not only more frequent visits of American investigators to foreign countries for field observations as well as research, but also the securing, either by permanent or temporary engagement, of the best of foreign experts in plant pathology.

especially where supported by public funds, should be correlated as closely as practicable on the grounds of both economy and efficiency.

3. One step looking to this should be an attempt by both departmental heads and general administrators in our graduate schools to encourage and facilitate the migration of graduate students from school to school and to locate their field operations where most favorable to the progress of their work.

4. Another step in this same direction should be an attempt at better correlation in state experiment station and national agricultural department investigations, coupled with more freedom in change of location of investigators.

5. These principles apply still more broadly to foreign relations, both as to graduate students and as to mature investigators. We need not only to make it easier for our graduate students to go abroad and to encourage our mature investigators to continue to do this with increasing frequency, but especially do we need so to arrange as to secure the official visits of foreign experts, both for advice on particular problems and to secure their intelligent general cooperation in working out our American problems.

L. R. JONES

DEPARTMENT OF PLANT PATHOLOGY,  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

---

*REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE*

(1)<sup>1</sup> During its 1913 (Monaco) session, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature has held ten executive meetings.

(2) The following nine active commissioners were present: Messrs. Allen, Blanchard, Dautzenberg, Hartert, Hoyle, Jentink, Monticelli, Stejnegger.

<sup>1</sup> For convenience of reference, the paragraphs or subjects of this report are given serial numbers in parentheses, thus: (1).

ger and Stiles. In addition, Messrs. K. Jordan and the Honorable Walter Rothschild, at the invitation of the commission, attended the meetings in an advisory capacity.

(3) The following active and advisory commissioners were not in attendance: Messrs. Apstein, Dollo, Jordan (D. S.), Ludwig and Mitchell.

(4) *Death*.—It is with profound regret that the commission reports the death of one of its members, Professor Dr. F. C. von Maehrenthal, who died in 1910, very shortly after the Gratz meeting. Putting entirely aside our feeling of personal loss as insignificant in comparison with the loss that Commissioner von Maehrenthal's death means to the international zoological profession, the commission feels that it is only just to pause a moment to recall to the members of this congress the modest character of this man who gave nearly his entire professional career to aiding his colleagues in their more tedious labors and than whom it would be difficult to find, in the entire history of zoology, any man with a keener insight into the intricacies and complications of zoological nomenclature with the possible exception of Linnæus and Strickland.

(5) *Resignations*.—During the interim since the 1910 session, the commission has received the following resignations, which are herewith reported to the congress with the recommendation that they be accepted:

Dr. G. A. Boulenger (London), who declined to serve.

Dr. Louis Dollo (Brussels), who begged to be excused from service, on the ground of poor health.

The resignation of Professor Hubert Ludwig (Bonn) has been received, but as his term of office expires with the present congress no formal action is necessary.

(6) *Advisory or Temporary Commissioners*.—Through the death of Dr. von Maehrenthal and the resignations of Drs. Boulenger, Dollo and Ludwig, the commission became reduced from 15 to 11 members. As it seemed very advisable not to permit the organization to decrease in size, and as there was no method of procedure prescribed whereby vacancies were to be filled in the interim between congresses, the commission, acting in the interest of the subject, invited certain gentlemen to fill the vacancies until these could be filled by the present congress. The gentlemen in question are as follows:

Dr. P. Chalmers Mitchell, secretary of the Zoological Society of London, was invited to serve in place of Dr. Boulenger.

Professor Kraepelin, of Hamburg, was invited to serve in place of Dr. von Maehrenthal; Dr. Kraepelin served but a short time, and Professor Apstein, of Berlin, was invited to fill the vacancy.

(7) Upon reaching Monaco, the commission invited Dr. K. Jordan, secretary of the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature, and the Honorable Walter Rothschild to sit with the commission in an advisory capacity and this has been done.

(8) Since not a single majority vote has been determined by the gentlemen in question, and therefore their temporary membership on the commission has in reality been equivalent to their serving simply in an advisory capacity, the legality of the action taken can not be questioned on the ground that these gentlemen were not formally elected by the congress. At the same time, as a matter of formality, the commission at present asks that its action in respect to the vacancies be confirmed by the congress by the adoption of the following resolution:

(9) *Resolved*, That the informal action taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to filling vacancies be approved and ratified by this ninth congress and be made formal.

(10) In order to provide for similar contingencies in the future, the Commission recommends to the congress the adoption of the following resolution:

(11) *Resolved*, That in case of vacancies in the Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by death or resignation during the interim between congresses, said commission is empowered to fill said vacancies temporarily, with the understanding that the appointees shall hold office until the vacancies in question are filled by the next succeeding congress.

(12) *Expiration of Term of Service*.—The term of service expires at the close of this (1913, Monaco) congress for the following five members of the class of 1913:

J. A. Allen, of New York; Ph. Dautzenberg, of Paris; Hubert Ludwig, of Bonn; F. C. von Maehrenthal, deceased, of Berlin, succeeded temporarily by K. Apstein, of Berlin; W. E. Hoyle, of Cardiff.

(13) *Nominations*.—In accordance with custom obtaining since the Cambridge (1898) congress, the commission, after careful consideration as to details of the work, of countries, languages, specialties, etc., herewith has the honor to submit nominations to fill the seven vacancies that will

exist upon adjournment of the present congress. These nominations are:

Class of 1919: Professor C. Apstein, of Berlin, Germany (Professor von Maehrenthal's successor in the office of *Das Tierreich*), *vice* Professor Louis Dollo, of Brussels, resigned.

Professor Roule, of the Paris Museum, *vice* G. A. Boulenger, resigned.

Class of 1922: Dr. J. A. Allen, of the American Museum of Natural History, New York, *vice* J. A. Allen, term expired.

Ph. Dautzenberg, of Paris, *vice*, Ph. Dautzenberg, term expired.

Professor H. J. Kolbe, of the Berlin Museum, *vice* Professor Hubert Ludwig, of Bonn, term expired.

Dr. Wm. Evans Hoyle, director of the National Museum of Wales, at Cardiff, *vice* W. E. Hoyle, term expired.

