ceae 1814 und Caesalpiniaeaeae 1814 vs. Fabaceae 1836. Proposal (15) sollte daher durch eine allgemeine Regel ersetzt werden.

Im jetzigen Code gibt es nirgends (weder im Art. 18 noch in App. II) eine allgemeine Vorschrift, daß ein durch Art. 18 Note 3 autorisierter Alternativname (z.B. Compositae 1792) bei Konkurrenz mit einem anderen, ebenfalls in App. II konservierten Namen (z.B. mit Cichoriaceae 1789) diesem letzteren gegenüber geschützt ist, obwohl dies wünschenswert erscheint und ich nicht daran zweifele, daß ein solcher Schutz sowohl vom Unterausschuß für Familien- namen als vom Herausgeberausschuß beabsichtigt ist. Diese Absicht muß jedoch im Text des Codes zum Ausdruck kommen, und dies ist bisher nicht der Fall. Alle in App. II konservierten Familiennamen sind gleichberechtigt, die Alternativnamen genießen keinerlei Sonderschutz, und bei Konkurrenz zwischen zwei in App. II konservierten Namen entscheidet — wenn nicht im Einzelfall das Gegenteil vorgeschrieben ist — lediglich die Priorität. Denn die allgemeine Vorschrift im jetzigen Code lautet (App. II Abs. 3): “When two listed names compete, the earlier must be retained, unless . . . an alternative name authorized in Art. 18 note 3 is employed.”, und das heißt, auf das Beispiel Cichoriaceae angewandt: Wenn der Name Cichoriaceae 1789 mit Asteraeaeae 1822 (bzw. Compositae 1792) konkurriert, muß der Name Cichoriaceae als der älteste behalten werden, falls nicht einer der beiden Alternativnamen angewendet wird. Die Konjunktion “unless” (“falls nicht”) bringt nun aber nach den Regeln der Logik und Grammatik nichts weiter als ein konditionales Satzgefüge zum Ausdruck, das heißt, sie schreibt nur vor, was einerseits zu geschehen hat, falls ein Alternativname angewendet wird, und was anderseits zu geschehen hat, falls er nicht angewendet wird (im letzteren Falle muß der ältere Name Cichoriaceae beibehalten werden). Der Konditionalsatz schreibt aber — und das ist das Entscheidende — nicht vor, daß ein Alternativname angewendet werden muß. Vielmehr läßt er die Möglichkeit offen, für die Gesamt familie, die die beiden Typusgattungen Cichorium und Aster umschließt, auch den Namen Cichoriaceae anzuwenden. Der jetzige Wortlaut des Codes gibt hier keine eindeutige Vorschrift zur Ermittlung des korrekten Namens und kann daher keine Einheitlichkeit in der Nomenklatur sichern. Keine Bestimmung des jetzigen Codes verpflichtet, einen Alternativnamen anzuwenden, wenn ein älterer Name existiert. Eine solche verbindliche Vorschrift wird in allgemein gültiger Form erst durch die Annahme des hier vorgelegten Proposals gegeben. Mit seiner Publikation ist Proposal (15) widerrufen.

“EMENDATION” IN ALGAL TAXONOMY

Jiří Komárek*

Summary

The expression emendatio is used in different senses in algal taxonomy. Some examples are analysed. The expression emendatio is used in connection with authors cited after the Latin name in two cases: (i) when completing the diagnosis (“inclusive typo”), or (ii) upon a misinterpretation of nomenclatural types. The citation of both cases is well provided for in other Articles of the Code and the use of the expression emendatio is therefore superfluous. In connection with this proposals are made to change some Recommendations of the Code.

The expressions emendatio, emendavit, etc. are generally applied in the taxonomy of algae in connection with the correction of the diagnoses of species and genera. If such a correction is to be expressed in the citation of a taxon, the
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abbreviation *emend.*, followed by the name of the emending author, is appended to the name of the original author. The cases which occur in the algological literature can be divided into three categories:

**Completion of the diagnosis**

Example: The genus *Aphanotoce* was described by Nägeli in 1849 (Gatt. einzell. Algen, p. 59-60). Even though its diagnosis is not quite precise (as is the case with most of the genera described in the last century), it can clearly be identified according to the original diagnosis and the included drawings. Elenkin gave a more precise diagnosis in 1934 (Sov. Botanika, p. 78) pointing out the distinctive feature of the elongated cells and their crosswise division. In 1938 (Monografia alg. cyanoph. URSS, pars spec. 1: 146), he included the species *A. elabens* (Brév.) Elenk. (formerly *Microcystis elabens* Brév. in Kütz. 1845) in the genus *Aphanotoce* on the basis of the more precise generic characteristics. Since then the genus has been quoted in several papers (i.e., p. 141, 1938; Hollerbach et al., Opredelitel presnov. vodorosl. SSSR 2: 79, 1933; and others) as “*Aphanotoce* (Näg.) Elenk. emend.”

