



Nomenclature Proposals Submitted to the Xth International Botanical Congress

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 12, No. 8 (Oct. - Nov., 1963), pp. 290-293

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1216576>

Accessed: 27/03/2014 10:46

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Taxon*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

be attributed to Hasskarl. "*Raphiacme* Harvey" adopted by K. Schumann (1895) is an error to be rejected in favour of *Raphionacme* Harvey (1842) and not a validly published name to be attributed to K. Schumann. "*Monocarpus* Miquel" adopted by Post & Kuntze (1903) is an error to be rejected in favour of *Monocarpia* Miquel (1865-6) and is not a validly published name to be attributed to Post & Kuntze. *Humiria* Aublet (1775) is a conserved spelling (see Appendix III) introduced by Jaume Saint-Hilaire (1805) in place of the spelling "*Houmiri*" actually adopted by Aublet; it is not a new name to be attributed to Jaume Saint-Hilaire.

NOMENCLATURE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO THE Xth INTERNATIONAL BOTANICAL CONGRESS

A. PROPOSALS BY A. A. BULLOCK (KEW)

Most of the following amendments are of an editorial nature; all of them are aimed at the removal of ambiguity or the clarification of the text. Explanation and justification are reduced to a minimum and many of the proposals are, it is believed, self-explanatory.

55. Rec. 7A. After the word "holotype" amend the text to read "... of the name of a species of infraspecific taxon ..."

The Code is concerned only with types of names and only names of species and infraspecific taxon have objective types which can be deposited in museums and herbaria.

56. Rec. 7B. After "lectotype" insert "of its name".

57. Rec. 7C. In the second line, delete "the first valid". These words are redundant, since a name has no existence under the code until it is validly published, and the time (i.e. date) of publication of a name must be "the first valid" publication.

58. Art. 9. In the first line delete "species" and insert in its place "specific name"; insert before "taxon" the words "of the name of a". In the first line of the Examples, before "polygamous" insert "name of the". In the last line of Note 2, for "ought to" read "must" [otherwise this note is a mere Recommendation]. In Note 3, before "a taxon" insert "the name of", and at the beginning of the Note for "A" read "The".

59. Art. 10. In the first line for "genus" read "generic name" and before "any taxon" insert "the name of". In Note 1, after "family" insert "name".

60. Art. 12. This article is redundant on account of the Note to Art. 6, and could be

deleted, whilst the cross-reference to Chapter IV, section 2, Arts. 32-45 should be added to Art. 6.

61. Art. 14, Note 3. In place of "for the same type" read "based on the same type".

62. Art. 14. Add a new Note as follows: "Note 7. Names included in the list of *nomina generica conservanda* without any corresponding rejected name are to be regarded as conserved against any earlier homonyms and nomenclatural synonyms as indicated in Note 3 above".

63. Art. 18. In the first line of the second paragraph after "Names" insert "of taxa" and after "order" insert "natural order".

The word "rank" clearly applies to the taxa concerned, not to their names.

64. Art. 22. In line 7 after "establishes" insert "the name of".

65. Rec. 23A. Add at the end of the first paragraph "— See Art. 73, Note 3."

66. Art. 25. Delete "if any" at the end of the second line; at best the words are redundant, but they are in fact nonsensical. In line 4 after "establishes" insert "the name of", and make a corresponding correction in the text of the example.

67. Art. 26. Add the text of Art. 27 in the form of a Note, and delete Art. 27.

68. Art. 28. Delete the first paragraph and in the second paragraph for "which tend to establish" read "which show"; place the third paragraph before the second. [It may be noted that the "fancy epithets" in the second paragraph are referred to, in the Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated plants, as names.]

69. Art. 31. At the end of the first line, delete "taxon" and substitute "name or new combin-

ation"; after "diagnosis" insert "or other matter required under this Code". It cannot be too strongly emphasized that publication refers to names, not to the taxa to which they are applied. The present article leaves the fate of new combinations "published" in this way uncertain. It is thought that the proposed new text embodies the intention of the present text.

70. Art. 33. In order to make clear the meaning of the term "replaced synonym" in the second paragraph, insert a comma after "or" in the third line and the words "when a new name or epithet is proposed the"; insert a comma also after the word "synonym".