Dr. Karl Jordan, secretary of the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature, *vice* F. C. von Maehrenthal deceased and term expired.

(14) *Proposition to enlarge the Commission.*—This commission originally consisted of five members, elected at the Leyden congress in 1895. Upon recommendation of the original commission, the Cambridge (1898) congress increased the number of commissioners to fifteen. The present commission is of the opinion that it is now in the interest of the subject to increase the membership from fifteen to eighteen with the understanding that the three new commissioners shall be so arranged that one joins the class of 1916, one that of 1919 and one that of 1922. The commission is led to this recommendation by several reasons, notably by the three following: (1) there exists at present an excellent opportunity to cooperate in work on the nomenclature of entomology and the situation is such that the commission desires the services of two additional entomologists in this connection; (2) the work of the commission has increased to such an extent that it seems in the interest of the subject to have three more men available for service; (3) the commission feels that it is desirable to return to its former policy of having a paleontologist among its members and in view of the present amount of work before us this will be difficult unless authority is given for the appointment of the additional men requested. If the congress authorizes the three additional men, the commission is prepared to make the nominations required, as follows:

Class of 1916: Dr. Henry Skinner, of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia.

Class of 1919: Dr. Geza Horváth, of Budapest.

Class of 1922: Dr. F. A. Bather, assistant keeper of geology, British Museum of Natural History, London.

(15) *Offers of Cooperation.*—It is a pleasure to report that two nomenclatorial committees have, since the last congress, made overtures to the commission to cooperate in work.

One offer of cooperation has come from the Committee on Nomenclature of the American Paleontological Society and consisting of Wm. H. Dall, F. H. Knowlton and S. W. Williston (secretary).

Another offer of cooperation has come from the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature.

(16) In this connection it may be stated that a working arrangement has been made between the secretary of the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature and the Secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in accordance with which all questions on entomological nomenclature will be referred to the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature for study as to premises and for report before any opinion on them is issued by the International Commission, and attention is invited to the fact that the secretary of the Committee on Entomological Nomenclature has been nominated for membership in the International Commission. Whether the time will ever come that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature will consist chiefly or exclusively of the secretaries of various international committees representing special groups remains to be seen.

(17) *By-laws.*—The commission has made no amendment to its by-laws since 1910, but attention may be invited to the fact that the president is the presiding officer and that the secretary is the administrative officer. If, therefore, any person desires to submit propositions to the entire commission, time will be saved if they are sent directly to the secretary, whose permanent address is: Hygienic Laboratory, U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.

(18) In order to avoid misunderstanding in the future, attention may be invited to the fact that the commission does not feel called upon to consider any communication addressed to it only through the medium of journals or the proceedings of learned societies. To insure consideration of communications the latter may best be sent direct

to the secretary and if their receipt is not acknowledged within a reasonable time the conclusion may safely be drawn that they were never received.

(19) *Official List of most Frequently Used Zoological Names.*—The Gratz congress adopted a recommendation by the commission to the effect that an attempt be made to establish, on basis of the International Rules of Nomenclature, an "Official List of most Frequently Used Zoological Names." In accordance with this vote, the secretary invited a number of workers to form themselves into special committees and to cooperate in the undertaking, and he submitted to several of these committees lists of names for study.

(20) The vigorous protests received from various sources were not foreseen. Some zoologists protested against the proposed list on the ground that this was the beginning of a list of "Nomina conservanda" to which they would not submit; others demanded that the secretary agree that the list be made without reference to the law of priority; some practically challenged the right of the commission to undertake the work; others flatly refused to cooperate; some agreed to cooperate and did so; others promised aid that has thus far not been forthcoming.

(21) In view of the great dissatisfaction with the proposed list, the secretary finally decided that the wisest plan would be to submit to the commission only a comparatively small number of names as a sample of what was proposed and to postpone further action on the matter until the commission might discuss the situation and lay its views before the congress for further consideration.

(22) The commission submits herewith a sample of what it had in mind in suggesting the official list. This consists of an *accepted* list of 40 generic names which appear from our present knowledge to be valid under the code and a *rejected* list of names which appear to be unavailable under the code.

(23) The commission recommends that this be taken as a beginning and that names be very gradually and carefully selected to be added to the list. It will, however, be impossible to build out this nomenclator unless cooperation is had from systematists in the different groups. With proper cooperation, however, the commission is persuaded that 100 to 500 accepted names and as many or more rejected names might be added to the list every three years and that in this way not only would we obtain a list of established names for

the genera most frequently referred to but that many useless names could be definitely eliminated from literature. The commission does not desire, however, to continue this very time-consuming labor unless there is a very distinct desire on the part of zoologists to have the work done and a willingness to cooperate in the undertaking.

(24) The names suggested as samples for adoption are distributed as follows: Trematoda, 11; Cestoda, 5; Nematoda, 7; Gordiacea, 2; Acanthocephala, 1; Arachnoidea, 8; Diptera, 6. Practically all of these come into consideration not only in zoological, but also in medical and veterinary literature.

(25) Public notice has been given that these names would be called up for vote at this (1913) meeting of the commission and ample opportunity has been afforded for the presentation of objections. No objection to any name in the list as now submitted has been presented to the commission.

(26) In addition to the list of 40 names submitted for action at the present meeting, the commission submits a list of 169 generic names of birds, with their authorities, references, genotypes and method of type fixation, based on the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature and unanimously agreed upon by a special committee of professional ornithologists, upon which the following gentlemen served: J. A. Allen (New York), E. Hartert (Tring), C. E. Hellmayr (Munich), H. C. Oberholser (Washington), C. W. Richmond, secretary (Washington), R. Ridgway (Washington), L. Stejneger (Washington) and W. Stone (Philadelphia).

(27) It is the intention of the commission to send this list of names to press in the very near future and to give ample opportunity to the zoological profession to offer objection to any of the names in question. Shortly after January 1, 1914, the commission contemplates announcing the fact whether or not objection has been raised and will issue an opinion regarding the adoption of the list. This opinion would then be laid before the Tenth International Congress for confirmation.

