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PROPOSALS FOR TREATMENT OF FUNGUS FAMILY NAMES WITH VERNACULAR TERMINATIONS

Ronald H. Petersen

Summary

Family names with vernacular terminations are discussed, especially as they relate to fungi, and changes in Art. 18, Note 2 and Art. 19, Note 2 and two new notes are proposed.

The helpful summary paper on family names for fungi by Cooke & Hawksworth (1970) came complete with its own questions and issues. Chief among these was a request for redefinition of Art. 18, Note 2, and Art. 32 of the Code (Lanjouw, et al., 1966, the Code then prevailing). These passages appeared to partially contradict each other, and allowed too wide a latitude for interpretation. Cooke & Hawksworth raised the problem as follows:

"The treatment of [fungal family] names published with German or French rather than Latin terminations present difficulties. Such names may be treated as not validly published under Art. 32(2) because they do not have a form which complies with Art. 18. Nevertheless they have Latin stems and it is usually only the terminations which require alteration and Art. 18, Note 2, permits family names with incorrect Latinized terminations to be corrected. This problem is not, however, specifically mentioned in the Code, as a result of which two distinct attitudes have been adopted recently: (1) to treat these as valid and correct the orthography without altering the citation (e.g. Singer, 1911, 1962; Gould, 1962; Pegler, 1966), or (2) to treat them as dating only from when they were given a Latinized termination even if the Latinized termination was not the correct one (e.g. Lanjouw, et al. 1966, pp. 209-225; Donk, 1964). The latter point of view is taken in the list of 'Nomina Familiarum Conservanda' in the Code but appears to be undesirable in the fungi as (a) such names were taken as valid by later authors last century (e.g. the names published with French terminations by Fée (1824-25) were taken as valid by Dumortier (1829) and Körber (1853), and (b) it affects the original dates of publication of about 114 fungal and lichen family names many of which are well established and would otherwise have to be rejected or proposed as nomina conservanda. We consider that it would be premature to take the latter attitude here and that this problem should be discussed first by the Committee for Fungi and Lichens of the Nomenclature Section of the International Botanical Congress and a more definite ruling made. The former view is therefore adopted here and users of the list should bear this problem in mind." [pp. 4-5]

The Code

From the earliest codification of nomenclatural principles (cf. Arts. 21-22 of de Candolle's Lois, and Arts. 21-22 of the Vienna Code), concern has been expressed over the formation of family names, including both the stem of the name ("Orders [including the concept of family] . . . are designated by the name of one of their genera . . ." Lois, Art. 21), and the termination of the name (". . . with the final aceae." ibid.) The concept remained almost untouched for many years, with the first serious proposal dealing with changes in terminations made at the Utrecht Conference in 1950. This proposal is important in that it sets the stage for subsequent considerations of changes in terminations: the proposal itself dealt only with a single very restricted point, as follows:

"The following note to Art. 24 [Cambridge Code, dealing with subfamilial names] proposed by Dr. Rickett is accepted: "Note: When names of the above taxa have been published with improper terminations, as -eae for a subfamily, -oideae for a tribe, the
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ending should be changed to accord with the rule, without change of authority; if, however, the rank of the taxon is changed by a later author, he is then cited as authority for the name, with the appropriate ending, in the usual way.” (Utrecht Conference report, under Art. 23)

This note was duly added verbatim to the appropriate article (Art. 29, Stockholm Code, which was later to become Art. 19, Paris and subsequent), and remains in the Seattle Code as Art. 19, Note 2. It was obviously never intended to cover the problem of vernacular terminations of family names, and by its obvious lack of intent in this area, becomes very important to this discussion.

No such clearcut history may be found for the similar note under Art. 18 (Seattle Code). Presumably, having applied the concept to a single nomenclatural rank (subfamily), the following editorial committee felt that the principle should be applied to other nomenclatural ranks covered in the Code, and in the subsequent Code (Paris), the concept is echoed (although surely not repeated) as Art. 18, Note 1: “When a name of a family has been published with an improper termination, the ending must be changed to accord with the rule, without change of author’s name.” With the wording very similar to that under Art. 19 (Paris), I conclude that the motives for both notes were identical, and that the addition of Art. 18, Note 1 (Paris) was made to bring that article into conformity with Art. 19, Note. In short, neither of these passages was ever intended to deal with vernacular terminations, and any discussion of vernacular terminations must be taken as totally separate from them, and essentially as new ground for cultivation.

It is important to note that the change in language from the Paris Code (“When a name of a family has been published with an improper termination . . .”) to the Edinburgh Code (“When a name of a family has been published with an improper Latin termination . . .”) is entirely consistent with the purpose of the original proposal, which dealt only with Latin terminations inappropriate for accepted nomenclatural ranks. In fact, the language of the Seattle Code, identical with that of the Paris Code, would seem a step backward, made for tradition’s sake. But to misinterpret Art. 18, Note 2 (Seattle) as having any bearing on vernacular terminations would be to do its spirit injustice.

If Art. 18, Note 2 (Seattle) appears to have been born of Art. 19, Note, then the meaning of Art. 32 (Seattle) becomes clearer. Brummitt (1969: 55) clearly stated his intention by first invoking the prevailing language of Art. 18, Note 2 (Edinburgh) (“. . . published with an improper Latin termination . . .”), then went on as follows: “But no comparable statement is anywhere made for names of any ranks other than that of family.” Next, a situation was cited entirely within the spirit of Art. 18, Note 2, and Art.19, Note (which was apparently overlooked by Brummitt), but dealing with a subsection name and therefore not formally covered by Art. 18, Note 2. To relieve this predicament, Brummitt proposed the addition of a note to Art. 32 (Edinburgh), the intention of which would be to apply the principle of Art. 18, Note 2 to all names. Again, there was no apparent intention to deal with vernacular terminations, but quite the contrary. Moreover, the very last part of Brummitt’s proposal, to eliminate Art. 18, Note 2, went unheeded, and that passage was left in the Seattle Code, but with its language changed.

In summary, the forerunner of Art. 19, Note 2, was adopted to apply only to a very restricted situation, not bearing on vernacular terminations of family names. The forerunner of Art. 18, Note 2, appears to have been born directly from Art. 19, Note 2, and Art. 32, Note 1 is a direct descendent from Art. 18, Note 2. None of these passages treats vernacular terminations in any sense.

But if this is so, then the answer to Cooke & Hawksworth’s request means plowing new ground, and apparently not only framing new proposals for addition to the Code, but rephrasing present passages to eliminate such misinterpretation.
Stems of Family Names

Unlike the latitude for interpretation of passages regarding family name terminations, the rules and recommendations concerning family name stems are quite clear, and little or no controversy has been forthcoming. From the Lois to the present, family names have been formed from the name of one of their genera, and the type genus has been designated specifically as the basis for the stem. Certain exceptions to this principle have been allowed, but these are not germane to this discussion. In short, family names not based on generic stems are not to be considered validly published, and this principle has been adhered to without apparent exception.

The argument could be advanced that family names, even constructed from a genus-name stem but without Latin termination, are not scientific names, and thus are not admissible under Principle V of the Code ("Scientific names of taxonomic groups are treated as Latin regardless of their derivation."). But the Principle does not specify Latin scientific names (if it did, then the point of the Principle would be lost), but only scientific names. It could be rebutted that if family names constructed from genus-name stems are scientific, they must be treated as Latin, including their terminations, under direction of Principle V.

Thus there even enters the question of the distinction between vernacular and scientific family names. A glance through handbooks of fungi in German, for instance, indicates three distinct forms for family names: a) Latin (Clavariaceae, Thelephoraceae, Phallaceae, Sarcoscyphaceae, Stemonitaceae); b) Latinized stem formed from genus name but with German termination (Clavariaceen, Thelephoraceen, Phallaceen, Sarcoscyphaceen, Stemonitaceen), and c) German common name (Keulen- or Korallpenilze, Erdwarzenpilze, Gitterpilze, Kelchbecherlinge. Padenstaüblinge). The first two categories are clearly scientific names, in opposition to the latter, vulgar names. Although similar, because French is a Romance language, the common name is etymologically closer to the scientific name (Boletaceae, Cantharellaceae; Boletacées, Cantharellacées; les bolets, les chanterelles). No such problem occurs in English, where very few vernacular names have been coined for fungus families. It appears obvious that two forms of scientific names occur in German and French, differing only in their terminations, but not in the intent of their scientific import.

Solutions

It would appear that two solutions would respond to the request of Cooke & Hawksworth.

First; a glance at Appendix II, Nomina Familiarum Conservanda, of the Code reveals that taxonomists working with higher plants have dealt with this or a similar problem by conserving numerous family names from the date of first Latin termination, but with obvious reference to the original vernacularly-terminated name. Examples of this procedure are as follows:

(2). Loasaceae Dumortier, Commentat. 58. 1822 ("Loaseae") [C. Sprengel, Anleit. ed. 2. 2(2): 347. 31 Mar 1818 ("Loaseen")].

Similar procedures might be adopted by mycologists. Taxonomists of higher plants have gone one step further, however, in using these lists for citation of family names with correct Latin terminations, with reference to the original name with incorrect Latin termination. Under the Code, such a procedure seems superfluous, for the articles cited above specifically were intended to alleviate this situation without resorting to conservation.

Second; appropriate passages in the Code might be changed so that family names based on suitable generic names, but with vernacular terms, might be Latinized and brought into accord with the rules, without change of author
or loss of priority. Additions to at least Art. 18 and 19, and perhaps other articles not dealing with particular subfamilial ranks would be needed so as to allow such procedures, but to continue exclusion of family names based on vernacular stems.

Based on the request from Cooke & Hawksworth, the Special Committee for Fungi and Lichens has been polled, and the responses predictably sort into the two categories just outlined. Moreover, opinion is almost evenly divided, making a judgement all the more difficult. Finally, to make matters even worse, Cooke & Hawksworth did not frame their request in the form of a single proposal, which could have been duly processed, and an affirmative or negative vote obtained. Instead, unless a new, single proposal is formulated, discussion need not continue outside the Committee, and resolution of the problem need not come at this time. Thus, as Secretary for the Committee, I feel obliged to formulate such a proposal for consideration.

In a search for the correct alternative, one is inevitable led to the library, for it is comforting to have the weight of history’s consensus on one’s side. In this case, such a search is eminently frustrating, for without question, most authoritative mycological monographic literature skirts the issue by listing families without authors, or in some cases by listing families as “Fungiaceae auct.,” or “Fungiaceae auct. ss Doe,” etc. Thus the number of publications which treat family names in such a way as to be germane to this discussion is very, very few. Of those readily available (in my personal library), I find that Donk (1964) and Lundquist (1972) specifically outlaw family names with vernacular terminations in favor of the earliest appropriate name with Latinized termination. Conversely, Singer (1962), Benjamin (1959), and Pegler (1966) specifically cite family names in such a way as to Latinize vernacular endings on family names based on generic names. Some other authors (Patouillard, Kühner & Romagnesi, Malencon & Bertault, Bourdot & Galzin), obviously intending to use names at the family rank (by explicitly stating so), employ vernacular endings in the monographic work itself (even though, in most instances, Latinized terminations are utilized for subfamilial ranks). So, in a quick library search, neither alternative is able to claim the authority of “common usage.”

Ultimately, I am disposed to propose that for the fungi, the importance of the termination is secondary to the correct formation of the stem of the family name, and is secondary also to the intent of the author in his attempt to define or to propose a name to represent a distinct, well-stated nomenclatural rank. In order to allow acceptance of family names with Latin stems but vernacular terminations, however, it is necessary to change the Code in at least two places; namely, Art. 18 and 19. These proposals are made as follows.

Proposal 39: Art. 18, Note 2: Change to read as follows: “When a name of a family has been published with an improper Latin termination, the termination is to be changed to conform with the rule, without change of the author’s name.”

Proposal 40: Add as new note under Art. 18 the following: “In the fungi, a family name based on a validly published genus, but with vernacular termination, is to be accepted as though latinized, and its termination changed to conform with the rule, with priority from its original publication.

Examples: 1) The family name “Piptocephalideen” Brefeld. 1872. was accepted as Piptocephalidaceae Brefeld. 1872. by Benjamin (Aliso 4: 334. 1959).
2) The family “Tricholomées” Roze. 1876. was accepted as Tricholomataceae Roze. 1876. by Singer (Agar. Mod. Taxonomy, 2nd Ed.: 200. 1962.)

Proposal 41: Art. 19, Note 2: Change the wording from “…with an improper termination…” to “…with an improper Latin termination…”

Proposal 42: Add as new note under Art. 19: “In the fungi, a subfamily or tribe name based on a validly published genus, but with vernacular termination, is to be accepted as though Latinized, and its termination changed to conform with the rule, with priority from its original publication.
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These proposals hopefully would have the following effects. First; by purposefully stating the intent of Art. 18, Note 2, and Art. 19, Note 2, to deal only with improper Latin terminations, the possibility for misinterpretation is closed. Second; the new notes retain major emphasis on the stem of the name rather than its termination. By introducing these new notes with an additional mention of the rank concerned (mention of rank begins each article as well), it may be hoped that names whose stems might be construed as conforming to the rule, but whose rank was not specifically stated by the original author, would not be accepted. Such treatment would be in accord with Art. 35, but hopefully would be considered retroactive. Third; the way is left open for conservation of later names, including the original name but with changed sense, over the Latinized scientific name acceptable under the proposed new notes. The reciprocal action (conservation of the genus stem name with vernacular termination over later names) appears to be prohibited at this time, as indicated by the manner in which such names are treated in the list of Nomina Familiarum Conservanda. Hence the way is clear for the elimination of names which, when adopted under the proposed new notes, cause confusion or materially change the prevailing taxonomy of the group. Fourth; by acceptance of these proposed new notes, the publication by Cooke & Hawksworth (1970) becomes an authoritative listing for over 100 family names whose acceptability is in doubt at this time. If the proposed new notes are not adopted, then these numerous family names must be considered illegitimate as listed by Cooke & Hawksworth, and a new listing of references for the Latinized versions of these names must be generated.

By explicitly limiting the new notes to the fungi, it may be hoped that taxonomists in other groups will not feel their traditions threatened, especially the history of conservation in such cases by taxonomists of spermatophytes. Conversely, if taxonomists of other groups wish to discuss these proposals and broaden their scope, appropriate measures may be taken at or before the coming Congress, or afterward by the Editorial Committee.
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ON THE COMPOSITION OF SYSTEMATIC NAMES. A PROPOSAL

Jan Jansonius*

Proposal 43: – To delete the ninth paragraph of Art. 73: “The use of a wrong connecting vowel or vowels (or the omission of a connecting vowel) in a name or an epithet is treated as an orthographic error (see Rec. 73G)”.

Discussion – In Art. 20 the ICBN allows a generic or subgeneric name to be taken from any source whatever, or even to be composed in an absolutely arbitrary manner. Art. 23 again allows a specific epithet to be taken from any source, or to be composed arbitrarily.
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