More on Family Names. Proposal No. 74 Submitted to the Paris Congress
Author(s): H. W. Rickett
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 2, No. 8 (Nov., 1953), pp. 211-213
Published by: International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1216873
Accessed: 18/09/2011 14:13

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

Nom. cons. prop. *Chaenorrhinum* (DC., Fl. Franç., ed. 3, **5**: 410, 1815, als sectio von *Linaria*) Lange in Willk. et Lange, Prodr. fl. Hisp. **2**: 577. 1870.

T.: *Ch. minus* (L.) Lange.

Nom. rej. prop. *Chanarrhinum* Reichenbach, Consp. regni veget.: 123. 1828.

Erläuterung: Bei *Chaenorrhinum* (DC.) Lange handelt es sich um die Verbesserung eines Rechtschreibfehlers. Als Sektion von *Linaria* wurde die Sippe bereits von *De Candolle* richtig mit o (aber mit einfachem r) geschrieben.

Proposal no. 70

Proposal to conserve the genus 7584 **Wulfenia** (Scrophular.).

Nom. cons. prop. *Wulfenia* Jacq., Miscell. **2**: 62. 1781.

T.: *W. carinthiaca* Jacq.

Nom. rej. prop. *Wulfenia* Agosti, De Re Botanica Tractatus: 195. 1770. (ad genus *Linaria* pertinet).

Erläuterung: Bei seinen gründlichen Literaturstudien hat *O. Schwarz* auch für die Gattungen *Gagea* und *Aethionema* ältere Synonyme, für *Forsythia* und *Wulfenia* störende ältere Homonyme gefunden. In diesen Fällen hat aber bereits er selbst den Schutz der eingebürgten Namen auf der Ausnahmsliste vorgeschlagen, was ich natürlich nur wärmstens begrüssen und befürworten kann. Da mir ein formeller Antrag von *O. Schwarz* bisher nicht bekannt geworden ist, habe ich auch diese vier Fälle in meine Liste aufgenommen.

Proposal no. 71

Proposal to conserve the family name **Taxodiaceae** Warming.

Nom. cons. prop. *Taxodiaceae* Warming, Haandbog i den syst. Bot., 2. Aufl. 1884, Neger 1907, Pilger 1924, 1926.

Nom. rej. prop. *Cunninghamiaceae* Sieb. et Zucc., Fl. Jap. **2**: 1, 5. 1844. *Sequoiaceae* K. Koch, Vorlesungen über Dendrologie: 318. 1875.

Erläuterung: Siehe prop. no. 72.

Proposal no. 72

Proposal to conserve the family name **Araucariaceae** Strasburger.

Nom. cons. prop. *Araucariaceae* Strasburger. Die Coniferen usw.: 25, 1872, restr. K. Koch, Vorlesungen über Dendrologie: 317, 1875, Neger 1907, Pilger 1924, 1926.

Nom. rej. prop. *Dammareae* H. Karsten, Phys. Abh. Akad. Wiss. Berlin "1856"/4: 216. 1857. *Dammaraceae* H. Karsten. 1861.

Erläuterung: Die Familiennamen *Taxodiaceae* und *Araucariaceae* sind seit *Neger* 1907 und besonders seit *Pilger* 1926 allgemein eingebürgert und zu festen Begriffen geworden. Ihre älteren Synonyme haben niemals Bedeutung erlangt und sind daher abzulehnen, Ausführliche Synonymie in *Janchen*, Das System der Koniferen. Sitzber. Österr. Akad. Wiss., m.-n. Kl., Abt. I, **158**: 234/235 bzw. 225. "1949", 1950.

Proposal no. 73

Proposal to conserve the family name **Betulaceae**.

Nom. cons. prop. *Betulaceae* (C. A. Agardh, Aphor. bot. **14**: 208, 1825, tribus Amentacearum) Bartling, Ord. nat. plant.: 99. 1830.

Nom. rej. prop. *Corylaceae* Mirbel, Elém. phys. végét. **2**: 906. 1815.

Erläuterung: Wenn man die *Betulaceae* und die *Corylaceae* nicht als zwei eigene Familien betrachtet, sondern zu einer einzigen Familie vereinigt, wie dies zumeist geschieht, so empfiehlt sich die Beibehaltung des Namens *Betulaceae*, da dieser seit langem wesentlich gebräuchlicher ist und auch in Lehr- und Handbüchern vorherrscht. Vgl. *Mansfeld*, Repert. spec. nov. **47**: 286 und *Janchen*, Repert. spec. nov. **50**: 354.

MORE ON FAMILY NAMES

Proposal no. 74 submitted to the Paris Congress

by

H. W. Rickett (New York)

In proposal no. 6 submitted to the Paris Congress by Antonio Ponce de Léon y Aymé and Maria Teresa Alvarez (Taxon **2**: 96-98. 1953), we find an example of the strange inability of botanists to distinguish between roots and stems. I do not know just what the expression "parte radical" signifies to a Spanish-speaking philologist; but in English, at least, we use "root" to refer to the usually monosyllabic elements of which words are

formed, the elementary parts which cannot be further analyzed; such syllables, as ac, anth, ju, glan, den. In the classical languages, words consisted of one or more roots variously compounded and often adorned with suffixes. Endings also were added to differentiate the cases, tenses, etc., and so modify the meaning of the words. Denuded of these endings, the word is spoken of as the "stem". Stems of most Latin nouns, and hence of the generic names derived from them, end in -a, -o, -i, and various consonants; stems of Greek nouns are similar. So we have Rosa-, Moro-, Jugland-, Irid-, Salic-, Aster-, Boragin-, and so forth. For the behavior of the stem endings in composition see Recommendation 82 H.

The proposal mentioned should, therefore, be corrected by the substitution of the word "stem" for "root" wherever the latter occurs. This would make it philologically respectable.

It is further unfortunate that the arbitrary method for determining the stem ("root") of a name is not clearly expressed. By "that portion of the word preceding the final vowel" we must, I suppose, understand, "that portion of the word preceding the vowel of the final syllable"; since many generic names do not end in a vowel and thus have no final vowel in the usual sense.

The phrasing is unhappy also in several of the exceptions provided. "When a generic name ends in *s* preceded by *a* or *i* in the last syllable, the *s* should be changed to *d*." Since the "root" is defined as that part of the word that precedes the last syllable, and since the latter is dropped in making the family name, one might wonder about the application of this exception. But the examples show that such modified final syllables are to be retained in compounding the word; we are to write Juglandaceae, not Juglaceae. The same applies to the provision for names ending in *x;* from Salix we derive neither Salaceae nor Salixaceae but Salicaceae.

But even if the necessary verbal corrections be made in the proposed new rule, this, with all its exceptions, would compel us to replace Albuginaceae by Albugaceae, Aponogetonaceae by Aponogetaceae, Dacrymycetaceae by Dacrymycaceae, Elaphomycetaceae by Elaphomycaceae, Fissidentaceae by Fissidendaceae, Hydrocharitaceae by Hydrocharidaceae, Lepyrodontaceae by Lepyrodaceae, Leucodontaceae by Leucodaceae, Lophiostomataceae by Lophiostomaceae, Melastomataceae by Melastomaceae, Micropeltaceae by Micropeltidaceae, Molluginaceae by Mollugaceae, Mucedinaceae by Mucedaceae, Phyllosiphonaceae by Phyllosiphaceae, Podostemonaceae by Podostemaceae, Potamogetonaceae by Potamogetaceae, Prinodontaceae by Prinodaceae, Protosiphonaceae by Protosiphaceae, Restionaceae by Restiaceae, Saccharomycetaceae by Saccharomycaceae, Stemonitidaceae by Stemonitaceae, Stigonemataceae by Stigonemaceae, Trichopeltidaceae by Trichopeltaceae, Ulotrichaceae by Ulothricaceae, and many other accepted family names with similar derivations. This would scarcely seem a contribution to the stability of nomenclature.

It is evident that the etymological monstrosities listed above fall into a few groups, which the proposers of the new rule had perhaps not considered. This means that with the addition of a few more explanations and exceptions, the rule could be accepted without disrupting established nomenclature. One could, for instance, make it clear that words ending in -ugo and -edo, and most other words ending in -o (but not all), should be treated as those ending in -ago are treated; and that words ending in -on are of three kinds (ŏn, -ōn, -odon). But, when one has done all this, and encumbered a proposed new rule with a complex apparatus of exceptions, one has only achieved what has always been done — to append the -aceae to the stem of the generic name. The fathers of botany (if I may be permitted such a term) were more or less acquainted with etymology; they naturally used the stems of words to which to add the artificial endings by which they designated orders, families, etc. We have only to follow their example, and rewrite our present rule to read: "The name of a family is .... taken from the stem of the name of its type genus...."; using the actual stem rather than involving ourselves in artificial rules for determining stems, with the consequences sketched above. This would accomplish everything that proposal no. 6 does, more simply and without disturbing accepted names.

It is true that many botanists lack sufficient training to know the stem of a name by inspection; but there are always dictionaries; and one may usually obtain the collaboration of a learned colleague, as the editorial committee did in the preparation of Recommendation 82 H. Even to the philologically untaught, many stems are familiar.

Any one who has ever required the services of a dentist will be revolted at "Fissidendaceae".

In place of the proposal by Ponce de Léon and Alvarez I therefore propose that Article 28 be changed to read as follows: "The name of a family is a plural adjective used as a substantive, formed by adding the suffix -aceae to the stem of the name of its type genus or of a synonym of this name.

Propositions pour le Congrès de Paris

Proposal no. 75

In **Section 13**, Rejection of Names and Epithets, insert the following **new article**:

Art. 00. A name (below the rank of order) must be rejected if it has no type.

Note 1: — In order to avoid disadvantageous changes in nomenclature, an accepted name which lacks a type may be provided with a lectotype or neotype; it will then avoid rejection under the rule.

Note 2: — Specialists in particular taxa of plants are urged to publish the types of all accepted names in those taxa.

Note 3: — All botanists are urged to avoid designating lectotypes or neotypes for untypified names which if accepted would displace names in current use.

The purposes of this article are obvious. If the type method is to be an integral part of the Code, it is clear that it should apply to all names, past, present, and future. The proposed article would practically compel every author of a new name below the rank of order to designate its type. This is already general practice; to legalize it is a step toward uniformity and completeness.

A second purpose is evident particularly in Note 3 of the proposed article. The displacement of familiar names by the discovery of obscure but prior synonyms is a chronic disease of botanical nomenclature. Most names thus disinterred are untypified and may be rejected if the above new article is adopted — and if botanists generally are willing to ensure their rejection by this means. A method is thus provided to stabilize names in common use (particularly names of plants of economic importance) without resorting to conservation.

Proposed by: H. W. Rickett (New York).

Proposition n. 76

LES SOUSSIGNÉS, qui s'occupent depuis longtemps d'Algologie, sont d'avis que les règles de nomenclature botaniques adoptées pour les Phanérogames, ne peuvent être reconnues pour les protophytes, en particulier pour les algues.

Les algologistes sont d'avis que:

1. la description d'une nouvelle espèce doit se faire en deux langues dont l'une doit être le latin ou une langue adoptée par les congrès internationaux, l'autre étant laissée au choix de l'auteur,
2. les descriptions qui ne sont pas accompagnées de bons dessins ne sont pas valables,
3. Les nouvelles espèces dont de bons dessins sont publiés dans de grandes publications iconographiques internationales dans lesquelles pour des raisons techniques les dessins ne sont pas accompagnés de descriptions doivent être reconnues valables.

THE UNDERSIGNED, who have been working for several years in the field of algology, are of the opinion that the botanical rules which are valid for the phanerogams cannot be accepted in their entirety as valid for the protophyta, particularly the algae.

The algologists believe:

1. descriptions of new species must be made in two languages, one in latin or an international congress language, and the other as desired by the author,
2. descriptions without good drawings are not recognised,
3. publication of good drawings of new species in well-known international iconographical works, in which for technical reasons no descriptions are given, must be recognised as valid.

DIE UNTERZEICHNETEN, die seit vielen Jahren auf dem Gebiet der Algologie tätig sind, sind der Auffassung dass die botanischen Nomenklatur-Regeln, die für die Phanerogamen angenommen sind, nicht in ihren Gesamtheit als gültig für die Protophyten, insbesondere Algen gelten können.

Die Algologen sind folgender Meinung:

1. Die Beschreibung einer neuen Art soll in *zwei* Sprachen erfolgen, von denen die eine die lateinische *oder* eine internationale Kongress-Sprache sein muss, die andere aber beliebig gewählt werden kann.