(28) A third list, consisting of 430 names "*to be rejected*," is submitted by the commission. These names also have been made public with invitation to zoologists to present arguments showing why any of said names should not be rejected. This list is to be interpreted simply as follows: Word has reached the commission in one form or another that these names are absolute homonyms and therefore (Art. 34) unavailable; under these

circumstances the commission will consider the names in question as stillborn unless evidence is presented that the premises now before the commission are erroneous; further, the commission suggests to authors that they cooperate in the work by either correcting the premises before the commission or by discontinuing to use the names. The "*To be rejected*" list consists thus far of 430 generic names, distributed as follows: Trematoda, 22; Nematoda, 40; Gordiacea, 1; Acanthocephala, 2; Diptera, 92; Mammalia, 273.

(29) Many other names, supposedly valid or supposedly unavailable, are still under consideration either by the commission or by the several special subcommittees, but no further work in this line is contemplated unless the present congress distinctly expresses its desire to have the labor continued.

(30) In the opinion of the commission, work of this nature is distinctly constructive and promises the ultimate possibility of an international and authoritative list of the names that should be applied to the most commonly cited 5,000 to 10,000 zoological genera.

[Here follow the lists of names. These will appear in the Proceedings of the Congress.]

(46) *Presumable Permanency of the Official List*.—That the question as to the presumable permanency of the Official List based upon the law of priority may arise in the minds of many zoologists is to be taken as self-understood. This question may be answered as follows:

(47) Changes in names dependent upon changes in conceptions of classification can not be foreseen from one generation to the next and any plan for nomenclature that ignores this point makes promises that can not count upon being fulfilled. The following statistics, however, worked out by Lester F. Ward (1895) give an indication of the changes that may reasonably be expected to occur upon nomenclatorial grounds:

(48) By taking the first 50 genera given in the American Ornithologists' Union Check-List, it is found that in only five cases did the generic name remain unchanged from 1859 to 1886. Thus prior to the establishment of the names on basis of the law of priority, 45 of the 50 names (or 90 per cent.) changed from 1859 to 1886. From 1886 (when the names were established on basis of the law of priority) to 1895, not one of the 50 names was changed. The complete list embraced 322 genera and about 1,000 species and subspecies. In the ten years following the publication of the list (based upon priority), it was found necessary to

change, by action of the law of priority, the names of 3 genera, 1 subgenus, 3 species and 1 subspecies.

(49) The commission invites the serious attention of the congress to these very remarkable results obtained by the code of the American Ornithologists' Union. If our international code is properly safeguarded against changes taken hastily and without due deliberation as to the many complications involved, it may reasonably be expected that our International Official List will undergo very few changes, upon nomenclatorial grounds, but this commission can not possibly foresee what changes must be adopted during the next 10 to 100 years because of unforeseen changes in conceptions of classification.

(50) The commission has the honor to request definite instructions from the congress as to whether or not it is the desire to have this list continued.

(51) *Code of Ethics*.—The commission permits itself to invite attention to the fact that there exists in the zoological profession no recognized and generally adopted code of ethics that is comparable to the code of ethics existing in the medical profession of certain countries. Without presuming to be the arbiter of points of general ethics, the commission is persuaded that there is one phase of this subject upon which it is competent to speak and in reference to this point it suggests to the congress the adoption of the following resolution:

(52) WHEREAS, Experience has shown that authors, not infrequently, inadvertently publish, as new designations of genera or species names that are preoccupied, *and*

WHEREAS, Experience has also shown that some other authors discovering the homonymy have published new names for the later homonyms in question, *be it therefore*

*Resolved*, That when it is noticed by any zoologist that the generic or the specific name published by any living author as new is in reality a homonym and therefore unavailable under Articles 34 and 36 of the Rules on Nomenclature, the proper action, from a standpoint of professional etiquette is for said person to notify said author of the facts of the case and to give said author ample opportunity to propose a substitute name.

(53) *Date of Author's Reprints or Separata*.—Among the cases recently submitted to the commission for opinion is one that involves a somewhat unusual point in respect to reprints. Under the present rules there is no article which permits the commission to rule that all separata are

of the same date as, or of a later date than, the original publication, although such a proposal has now been submitted as an amendment to the rules and will be considered in time for the Tenth Congress. In the meantime, the commission has instructed the secretary to report the following resolutions to the congress:

(54) *Resolved*, That the commission, under unanimous suspension of the by-laws if need be, recommends to the congress the adoption of the following resolution, namely:

(55) WHEREAS the widespread custom of issuing reprints in advance of the appearance of the original publication gives rise to much unnecessary confusion in nomenclature, be it

(56) *Resolved*, That the Ninth International Zoological Congress expresses its disapproval of this custom and appeals to editors to discontinue it, and further, be it

(57) *Resolved*, That editors be requested to give on each edition of all publications the exact date (year, month, day) of issue of said edition.

(58) *Opinions*.—At the Boston (1907) congress the commission reported upon opinions 1 to 5 inclusive; at the Gratz (1910) congress it reported upon opinions 6 to 28 inclusive; at the present congress, it herewith reports the summaries of opinions 29 to 56 inclusive. The full opinions have been published by the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., as Publications Nos. 1938, 1989, 2013, 2060; No. 2169, containing opinions 52 to 56 inclusive, is now in proof and will soon be issued. Attention is invited to a correction of opinion 31 published on page 89, Publication No. 2060.

The commission regrets to hear that some zoologists claim to have been unable to find copies of these opinions and desires to state that they are sent to 1,100 libraries, to the members of the International Congress and to a limited number of specialists. Only the summaries are issued in the proceedings of the congress. If any member of the congress fails to receive the full opinions, he is invited to notify the secretary of the commission.

At its present session the commission has taken a preliminary or a final vote upon several additional opinions and it now has under consideration about 15 other cases that have been submitted to it for study.

[Here follow the summaries of opinions 29–56.]

(59) The opinions have now been a policy for six years. They have been received by various zoologists in different ways. Some of our colleagues in the profession are urging us to continue

this policy, on the ground that it is the logical method of settling difficult questions. Others are opposed to the policy and one man has even practically challenged our right to issue the series.

(60) This commission is well aware of the fact that in issuing 56 opinions we have not been able to decide on both sides of every question and thus to please every person.

(61) It may not be out of place to remark that these opinions have recently probably been the greatest factor in pressing to the fore the law of priority and in producing discontent. Formerly, so long as two authors could not agree upon a given point of nomenclature, each followed his own interpretation. If one of these authors now submits the case to the commission, an opinion is rendered which, of course, has not the force of law, but which nevertheless is a strong moral support to one side of the controversy in question. Experience has, however, shown that instances are not lacking when the commission by giving its opinion has drawn upon itself the fire which in earlier days would have been directed to the individual worker in whose favor the opinion happens to be given. And it has come about that the commission has not been permitted to remain ignorant of the fact that it has perhaps made fewer friends than enemies in its endeavor to conform to the wishes of our colleagues to settle cases for them.

(62) The commission does not consider that in rendering these opinions it is placing itself under any obligations whatever to zoologists for the privilege of doing so much work for other people, and is perfectly willing to discontinue the series. In continuing to give opinions, however, the commission can not be expected to depart from the code and to make exceptions in order to please individual workers. If the congress is not satisfied with the results, it will be an easy matter for the congress to say so.

(63) The commission as at present constituted feels it proper, however, to remind zoologists that in the performance of our duties we are not supposed to take into consideration any personal preferences or any local, factional or personal quarrels—such as have actually been presented to us as if they were valid nomenclatorial argument.

(64) *Increasing Interest in Nomenclature*.—Probably at no time in the history of zoology has there been a more widespread interest in the subject of nomenclature than exists at present. This interest is probably due to several factors, one of which is the increased sense of necessity or at least desirability for international uniformity in use of

technical names. As authors increase in number and attempt to monograph various groups the lack of uniformity in the use of names is brought home to them, and no matter what policy they may try to follow they usually find it necessary to change some of the names more or less current in their group. Under existing rules and under all standard codes since 1845, and in spirit at least since the Linnean Code of 1751, the law of priority has in general been taken as fundamental criterion in deciding certain classes of the changes, and in fact so many points have been made upon basis of this law that it has aroused opposition from certain quarters.

(65) In this connection it is interesting to note that if an author changes from *Amœba* to *Ameba*, or from *Amœba vulgaris* to *A. princeps*, or if he makes a change of name and gives as his reason the fact that the rejected name does not please him, or even if he divides an old collective genus into 40 or 50 new genera, introducing 39 or 49 new names and retains the old collective generic name for the indefinite residuum, his action is not very likely to produce any particular indignation, but if any author consistently applies the law of priority, thus attempting to settle all cases objectively he becomes what one author is pleased to call a "fanatic priority ruler."

(66) As authors are increasing in number and as publications become so numerous, both the application of the law of priority and the protests against the law increase.

(67) The commission is distinctly gratified if its efforts have contributed in even a small degree to the present increased interest in the subject. It may, however, be permitted to invite attention to three phases of the present status of the subject which are somewhat disquieting.

(68) 1. *Intemperate Language*.—Whether or not it be an actual fact, appearances to that effect exist that if one author changes or corrects the names used by another writer, the latter seems inclined to take the change as a personal offense. The explanation of this fact (or appearance, as the case may be) is not entirely clear. If one person corrects the grammar of another, this action seems to be interpreted as a criticism upon the good breeding or education of the latter person. Nomenclature has been called "the grammar of science," and possibly there is some inborn feeling that changes in nomenclature involve a reflection upon one's education, culture and breeding. Too frequently there follows a discussion in which one or the other author so far departs from the

paths of diplomatic discussion, that he seems to give more or less foundation to the view that there is something in his culture subject to criticism. It is with distinct regret that the commission notices the tendency to sarcasm and intemperate language so noticeable in discussions which should be not only of the most friendly nature, especially since a thorough mutual understanding is so valuable to an agreement, but which are complicated and rendered more difficult of results by every little departure from those methods adopted by professional gentlemen.

(69) In the opinion of the commission the tendency to enter into public polemics over matters which educated and refined professional gentlemen might so easily settle in friendly and diplomatic correspondence is distinctly unfavorable to a settlement of the nomenclatorial cases for which a solution is sought. It may be assumed that the vast majority of zoologists agree with the commission in desiring results rather than polemics, and the commission ventures to suggest that results may be obtained more easily by the utmost consideration for the usual rules of courtesy when discussing the views of others.

(70) 2. *Education in Nomenclature*.—It may safely be asserted that comparatively few zoologists upon beginning their independent professional career have even a general idea of the subject of nomenclature, for the reason that zoological grammar (namely, zoological nomenclature) is not usually taught in courses leading to the bachelor's, the master's or the doctor's degree. Without wishing to emphasize the point unduly, the commission ventures to suggest that it would be in the interest of harmony if at least the elementary rudiments of the subject were taught more generally to students preparing themselves for a career as professional zoologists.

(71) 3. *The Immensity of the Task before Us*.—Despite the quite generally increased interest shown in the subject of nomenclature, there are some grounds for disquiet in the fact that relatively so few workers seem to grasp the immensity of the task involved in introducing harmony of system among so many different groups and in bringing about satisfactory conditions among so many hundreds of thousands of technical names scattered over so many different publications written or edited in so many instances by workers who, despite their erudition in respect to their subject, were so to speak not exactly grammatical—or at least rhetorical—when it came to their technical names.

(72) That present conditions are to be settled in a day or in a few years is not to be expected. The transitional period between the lack of uniformity in the past and the hoped-for uniformity of the future will last at least one entire generation, and to our generation falls the pleasure or the misfortune (according to one's point of view) of undertaking the extensive and distinctly altruistic duty of saving future generations of scientific workers from the dangerous inheritance of chaotic nomenclature that threatens them.

(73) Stability in *all* zoological names during our generation is not in the dreams of the members of this commission, which at your request undertook eighteen years ago a most trying, most thankless and very extensive task, for which the only reward in its successful accomplishment exists in the thought that our work is a sacrifice.