71. Rec. 50F. Delete the last line. The generic name *Ribes* is neuter.

72. Art. 62. The following addition is controversial, but this or its opposite should be included. Add a new Note: "The publication of a name or epithet which is an avowed or implied orthographic correction of a name or epithet previously published for the same taxon does not constitute valid publication of a new name or epithet. See also the second footnote under Art. 73. Example. "*Lepidostemon* Blume" published by Hasskarl (1844) as a correction of *Lepistemon* Blume (1825) was not a validly published new name and does not render *Lepidostemon* Hooker & Thomson (1861) an illegitimate later homonym.

73. Art. 63. There is some contradiction between the Article and the Note which was added to it at Montreal (1959). Instead of the opening words "A name..." read "A new name..." This makes the necessary distinction between a new name and the special category of new combination to which the note refers. From the Note it may be advantageous to delete the words "the epithet of".

74. Art. 69. The present text is incompatible with the type method. For both examples given, satisfactory typification has been demonstrated, and the names concerned, however much they may have been misapplied in the past, need no longer lack accurate application. The article and examples should be deleted or replaced by "A name must be rejected if it cannot be typified". This simply means that for practical purposes an untypified name will fall into disuse.

75. Art. 70. Under the type method, names cannot be based on two or more elements whether or not such elements are discordant. The article is a relic of the circumscription method and should be deleted. It is significant

that the examples do not include a name which must be rejected under the article, and it may be impossible to find such an one because it could be detected only by more or less complete identification of one or more of the discordant elements. Such identification leads to adoption of the name as in the case of *Pouteria* Aublet, or rejection of the name as in the cases of *Actinotus* Oliver and *Schrebera* Linnaeus.

76. Art. 71. There has been complete failure to define the term "monstrosity", which is necessary before this article can be applied. When "monstrosities" are identified with the corresponding normal organism there is no difficulty in application of names. In the case of generic names conservation is a means of preserving, if desirable, a later name applied to the normal plant, whilst the actual use of specific and infraspecific names depends upon identification as well as typification. The article is redundant and should be deleted.

77. Rec. 75A. The value of this is quite lost by its permissive and non-retroactive nature. It is again proposed that the text be modified as indicated in Taxon 7: 267-268 (1957) to form a new Art. 75 bis.

B. PROPOSAL BY H. K. AIRY SHAW AND F. C. DEIGHTON (KEW)

Proposal 78. New Note 7 to Art. 71. For the sake of simplicity, all generic names ending in *-is* or *-ys* (with the exceptions noted below) are treated as having the stem *-id* or *-yd*, respectively, whether this is supported by known classical usage or not. Examples supported by classical usage: *Agrostis*, genitive *Agrostidis*; *Bellis*, *Bellidis*; *Cannabis*, *Cannabidis* (Greek, but not Latin); *Epipactis*, *Epipactidis*; *Hippocrepis*, *Hippocrepidis*; *Hydrocleiis* (irreg. spelling for *Hydrocleis*), *Hydrocleiidis* (for *Hydrocleidis*). Examples not supported by classical usage: *Achlys*, *Achlydis*; *Capparis*, *Capparidis*; *Coris*, *Coridis*¹); *Haloragis*, *Haloragidis* (?); *Orchis*, *Orchidis*; *Pedicularis*, *Pedicularidis*; *Vitis*, *Vitidis*.

Exceptions. Names ending in *-charis* retain the stem *-it-*, e.g. *Hydrocharis*, *Hydrocharitis*; *Nomocharis*, *Nomocharitis*; etc. Names ending in *-basis*, *-caulis*, or other technical terms widely employed in Latin descriptions, retain their customary stem, e.g. *Anabasis*, gen. *Anabasis* or *Anabaseos*; *Physocaulis*, gen. *Physocaulis*;

¹) *Pace* Airy Shaw in Kew Bull. 6: 31 (1951), in adnot.; Bullock in Taxon, 7: 160 (1958).

etc. The generic name *Cucumis*, with irregular genitive *Cucumeris*, retains its *-er-* stem, in order to correspond with the widely used adjective or epithet *cucumerinus*.

Argument. It is sometimes difficult, or even impossible, to discover the appropriate stem of generic names ending in *-is*. Most of such names are of Greek derivation, and the majority of these have the stem *-id-*, such as *Hippocrepis*, *Hippocrepidis*. Others, however, such as *Orchis*, *Capparis*, etc., have no *-d-* in the stem in their original classical usage, the logical consequence of which is that the names of the corresponding families, etc., based upon these names should be *Orchiaceae*, *Cappariaceae*²⁾, etc., and adjectives such as *Coriifolius* should properly be spelt *Coriifolius*, etc. There has been, however, a long-standing tradition, dating from before the time of Linnaeus, to give an *-id-* stem to many of these: hence the names *Orchidaceae*, *Capparidaceae*, etc., have become firmly established, and to change now to the philologically more correct forms would be somewhat distasteful and tiresome. The same applies to some names in *-ys*, e.g. *Stachys*, gen. *Stachyos*: the correct spelling of the tribal name would be *Stachyae*, but the spelling *Stachydeae* has been universally adopted for almost 200 years. It is therefore felt that the standardisation of all such names as having stems in *-id-* or *-yd-* will be a reasonable and practical step in the nationalisation of botanical orthography.

The provisions of this Note have particular application to the formation of the names of families and other supra-generic taxa, some of which are already well established, e.g. *Orchidaceae*, *Hydrocharitaceae*, *Capparidaceae*. It is also of much relevance in the orthography of the specific epithets of many fungi, which are frequently the generic names of phanerogams in the genitive case, or with the suffix *-icola*. Examples: *Meliola amomicola* F. L. Stevens (not *M. amomicola*, as published), from the generic name *Amomis* Berg (*Myrtaceae*) (not from *Amomum* L., *Zingiberaceae*); *Cercospora physalidicola* Ell. & Barth. (1896) (not *C. physalicola*, as published), from the generic name *Physalis* L. (*Solanaceae*) (*C. physalidicola* Speg. (1898) therefore becomes a later homonym). A number of such epithets have been published in two different forms (cf. also the last example), e.g. *agrostis* and *agrostidis*, *pedicularis* and *pedicularidis*, etc.: if em-

²⁾ Not *Capparaceae* as given in Intern. Code Bot. Nomencl. (Montreal): 190 (1961).

ployed under the same genus for different species, they are to be treated as homonyms, and the legitimate epithet must be used in the correct form as prescribed under this rule.

C. PROPOSITIONS PAR J. LEONARD ET R. TOURNAY (BRUXELLES)

Nous soumettons les remarques suivantes à l'attention des membres de la section de nomenclature du Congrès d'Edimbourg:

79. Article 4: ajouter une note:

"Note. L'expression "subdivision de genre" s'applique uniquement aux taxa de rang intermédiaire entre le genre et l'espèce. Le mot "infragénérique" s'applique à tous les taxa de rang inférieur au genre."

Justification: ces définitions se trouvent en notes infrapaginales, la première en tête de la section 3 et sous l'article 54, la seconde sous l'article 60. Il semble utile de les répéter dans l'article 4, où leur juxtaposition attire mieux l'attention du lecteur.

80. Texte français, article 5 (p. 72, ligne 8), article 20 (p. 81, lignes 7 et 21), article 21 (p. 82, ligne 4 à partir du bas), article 23 (p. 84, ligne 5) et article 33 (p. 90, ligne 10): remplacer "ne doit pas" par "ne peut pas".

Justification: l'absence d'obligation n'équivaut pas à une défense: si je ne dois pas faire telle chose, il ne m'est pas nécessairement défendu de la faire; le texte anglais des articles 20 et 23 contient une défense: "may not"; nous laissons à nos amis britanniques le soin de décider s'il ne convient pas, dans les articles 5, 21 et 33, de remplacer "must not" par "may not".

81. Texte français, article 5 (p. 72, ligne 8): remplacer "changer" par "être changé".

Justification: l'ordre relatif ne change pas par lui-même; c'est aux botanistes qu'il faut défendre de le changer; le texte anglais porte "be altered".

82. Article 33, § 3: remplacer "être attribuée à Bentham et Hooker f. simplement parce que ces auteurs citent . . . (Gen. Pl. 1: 885. 1867)." par "être attribuée à Bentham simplement parce que cet auteur cite . . . (in Benth. et Hook. f. Gen. Pl. 1: 885. 1867)."

Justification: le texte de la famille des *Umbelliferae* a été rédigé par Bentham seul (voir Stearn, Journ. Soc. Bibliogr. Nat. Hist. 3: 131. 1956).

83. Recommandation 50 D: remplacer "Ann.

Mus. Congo Belge Bot.” par “Ann. Mus. Congo, Bot.”.

Justification: en 1899 et 1904, le Congo était un état indépendant; le mot “Belge” ne se trouve pas dans le titre du périodique.

84. Recommandation 73 C (a): après “Bureau”, ajouter “; *keayi* de Keay”.

Justification: contrairement à ce que pourrait laisser croire l'article 73, § 2, *y* n'est pas toujours une consonne. En particulier à la fin des noms de personnes, *y* est une voyelle dans beaucoup de langues:

en français: *Stapeliopsis ballyi*, *Brenania brieyi*, *Xerosicyos decaryi*, *Cleistanthus letouzeyi*, etc.

en anglais: *Crotalaria hemsleyi*, *Brachystegia kennedyi*, *Habenaria keayi*, etc.

en d'autres langues: *Nervillia kotschyi*, etc.

85. Recommandation 73 C (d): après “*hayatanum*”, ajouter “*Andropogon gayanus*”.

Justification: comme ci-dessus:

en français: *Cissus barbeyana*, *Andropogon gayanus*, etc.

en anglais: *Microdesmis keayana*, *Habenaria ridleyana*, etc.

en d'autres langues: *Cassia kotschyana*, etc.

D. PROPOSAL BY C. E. SMITH JR. AND E. E. TERRELL (BELTSVILLE, MD.)

A committee on terminology for hybrids

Appendix I of the International Code (1961) does not deal adequately with the subject of terminology and names for hybrids. Fuller consideration needs to be taken of the modern accumulation of knowledge from a variety of sources and disciplines. E. L. Little (Taxon 9: 225-231. 1960) ably discussed formula designations versus Latin epithets for hybrids. One of us (Taxon 12: 105-108. 1963) was concerned with the standardization of symbols for kinds of hybrids and all morphologically-similar plants. We feel that the subjects of hybridization and polyploidy should be dealt with on a more comprehensive level and that the ways of naming or designating hybrids should be improved.

86. We propose that the Xth International Botanical Congress appoint a committee to study the desirability of emending the Code to better fulfill the needs of botanists dealing with hybrid plants. We believe that to serve the needs of scientists in other fields, the committee must include not only taxonomists, but also plant breeders and horticulturalists.

NEW TAXA AND COMBINATIONS IN WEST AFRICAN LENTIBULARIACEAE AND GENTIANACEAE

P. Taylor (Kew)

Utricularia tetraloba P. Taylor, sp. nov., *U. rigidae* Benj. affinis, sed foliis multo brevioribus, utriculis numerosis, inflorescentiis brevioribus gracilioribus, floribus minoribus, labio inferiore 4-lobis, capsulis minoribus differt.

Herba aquatica substrato adhaerens. Stolones breves, filiformes, papilloso. Rhizoidea numerosa, unguiformia. Folia pinnata, usque 6 cm. longa, segmentis capillaribus. Utriculi numerosi, e rhachi folii orti, ellipsoidei, 1-1.4 mm. longi, breviter stipitati, ori obliquo appendiculis 2 simplicibus capillaribus instructo. Scapi caespitosi, erecti, recti vel flexuosi, 2-7 cm. alti, 2-8 flori, racemo usque 2 cm. longo floribus secundis. Squamae steriles in scapo paucae, bracteis similes. Bracteae basifixae, ovatae, 1-nerves, 0.6-0.8 mm. longae; bracteolae lineares, c. 0.5 mm. longae. Pedicelli recti vel leviter

curvati, capillares, sub anthesi 1-2 mm. longi, sub fructu 2-3 mm. longi. Calyx leviter accrescens, lobis inaequalibus, lobo inferiore late ovato c. 1.5 mm. longo 1 mm. lato 4-nervi, inferiore oblongo c. 1.2 mm. longo c. 0.7 mm. lato 2-nervi. Corolla alba, palato flavo nervis purpureis, labio superiore late ovato 1.3-1.7 mm. longo 1.2-1.4 mm. lato apice rotundato; labio inferiore ± flabellato 1.7-2 mm. longo 2.2-3 mm. lato apice 4-lobis; calcari saccato. Filamenta filiformia, antherarum thecis confluentibus. Ovarium globosum, stylo brevissimo, stigmatis labio inferiore orbiculari, labio superiore minuto deltoideo vel obsoleto. Capsula ellipsoidea, 1.2-1.4 mm. longa. Semina numerosa, ovoidea, 0.3-0.35 mm. longa, 0.2-0.25 mm. lata, testa mucilaginoso.

Typus: Sierra Leone, Sugar Loaf Mt., Jones 239a in K.