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Botanical taxonomic nomenclature has, in my opinion, three fundamental aims:

1) To become a technical means of understanding between taxonomists.

2) To make possible the avoidance of ambiguity of taxonomic names.

3) To stabilize botanic nomenclature.

4) To preserve and stabilize the nomenclature now mostly used, and, on the other hand,

5) To legitimise the exhumation of forgotten names.

The Rules valid at present have, during the last decades, become a complicated Code full of traps, exceptions and conditions, so that instead of being a technical expedient, they have become a self-contained formal science. This, of course, is the reason why such a great number of botanists are not inclined to keep to the Rules, even if they admit their necessity. To gain for the Rules the greatest possible acceptance among botanists, and, no doubt, this is their aim, it will be necessary to adjust the Rules gradually, so as to make them:

a) As simple and comprehensible as possible, making possible a quick orientation with regard to nomenclatural problems.

b) Such that the nomenclature of taxa decided upon by the Rules should tax the memory of the taxonomists as little as possible and require little mental work, as the taxonomist's full interest must be devoted to taxonomic problems, and he must not be troubled with the difficult solution of nomenclatural problems.

It will therefore be necessary to stabilize through typification and conservation the greatest possible number of names of species and genera, especially in the case of useful plants and of nomenclatural types, and it will be necessary to make automatic the nomenclature of taxa above the rank of genus (through standardization of nomenclatural types and through consistent derivation of names of taxa above the rank of genus from the correct name of the nomenclatural standard).

At this point I should like to discuss the proposal put forward by Mr. A. A. Bullock, whose very meritorious and very carefully compiled list of the families of Spermatophyta is the basis for the nomenclature of this group.

I warmly agree with the reasons for the discussion of the names of families, but, in my opinion, one cannot accept the continued authorisation of the exceptions to Article 18 of the Code only because we have been used to using some names formed in a different way.

Just as in the case of taxa of lower rank it is necessary to cite the author when giving precise names to families, as in this taxonomic rank a different breadth of the "family" is more frequent than is the case with taxa of the rank of species or genus. From this precise designation the character of the family will be clearly visible (through the name derived from the name of the standard) and also their range (through the author's name). Only within the frame work of a certain character and range is it possible to consider priority of name, and it will therefore be necessary to accept as starting-point only such a basic work as will make it possible to give a precise circumscription to the family by containing all genera of the world's flora. There are, indisputably, only three works of this kind: Bentham and Hooker's Genera Plantarum, the Pflanzenfamilien, and Dalla-Torre et Harms Genera Siphonogamarum (this last one only for Spermatophyta). As these authors accepted comparatively large families, their names will be valid only for such large concepts, and later changes with regard to range of family will have to be denoted by means of the name of the respective author. I consider it superfluous to use in such a case long and complicated nomenclatural formulae, as for example Saxifragaceae [(A. L. Jussieu "Saxifragae",) D.C. in Lam.] emend. Tachtadz to indicate that, because of its ending, Jussieu's name did not accord with Article 18, but his concept of the family is much larger than Tachtadzian's. To avoid such complicated nomenclature, but to state also the precise range of the family at the same time, there is no other solution than that suggested by A. A. Bullock: to issue a complete list of families, in which, however, contrary to his proposal, also the names of the authors
of the various ranges of concept of each family will be included (insofar as they can be precisely derived from the cited work).

The names of families have not been formed uniformly and I have not been able to propagate with sufficient energy the forming of names of families by one single method, from the standard names, in the sense of the proposal of Ponce de Leon and Alvarez (Taxon 2: 96. 1953, 3: 53. 1954). In this way full automatization will be achieved with regard to names of families, and the unnecessary burden on the memory of taxonomists will be removed. Today it may seem impossible to replace customary names like Cruciferae, Compositae, Labiatae etc. I am, however, convinced that it is a matter of only a few years before names formed in full accord with the rules will be fully accepted.

In the first edition of my book “The Flora of Czechoslovakia (Dostal: Květena Csr. 1948-1950) I consistently used names of families derived from the valid name of the standard — and in five years these names had been accepted by a majority of botanists in Czechoslovakia, and the younger generation no longer uses the traditional names even in colloquial language. The only objection was made by pedagogues, who quite rightly pointed out that the czechisized names of the largest families were not suitable for practical teaching (Asteraceae, Amiaceae), because they were derived from little known genera. It would therefore be necessary in the above-mentioned list to determine also standards for the names of families in the sense of the proposal worked out by Sprague (1928), i.e. to use as standards for the names of families only the correct names of the most widespread genera whose character is most in keeping with the character of the families, and simultaneously to carry out the standardization of this generic name (to avoid in future the occurrence of such confusion as occurs in the case of Fabaceae versus Viciaeae).

With regard to endings it is today an accepted presumption that the ending -aceae should be added to the grammatical stem of the standard name. Old names formed by a different method should no longer be used, and, insofar as it is necessary to cite their authors, a method of citation should be decided upon, e.g. Sparganiaceae C. H. Schulz 1832 corr. J. G. Agardh. 1858, or by some other suitable method.

I think that today, after the very meritorious publication of a register of genera, it will be possible to suggest a complete list of families of all classes of plants, and so to introduce order into this branch. I am convinced that the new names formed in accordance with the rules (i.e. not necessitating any exceptions) will be fully accepted very soon, and in a few years those unsuitable names will be eliminated just as the names of orders not in accordance with the rules have been (Contortae, Parietales, Scitamineae etc.).