In this case the original diagnosis (“inclusive typo”) is completed by characteristics that had not been included originally. At the same time the genus is extended by a further species on the basis of the more precise diagnosis. The citation of Elenkin’s name after the name of the genus is not justified and is against the Code (Art. 47). There is no boundary between a “greater” and a “smaller” completion of the diagnosis; to be consistent we must consider every paper which deals in detail with an earlier genus or species, or every description of an added subordinate taxon, as a completion and extension of the diagnosis of the higher taxonomic unit. The names of taxa “completed” in this way must be cited only with the name of the original author (Code, Art. 47).

**Revision of later material**

Example: Perty (Zur Kenntnis kleinst. Lebensg., 128 p., 1851) described the flagellate *Mallomonas acaroides*. The description and the drawings are not clear and do not inform us precisely about the species dealt with (Fott, Preslia 34: 72-77, 1962). Iwanoff (Bull. Acad. imp. Pétersbourg, 11: 247-262, 1899) found stable characteristics in *Mallomonas* (namely the shape and the structure of the silicious scales). He used the name “*Mallomonas acaroides* Perty” to designate the species which he defined with precision from the newly recorded characteristics. However, he studied them on his own material, not on Perty’s nomenclatural type. Perty’s drawing represents a species which might be identified with the species revised by Iwanoff, but this cannot be proved. Fott (l.c.p. 72-79, 1962) uses the name “*Mallomonas acaroides* Perty emend. Iwanoff”.

In cases such as the above we encounter either a new revised, concept (in this case that of Iwanoff) of the new material “exclusive typo” (without any guarantee that it is the same species) or a misinterpretation by the later author, who used the previously published name for a species which did not correspond to the original (sometimes not precisely defined) nomenclatural type (*nomen dubium*). An author, not wanting to describe a new species, often intentionally identifies his finding with the name of a former, unclearly described species or genus adding a more precise and unequivocal description. This “error” (either intended or non-intended) is then cited in later papers, particularly when there is no type material at hand and the later author gives an unambiguous description, as in the above-mentioned case.

In the sense of the Code (Art. 7) no older names should be used for taxa that have been revised on the basis of later material, without using the original nomenclatural type. This case, however, is very frequent in algology, when the original type material does not exist or when its deposition is unknown or virtually inaccessible. Example: *Raphidium braunit* Näg. sensu Chodat 1897 (non sensu Näg.) = *Ankistrodesmus stipitatus* (Chod.) Kom.-Legn. 1969.

Authors should avoid such designations. Cases in which the name of the taxon
revised in this way is correct are relatively rare, since they are usually contrary to the Code, Art. 11 and 47 to 48. It may happen occasionally that the new author changes the diagnostic features but uses for typification the type material of the original author; see for instance Komářková-Legnerová Stud. in Phycol., Praha, p. 90, 1969: Ankiastrodesmus fusiformis Corda sensu Korš. 1953. However, it is often necessary to quote later conceptions and errors in the synonymy.

In this case it is not a mere correction of the original nomenclatural type; neither does the word emendation truly describe the changes made. We, therefore, propose in such cases to add to the name of the original author (and to the citation of his paper, respectively) the name of the new author preceded by the expression sensu (e.g., “Mallomonas acaroides Perty sensu Iwanoff Bull. Acad. imp. Pétersbourg 11: 249, 1849”, or abbreviated “Mallomonas acaroides sensu Iwanoff 1849” i.e. excluding the name of the original author). The priority of a taxon thus understood should be valid from the date of the new author’s publication. Subordinate taxa of an earlier date should be recombined in accordance with the newly chosen (designated) nomenclatural type (as in later conserved generic names).

Alteration of the diagnostic features

Example: In 1845 Kützing described the genus Raphidium (Phycol. germ., p. 144), which was based mainly on the shape of its long, spindle-like cells. The diagnosis also contained several incorrect data which can now be explained (e.g., the connection of cells, which is a stage of the releasing autospores). The genus based on Kützing’s conception (shape of the cells) had no priority and was, therefore, put into synonymy with the genus Ankiastrodesmus Corda 1838. Legnerová performed the revision of both genera including their types (Preslia 37: 1-8, 1965) and found two taxonomically different groups of species which had the value of independent genera, on the basis of entirely new diagnostic features; these had not been mentioned by Kützing (the process of the formation of autospores and their release, the unicellular mode of life without the formation of colonies). It was not possible to deduce from Kützing’s iconotype whether his original material had the newly defined diagnostic features or to which of the two groups the original Raphidium belonged; nevertheless, Legnerová acknowledged the genus Raphidium Kütz., redefined its diagnostic features and gave it the designation “Raphidium, emend. Legnerová”.

This case happens mainly in taxa which had been described at a time when the authors had only primitive facilities for their study. They found, often by intuition, a new, justified taxon; however, they defined it by means of diagnostic features which were obvious but taxonomically worthless. It may be that such a genus or species is valid, but was in reality based on unstable features, and this has not been cleared up until a later revision.

During such a revision and alteration of the diagnostic features of the original nomenclatural type, the merit of both the first and the later author is evident. In taxonomic practice, however, these cases can always be identified as either a completion of the diagnosis (inclusive typo) or a misinterpretation. Thus, in these cases any citation of the authors with the expression emendatio is not justified.

Conclusion

When a taxon is corrected or emended with inclusion of the type it is superfluous to cite the name of the emending author after the name of the taxon (and so is the use of the expression emendatio).

Proposals

Proposal 54: change the Recommendation 47A of the Code as follows: “When the alteration mentioned in Art. 47 has been considerable, the nature of the change and the author responsible should be indicated by adding such words, abbreviated where suitable, as mutatis characteribus (mut. char.), pro parte (p.p.), exclusio generi or
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exclusis generibus (excl. gen.), exclusa specie or exclusis specibus (excl. sp.), exclusa varietate or exclusis varietatibus (excl. var.), sensu ampio (s. ampl.), sensu stricto (s. str.), inclusive (incl.), etc. Such a note with the citation of the author’s name has the character of a literary quotation and should not be connected with the preceding name of a taxon in the sense of Art. 46.”

In taxonomic studies it is often necessary to quote errors and misinterpretations, especially in citing synonymy. In these cases some ambiguous citations can be cleared up in taxonomic practice by the use of the expression sensu; therefore it should be useful to include it in the Code as an independent recommendation (to Art. 46) as follows:

Proposal 55: “When it is necessary to cite a misinterpretation exclusive of the type, the name of the responsible author should be placed after the name of the original author, using the word sensu. In this case, priority is connected with the date of publication of the misinterpretation.”

The author expresses his thanks to Dr. J. Holub (Praha) and Dr. J. Růžička (Písek) for their critical remarks.

PROPOSALS TO THE LENINGRAD CONGRESS ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF HYBRIDS

These proposals from various sources have been assembled by P. F. Yeo, as Secretary of the Committee for Hybrids [University Botanic Garden, Cambridge, G.B.] A first and a second draft were circulated to the members of the committee and some others, several of whom have provided helpful comments and suggestions. Nevertheless, the proposals cannot be said to represent the collective view of the committee, and direct opposition by anyone who has seen the proposals is indicated here where necessary.

Proposals which seem to be of a mainly editorial nature have been put last.

Proposals for Changes in Appendix I

ARTICLE H. 4

This article rules that certain designations used for hybrids are considered to be formulae and not true epithets. The epithet davimottiae in the Example to H. 6 is composed of two epithets with the ending of one, and the beginning of the other, removed. The wording of H. 4 line 2 (“with the ending of only one epithet changed”) would therefore appear to apply to davimottiae, yet surely such compounds are epithets and not formulae? The matter can be set right by changing the position of the word “only”. An example of a similar epithet in which the ending of one is changed and the other is unaltered is found in Acaena xanserovina (anserinifolia × ovina), but here again, this is surely an epithet, not a formula. The kind of change of ending which the Code has in mind is clearly shown by the example of Verbascum nigro-lychnitis, where the stem is intact. In Article 73 the part of an epithet after the stem is called a termination. The following alteration to H. 4 is proposed (opposed by E. L. Little on the ground that proposal 3, or failing that, proposal 4, is preferable).

Proposal 1[56]. Art. H. 4, line 2, alter the clause between commas to read: or with only the termination of one epithet changed.

Proposal 2[57]. Add to the examples: The following names include true epithets: Acaena xanserovina Orchard (from anserinifolia and ovina), Micromeria xebenthamineolens Svent. (from benthamii and pineoleons).

There are, however, disadvantages in recognizing any of these compounds as epithets. If it proves that there was a mistake about the parentage, or if a name-change affects the parents, they become misleading. Examples are Narcissus
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