(74) That many of our colleagues should differ with us in point of view does not disquiet us, but it is a matter of some misgiving to us that some of our colleagues are (or at least *seemingly* are) of the opinion that the difficulties at hand are to be settled so easily and in a few years.

(75) The transitional period will be mentioned again in connection with the reference to the law of priority.

(76) Whatever the outcome of the present situation, the commission desires to express its gratification of the fact that, judged from the various postal card votes that have recently been taken, many persons to-day are hearing of the rules of nomenclature who probably rarely if ever heard of them before and many others are taking an active interest who formerly ignored the subject. At the same time the feeling that has been exhibited in some instances leads the commission to the view that the present occasion is one that calls for cool and calm deliberation rather than for attempts to obtain majorities in postal card votes, for surely the quiet deliberations of a few representatives selected because of their long experience in the intricacies of a very intricate subject are more likely to reduce confusion than is the conclusion of a large number of persons, voting upon a subject perhaps by mail and assuredly with less careful deliberation.

(77) This latter point was clearly recognized in the Cambridge (England) meeting when the commission was not, because of a lack of unanimity in its report, even accorded a place on the program to present the rules, and again in the Berlin congress when the commission was urged to keep the subject of nomenclature out of the general meet-

ings by reporting only upon propositions agreed upon by unanimous vote in commission.

(78) *The Relations of the Commission to the Congress.*—Certain letters and certain published criticisms seem to indicate more or less clearly that there is considerable misunderstanding in regard to the relationship of the commission to the congress. In the hope of clearing up certain points and thus in the hope of a better understanding, the commission ventures to give a brief statement bearing on this subject.

(79) In 1889 and 1892, at the Paris and the Moscow congresses, a code of zoological nomenclature was discussed and adopted.

(80) In 1895, at the Leiden congress, a desire was expressed by one of the German delegates to have all codes submitted to a comparative study and to have the results presented to the next congress. As a result, a commission of five members was appointed to carry out this task. This commission worked for three years and was prepared to present its report to the Cambridge congress of 1898, but because of the fact that this report was not unanimous on all points, the commission was refused a place on the program for the presentation of its conclusions as to the rules. The commission was, however, increased to 15 members in the hope of reaching more satisfactory results in its vote, and upon motion the general session voted that all propositions that were to be reported upon at any given congress were to be in the hands of the commission at least one year prior to the meeting of the congress.

(81) After another period of three years' work, during which the enlarged commission had to re-study the entire report of the original commission, the former met at Berlin in 1901. Before its report was completed conferences were held with quite a number of the more prominent members of the congress. During these conferences the commission was given very distinctly to understand that the congress would not receive any report unless it was unanimous. As one prominent German member of the congress stated *in effect*: "It is the duty of the commission to become unanimous in its vote; give us a definite set of rules, good, bad or indifferent, but be unanimous in your report, and after you give us the rules, see that they are carried out." The words of this prominent German savant were a fair reflection of the feeling we found at the Berlin meeting, so far as the secretary of the commission could discover.

(82) Unfortunately the Commission could not



agree upon all points, and after many conferences, it finally suggested to the congress the proposition that those portions of the rules upon which the commission was unanimous should be accepted, and that all other portions be referred back to the commission. This motion, suggested in the general session, prevailed.

(83) After its experience at Cambridge and Berlin the commission was indeed not inclined again to repeat its action of preparing for the congress (as it did at Cambridge) any proposition unless all of its members present at the congress were unanimously agreed upon it. In order to make this point certain the commission adopted at the Berne congress the principle of reporting recommendations in regard to changes in the rules, only when the vote upon them was unanimously in the affirmative. Since the Berne congress this plan has, in the interest of conservatism, been strictly adhered to. From the Berlin congress in 1901 until the present congress, no section on nomenclature has been provided by the program committee and the commission has endeavored to meet this situation by holding an open meeting of the commission which all persons interested in nomenclature were invited to attend.

(84) The history of the commission has clearly demonstrated that the congress has thus far desired not to have its general meetings turned into open discussions on questions of nomenclature, but rather to have nomenclatorial discussions confined to sections and commissions and nomenclatorial questions decided in committee.

(85) If at present there is a change of desire on the part of the congress and if the congress wishes these very technical and complex matters discussed in the general sessions, the commission would rejoice at the more general interest in nomenclature as evidenced by such a desire, but at the same time it is constrained to state that nomenclature is a subject that requires quiet deliberation rather than formal debate, and, further, that to throw open the general meetings of this congress as a forum for this exceedingly dry and complicated subject will be not only to jeopardize the success of future congresses, but, since this plan is not in accord with the plan under which many zoologists elected to follow the international rules, a grave question arises as to following such a policy.

(86) *Amendments to the "Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique."*—There have been fifteen series of amendments submitted to the commission which has been in session since Friday,

March 22, studying the various suggestions, giving hearings, etc. For instance, a special hearing was given both to Professor Brauer and to Dr. Poche for presentation of any arguments or points of view they might desire to submit in connection with the proposed amendments in which they were especially interested.

(87) A somewhat embarrassing situation presented itself because of the unusually early date of the congress, but a valid parliamentary method was suggested under which it became possible to consider all of the propositions submitted.

(88) Departing from the usual custom, the secretary had published in the *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, November 26, 1912, and March 11, 1913, all propositions that had reached him and in addition several propositions that were known to him by fact of their publication.

(89) Under the by-laws adopted by the commission, and published for general information in the last report, the commission proceeds as follows: Under Art. IV., Section 1(a) the commission reports to the congress "Recommendations involving any alteration of the 'Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique,' but no such recommendation is to be reported unless it has first received a majority (8) vote of the commission and the unanimous vote of all commissioners present at the meeting."

(90) In accordance with this by-law, the commission herewith reports upon the following amendments with the recommendations that they be inserted in their proper place in the Règles.

(91) (a) Suggested amendment No. 9, submitted by the First International Entomological Congress, has been modified slightly by the commission, and is reported in the following form as a *Recommendation*: "It is recommended that in published descriptions of new species or new subspecies, only one specimen be designated and labeled as *type*, the other specimens examined by the author at the same time being *paratypes*."

(92) (b) Suggested amendment No. 13, submitted by J. A. Allen and T. D. A. Cockerell.—After considerable discussion, the commission voted that the first portion of the proposed amendment (concerning *Gavia*, *Fregata* and *Piccooides*) and the first portion of the second paragraph (concerning *Plautus*) are already covered by the Règles as interpreted by opinion 46.

(93) The idea also obtains for at least a portion of suggested amendment No. 1, that the points in question are provided for in the code, and a formal opinion to this effect is now contemplated.

(94) *The Law of Priority*.—The law of priority has been affirmed by a number of zoological codes, and has been formally affirmed twice (1892 and 1901) by the International Congress of Zoology. The original code of 1889 and 1892 permitted certain exceptions to this law. Contrary to the very earnest appeals of the president and the secretary of the commission, the section on nomenclature in the Berlin congress adopted the view that these exceptions should be eliminated and in said section the view obtained that the law of priority should be rigidly enforced *without any exceptions of any kind in any group*. When the matter came to argument in the commission, the president and the secretary after a long discussion and with many misgivings, finally, for the sake of harmony accepted the will of the majority, but this was not until after they had received positive assurance from prominent members of the congress that the commission would be supported in its attempt to carry out the amended law, for which, in the minds of the president and the secretary, the zoological profession was not then prepared. Clearly foreseeing at that date the tremendous dissatisfaction that the amended law would cause, in a profession not all of whose members are accustomed to dealing with a large number of names, the president and the secretary of this commission immediately, in part even before adjournment of the Berlin congress in 1901, made preparations to meet the discontent which to their minds was inevitable as a result of the action taken at the Berlin congress. This discontent has now culminated in the presentation to the commission of several propositions which have for their purpose the authorization of exceptions to the law of priority. From the fact that the several propositions submitted to the commission before this congress convened, and no less than four substitute propositions submitted formally or suggested informally during the present work, are very different in character, the commission is persuaded that the adherents of the policy of making exceptions to the law are far from being in accord as to the method that should be adopted. From the fact that memorials, protests, resolutions, letters, etc., both for and against the plan of exceptions have reached the commission evidence is clear that the conclusions of the International Congress of Zoology held in Berlin, Germany, are still subject to a considerable difference of opinion. The commission does not see its way clear to accept the postal card votes that have been taken as representing a sound basis upon which its decision must

be made, but incidentally it may be mentioned as a matter of more or less general interest that more persons have protested to the commission against changing the rules by admitting exceptions than have asked that exceptions be made. The interpretation the commission places upon the two votes is that there is a tremendously increased interest on both sides of the subject and that there are many zoologists who feel the same inconveniences that the commission has felt ever since its organization and the same inconveniences that all zoologists have felt who have tried to consistently apply the law.

(95) Admitting without any reservation the point that the commission itself feels very keenly the inconveniences of the law, even claiming in fact that the original commission of 1895 was in favor of certain exceptions as evidenced by its report, the present personnel of the commission, whatever may be its views as to the wisdom of the action taken in Berlin, stands in overwhelming majority against admitting to the code any provision looking to exceptions to this long-established rule.

(96) The administrative office of the Deutsche Zoologische Gesellschaft, through a statement published (*Zool. Anz.*, March 11, 1913) as official by its secretary gives its view to the effect that decision on this matter should be reached during the present congress and that this decision can not be postponed for three years; furthermore, a number of members of the congress have expressed the view to the effect that this subject must now be settled definitely, finally and once for all, so that they may proceed in their work undisturbed by vacillations in the rules.

(97) So far as the question concerns the commission, the matter may be viewed as settled; and if this matter, at least in its present form, come before any future congress it will be because of the changes in the commission's personnel that occur by death, resignation and expiration of terms of service, or because it is forced upon the commission by circumstances.

(98) In this report it has been unreservedly stated that the law of priority is a harsh law and produces inconveniences. It has also been stated that the president and the secretary of the commission, when defeated in the Berlin congress in attempt to make this law somewhat milder, immediately laid plans with a view of possibly meeting the situation in some other way. The general plan discussed by them after their defeat in Berlin in 1901 has been constantly held in reserve to be

presented when the proper time should come. It is this plan, in slightly modified form, that the commission presents to the congress as basis for an attempt to relieve zoologists, more especially teachers, of at least some of the inconveniences of which complaint is made. That this plan does not go far enough to suit some members of this congress is so self-evident that it need not even be admitted. It is, however, the unanimous opinion of the commission as assembled in Monaco, that this is the most feasible method in view by which this work may be inaugurated. Prior to giving the plan in detail, it may be stated that the secretary of the commission has asked a number of zoologists to give a rough estimate as to the number of names for which exceptions were desired and also the number of names in the working vocabulary of the average zoologist other than systematists. The estimates in reply to the first question varied exceedingly, one man placing it as low as 20, others as high as 600; the estimate in reply to the latter question, as to vocabulary, usually varied from 300 to 600, although one man placed it at 1,000. This highest estimate, namely, 1,000 names, is taken as present numerical basis in the suggestion here made, namely, the adoption of the following resolution:

(99) *WHEREAS*, It is claimed that during the transitional period in nomenclature when the names are being reduced to a consistent, uniform and objective basis, hardships result to many zoologists, especially to teachers, because of the changes involved, therefore, be it

(100) *Resolved*, That the Ninth International Zoological Congress establish an "International Committee on Transitional Names," as follows:

1. No person is eligible to serve at the same time as a member of the International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature and on this new committee.

2. Said committee is to be composed of 15 zoologists who shall have power to organize in such manner as they may deem wise.

3. Said committee is empowered to select 1,000 (and no more) zoological names, in such manner and with such aid from other zoologists as the committee may desire, and is instructed definitely to define the meaning of the names selected.

4. Said list of 1,000 names is to be known as the "Transitional List" and it shall be considered proper during the transitional stage of nomenclature of any given group, for any author to use any of said names, even though they be not in accord with the law of priority.

5. All authors making use of the Transitional List are urgently requested to designate the name by a dagger (†) or by such other sign as the committee may select, in order to signify that they are using the names in the sense of the list.

6. As soon as both the International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature and the International Committee on Transitional List vote independently by a two thirds majority that the time has come in the nomenclature of any group to drop any given name or names from the Transitional List, joint report to this effect is to be made to the International Congress and the name or names in question are then to be removed from the Transitional List.

(101) *Resolved*, That this action is not to be interpreted as in any way restricting the application of the law of priority or of any other provision in the rules of nomenclature.

(102) Incidentally it may be stated that the commission has for some time had under informal discussion the advisability of a resolution by the congress placing in the hands of the commission the plenary power of suppressing entirely, in some way, certain names which it is claimed are at present applied in an erroneous sense and which when transferred to the correct genus or species under the law of priority are calculated to produce unusual confusion. As yet the views of the commission are not formulated in a sufficiently safeguarded manner to make it advisable to report definitely on the subject at the present congress. [See below, Supplementary Report.]

(103) Although the resolution as reported places in the hands of the proposed Committee on Transitional List unrestricted power as to the selection of the names, this point does not raise any misgivings in the mind of the commission. Furthermore, the resolution gives to the committee in question unrestricted privilege of inviting cooperation and it safeguards the list by requiring a two thirds majority in order to eliminate names from the list.

(104) In reference to the personnel of the new committee, the commission presents the following resolution:

(105) *Resolved*, That, for purposes of organizing, the initial members of the Committee on Transitional List shall be: Professor Brauer (secretary of the Deutsche Zoologische Gesellschaft), Dr. Mortensen (of Copenhagen) and Dr. Williston (of the University of Chicago); and

(106) *Resolved*, That these men be authorized

and instructed to complete the personnel of the committee.

(107) *A New Edition of the Code*.—The commission recommends to the congress the insertion into the proceedings of the present congress a copy of the revised code of rules, and that the summaries of opinions be printed in the appendix.

(108) Signed in name of commission.

C. W. STILES,  
Secretary

#### (109) SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

[(110) After the foregoing report was prepared, an additional proposition was submitted to the commission that had been adopted by the Section on Nomenclature. This proposition, however, after presentation of the foregoing and this supplemental report, the section voted to reconsider and upon such reconsideration the section approved in its place the resolutions presented in this supplemental report.—C. W. S.]

[(111) In presenting this supplemental report, the secretary made a verbal statement to the effect that these resolutions were not completed until after the foregoing report had been adopted by the commission, hence they could not be included in the regular report. They were in fact not completed until the morning of the last day of the congress. Prior to the meeting of the Section on Nomenclature, most of the members of the commission had approved the resolutions, and the section took a recess in order to permit the other commissioners to consider them. All commissioners approved the resolutions and the secretary was instructed to present them to the section and the congress as a supplemental report. From a parliamentary point of view, they are accepted by the commission as addition to the subject discussed in paragraph (102) of the report and as substitute for several of the proposals that had been presented as amendments to the code. The subject matter was first presented to the commission during its Gratz meeting, and since that time has been under more or less consideration. It was discussed during the Monaco (1913) meeting of the congress, but the form of the proposition was not agreed upon until immediately prior to its presentation at the joint session of the commission and of the Section on Nomenclature.—C. W. S.]

(112) The commission unanimously recommends to the congress the adoption of the following resolutions:

(113) *Resolved*, That plenary power is herewith conferred upon the International Commission on

Zoological Nomenclature, acting for this congress, to suspend the Règles as applied to any given case, where in its judgment the strict application of the Règles will clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity, *provided*, however, that not less than one year's notice shall be given in any two or more of the following publications, namely, *Bulletin de la Soc. zoologique de France*, *Monitore zoologico*, *Nature*, *SCIENCE* (New York) and *Zoologische Anzeiger*, that the question of possible suspension of the Règles as applied to such case is under consideration, thereby making it possible for zoologists, particularly specialists in the group in question to present arguments for or against the suspension under consideration; and *provided*, also, that the vote in commission is unanimously in favor of suspension; and *provided* further that if the vote in commission is a two thirds majority of the full commission, but not a unanimous vote in favor of suspension, the commission is hereby instructed to report the facts to the next succeeding International Congress; and

(114) *Resolved*, That in the event that a case reaches the congress, as heretofore described, with a two thirds majority of the commission in favor of suspension, but without unanimous report, it shall be the duty of the president of the Section on Nomenclature to select a special board of three members, consisting of one member of the commission who voted on each side of the question and one ex-member of the commission who has not expressed any public opinion on the case, and this special board shall review the evidence presented to it and its report, either majority or unanimous, shall be final and without appeal, so far as the congress is concerned; and

(115) *Resolved*, That the foregoing authority refers in the first instance and especially to cases of the names of larval stages and the transference of names from one genus or species to another; and

(116) *Resolved*, That the congress fully approves the plan that has been inaugurated by the commission of conferring with special committees from the special group involved in any given case, and that it authorizes and instructs the commission to continue and extend this policy.

#### ACTION OF THE SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE AND OF THE CONGRESS ON THE FOREGOING REPORTS

At the Saturday morning session of the Section on Nomenclature the chairman gave the floor to the secretary of the Commission on Nomenclature. The secretary invited attention to the fact that the

by-laws of the commission provided for an open meeting of the commission, and he moved that the present session of the section resolve itself into a joint meeting of the commission and of the section, in order to comply with the provision in question. Upon second, this motion prevailed.

The secretary reported that he was under instructions from the commission to present to the meeting the report and a supplemental report of the commission. The chair called for the reports which were read in full, except that upon motion, second and vote, he read paragraphs (31-45 and 58) by title, or by title and examples.

Following the reading of the regular report, the meeting took a short recess to enable certain members of the commission to examine and vote on the supplemental report. After the meeting was again called to order, the supplemental report was read.

The secretary requested the adoption of the reports as a whole, explaining that this adoption did not carry with it the approval of the separate recommendations. Upon motion, and second, the reports were adopted.

The secretary requested action on those paragraphs that involved recommendations, nominations and resolutions. Acting upon each subject separately, the joint meeting, upon motion and second *approved* the following paragraphs separately:

(5), (9), (11), (13), (14), (50) [commission instructed to continue the list], (52 *a, b, c*) [vote unanimous except for one], (55), (56), (57), (91), (107), (113), (114), (115), (116).

The secretary was asked if it would be agreeable to him to resubmit the names in (31), (32), (33), (34), (35), (36) and (37) to subcommittees of specialists before they were formally approved. His reply was that the suggestion was entirely agreeable, and he withdrew his request for formal approval of these lists.

The secretary gave notice that the list of bird genera in (38) would be published before action was taken by the commission.

No formal action was asked upon (40), (41), (42), (43), (44), (45).

In view of the fact that opinions 29-51, inclusive, had been printed in detail, it was moved, seconded, and voted that the section (58) of the report dealing with opinions 29-56 be read by title, and that the opinions be approved.

Commissioner Stejneger stated that he now had some misgivings as to whether or not practical difficulties might arise in coordinating the resolutions of paragraphs (99), (100), (101), (105),

(106) with (113), (114), (115) and he requested that action on the former be postponed until the next congress, in order to determine more clearly whether the two propositions contained anything of a contradictory nature. As any one commissioner has a right to cause postponement of action on any portion of the report (since the commission's vote must be unanimous), Dr. Stejneger's request was respected and no final action was taken in regard to the Transitional List; these sections were tabled.

In reply to certain questions, the secretary explained the following English parliamentary expressions:

"*To table*" or "*to lay on the table*" any motion means that final action is postponed upon the matter in question. Matters that are "*tabled*" may be "*taken from the table*" for further consideration and for final action.

The expression "*suspend the Règles*" in the supplemental report is used in its accepted parliamentary sense. Parliamentary procedures are carried out under recognized or special "*parliamentary rules*" and under provisions contained in "*constitutions*" and "*by-laws*." Upon a unanimous vote, by-laws may be temporarily "*suspended*," that is to say, they may be set aside and the body takes action on the matter under consideration unrestricted by the provisions of the by-laws, and such action, if taken under a "*special rule*" framed for the case at hand or without reference to any rules, except the "*constitution*" and recognized "*parliamentary rules*," has all the validity of an action taken under the "*by-laws*."

Thus, if the congress confers upon the commission the plenary power to suspend the Règles in any given case, it practically says to the commission: "If you carry out the precautions provided for in the supplemental report, you may decide any given case arbitrarily without reference to the Règles or you may make a "*special rule*" to govern that particular case, and this congress will accept your decision as being just as authoritative as if you had made your ruling strictly in accord with the code." A plan of this kind is thoroughly in accord with recognized parliamentary customs and it has the great advantage of saving the necessity of introducing "*exceptions*"<sup>1</sup> to the rules.

<sup>1</sup>To make this point as to the difference between "*exceptions*" and "*suspension*" of rules clearer to some of the non-English-speaking members, the secretary later used this comparison upon adjournment of the meeting:

In reply to a question, the secretary stated that a number of special committees had been formed, consisting of specialists in various groups, and that the general policy had been adopted to confer with these committees upon questions and cases affecting their particular groups. Despite the experience that this method added greatly to the routine of the secretary's office, he felt the policy should be not only continued, but also extended, and he was willing to accept, without confirmation by the section, any special committees chosen by any general committees appointed for that purpose.

In conclusion, the secretary invited attention to the fact that during part of the meeting the secretary of the section had been obliged to be absent from the session, and he therefore moved that the edited copy of the reports, with his marginal notes as to action taken, be accepted as the minutes of the joint meeting. Upon second, this motion prevailed.

C. W. STILES,  
*Secretary of Commission*

At the afternoon general session, the secretary of the commission reported in English upon the resignations, nominations, amendments and resolutions, recommended by the commission, and approved by the Section on Nomenclature, but he did not read the report in full.

The president of the commission gave a résumé of the subject in French, translating most portions of the resolutions verbatim, and adding certain explanatory remarks.

All matters involved were voted upon by the general session, *en bloc* and without discussion (which it had been decided should be confined to

"It would be dangerous to make a law read:

" 'Theft shall be punished by imprisonment for one to ten years, *except* in such cases where the thief has tuberculosis.' But justice is tempered with mercy if one law reads:

" 'Theft shall be punished by imprisonment for one to ten years,' and if another law reads:

" 'The President (or the King) is empowered to *suspend* punishment in certain cases in which, in his judgment, a feeling of humanity demands such a suspension.'

"Suppose, now, it is shown that a thief, who is sentenced to ten years imprisonment, is about to die of tuberculosis; even if the sentence is passed upon him, the President (or the King) could parole or pardon the man in order to permit him to go home to die."

the meeting of the section). Against only four dissenting votes, all the subject matter in question was adopted and approved.

C. W. STILES,  
*Secretary of Commission*

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

On June 24 Governor Dunne signed senate bill 675 carrying an appropriation of \$4,500,000 for the University of Illinois for the biennium 1913-1915.

A correspondent writes:

The signing of this bill by Governor Dunne is one of the most important events in the history of higher education in Illinois.

First of all the passing of this bill indicates that the legislature approved by an overwhelming vote the mill tax for the university which was passed by the preceding legislature, so that all the leading parties, democrats, republicans, progressives and socialists, have endorsed this policy with unanimity. It indicates, too, the high-water mark of the whole history of educational development in the state.

In the second place it marks an epoch on account of the particular form in which the bill was passed since it leaves to the judgment of the board of trustees, within certain broad lines, the use of funds in the development of the institution and puts a stop to tendencies shown in nearly all legislatures to interfere unduly with the management of the institution by itemizing appropriations which have the effect often of thwarting the very purpose for which they were given.

The people of the state are to be congratulated that the university has never entered into politics and that all parties have had an active part in its development. The university was founded under a republican administration, but it was in the régime of a democratic governor—Governor Altgeld—that it received its first large appropriation. It was a republican administration that passed the mill tax, but a democratic one that has made it permanent and initiated a new form of passing the appropriation that marks a new era in the institutional development.

The present legislature has definitely settled another important question—one upon which for years there has been much discussion. In the university bills that were first introduced this year there was an item calling for \$100,000 a year for the support of medical education. A determined