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PINUS BANKSIANA LAMB.: STILL THE CORRECT NAME OF THE JACK PINE

Argus (in Canad. J. Bot. 49: 573-576. 1971) asserts that the familiar name of the Jack Pine, Pinus banksiana Lamb. must be rejected in favour of P. divaricata (Aiton) Dum. Cours. It is Argus's opinion that the name P. divaricata was first validly published, not in the second edition of Dumont de Courset's 'Le Botaniste Cultivateur' (1811) as commonly supposed, but in the first edition (1802), thus antedating P. banksiana Lamb. (Genus Pinus, 1: 7. 1803).

Whether or not the name P. divaricata (Aiton) Dum. Cours. was validly published in the 1811 edition is arguable, but there can be no doubt that it was not so published in that of 1802, where the entry (l.c., 3: 760, quoted in full): '3...[Pin] à feuilles divergentes. P. divaricata H.K.' is that of a variety (one of five listed under the bold heading 'Variétés') of 'Pin sauvage' (P. sylvestris L.), the first of six species of 'Pins à deux feuilles'. Besides 'Pin sauvage', no. 2 'Pin pinastre' is also treated as having a number of varieties. It is perhaps slightly confusing that arabic numerals are used for both species and varieties (though in the latter case they are indented) and that Dumont de Courset occasionally begins remarks about a variety 'Cet te espèce...' (but only when another author had treated the variety as a species). Nevertheless, the rank Dumont de Courset assigns to the taxa is unequivocal. In the present case it is abundantly clear that he was treating the '[Pin] à feuilles divergentes' as a variety of P. sylvestris, that his citation 'P. divaricata H.K.' was no more than a mistake or abbreviation for P. sylvestris [var.] divaricata, and that he had no intention of changing the rank of the variety or of publishing a new name or combination. (No botanical name at all was quoted for varieties nos. 4 and 5, incidentally). The fact that in the 1811 edition (vol. 6: 457), all these varieties and those of the 'Pin pinastre' are treated as species under the heading 'Affinités', and the numbering altered accordingly, cannot affect the status of the taxa in the 1802 edition.

If the 'P. divaricata' of 1802 is not to be regarded as merely a slip of the pen or an abbreviation, equally it cannot be accepted as a new combination at specific rank since the taxon concerned is not treated as a species by the author himself. It is invalid (cf. ICBN, 1966 edition, Art. 34), and cannot displace the validly published P. banksiana Lamb. (1803).

D. R. HUNT
R.B.G. Kew, Great Britain

NOMENCLATURE PROPOSALS FOR THE LENINGRAD CONGRESS
(1975)

Gandoger: a front-door exit?

This note has been prepared during the latter stages of studies on Gandoger's names of Australian plants. (A paper on these names will be published in the Contributions from the New South Wales National Herbarium).

In submitting this note I feel like the person at a party who has re-opened conversation with a departing unwelcome guest. After reading and considering the papers and the notes referring to Gandogerian nomenclature (Gandoger (1883, Flora Europaeæ, Préface; 1900, 304; 1918, 144), Maiden (1901; 1903), Charbonnel (1927), Willmott (1935), Fuchs (1960), Rothmaler (1962), Stafleu 1967; 1970, 41), Greuter 1968a, 87-96; 1968b) and Moore, Stafleu and Voss (1970, 46) there was a temptation to deal with this subject at length. However, it seems more effective to examine the undisputed parts of Gandoger's nomenclature (examples of them appeared in the Bulletin de la Société Botanique de France) and compare them with the nomenclature of his monumental holographic Flora Europææ 1883-1891.

The following two examples provide short, though adequate, references to the subject. The first is from Bull. Soc. Bot. France 65: 144 (1918) in which Gandoger
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validly published names for several forms of *Helichrysum* (forma and species secondi ordinis here being synonymous). The second paragraph of Examples under Article 24 of the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* illustrates this form of valid publication, and Gandoger's annotations on the labels of the types confirm his intentions. The second example is on page 313 of *Flora Europae* volume 1, in which names are published within the genus *Papaver*. A similarity is evident between the two examples in the presentation of names of species and infraspecific taxa. However, there is an important difference; in the former the rank is defined, whereas in the latter there is no definite indication of the rank of the infraspecific names. Gandoger's work shows a correct sequence of the principal ranks of taxa; this cannot reasonably be disputed. Current decisions to invalidate Gandoger's names through Article 33 (see Moore, Stafleu and Voss, 1970, 46) appear to be inconsistent with the facts.

The combinations (valid according to Art. 33 paragraph 1) published in an undefined supplementary rank in *Flora Europae* are contrary to the requirements of Art. 4, paragraph 2, but the conditions for valid publication of names in Art. 32 (2) do not invalidate the names which fail to comply with this paragraph. (If Art. 35 was applied there would still be confusion, owing to the large number of names involved). The amendment of Art. 32 (2) to include a reference to Arts. 2-5 would eliminate this deficiency. If this was done the second last paragraph of Art. 33 could be deleted. Even if this paragraph was retained and it was still held that Gandoger's names are contrary to Art. 5, they could be invalidated more appropriately under Art. 32, the article dealing with conditions for valid publication. The exception to the requirements of Art. 5 (*Fries, Systema Mycologicum*) could be included under Art. 32 as a Note 4, together with the example of misapplication of terms.

**Proposals**

10.: Amend Art. 32 (2) to read:

(2) have a form which complies with the provisions of Arts. 2-5, 16-27 (but see Art. 18, notes 1, 2 and 3).

11.: Delete the second last paragraph of Art. 33 — "A name . . . . . . . . . . . tribes".

12.: Transfer the last paragraph and Example of Art. 33 to Art. 32 as — Note 4. An exception . . . . . . . . . . section.

13.: Add to Art. 32 under Examples of Names not validly published:

The names first published in Gandoger, *Flora Europae* 1883-1891 are contrary to Art. 4 paragraph 2.
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MAIDEN, J. H. 1901 - Botanic gardens and domain (Report on, for year 1900): 3.


Proposed by: D. J. Mc Gillivray, National Herbarium of New South Wales, Royal Botanic Gardens, Sydney, Australia.

FIVE PROPOSALS BY S. RAUSCHERT

(14) A proposal to delete the words “of the same name” in Article 64 of the Code.

Art. 64 (Note) lautet: “Mere orthographic variants of the same name are treated as homonyms when they are based on different types.” Namen, die auf verschiedene Typen gegründet sind, gelten im Sinne des Codes stets als zwei (oder mehr) Namen, nicht aber als ein Name, nicht als derselbe Name. Verschieden typisierte Namen sind, falls sie einander gleichen, Homonyme, und Homonyme sind zwei (oder mehr) gleichlautende Namen, nicht ein und derselbe Name. Falls geringfügige orthographische Unterschiede vorliegen, handelt es sich bei verschiedenen typisierten Namen um zwei (oder mehr) ähnliche Namen, aber nicht um orthographische Varianten ein und desselben Namens. Es sind allenfalls “orthographic variants of the same name”, doch ist es möglich und wird hiermit vorgeschlagen, den Passus “of the same name” ganz zu tilgen.

Proposed by: S. RAUSCHERT (Halle a.d. Saale), DDR.

(15) Proposed additions to the list of nomina familiarum conservanda (Appendix II of the Code).

Eine Familie, die so umgrenzt ist, dass sie die Gattungen Aster L. und Cichorium L. einschließt, muss gemäß Appendix II Absatz 3 des Codes Cichoriaceae A. L. de Jussieu heissen. Da im Appendix II bei Cichoriaceae kein nomen alternativum angegeben ist, sind die Benennungen Asteraceae bzw. Compositae bei einer solchen taxonomischen Umgrenzung der Familie nicht zulässig. Nur sehr wenige Autoren haben jedoch bisher den Namen Cichoriaceae in diesem weiten Sinne angewandt; vielmehr wurde und wird die so umgrenzte Familie fast stets Compositae Giseke oder Asteraceae Dumortier genannt. Um diese weithin eingebürgerte Benennung zu legitimieren, sollten in Appendix II des Codes folgende drei Zusätze aufgenommen werden:

1. bei Asteraceae ist anzufügen:
   “Note. If this family is united with Cichoriaceae A. L. de Jussieu, Gen. 168. Jul-Aug 1789 (Cichoraceae), the name Asteraceae (Nom. alt.: Compositae) must be used.”

2. bei Cichoriaceae ist anzufügen:
   “Note. If this family is united with Asteraceae Dumortier, Commentat. 55. 1822 (Asteraceae) (Nom. alt.: Compositae), the name Cichoriaceae is rejected in favour of Asteraceae (Nom. alt.: Compositae)"

3. bei Compositae ist anzufügen:
   “Note. If this family is united with Cichoriaceae A. L. de Jussieu, Gen. 168. Jul-Aug 1789 (Cichoraceae), the name Compositae (Nom. alt.: Asteraceae) must be used.”

Proposed by: S. RAUSCHERT (Halle a.d. Saale), DDR.

(16) A proposal to emend Article 18 of the Code.

In Artikel 18 Anmerkung 3 ist der Schlusszusatz zu streichen und an seine Stelle
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