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NOMENCLATURE PROPOSALS FOR THE MONTREAL CONGRESS

XIV. PROPOSALS BY G. M. SCHULZE and G. BUCHHEIM (Berlin-Dahlem)

120. Preamble, par. 6. Proposed rewording: "The provisions regulating the method of modification of this Code form its last division."

Comments: The proposed wording is in accordance with the title of Division III, see p. 51.

120a. Article 10, Note. To read: "For plants of which it is impossible to preserve a type specimen, or for a species or a taxon below the rank of species without a type specimen, the type may be a description or figure."

Comments: By the present wording this provision applies only to species and not to infraspecific taxa. We cannot see any reason for such a restriction. (In the wording proposed above, we have inserted intentionally "taxon below the rank of species" instead of "infraspecific taxa" since the term "infraspecific taxa" is not introduced into the Code until p. 24, Title of Chapt. III of Section 6).

120b. Recommendation 29A: To delete "in ephemeral publications".

Comments: Such publications are already contained in the last par. of Art. 29 (tradesmen's catalogues, non-scientific newspapers).

120c. Article 40, line 2 and Note 2: The definition of the term "nothomorph" differs from that in Art. H. 5.

In Art. H. 5, Note one will read "... any hybrid form, whether ...", in Art. 40, Note 2 "... any taxon of hybrid origin, whether ...", in Art. 40, line 1, 2 "... hybrids (any nothomorphs)".

It is proposed that the Committee for Cultivated Plants should re-examine the definitions in order to supply a suitable wording.

121. Article 41, Examples. It is proposed that the order of the two examples be reversed, since the Philogemia example refers to (2) and the Strophioblachia example to (1).

122. Article 55, Example f. The last part of the sentence to read: "The citation in parentheses (under Art. 49) of Bongard indicates the original author using the epithet in a name based on a type different from that of Tsuga heterophylla."

Comment: We think that this wording really makes clearer what is meant.

123. Article 59: It is proposed that the Committee for Fungi and Lichens should reconsider the wording of this Article with especial regard to the use of "state" and "stage" in the third sentence.

124. Article 59: Last line of the first par. to replace "transfer" by "new combination".

Comment: We think that only a taxon can be transferred to another taxon or an epithet to another name (e.g. generic name).

125. Article 73, par. 1. To read:

a) "The original spelling of a name or epithet must be retained, except that typographic or orthographic errors may be corrected."

Or alternative wording:

b) "The original spelling of a name or
epithet must be retained, but corrections of typographic or orthographic errors are permitted."

Comment: The present wording of the second part of par. 1 is that of a Recommendation but not of an Article by using the word “should”.

126. Article 73, Note 3. To read: “The wrong use of the terminations which are dealt with in Rec. 73C (a, b, d) is treated as an orthographic error.”

Comments: The present wording of Note 3 is rather strange in its use of the phrase “and the reverse errors”. Where is it stated that, e.g., the use of i (etc.) instead of ii (etc.) is an “error”? And if it were an error we cannot say that it is “treated” as an error: an error is an error! Rec. 73C (a, b, d) deals only with the proper use of terminations. If i instead of ii is used under Rec. 73C (b) this may be an “error” or an intentional use. Whether it is an error or an intentional use, under Rec. 73C (b) it is what we would normally call a “mistake”. What we can do is only to treat “the wrong use of terminations” as an orthographic error.

The proposed wording is in parallel with that of Note 2, in the text of which also no special provisions are contained.

127. Article 73, Examples of typographic errors and Examples of orthographic errors. Alternative proposal:

a) To combine both groups of Examples under the heading “Examples of typographic or orthographic errors”.

b) To establish a special paragraph with the heading “Example of both a typographic and an orthographic error: Rosa pissarti Carr. (Rev. Hort. 1880: 314) is a typographic error, the correct name being Rosa pissardi (see Rec. 73C, b)”.

Comments: In several cases, it is difficult or impossible to decide whether there is a typographic or an orthographic error. If proposal (a) cannot be accepted, proposal (b) should be taken into consideration, since the Rosa example is an example of both a typographic and an orthographic error.

Both the placing of the Rosa example under “Examples of typographic errors” in Art. 82, Code (1952. p. 44) and the wording was correct, since nothing was said about the correction of R. pissardi to R. pissardi.

From the wording of the Rosa example in the Code (1956) it looks as if in Rev. Hort. 1881. 190 R. pissarti was corrected to R. pissardi, but in Rev. Hort. 1881. 190 it is only stated that R. pissarti is a typographic error and is to be changed to R. pissardi. The correction of R. pissardi is only in accordance with Art. 73, Note 3.

