Proposals by C. Váczy, Cluj
Author(s): Cluj C. Váczy
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 23, No. 5/6 (Nov., 1974), pp. 872-876
Published by: International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1218458
Accessed: 13/04/2014 09:30

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

This content downloaded from 212.238.43.46 on Sun, 13 Apr 2014 09:30:50 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

PROPOSALS BY C. VÁCZY, CLUJ

Proposal 127. for a new title:
..a. International Code of General Botanical Nomenclature, or
..b. International Code of Fundamental Botanical Nomenclature, or
..c. International Code of Idiotaxonomical Nomenclature of Plants.

Justification: The old name of the Code (1867) is incongruous and obsolete. At present we have:
International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria,
International Code of Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants,
Sooner or later will appear the International Code of Syntaxonomical (Geobotanical) Nomenclature.

All these are 'special botanical Codes', but based on the old International Code of Botanical Nomenclature as a 'general' or 'fundamental' Code.

Proposal 128. Principle II: The application of names of individual taxonomic groups is determined by means of nomenclatural types, except in specified cases.

Justification: This principle is not general in application, but restricted (see proposal for changing of the title, the Preamble, Art. 16, and the reasons for exceptions formulated at Principles IV and VI).

Proposal 128a. Principle III: The nomenclature of an individual taxonomic group is based upon priority of publication, except in specified cases.

Justification: See the justification under Principle II above and the provisions of Art. 11, 14, 16.

Proposal 129. Article 6: Note 1. In this Code, unless otherwise indicated, the word 'name' means generally a name that has been validly published, whether it is legitimate or illegitimate, but it refers particularly to the uninominal names for taxa of higher rank than species. The word 'epithet' (specific or infraspecific) means the second term applied in the names of all species and infraspecific taxa, connected with a generic name and mostly according grammatically with the later.

Examples: Asteraceae (a family name), *Hieracium* (a generic name), subgen. *Pilosella* sect. *Pilosellina* (name of a subgenus and sectio), *Hieracium* (a generic name) *hoppeanum* (specific epithet) ssp. *multisetum* var. *testimoniale* f. *parcipilum* (infraspecific epithets).

Justification: It is necessary and has practical usefulness to clearly distinguish a 'name' of general concept, on one hand, from the 'special' ones of higher taxa, and the 'epithets' of specific and infraspecific taxa, on the other hand. This distinction arises implicitly from the Code (see Art. 23 'Name of the genus [and] specific epithet;' Art. 24 in note; Art. 45 lines 1, 2; Art. 55; Art. 62, 'Rejection of names and epithets,' etc.). It would be desirable to consider the subdivisional taxa of the genus (see Art. 21) not as epithets, but as names (e.g. name of subgenus, name of sectio etc.) and to use this distinction with uniformity in the whole Code.

Proposal 130. Article 6, Note 2: Examples of simple combinations: *Gentiana lutea* . . .

In the case of a genus and below, 'combination' includes transfer (ascendent or descendent) of taxa with a change of rank (see Art. 49, 60), called *vertical transfer;* collateral transfer by subordination to another taxon (see Art. 54, 55, 56) without change of rank, called *horizontal transfer*; and horizontal transfer followed by change of rank, called *vertical-horizontal transfer.*

Examples of vertical transfer: *Stenanthium* (A. Gray 1837 pro sect.) Kunth 1843, nom. gen. cons.; *Lolium temulentum* L. var. *arvense* (With. 1796 as *L. arvense*) Bab. 1843.

Example of horizontal transfer: *Glyceria maxima* (Hartm. 1820 as *Molinia maxima*) Holmberg 1919.

Example of horizontal-vertical transfer: *Gymnadenia conopea* L. var. *densiflora* (Wahlb. 1806 as *Orchis densiflora*) Fried 1851.

Justification: These possibilities of combinations are implicity comprised in Art. 55 lines 1, 2; Art. 56 lines 1, 2; Rec. 60A (2, 3), etc.; and in the genera combinations from the Appendix III nr. 567, 957, 1315 etc.

This content downloaded from 212.238.43.46 on Sun, 13 Apr 2014 09:30:50 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Proposal 131. Article 6 (at the end): 'New combination' (comb. nova) means only the combination when first published.

Justification: This specification is necessary for the purpose of an obligatory indication of the basionym (Art. 33, 49), but such indications are not obligatory in later citations.

Proposal 132. Section 2. Typification*: *See Guide for the determination of types (p. 75) (therefore footnotes are not necessary on pag. 19, 20).

Justification: This note is valid for the whole section on typification.

Proposal 133. Article 7: After neotypus, the definition of paratypus (footnote p. 76) should be added.

Justification: All terms of typification should be treated together.

Proposal 134. Article 20: The name of a genus is a substantive in the singular number, or a word treated as such; however it cannot have the standardized terminations provided in Art. 16-19 and 21. It may be taken . . .

Proposal 135. Recommendation 20A: (k) to avoid the terminations used in syntaxonomy for systematic categories, as: -etea, -etalia, -ion, -etum, -etosum, etc., e.g. *Glochidion, Combretum,* as well as the terminations of names used for cultivated plants, as: -ara (see Art. 16 Code of Cult. Plants).

Proposal 136. Article 23: Add after paragraph 5: The specific epithet, when adjectival in form but used as a substantive (particularly in the cases of early generic names) does not agree grammatically with the generic name.

Examples: *Aesculus hippocastanum* L., *Allium victorialis* L., *Andropogon ischaemum* L., *Delphinium consolida* L., *Ruscus hypoglossum* L., *Sedum rosea* (L.) Scop. (all these epithets are old generic names).

Proposal 137. Add at the end of (3) after the word 'employed': .. Such as in the cases of the names created by J. E. Gilibert (Fl. Lith. 1781, Exerc. Phyt. 1792), Ph. Miller (The Gard. Dict. ed. IV abridged, 1754), J. G. Kramer (Elench. Veg. 1756), J. Hill (Brit. Herb., 1756).

Justification: The addition of this specification is necessary and useful because the high frequency with which such epithets are used by botanists.

Proposal 138. Recommendation 32B: Should be treated as an Article and included as Note 5 of Art. 32: In the Latin description or diagnosis of a new taxon published on or after 1 Jan. 1976, the characters in which the taxon differs from its allies, and particularly from the type of the next higher taxon, must be printed in italics.

Justification: As a Recommendation it almost has no efficiency; as an Article it requires emphasizing the new distinctive characters, helping the work of the taxonomists to avoid confusion and creation of unjustified new taxa.

Proposal 139. Section 4. General recommendations on citation*: Add as footnote: * See Guide to the Citation of Botanical Literature (p. 77).

Justification: This reference has a general worth for the whole section.

Proposal 140. Article 73: I propose to strike out the statement concerning *Fagus sylvatica* L., which should be handled as Recommendation 73J as follows:

'Recommendation 73J: For the sake of uniformity in writing of some epithets, botanists should agree on the following suggestions:

silvestris and *silvaticus,* not *sylvestris* and *sylvaticus* (including Linné's epithets too), e.g. *Fagus silvatica* L.

littoralis, not *litoralis,* e.g. *Corrigiola littoralis* L.

laevis, not *levis,* e.g. *Aster laevis* L.

caeruleus, not *coeruleus,* e.g. *Passiflora caerulea* L.

When such epithets are used in the citation of synonym, the original writing should be applied.

Justification: It is a permanent difficulty and source of errors for botanists to write

This content downloaded from 212.238.43.46 on Sun, 13 Apr 2014 09:30:50 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

the above-mentioned epithets. It is not justified why one should make an exception for Linné's plant names, when we should use in the case of all other authors 'i' instead of 'y' (*silvaticus*, not *sylvaticus*). This exception unnecessarily obliges botanists to keep in mind all 25 species of Linné which have the '*sylvestris*' or '*sylvaticus*' epithets. The Code should avoid such difficulties as stated in Preamble: 'Botany requires a precise and simple system of nomenclature used by botanists in all countries.. The purpose of giving a name to a taxonomic group is not to indicate its.. history..'

In a similar way, Linné used '*littoralis*' (with double 't', excepting one case, *Corrigiola litoralis* L.), or '*laevis*' (not *levis*) and '*caeruleus*' (not *coeruleus*).

Proposal 141. Recommendation 75A: Generic plant names (simple or compound, vernacular or new creations), preferably of Greek or Latin origin, should be in Latin or have latinized endings and their gender should be treated grammatically in accordance with the rules of the Latin language. Generally, it is desirable for generic names of plants to have feminine endings.

In the establishment of the correct grammatical gender of plant names of Greek or Latin origin, one should have in view the following principles:

I. *Vernacular Greek plant names:*

1) adopted with *unaltered writing and ending*,

a) *when the grammatical gender used by the ancients* was consistent, the original gender should be retained.

Examples: *Erigeron* L. (Th. HP VII. 8, CP I. 27, Diosc. IV. 92, Pliny XXVI. 15 'erigeron', -ontos, consistently masculine), Linné, indicating the feminine gender, has failed and this must be corrected to masculine; *Hemerocallis* L. ('hemerokalles', -eas is neuter by Th. HP VI. 1 and by Pliny XXI, 10, 21, but 'hemerokallis', -idos is feminine by Dios. III. 128), firstly used by Linné (Crit. bot. 1751, p. 274) as feminine and then (Sp. Pl. 1753, p. 324) wrongly considered as masculine, therefore it should be corrected to feminine; *Nuphar* Sm. ('nouphas' neuter at Aristotle Pl. 2.4, 7, but 'nouphar' neuter at Diosc. III. 149), Smith wrongly changed its gender into feminine and it must be corrected to neuter; *Onosma* L. ('onosma', -matos consistently neuter at Diosc. III. 38 and Pliny XXVII. 12), correctly used by Linné as neuter and cannot be corrected to feminine (he osme, feminine); it is different in the case of *Camphorosma* L., a new-creation, to which Linné freely attributed the feminine gender; *Phyteuma* L. ('phyteuma', -matos consistently neuter at Diosc. IV. 125 and Pliny XXVII, 12), incorrectly used by Linné as feminine (*Phyteuma*, -ae) and therefore must be corrected to neuter; *Sicyos* L. ('sicyos', -ou, constantly masculine at Th. HP VII. 6 and Diosc. IV. 149), therefore Linné's feminine gender must be corrected to masculine.

b) *when the grammatical gender by the ancients was doubtful* (inconsistently used) one should adopt the grammatical gender chosen by the author of the generic name, or if he has failed to indicate it, the choice of the next subsequent author should be accepted.

Examples: *Diospyros* L. ('diospyros', -ou masculine at Th. HP III. 13 and Pliny XXVII. 11, but 'diospyron', -ou neuter at other old authors), the choice of the feminine gender of Linné must be followed; *Strychnos* L. ('strychnos', -ou masculine at Th. HP VII. 4, 15 and Pliny XXVII. 18, 'strychnon', -ou neuter at Diosc. IV. 71, but 'strychnos', -ou feminine at other old authors), Linné's choice of the feminine gender must be followed.

2) adopted *with altered writing and ending*, should be given the gender corresponding to the Latin ending; in a doubtful case, the gender indicated by the author of the generic name should be preferred, but if he has failed to indicate epithets with clear genders, the choice of the next subsequent author who assigned them consistent grammatical gender must be followed.

Examples: *Atriplex* L. ('andraphaxis' at Th. HP VII. 1, 'atraphaxis' at Diosc. II. 110, 'atriplex' Colum. RR375 feminine and by Pliny XX. 20 neuter); Linné has given it the feminine gender and must be followed. *Dictamnus* L. ('diktamon' neuter at Arist., Hipp., Th. HP 16, but 'diktamnos' feminine at Diosc. III. 33 and 'dictamnum' neuter at Pliny XXV. 8); Linné adopted the writing of Dioscorides, giving it the masculine ending, and therefore the choice of Linné for masculine must be followed. *Hyssopus* L. ('hyssopos' feminine at Diosc. III. 27, 'Hyssopon' neuter at Gal., and 'hyssopum' neuter at Pliny XXVI, 7, 8); Linné's choice of the masculine gender in accordance with the indicated ending must be followed.

This content downloaded from 212.238.43.46 on Sun, 13 Apr 2014 09:30:50 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

II. *Old or modern plant names*, simple or compound, formed from Greek or Latin words.

1) when the word or the last component *has a substantival ending and acceptance*, generally should take the grammatical gender of the last.

Besides the names ending in *-us, -os* (excepting the woody plants, which are feminine), *-er*, etc., the frequently used following terminations should be considered as *masculine*: -calyx (-ykos), -codon (-onos), -geron (-ontos), -geton, -geiton (-onos), -myces (-etos), -odon (-ontos), -pogon (-onos), pus (podos), -siphon (-onos), -stemon (-onos) etc.: besides the names ending in *-a* (-ae), *-ma* (-ae), *-is, -ys, -as, -e, -es*, etc. the following should be considered as *feminine*: *-achne* (-es), *-ago, -igo, -ugo* (-inis), *-chlamys* (-ydos), *-chloa, -chloe* (-es), daphne (-es), *-mecon* (-onos), *-odes, -oides* (-idis), *-ops* (opos), *-opsis* (-eos), *-osma* (-ae), *-osme* (-es), *-thrix, -trichis, -triche* (-es), *-tricha*, -ia (-ae) etc.; besides the names ending in *-um, -ium, -on*, etc., the frequently used following terminations in *-ma* (-matos) (excepting those modern compounds ending in *-ma* (-ae), which are however considered by the author of their generic names as feminine), should be considered as *neuter*: *-chasma* (-matos), *-derma* (-matos), *-desma* (-matos), *-lema* (-matos), *-loma* (-matos), *-nema* (-matos), *-osma* (-matos), *-phragma* (-matos), *-sema* (-matos), *-soma* (-matos), *-sperma* (-matos), *-stema* (-matos), *-stemma* (-matos), *-stigma* (-matos), *-stoma* (-matos) etc.

2) when the last component part *has an adjectival ending and acceptance*, should have the grammatical gender in accordance with the ending of the last word; those with a single (unchangeable) ending should take the gender assigned to them by their author, and when the author has failed to do it, the choice of the next subsequent author should be accepted.

Examples for the most frequent cases: [will be supplied by author to Editorial Committee, here omitted for reasons of economy. Ed.]

III. *Simple Latin adjectives* as generic plant names, in accordance with the ending, should be given the gender assigned to them by their authors and if the latter has failed to indicate it the next subsequent author may choose a gender and this choice should be respected.

Examples: *Convolvulus* L. (masculine), *Fluviatilis* Mich. (feminine), *Fontinalis* L. (feminine), *Terminalia* L. (feminine), etc.

IV. Names of persons, organs, etc. *changing their original meaning and becoming plant names*, should have the grammatical gender attributed by the author of their generic name, or if he has failed to indicate it, the next subsequent author may choose a gender and his choice should be accepted.

Examples: *Adonis* L. (after the name of the legendary personage Adonis, masculine noun); as a plant name Linné gave it the feminine gender. *Tagetes* L. (after the name of the God Tages, -etis, masculine noun); as a plant name Linné treated it as feminine. *Orchis* L. (testicle, masculine noun); Linné gave it the feminine gender in botany. *Stachys* L. (ear of wheat, masculine noun as plant organ); as plant name at Diosc. III. 111 and by Linné is a feminine noun.

V. *Arbitrarily formed* generic plant names, having *neither Greek nor Latin origin*, without Greek or Latin endings, should take the grammatical gender assigned by the author of the generic name, and where he has failed to indicate it, the choice of the next author should be followed.

Examples: *Agati* Adans. 1763 (a malabarian name, for which Adanson did not indicate the gender); the choice of the first author (Desvaux 1813), who assigned the feminine gender, must be followed. *Muscari* Mill. 1754, validly published as a genus and in 1768 with validly published neuter species; *Taonabo* Aubl. 1775 (a guianan name) has had from the beginning the feminine gender, that must be followed.

VI. *Generalized custom* may provide exceptions which should be followed.

Justification: Recommendations regarding the grammatical gender of generic names may propound their regulation not only for the future, they may settle the solution of these problems too, that have often remained doubtful or dim, because of a more than 200 years old nomenclatural practice. A much broader solution than the Code 1972 is all the more necessary, as one meet abundant heterogenities in the grammatical gender of

This content downloaded from 212.238.43.46 on Sun, 13 Apr 2014 09:30:50 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

several generic names in modern botanical literature. Another reason is the diversity of conceptions, that affects negatively the nomenclature used in syntaxonomy – however still uncodified –, where the correct genitive form of the name (in accordance with the correct grammatical gender) causes uncertainty and heterogenity.

Based on a great many generic plant names, both superior and inferior, having several concrete examples for the cases enumerated in our proposals here, we have drawn up these detailed recommendations, hoping they would be able to explain more easily and clearly to those botanists who have such problems.

Preparing these recommendations, we have had in view the following points:
– to remain in accordance both with the tendency of Rec. 75A (Code 1972) and the practice used in the past,
– to find easier possibilities to establish the correct grammatical gender, placing the names into one of the prescriptions included in these recommendations,
– to continue the Latin grammatical tendency in these solutions,
– to maintain the grammatical gender of those plant names having consistent grammatical gender in the ancient literature, which had been assumed in their unalterable forms, to avoid their too artificial and undesirable alteration,
– we must make difference between the second substantival compound of the name, that often is used as an adjective with 3, 2 or a single invariable form for all the grammatical genders.

Proposal 142. Appendix III: Nomina generica conservanda et rejicienda
468b Schoenoplectus (Rchb. 1846 pro sect.) Palla . . . 1888. 1119. Maianthemum Web. in Wigg. Prim. Fl. Hols. 1780 . . .

Justification: Cf. Pritzel, Thesaurus p. 341: 'Dissertationem die 29 Martii 1780 sub praesidio J. Chr. Kerstens proposuit Fr. H. Wiggers, sed autorem se professus est cl. G. H. Weber'.

VARIOUS PROPOSALS

Proposal 143. Art. 13, new paragraph e bis: '*Fungi: Ascomycetes.* 31 Dec. 1822. (Fries, Systema Mycologicum vol. 2, part 1). Syst. Mycol. 2, part 2, is treated as having appeared on Jan. 1, 1823.'

The nomenclature of the 'Fungi caeteri' is complicated by unique difficulties. Valid publication of those names begins January 1, 1821, which also is the arbitrarily fixed publishing date for Systema Mycologicum, vol. 1. But, alas, the major part of the Fungi caeteri are not treated in that volume, viz. the Phycomycetes, most Ascomycetes, and the Imperfecti. As a matter of fact, these large and important groups are in reality devoid of a starting-point book, in contrast to all other groups of plants. This situation has very annoying consequences for the workers on the fungi concerned – we have extraordinary trouble in ascertaining the place and date of valid publication of pre-starting-point names, i.e. the first valid publication after Jan. 1, 1821. We are charged with the heavy burden of scanning a great number of often very obscure and rare books, which have attained quite disproportionate importance only because of being published in the early 1820's. Even very peripheral papers must be considered, as the mere mention of a pre-starting-point name can constitute valid publication (Art. 32, Note 2). And even if we theoretically could get a complete inventory of all publications from that period mentioning a fungus name, we still be confronted with unsurmountable dating problems. To take one example: *Sphaeria concentrica* Bolton is a well-known Pyrenomycete. Where is the name validly published? In the Seattle Code, p. 256, the validation is ascribed to S. F. Gray (A Natural Arrangement of British Plants, Nov. 1, 1821). But the name was also published by Fries in the same year, in his exsiccata *Scleromyceti Sueciae*, as No. 141, *in sched.* Nobody can tell whether Fries's validation was anterior or posterior to Gray's. There are no doubt numerous cases like this, something which is highly unsatisfactory, for a validated name must by typified in accordance with the protologue of the validating author. This state of affairs means in short that an enormous amount of precious time is wasted on scanning old literature – which to a great extent is mycologically irrelevant – and that these efforts nevertheless may be in vain, for often we have to bow before unsolvable problems of chronology.

This content downloaded from 212.238.43.46 on Sun, 13 Apr 2014 09:30:50 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions