Proposals for Additions to the Code of Nomenclature. Proposal No. 27 Submitted to the Paris Congres
Author(s): Rodolfo E. G. Pichi-Sermolli
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 2, No. 6 (Sep., 1953), pp. 136-138
Published by: International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1216452
Accessed: 18/09/2011 13:47

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

of Andrews. It has, however, generally been regarded as a separate publication and was referred by Nees ab Esenbeck, in DC. Prodr. 9: 456. 1847, to *Eranthemum bicolor* Schrank, where it does not belong, leading Merrill, much later, into error *(vide infra)*. Nees, op. cit. 446, follows Aiton's lead and refers *E. pulchellum* to *E. nervosum* R. Br. It is probably the weight of Nees' authority on both of these points that perpetuated and increased the confusion surrounding these names.

6. *Eranthemum nervosum* R. Br. ex R. & S. Syst. 1: 174. 1817.

This was based on *Justicia nervosa* Vahl and, taken up by Nees, became for many years the generally used name for the plant.

7. *Daedalacanthus nervosus* T. Anders., Jour. Linn. Soc. 9: 487. 1867.

Based on *J. nervosa* Vahl. Anderson, realizing that, as currently applied, *Eranthemum L.* included two genera, supplied *Daedalacanthus* for one of them. Unfortunately he applied it to the one that included *E. capense* L., the original or type species of the genus. Radlkofer, Sitzungsber. math.-phys. Kl. Akad. Wiss. München 13: 285. 1883, recognized this error and restored *Eranthemum* in place of *Daedalacanthus* and gave the other genus, which Anderson had called *Eranthemum*, the name *Pseuderanthemum*.

8. *Pseuderanthemum pulchellum* (Hort.) Merr., Phil. Jour. Sci. Bot. 7: 248. 1912.

This was based by Merrill on the Gartenmagasin publication of *Eranthemum pulchellum*, apparently as a result of Nees' error in referring the latter to *Eranthemum bicolor* Schrank, which is a *Pseuderanthemum*. Merrill proposed *P. pulchellum* as an earlier name for *Pseuderanthemum bicolor* (Schrank) Radlk., but the combination actually belongs in the synonymy of *E. pulchellum* Andr. whether or not one considers that it is ultimately based on the latter name, as the plant described in the Gartenmagasin really belongs here, too.

It may be hoped, in conclusion, that no earlier epithet will be found for this attractive species, though it would not be surprising if one existed. It is a rather conspicuous plant to have remained unnamed until 1798.

Pacific Vegetation Project

Proposals for additions to the Code of Nomenclature

Proposal no. 27 submitted to the Paris Congres

by

Rodolfo E. G. Pichi-Sermolli (Firenze)

The International Code of Botanical Nomenclature provides (Appendix I) a guide to the determination or selection of nomenclatural types of previously published taxa. This guide is a great improvement on the application of the type method (Section 2. Article 18-21), but, nevertheless, is not a sufficient means to fix unequivocally the nomenclatural type of some taxa, genera above all, the typification of which is particularly questionable and can be established only by means of the resolution of an International Botanical Congress.

It is a fact that the application of the old generic names depends chiefly on the selection of their type species. In several cases this selection is easy, and often, even if some authors disagree regarding some typification, the Guide to the determination of types leads us to an unequivocal selection. Sometimes, however, the selection of a lectotype of a genus is very difficult and the arguments adduced by the authors who have contrasting opinions on the subject appear equally good to anyone who is prepared to judge objectively. It follows that in some cases the same generic name is adopted by authors for different genera while, on the contrary, in other cases an uncertain typification results in the same genus having two different names, since not all authors accept the generic name of uncertain typification and some of them adopt for the genus a later name. At all events even if an uncertain typification does not affect the nomenclatural state of a genus, a selection of its lectotype species is necessary for the nomenclature of its subdivisional taxa.