128. Article 73, Examples of typographic errors. To read: “Globba brachycarpa Baker (in ...) and Hetaeria alba Ridley (Journ. ...) are typographic errors, the correct names being Globba trachycarpa Baker and Hetaeria alta Ridley respectively (see Journ. ...).”

For argument see above under proposal no. 125.

129. Article 73, Examples of orthographic errors: To replace in lines 4, 7, 9, 13 (twice) “should” by “may”.

For argument see under proposal no. 125.

130. Recommendation 73C (d). To read: “When an epithet taken from the name of a man is used as an adjective, it is formed in the following manner: (1) when the name of the person ends in a vowel, anus (a.umn) is added (thus clarkeanus after Clarke; koidzumi anus after Koidzumi; berteroanus after Bertero), except when the name ends in a, when eanus (a,ul) is added; (2) when the name ends in a consonant, ianus (a,um) is added (e.g. dielsianus after Diels), except when the name ends in -er, when anus (a,um) is added (hassleranus after Hassler).”

Comments: We are not sure if it is correct to add eanus, when the name ends in a, e.g. saportacanus from Saporta. We do not know an existing example, where this procedure has been followed. Centaurea riaeana (Reichb. f.) Sennen does not count, since Reichenbach does not ascribe this taxon to a man called “Ria”, but to a man called “Durieu”.

In Ind. Kew. Suppl. X, 1936-1940, there are to be found the names:

Asarum Hayatanum Maekawa (after Hayata), Bulbophyllum Hatusimanum Tuyama (after Hatusima), Calamagrostis Hiigamana Hondo (after Hiigamana), Cardamine Matsudanurana Nemoto (after Matsumura), Cordin Mexiana Johnston (after Mexia), Cynanchum Matsudanum Koidzumi (after Matsuda).
We should like to know if these epithets are formed in a correct manner.

In Art. 73, Note 3, the terminations anus and ianus are mentioned; besides there is also a reference to Rec. 73C (d), but in (d) nothing is said about the use of these terminations. It would be advantageous and desirable to state explicitly the proper use of the terminations concerned.

131. Appendix I, Article H. 1, par. 2. The first sentence to read: “The formula consists of the names or of the specific epithets of the two parents in alphabetical order connected by the multiplication sign.”

132. (idem). The Salix example to read: “Salix × capreola = (Salix aurita × caprea).”

Comments: It is stated in Art. H. 1 that for hybrids or putative hybrids between two species of the same genus “The formula consists of the specific epithets of the two parents in alphabetical order connected by the multiplication sign”. But in the Examples to this Article the formula consists of the names of the parents, not of the epithets of the parents. According to the text the Examples should have read:

*Digitalis lutea ♀ × purpurea ♂; Salix × capreola (= Salix aurita × caprea).* In fact, both forms of designating interspecific hybrids of the same genus (e.g. *Salix aurita × S. caprea; Salix aurita × caprea*) are in general use in botanical literature, also in agricultural, horticultural and silvicultural literature.

133. Appendix I, Article H. 1, Note 2, Examples. The second example to read: “The designation *Potentilla tormentillo-formosa* published by Maund is considered as a formula *Potentilla formosa × Tormentilla reptans*.”


The *Potentilla* example is intended to refer to “consisting of the specific epithet of one parent combined with the generic name of the other” (Note 2).

134. Appendix I, Article H. 2. The second sentence to read: “In the formula the order of the names or epithets and the use ...... should follow the procedure set down in Art. H. 1.”

For arguments: see above under proposal no. 132.

135. Appendix I, Recommendation H. 5A: To delete “or the symbol 0”.

Comments: This symbol is really superfluous and has already been removed in the new 1958 edition of the Intern. Code of Nomencl. for Cult. Plants.

136.-138. Article 17, On the nomenclature of orders. Strict application of Art. 17 in connection with Art. 16 involves many difficulties. According to Art. 17, the name of an order is taken from that of its type family.

a) The correct names of families and consequently of many type families of orders are not yet fixed. By change of the name of a type family of an order the name of that order often has to be changed. There is no provision that a name of an order may be taken from a synonym of the name of the type family.

b) Apart from the fact that many names of orders not taken from the name of a family (e.g. *Helobiae, Farinosae, Scitamineae, Centropermae*, etc.) are not in accordance with Art. 17 and have to be changed, several well known and widely used names taken from the name of a family and ending in -ales are illegitimate and have to be replaced by other names (e.g. *Magnoliales* by *Annonales, Saraceniales* by *Nepenthales, Sapindales* by *Acerales, Celastrales* by *Coriari-ales*, etc.).

It is proposed that:

136. Article 17, first par., read: “The name of an order is taken from that of its type family or a synonym of this name, even if illegitimate, and has the ending -ales.”

137. The following be added to the examples of names of orders: “Opuntiales, from *Opuntiaceae* A. Juss., a synonym of *Cactaceae* A. L. Juss.”

138. A provision giving the possibility of conserving names of orders be inserted.

139. Appendix II: To insert in parentheses between the titles “Special provisions concerning fossil plants” and “1. General Principles”: “(See also Preamble, par. 7; Art. 7, Note 5; Rec. 8 D; Art. 13 j; Art. 36, par. 1; Art. 55; App. IV, 6. and 7.)”

Comments: A reference to these provisions dealing with fossil plants would be of advantage to paleobotanists. Experience has shown that these provisions are likely to be overlooked.
140. Proposal for a better arrangement of Arts. PB. 1-PB. 6: (Former Article-number first) PB. 2 = PB. 1; PB. 1 = PB. 5 (amended in accordance with prop. 141); PB. 3 = PB. 3; PB. 6 = PB. 4; Art. 36, par. 1 = PB. 5 (amended in accordance with prop. 142); PB. 4 = PB. 6; PB. 5 = PB. 7 (amended in accordance with prop. 149); Rec. PB. 6A-PB. 6F = Rec. PB. 7A-PB. 7F.

Comments: Art. PB. 2 is the basic rule for the nomenclature of fossil plants; therefore Appendix II should start with this Article.

Arts. PB. 3, PB. 6 and Art. 36, par. 1 deal with conditions and dates of valid publication; Arts. PB. 4 and PB. 5 deal with typification.

We are very much in favour of a reprint of Art. 36, par. 1 in this Appendix; this Article is really a special provision for fossil plants.

141. Article PB. 1 (proposed PB. 2), first sentence, to read: “Since species, and consequently many of the higher taxa of fossil plants are usually based on specimens of detached organs .......”

Comments: Organ-genera and form-genera are not distinguished as taxa by the fact that the names of the species are based on specimens of detached organs .......

142. Article 36, par. 1 (and proposed Art. PB. 5) to read: “A name of a new taxon of fossil plants of specific or lower rank .......”

Comments: This provision apparently refers only to the names of new taxa of fossil plants of the rank of species or below. It is impossible to give an illustration or figure for such taxa as genus, family, order, etc.

143. Article PB. 5 (proposed Art. PB. 7), first sentence to read: “When diagnostic characters are altered or circumscription changed in taxa of fossil plants of specific or lower rank, the type .......”

Comments: Specimens can be only types of taxa of the rank of species or below.

144. To insert as first sentence of Rec. PB. 6A (proposed PB. 7A): “An author describing a new genus of fossil plants should indicate whether it is a genus, organ-genus or form-genus.

An author describing organ-genera ...... established.

It is desirable ...... theca, etc.).”

Comments: This addition would be advisable and very useful in order to avoid later doubts about the nature of the genus concerned. This proposal is based on a suggestion in a letter from Dr. W. Krutzsch, Berlin-Pankow.

145. Article 7, Note 5 and Appendix IV, 7. to read: “The typification of both organ-genera and form-genera based either on plant macrofossils or plant microfossils, of genera of imperfect fungi .......”

Comments: The present wording of Art. 7, Note 5 and App. IV, 7. looks as if “genera based on plant microfossils” belong to a category of genera different from form- and organ-genera. But German paleobotanists, e.g. Kräusel, Potonié, Weyland, are of the opinion that plant microfossils may be assigned either to form- or to organ-genera.

145a. Article 11: In lines 6 and 9, delete the words “validly published”.

Comment: A legitimate name is always validly published.

146. Article 20: The following alteration is proposed: The name of a genus is a substantive in the singular number, or a word treated as such. It may be taken ...... arbitrary manner.

Comment: Names like Aa or Iflogo, which in themselves are only meaningless combinations of letters, hardly belong to any part of speech whatever.

147. Article 32: In the first sentence, delete the words “recent plants”.

Comment: It is a curious fact that the present Code does not contain a general rule that even names of fossil plants must be accompanied by a description in order to be validly published. Art. 36 states indirectly, that this is required for names published on