I therefore suggest that:

259. Article 18 should be retained, but the words “or of a synonym of this name, even if illegitimate” should be omitted, and the whole Note 2 should be deleted. Also:

260. Article 19 should be retained, but the words “or of a synonym” should be omitted.

It cannot be expected than any proposal aiming at the normalization of names of families will be accepted without any objection, as on this point more than anywhere else conservatism and custom will prevail, leading to objections to the stabilization of some still unusual names.

I should like to add to the list of names of families, contained in A. A. Bullock’s proposal, the following notes and supplements:

261. I suggest the inclusion among nomina rejicienda propoista of (besides A. A. Bullock’s proposal) the following families, because their names have not been derived from correct standard names:

Acornaceae Link 1829. — T. Atractylys.
Alsinaceae Lam. et DC. 1805. — T. Arenaria.
Alsodieaceae J. G. Agardh 1858. — T. Rinorea.
Balsaminaceae DC. 1824. — T. Impatiens.
Barteriaceae Martius 1835. — T. Paraqueiba.
Botryodendraceae J. G. Agardh 1858. — T. Meryta.
Buchlandiaceae J. G. Agardh 1858. — T. Exbucklandia.
Buglossaceae Hoffms. et Link 1809. — T. Anchusa.
Cardiopteridaceae Blume 1847. — T. Pipterigium.
Castaneaceae Link 1821. — T. Aesculus.
Compositae Gaertn. 1791. — T. Aster.
Dulongiaceae J. G. Agardh 1858. — T. Phyllonoma.
Freinontiaceae A. G. Agardh 1858. — T. Freumontodendron.
Grossulariaceae Lam. et DC. — T. Ribes.
Henslowiaceae Lindley 1836. — T. Crypteronia.
Hewardiaceae Nakai 1943. — T. Isophysis.
Himantandraceae Diels 1917. — T. Galbulimima (insofar as the hitherto more frequently used name Himantandra F. Muell. ex Diels is not protected).
Lippagaceae Meisner 1836-1843. — T. Dentella.
Lowiaceae Ridley 1924. — T. Orchidanthus.
Lupulaceae Lindley 1831. — T. Humulus.
Nhandirobaceae A. St. Hilaire 1822. — T. Fevilia.
Ochranthaceae (Lindl. 1836). — T. Turpinia.
Patrisiaceae Martius 1835. — T. Ryania.
Podoaceae Franchet 1889. — T. Dobinea.
Pyrolaceae → Pterolaceae.
Roxburghiaceae Wallich 1832. — T. Stehena.
Spielmanniaceae J. G. Agardh 1858. — T. Ofria.
Staticaceae S. F. Gray 1821. — T. Limonium.
Stilaginaceae C. A. Agardh 1825. — T. Antidesma.
Thesidaceae Salisbury 1856. — T. Brodiaea.
Treubellaceae van Tighem 1897. — T. Treubana.
Winteraceae Lindley 1836. — T. Pseudo-wintera.

To retain this name, or even to conserve it, would mean that botanists would have to remember in which family the name has been derived from the valid name of the nomenclatural type, and in which case it has been derived from a synonym, which I consider absolutely unnecessary for botanical science.

262. A. A. Bullock's list contains many names of families that are to be included in the list of nomina rejicienda, or are to be considered illegitimate. Insofar as these names have been derived from their nomenclatural type, I do not think it correct to propose their elimination, even if they were published later than the names of the same families derived from synonyms of their nomenclatural types, or formed by other methods. They are:

Daucaceae Dostal 1949. — T. Daucus L. — The name of this family, hitherto currently named Umbelliferae, has a very varied nomenclature as to the name derived from
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the standard. The International Code (1952) App. VA lists the name Ammiaceae according to V. H. Camp's proposal: Syn. Propos. Stockholm: the probable author of this name is C. B. Presl, and the standard is Ammi L. — A. A. Bullock's proposal mentions Apiaceae Lind. 1836, based upon the standard Apium L. — I do not think it right that the small, and rather little known genus Ammi should be the nomenclatural type for one of the most widely spread families. The name Apiaceae formed as early as 1836 and used in “Pflanzenfamilien” (3/8 : 63) by Drude as the first synonym, is, indisputably, more fitting. If, however, a standardization of the names of families should be undertaken, then I suggest (because of the present inconstancy) the name Daucaceae with the type Daucus L., as this genus is very numerous, widely spread (also secondarily) all over the world (perhaps with the exception of South-America), it is commonly known all over the world as a useful plant, it has all the characteristic features of the family and has no other properties that might cause its separation into a self-contained family in future. Even though nomenclature should be governed by no other considerations than priority and validity of publication, I am of the opinion that, in the case of current names and widely spread families included in the curriculum taught in schools, we must consider also the practical use of the names of families, so as to achieve the greatest possible recognition of the Rules of nomenclature. For these reasons I consider it unnecessary to look for a new, common, suitable name for this family.

Dichapetalaceae Baillon in Martius 1883. — T. Dichapetalum Thouars — vs. Chailletiaceae R. Br. in Tuckey 1818.


Picrodocaceae vs. Pyrolaceae.


NEW COMBINATIONS IN MOSSES I

R. van der Wijk et W. D. Margadant (Groningen)

In compiling the Index Muscorum the authors discovered that many names of mosses were invalid or illegitimate. In most cases these names should be replaced by new combinations. However, the authors are of the opinion that the publication of new names should be limited to those cases where it is necessary to cite the new name in synonymy elsewhere in the Index.

The reason why these new combinations are published here in advance is that Art. 32 of the Code states that a new combination published after 1 Jan. 1935 is only validly published if it is accompanied by a full