In these cases the lectotype species of these genera of uncertain or questionable typification can only be established conventionally by means of the decision of an International Botanical Congress. At present the Code does not allow us to do so, as we cannot include a genus in the list of Genera Conservanda (Appendix V.B.) simply in order to fix its

type species. For these reasons I propose to add as an appendix to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature a list of the lectotype species which are selected conventionally and must be retained.

In order to avoid the creation of new Committees I think that it would be advisable at least for the time being to refer the proposals for typification to the same Special Committees of Nomenclature for the various taxonomical groups as are appointed for the study of the proposals of the nomina conservanda.

I realize that this list will require a lot of work, but we must consider that it would be devoted chiefly to the genera the typification of which is uncertain. On the other hand we must remember that the opportuneness of this Appendix with the "Species Lectotypicae Generum" is demonstrated by the list of the lectotype species of the Linnean genera prepared by A. S. Hitchcock & M. L. Green which was published as a supplement to the last edition of the "International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature".

To sum up what I have noted above, I propose the creation of a new Appendix to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature under the name of "Species Lectotypicae Generum", and consequently the addition to the same Code of the following new article:

Art. 21 bis

In order to fix the nomenclatural type of some genera, the typification of which is uncertain or disputed, this Code provides a list of the lectotype species of these genera, which are established by convention and must be retained (Appendix VII. Species Lectotypicae Generum). This list will remain permanently open for additions. Any proposal for the typification of a genus must be accompanied by a detailed study, with full bibliographical data, in which historical, taxonomical, and nomenclatural grounds for the typification of the genus are carefully and exhaustively discussed.

The proposals must be submitted to the General Committee for Botanical Nomenclature, which will refer them for examination to the Special Committee for the taxonomical group concerned. This Committee will submit its comment and voting on the proposals to the Advisory Board and the General Committee of Nomenclature which in its turn will take into consideration the proposals and will refer all the data on them to the International Botanical Congress for the final decision.

I hope that taxonomists realize the necessity of this list of the lectotype species of genera, which represents another important means for reaching stability and clarity in the nomenclature of genera and species.

* * *

The tendency of some authors to select doubtful or misinterpreted species as lectotypes of genera induces me to make two other proposals.

Sometimes authors on the basis of the strict application of Appendix I "Determination of types" of the Code of Nomenclature are led to select as the lectotype species of a genus a doubtful species. Since the principal aim of the type method is to fix the correct and unequivocal identity of a taxon, and on the other hand this depends chiefly on the sure identity of its type, I think that, whenever the lectotype of a taxon must be selected, the first qualification of this lectotype must be its certain identity, otherwise the typification becomes a source of confusion rather than of clarification.

This principle must be above all borne in mind in the selection of the type for a genus as in this case changes of names and the creation of new combinations could be involved owing to an unsuitable selection. For these reasons I think that it is senseless to select as the lectotype of a genus a doubtful species, even if according to the guide for the determination of types this selection ought to be the most suitable. In fact in so doing the identity of the genus concerned will result in its turn doubtful and we might be liable to misapply the generic name concerned and eventually be compelled to changes of names. Even if the doubtful species is to be referred unquestionably to the genus concerned, such a typification is not advisable. In fact, apart from the question of principle, I think that it is unsuitable that the type cannot be mentioned among the species of the genus.

Sometimes a genus consists of species previously described under another genus. When the author failed to designate the type of his new genus, a lectotype must be selected for it. Authors on the basis of a previous selection sometimes accept as lectotype of a genus a species which was incorrectly interpreted and erroneously named by the author of the genus itself. Clearly this is incorrect. In fact according to Article 65

"When on transference to another genus, the specific epithet has been applied erroneously in its new position to a different plant, the new combination must be retained for the plant on which the epithet was originally based, and must be attributed to the author who first published it." Consequently if we select as the lectotype of a genus a species which was misinterpreted and erroneously named by the author of that genus we find ourselves in the strange situation of selecting as lectotype of a genus a species which was not studied by the author of the genus itself; which is not compatible with the rule 4.b of the Appendix I. If, on the contrary, we select as the lectotype of that genus the species which was actually described by the author of the genus the lectotype species does not correspond to that which was selected as the type of the genus by previous authors, and on the other hand this lectotype species has a different author from the one who described the genus. In both cases such a selection is not advisable and I think that it is better for the sake of clarity to select another lectotype of that genus, if another species is equally qualified to be its type.

The guide for the determination of types (Appendix I of the Code of Nomenclature) does not take into account these two cases of doubtful and misinterpreted species and therefore I think it advisable to add to it the following two new rules:

Appendix I

Determination of types

8. A species of uncertain identity cannot be selected as the lectotype of a genus or any infrageneric taxon.

9. A species which was incorrectly interpreted and erroneously named by the author of a genus cannot be selected as lectotype of that genus.

7th June, 1953.

Propositions pour le Congrès de Paris

Proposition n. 28

Proposition pour les modifications suivantes aux articles 28 et 29:

Article 28

Transformer ainsi le premier paragraphe: Un nom de famille est un adjectif au pluriel, utilisé comme substantif, formé par adjonction du suffixe *-aceae* au radical du nom du genre-type ou d'un synonyme au génitif.

Article 29

Transformer ainsi le premier paragraphe: Un nom de sous-famille est un adjectif pluriel, utilisé comme substantif, formé par adjonction du suffixe *-oideae* au radical du nom du genre-type ou d'un synonyme au génitif; les noms de tribus.... etc. (comme précédemment).

Commentaires: La rédaction actuelle de ces articles est d'une imprécision flagrante. Une proposition a déjà été publiée pour y remédier (Proposition no. 6, par Antonio Ponce de León y Aymé et Maria Teresa Alvarez; Taxon 2 (4): 96-98. 1953). Mais le remède est pire que le mal, car les auteurs supposent que le suffixe *-aceae* doit être accolé au radical du nom du genre-type au nominatif. D'où une complication extrême: 5 cas d'exceptions sont prévus (noms en *-r*, noms en *-as*, *-is* ou *-ans*, noms en *-x*, noms en *-ago*, noms à radical en *-i*), malgré lesquels les auteurs sont conduits à former des noms grammaticalement incorrects, Hydrocharidaceae et Melastomaceae (*loc. cit.* 98), et leurs propositions conduiraient à en former bien d'autres, tels que Saccharomycaceae (pour Saccharomycetaceae), Fissidaceae (pour Fissidentaceae), Phytelephadaceae (pour Phytelephantaceae) ou Vitidaceae (pour Vitaceae).

En fait, le radical d'un nom latin de la 3e déclinaison peut être tronqué ou altéré au nominatif, alors qu'il ne l'est jamais au génitif (exemple: *vis, viris*, rad. *vir-; flumen, fluminis*, rad. *flumin-; dux, ducis*, rad. *duc-*). C'est sur le radical du génitif que doivent être formés les noms de familles, comme du reste les noms de sous-familles, tribus et sous-tribus. Aucune exception n'est alors à prévoir. Rappelons que le génitif latin des noms grecs latinisés est calqué sur le génitif grec, la terminaison *-oς* étant simplement remplacée par la terminaison *-is*.

Exemples tirés de la proposition no. 6

Papaver, Papaveris, rad. *Papaver-: Papav*eraceae.

Cycas, Cycadis, rad. *Cycad-: Cycad*aceae.

Iris, Iridis, rad. *Irid-: Irid*aceae.

Juglans, Juglandis, rad. *Jugland-: Juglanda*ceae.

Salix, Salicis, rad. *Salic-: Salic*aceae.

Borago, Boraginis, rad. *Boragin-: Borragin*aceae.

Nyctago (et non *Nyctaginia*), *Nyctaginis*, rad. *Nyctagin-: Nyctagin*aceae.