



Our Corpus and Carrpos

Author(s): J. Proskauer

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 10, No. 6 (Jul. - Aug., 1961), pp. 155-156

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1216002>

Accessed: 29/03/2014 09:24

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>

OUR CORPUS AND CARRPOS*

J. Proskauer (Berkeley, Calif.)

Some five years ago Professor J. D. Carr (Belfast) described a new liverwort, belonging to the Marchantiales, from Australia. The name he chose for it has raised a number of questions concerning interpretation of our Code, and the lack of certain provisions in it. I am currently preparing a manuscript on the morphology of the plant for publication elsewhere, but wish to take up the nomenclatural matters here.

Carrpos nomen genericum novum.

Basionym: *Monocarpus* Carr, Australian Journal of Botany 4: 176, 1956; non *Monocarpus* Post et Kuntze, Lexicon generum phanerogamarum, p. 372, 1903 (= *Monocarpia* Miquel).

Type species: *Carrpos sphaerocarpus* (Carr) comb. et corr. nov. (*Monocarpus sphaerocarpus* Carr, loc. cit.).

The new generic name honors Professor and Mrs. J. D. Carr. It is arbitrarily formed and carries masculine gender. Its stem is *Carrp-*. The specific epithet, according to Prof. Carr (in litt., 21. vi. 61), is a noun used in apposition, viz., the generic name *Sphaerocarpus* Boehmer, in Ludwig.

a) Is *Monocarpus* Carr a later homonym? The actual entry by Post and Kuntze (loc. cit.) reads, in the alphabetical sequence of their "Lexicon":

"*Monocarpia* Miq. corr. = us
Monocarpus Miq. 1865/6, Anonaceae"

The name adopted by them was *Monocarpus*. What they intended and thought they had done was to produce merely a correction of Miquel's name. The reason for their actions can be seen by reference to Articles 11b and 5b of their "Codex brevis maturus", bound in the same work. This was a draft code, to be submitted to the International Botanical Congress in Vienna. What is relevant is what they actually did under our Code. I hold that they validly published a new name, *Monocarpus* Post et Kuntze, which however is illegitimate as being unnecessary, but has to be considered for purposes of homonymy. Valid publication, not legitimacy, is what counts. The basionym citation would seem to be sufficient. Especially relevant is the example of *Rubia* and *Rubus* as different names under Art. 75, 1956 Code. Drs. Papenfuss, Silva, and Stafleu concur in this opinion.

The other possibility would be to interpret the *Monocarpus* of Post and Kuntze as a mere orthographic variant of *Monocarpia* Miquel, and not as a new name. The trouble with this argument is simply that if one *Monocarpus* is an orthographic variant of *Monocarpia*, another is also, whether based on the same type or not. (The manipulation of a patently different name as not a new name somehow savors more of theological than nomenclatural dialectics.) If a name is very similar to another based on the same type, the two are to be treated as "mere orthographic variants" and not as "homonyms" (implied passim in Arts. 64, 75), a very useful provision as regards priority, but one which by no sleight of hand can undo the actual valid existence of such a variant. If *Monocarpus* as used by Post and Kuntze is a variant of *Monocarpia* Miquel, then *Monocarpus* Carr is a later homonym of a validly published variant of *Monocarpia* Miquel. It is just as dead this way round. In a closely

*) Written during the tenure of NSF grant G-8701.

comparable case, that of *Tripteris*, this second interpretation has recently been advanced by Rickett and Stafleu (Taxon 9: 158, 1960) as the argument for rescinding an effective conservation as unnecessary. I consider this highly dubious, especially as Dr. Stafleu (in litt.) has stated the opinion that Thunberg very probably intentionally, rather than accidentally, corrected the Linnean name *Triopteris*.

b) The epithet "*sphaerocarpus* Carr" must, may, or may not, be corrected to "*sphaerocarpos*"? Article 73 can be construed to support any one of these contentions. The epithet is a noun in apposition, standing for the generic name *Sphaerocarpos* [Micheli] Boehmer, in Ludwig, thus spelled correctly mercifully both by priority (the validating author) and etymology. For fifty years it has been so written on this side of the Atlantic, while European authors in general have persisted to use the incorrect version "*Sphaerocarpus*". The latter also was used by Prof. Carr, presumably owing to unfamiliarity with provisions of the Code. Used as a generic name, the spelling *Sphaerocarpos* alone can prevail. Logic would have it that this same generic name when used as a substantive epithet may also only be spelled in this one correct manner. Otherwise we end up with the ridiculous situation that even in the same sentence the generic name has to be spelled one way and a substantive epithet standing for that generic name has to be spelled slightly differently. Art. 73 is ambiguous and should be modified to clarify this situation, which was clearly not contemplated. In the liverworts, apart from *Thallocarpus* Lindberg, generally in synonymy these days, we can forget about the *-carpus/-carpos* problem, for as I have been pointing out, luckily Corda wrote *Ricciocarpos* when he erected that genus.

Summary

Monocarpus sphaerocarpus Carr is renamed *Carrpos sphaerocarpos*. Certain aspects of the homonym rule are discussed. Attention is drawn to the lack of provisions in the Code concerning the correctability of generic names when used as substantive epithets.

CONTRIBUTION A L'ETUDE MONOGRAPHIQUE DU GENRE *Bombax* s. l.

II. LA TYPIFICATION DE *B. Ceiba* L.

André Robyns (Bruxelles)

Dans le *Species Plantarum* (1753, pp. 511—512), Linné classe sous le nom générique de *Bombax* L., trois espèces: *B. Ceiba* L., *B. pentandrum* L. et *B. religiosum* L. *B. pentandrum* fut transféré en 1791 par Gaertner dans le genre *Ceiba* Gaertn., sous l'appellation *C. pentandra* (L.) Gaertn., tandis que *B. religiosum* devint, en 1931, *Cochlospermum religiosum* (L.) Alston. Seul *B. Ceiba* reste inclus dans le genre *Bombax* L. et cette espèce doit donc typifier le genre, contrairement à la proposition de M. L. Green (2) (voir p. 157).

L'interprétation et la typification de *B. Ceiba*, fondamentales pour la délimitation du genre *Bombax* L., ont donné lieu à controverse, l'espèce étant considérée par certains comme asiatique et par d'autres, de loin les plus nombreux, comme américaine.

Pour élucider cette question, il y a lieu d'étudier le texte original de Linné, ainsi que tous les autres documents bibliographiques qui s'y rapportent.