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ON THE TYPIFICATION OF PLECTRANTHUS

The generic name Plectranthus was published by L'Héritier in his Stirpes Novae, Fasc. 4: 84, probably March 1788 (see Woodward & Britten, Journ. Bot. 43: 267. 1905) and the first selection of a lectotype species of Plectranthus was P. punctatus (Linn. f.) L'Hérit., made by Miss M. L. Green (in Prop. Brit. Bot. 107: 1929). No argument was given and the only reason for choosing that species appears to be that it was described (as Ocimum punctatum Linn. f.) some years earlier than P. fruticosus L'Hérit. The latter was quoted as lectotype by Phillips (Gen. S. Afr. Fl. Pl. ed. 2. 650: 1951), again with no argument, but presumably because he had found that P. punctatus (Linn. f.) L'Hérit. has united stamen filaments and must be transferred to Coleus *). This character is not shown in L'Héritier's figure (l.c. t. 42).

It is clear that this will involve the coining of a new generic name for P. fruticosus and its very numerous allies unless Phillips' counter proposal is accepted.

It is necessary to show that P. fruticosus fits the generic description more closely than does "P. punctatus" in accordance with Appendix IV, 4e of the Paris Code (p. 295).

In the first place, the spur of P. fruticosus is very prominent whilst that of P. punctatus is a mere gibbosity. Indeed, the generic name is derived from this character (l.c. p. 84).

"A vocibus graecis πληγησεων, calcar gallinae- ceum, et δνος, flos, uti solum adhuc genus ex didynamis gymnospermis gaudens nectario calcarato, haud absolute in insolito inter didynamas angiospermas." Later (l.c. p. 88) L'Héritier remarks that the corolla of P. punctatus is saccate and not spurred. The lower calyx lobes of P. fruticosus fit the generic description exactly whilst those of P. punctatus, instead of being very narrow and unequal, are broad and subequal. The anthers of P. fruticosus are very clearly tetragonal whilst those of P. punctatus differ from the generic description in being ovate. These facts, allied to the nomenclatural changes which are involved in retaining P. punctatus as the type of Plectranthus are, in our opinion, sufficient to render most desirable the adoption of P. fruticosus as the type-species of the generic name.

A. A. BULLOCK (Kew)
D. J. B. KILLICK (Pretoria)

PROPOSALS TO THE MONTREAL CONGRESS

14. Proposal: That the following specific example be added to the phonetic alphabetic-al equivalents given in Art. 73 (ICBN 1956): "ψ" becomes "s" and not "c".

Justification: Judging by the example given in Taxon 6(7): 209, there is a need for a specific ruling on this point. This example concerns the incorrect romanization of the Japanese plant name as "kumasa" instead of "kumasasa".


15. Proposal: After Art. 14, Note 6, add the following:

Note 7. When a controversy has arisen about any particular proposal, safeguards shall be observed to insure impartial procedure so that the proposal will be considered strictly on its merits: The General Committee shall refer the proposal for examination to a committee of the customary number of members who are not involved in the controversy either directly or indirectly, and who according to their solemn affirmations have no preconceived mental reservations on the subject. This rule shall apply to all controversial proposals under this Article not finally approved by a Congress up to and including 1934.

Argument: It is logical and desirable to set up a simple procedure as outlined in the proposed Note 7, in order to make the impartial consideration of controversial proposals automatic. In this manner the officers will not be embarrassed by protests and complaints, and the elementary human rights of all taxonomists will be preserved. Under such an impartial procedure, the business of the committee concerned will be carried out with a minimum of friction. All should welcome the adoption of an impartial procedure in such controversial cases.
The proposals under Art. 14 may be placed into two classes:

(1) In the first class are those made by specialists in the groups concerned who have a profound knowledge of the biologic (taxonomic) facts as applied to the Code provisions (cf. Preamble, of the Code). In addition there is no serious objection from other workers whose published results are affected. This class includes most of the proposals, and there is work of this kind to be done for a great many years. Any work thus accomplished will be applauded by all.

(2) In the second class are proposals made by non-specialists in the groups concerned who have no profound knowledge of the biologic (taxonomic) facts as applied to the Code provisions. These concern attempts to conserve a particular name for sentimental reasons even when it will upset a stabilized Code-based nomenclature built up over a period of years, and would thus make necessary many unnecessary name changes, cause utter confusion, and sabotage the conscientious work of living specialists in the particular groups concerned and who have a profound knowledge of the biologic (taxonomic) facts as applied to the Code provisions (cf. Preamble, of the Code).

It is the latter class of cases, relatively few in number but very important from the standpoint of elementary justice, to which Note 7 would apply. It would automatically provide an impartial committee to consider such proposals and would thus tend to eliminate controversies, and would shield the officers from embarrassment.

Proposed by: Hamilton P. Traub (Arcadia, Calif.).

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Division of Biological and Medical Sciences of the National Science Foundation announces that the next closing date for receipt of research proposals in the life sciences is January 15, 1958. Proposals received prior to that date will be reviewed at the Winter meetings of the Foundation’s Advisory panels and disposition will be made approximately four months following the closing date. Proposals received after the January 15, 1958, closing date will be reviewed following the Spring closing date of May 15, 1958.

In addition to funds for the support of basic research in the life sciences, limited funds will be available during the current fiscal year for the support of research facilities and programs at biological field stations.

Inquiries should be addressed to National Science Foundation, Washington 25, D.C.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC PLANTS

The International Commission for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants of the International Union of Biological Sciences held its inaugural meeting at Utrecht from 21-23 November 1956. This Commission took over the sponsorship of the International Code for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants (ICNCP), a sponsorship formerly held by the International Horticultural Congress.

The Commission consists of representatives from agriculture, forestry and horticulture and maintains close contact with the appropriate international bodies in this field.

Although the main task of the Commission is to redraft the I.C.N.C.P. so as to bring it into accordance with the requirements of agriculture and forestry, it discussed for some time the question of the stabilization of specific names of plants of great economic importance. The Commission agreed that it would be highly desirable to have a special committee, preferably working on the same level as the other special committees of the International Botanical Congress, that would be charged with the following duties:

1. To take into consideration and to report on cases of name-changes (on the specific level) of plants of great economic importance. This task could be compared with that of the regular nomenclature committees. By a detailed and thorough study of such cases, the erroneous changes could be avoided. Unavoidable changes would, on the other hand be more easily acceptable, when they come from such an authorized body.

2. To consider the possibility of establishing lists of names of plants of economic importance. Such lists could be studied by the appropriate authorities and might eventually lead to the setting up of check-lists of what are considered to be the correct names of those plants under the Botanical Code. It is realized that the setting up of such lists will be practicable only in those cases where the number of species per type of crop is not too high (e.g. in forestry; cereals).