A Stable Nomenclature
Author(s): R. A. Dyer
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Apr., 1954), pp. 82-83
Published by: International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1216358
Accessed: 01/03/2014 08:45

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

This content downloaded from 212.238.12.29 on Sat, 1 Mar 2014 08:45:46 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

schlagen. Wenngleich dieser Vorschlag einem rund 100jährigen Gebrauch entspricht, so schafft er die Tatsache doch nicht aus der Welt, dass dieser Gebrauch im Gegensatz zu den Regeln § 16 steht, genau wie im Falle von *Satyrium* L. und *Statice* L.; denn er lässt die Tatsache ausser acht, dass die Gattung *Scabiosa* L. bereits von ZINN, l.c., gültig auf *Sc. succisa* L. typisiert wurde. Gleiche Sachlage ist gegeben bei *Erica* L. em. Zinn (Typusart *E. vulgaris* L.) gegenüber *Erica* L. em. Sal. (Typusart *E. tetralix* L.). Es ergibt sich also zwangsläufig aus der jetzigen Fassung der Regeln, dass eine ganze Anzahl der vorgeschlagenen "species lectotypicae Linneanae" im Widerspruch zu den Regeln stehen und fallen gelassen werden, bzw. ersetzt werden müssen durch die älteste den Regeln entsprechend ausgewählte Typusart. Als Beispiele gebe ich: *Erica tetralix* zu ersetzen durch *Erica vulgaris*, *Scabiosa columbaria* zu ersetzen durch *Sc. succisa*, *Rhinanthus crista-galli* durch *Rh. elephas* *).

Die weitere Konsequenz aber ist, dass alle diese LINNEschen Gattungen auf die Liste der "nomina conservanda" und zwar in ihrer durch den langjährigen Gebrauch sozusagen sanktionierten Fassung gesetzt werden müssen, also *Erica* L. em. Sal., *Rhinanthus* L. em. Necker, *Scabiosa* L. em. Coult., während auf die Liste der "nomina rejicienda" gehören: *Erica* L. em. Zinn, *Rhinanthus* L. em. All., *Scabiosa* L. em. Zinn. Ganz im Sinne dieser Folgerung aus den Regeln hat neuerdings SEALY, in Taxon 3 : 66 (1954), den Namen *Dracocephalum* L. em. Benth. (1830) gegenüber *Dracocephalum* L. em. Adans. (1763) zur Konservierung vorgeschlagen.

Um aber nicht immer wieder erneute Diskussionen und umständliche Ueberlegungen anstellen zu müssen, ist es ratsam, die Artikel 51 und 52 in folgender Fassung in einen einzigen Artikel zusammenzuziehen:

> Art. 51. Wird ein Taxon in zwei oder mehrere zerlegt, so ist sein Name für eines von ihnen beizubehalten und zwar für dasjenige, das den Typus enthält. Ist der Typus des Namens von seinem Autor nicht festgelegt worden, so ist die älteste Typus-Auswahl, die den Nomenklaturregeln entspricht, verbindlich.

---

## A STABLE NOMENCLATURE

by

R. A. Dyer (Pretoria)

Every botanist knows that Article 4 of the Code reads as follows: "The essential points in nomenclature are: (1) to aim at fixity of names; (2) to avoid or reject the use of forms and names which may cause error or ambiguity or throw science into confusion.

Next in importance is the avoidance of all useless creation of names."

The fixity of names is the first objective because "Botany cannot make satisfactory progress without a precise system of nomenclature".

We go further by saying in Article 17 "that no one may change a name (or combination of names) without serious motives, based either on more profound knowledge of facts or on the necessity of giving up a nomenclature that is contrary to the rules of this Code".

In spite of these injunctions, however, there is no effective check on what is published in the name of taxonomy; there is nothing to prevent an author from making almost unlimited nomenclatural changes for such flimsy reasons as they

*) Die älteste legitime Emendierung liegt bei ALLIONI, Fl. Pedem. 1 : 58 (1785), in obs. — *Alectorolophus* Zinn, Catal. 228 (1757), ist totgeboren, da es nur eine Umtaufe von *Rhinanthus* L. ist.



This content downloaded from 212.238.12.29 on Sat, 1 Mar 2014 08:45:46 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

"appear", "seem" "are considered" or "deemed" desirable or are made according to the author's "principle" or "policy". Are these to be accepted as sufficiently serious motives for name changes?

We all know to what lengths we have gone in the past to preserve the stability of nomenclature in current use by the acceptance of rules governing the conservation of illegitimate names above specific rank. Even in the realm of specific epithets many efforts have been made to preserve illegitimate combinations in current use. And yet changes in nomenclature go on faster than we can cope with them.

It may well be said that one is not forced to follow every monograph which appears in print and that each work should be judged on its merits. But half the workers may wish to accept a work and half to reject it. How, then, do we achieve nomenclatural stability.

With the publication of each new taxonomic study, the nomenclatural aspect of taxonomy becomes more and more time absorbing; more and more time has to be spent on the historical background and less and less time is available for the study of the plants themselves.

What are our objectives in taxonomy? What are our guiding principles? Are we agreed that our taxonomy seeks to express our views on phylogeny? Let us admit that our views on phylogenetic relationships are mostly based on guesswork, which we term judgement, good or bad. Is it not possible to express these views and at the same time achieve the other objective of a stable nomenclature? Are some of us perhaps losing sight of the fact that both nomenclature and taxonomy are the tools of the whole science of botany; that the ecologist, the physiologist, the horticulturist, most taxonomists and the man in the street are all impatient for a stable nomenclature of plants?

My main concern is for the stability of generic names. I have no solution to offer and merely as a basis for discussion, I propose that suggested generic name-changes should first appear in Taxon supported by relative evidence in order to give interested taxonomists the opportunity of making constructive criticisms within a period of twelve months, after which the evidence should be submitted to a Committee for decision, such as the Committee for Urgent Taxonomic Needs.

And secondly I propose that the time is ripe for the general acceptance of a written Code to be followed by all plant taxonomists.

---

## Notice sur la façon de concevoir la Liste des Nomina Conservanda

par

B. P. G. Hochreutiner (Genève)

Le Secrétaire du comité spécial pour la nomenclature des Phanérogames, le prof. Pichi-Sermolli, nous a demandé de voter pour la conservation ou pour l'exclusion parmi les nomina conservanda des noms de genres dont il nous a envoyé une liste accompagnée de nombreux commentaires.

Trois cas se présentent:

1) Il s'agit d'un genre dont le nom est usuel partout et qui a la priorité. On votera donc *non* pour son adjonction aux nomina conservanda. C'est inutile.

2) Il s'agit d'un genre bien connu sous un nom usuel, mais on a découvert un synonyme inconnu de tout le monde dans un livre très ancien et qui a la priorité. On votera donc *oui* pour le nom usuel qui sera incorporé à la liste des nomina conservanda.

3) Mais il est des cas où la priorité est contestable; elle dépend de l'opinion



This content downloaded from 212.238.12.29 on Sat, 1 Mar 2014 08:45:46 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions