



Neotypes

Author(s): David B. Dunn

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Jan., 1960), pp. 27-28

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1217355>

Accessed: 29/03/2014 09:38

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>

jedoch unter ihrer '*Torula basicola*' das Chlamydosporenstadium des später als *Thielaviopsis basicola* bekanntgewordenen Pilzes. Der Name *Thielavia basicola* Zopf (non *Torula basicola* B. et Br.) ist demnach gültig für die Ascomycetenspecies, die zudem Gattungstypus sein muss; *Torula basicola* B. et Br. darf nicht einbezogen werden (Code intern. Nom. Bot. 1956, Art. 59)."

It is just the other way! If *Thielavia basicola* and *Thielaviopsis basicola* were treated as conspecific, i.e. as members of one and the same pleomorphic life cycle, the former name would be quite valid, as stated by the Code (Ed. 1956, Art. 59; Ed. 1952, Art. 69; Ed. 1947, Art. 57).

Thus, the arguments of Härril are unacceptable, and the only correct name for the fungus known formerly as *Thielavia basicola* is *Thielavia renominata*.

Literature cited:

HÄRRIL, E. 1959: Physiologische Untersuchungen über die Gattungen *Thielavia* Zopf und *Thielaviopsis* Went. *Phytopathol. Z.* 36: 27-66.

PACLT, J. 1951: A nomenclatorial discussion of *Thielavia basicola*. *Parasitica* 7: 109-110.

J. PACLT

THE SPELLING OF BOOPHANE

The name of one of William Herbert's Amaryllidaceous genera '*Boophane*' is seen spelled in four different ways. Therefore, it seems advisable to review the situation in order to arrive at the legally correct spelling.

Boophane: Herbert (A Treatise on Amaryllidaceae) p. 17, 1821. (Appendix, Edward's Botanical Register, vol. 6).

In this work only the one spelling is used and it is accompanied by a full description and synonymy of the taxon. No derivation of the name is given.

Buphane: Herbert, in Curtis' Botanical Magazine, sub. t. 2578, 1825.

In a brief discussion of certain Amaryllidaceous genera following a description of *Brunsvigia josephinae* v. *josephine* (t. 2578) Herbert states in part, "*Buphane* (*Boophane*, Appendix) forms a link between Amaryllis and Haemanthus."

Buphone: Herbert, in Curtis' Botanical Magazine, post t. 2606 sub. Amaryllidearum Synopsis, 1825.

The genus does not appear in the index of the volume.

Buphane: Herbert, Amaryllidaceae, pp. 239-241, 1837.

The above spelling is used consistently in this volume, appearing on pp. 61, 77, 385, 390, 392 and on plate 22 as well as the pages cited above. No derivation or other spelling is mentioned.

Marloth (Flora of South Africa, 4: 115, 1915) accepted the spelling *Buphane* postulating it was derived from *Bupho* = toad.

Milne-Redhead and Schweickerdt (A new conception of the genus *Ammocharis* Herb.) in Journ. Linn. Soc. Lond. 52: 162 (footnote). 1939, accept Wittstein's (Etymol. Bot. Handwörterbuch, p. 131. 1856) derivation of the genus name from *Boûs* = ox and *oun* = murder. This was based on the fact that *B. toxicaria* is known to be fatal to horned cattle. They further state, "Herbert in 1821 spelt the name '*Boophane*' which in view of the above is clearly an error for '*Boophone*,'" and that Herbert in 1825 changed the spelling to '*Buphone*'. On the basis of this, Milne-Redhead and Schweickerdt conclude that the correct spelling is '*Boophone*'. Thus they accept Herbert's supposed correction of '*phane*' to '*phone*', but reject his change of '*boo*' to '*bu*' because of the derivation.

It is true that in 1825 Herbert once spelled the name *Buphone*, but subsequently he used the spelling *Buphane* consistently. This suggests that *Buphone* may well have been a typographical error.

I have discussed the situation with G. H. M. Lawrence and we presented the problem to F. A. Stafleu. Dr. Stafleu is of the opinion that, since there is no clear proof that the original spelling, *Boophane*, is an orthographic or typographic error, neither the change to *Buphane* nor that to *Boophone* can be justified under the present Code of Nomenclature, and that the original spelling must stand.

D. G. HUTTLESTON

NEOTYPES

In view of the confusion which followed a rather warm discussion of Prop. H. (155 — Bullock et Ross, Taxon 7: 258) for Article 7 at the IXth International Botanical Congress at Montreal, Canada, it seems appropriate to attempt to review some of the consequences which would result from the adoption of this proposal to delete neotypes, leaving only the descriptions as types when the original material could no longer be found.

I must first acknowledge that I have done exactly what Bullock and Ross suggest i.e.

use the description and an illustration as the type when it was impossible to locate the type material. This was done in determining the identity of the taxon *Lupinus ornatus* (see *Leaflets of Western Botany* 8: 52. 1956). I did point out that the material of *L. helleriae* was representative material and amounted to a topotype (i.e. from the original type locality). In this particular case the illustration in Edwards Botanical Register and the accompanying description are exceptionally good and are almost as good as an actual specimen. Original descriptions seldom have such excellent illustrations. The description alone would not have been sufficient to verify the identity of the taxon.

Even with the excellent colored illustrations in the Botanical Magazine, unless the illustration and description are those which first describe the taxon, there is no assurance that they represent the material a different author used when he supplied the original description for a taxon.

I might cite the mass of "species" described by C. P. Smith in *Species Lupinorum*, which, without specimens, would be impossible to identify even though he supplied elaborate latin descriptions. Smith was for the most part describing variations of individual plants sent to him without picking out characteristics which could be used to identify species. His shotgun approach of scattering names on plants undoubtedly placed some names on taxa which require a name but to attempt to unravel this maze without specimens would be impossible and where specimens cannot be found there will probably be names which will have to be rejected as provided in the present rules. I believe this same problem could arise as much of the "protologue" with the types of species wear out with time and use.

In short it is quite conceivable that it would eventually be necessary for monographers to designate neotypes for many old long established names and if we are to achieve stabilization of names we must certainly have a means of maintaining material considered to typify these taxa. If not, there would be a gradual and continual loss of the oldest and longest established names as the "protologue" disintegrated in time.

In short, I view the idea of deleting the term neotype as casting a shadow on the entire type method of verifying taxa. It goes without saying that neotypes should not be designated without extreme care and the present rules provide that such are only

acceptable so long as the material used originally in describing the taxon is missing. Article 8 in the 1956 International Code quite adequately takes care of any abusive use of either neotypes or lectotypes.

DAVID B. DUNN

NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN

Dr. WILLIAM C. STEERE, Director of The New York Botanical Garden, has been notified by Dr. ALAN T. WATERMAN, Director of the National Science Foundation, that the Garden has been awarded a grant of \$ 145,400 for the support of a plant survey of the Guiana Region of South America under the direction of Dr. BASSETT MAGUIRE, Head Curator and Coordinator of Tropical Research, and Dr. JOHN J. WURDACK, Associate Curator. The grant, which will be five years in duration, became effective July first of this year.

The New York Botanical Garden also received a National Science Foundation grant of \$ 20,100 of three years' duration, for the support of basic research on monographic studies in the Hypocreales (Ascomycetes) under the direction of Dr. CLARK T. ROGERSON, Curator of Cryptogamic Botany. The Hypocreales are higher fungi related to the mushrooms.

The third grant to the Garden — \$ 6,000 for one year — is for the support of basic research on the characterization of causal agents in the crown-gall of plants and is under the direction of Dr. RICHARD M. KLEIN. Dr. Klein, who is a plant physiologist, holds the Alfred H. Caspary Curatorship at The New York Botanical Garden.

EXCHANGE OF PUBLICATIONS

The Federal Herbarium (SRGH), Salisbury, Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland has been struggling for a number of years to improve its collection of taxonomic works. Its staff is now doing its best to help with the writing of the Flora Zambesica and the lack of botanical literature is creating more difficulties than ever. Efforts to remedy this state of affairs are being made by the purchase, as well as the manufacture on the spot, of microfilm and the purchase of books in the normal way.

Many other herbaria in the less developed countries of the world must be in a similar state but perhaps there are members of I.A.P.T., both personal and institutional, who could help us if they knew what our require-