Did Linnaeus Ever Indicate a Type?
Author(s): M. Guédès
Reviewed work(s):
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (Feb., 1978), pp. 128-129
Published by: International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1220512
Accessed: 15/08/2012 04:57

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

BONNER, C. E. B. 1966 – Index Hepaticarum, Pars VI: Goebeliella to Jubula. Lehre.
FULFORD, M. 1976 – Manual of the Leafy Hepaticae of Latin America – Part IV. Memoirs New York Bot. Gard. 11: 393-535.
HODGSON, E. A. 1943 – A review of the New Zealand species of the genus Chiloscyphus. Trans. Roy. Soc. New Zeal. 73: 27-52.
INOUE, H. 1974 – Illustrations of Japanese Hepaticae. I. Tokio.
SCHIFFNER, V. 1910 – Über die Gattungen Chiloscyphus und Heteroscyphus n. gen. Österr. Bot. Zeitschr. 60: 169-173.
STAFLEU, F. A. (ed.) 1972 – International Code of Botanical Nomenclature. Regnum Veg. 82: 1-426.
STEPHANI, F. 1906-1908 – Species Hepaticarum [Chiloscyphus] 3: 196-263. Genf.
TREVISAN, V. 1877 – Schema di una nuova classificazione delle epatiche. Memorie Real. Istit. Lombardo Sci. Lett., Cl. Mat. Nat., Ser. 3, 4: 383-451.
Proposed by: R. Grolle, Jena, DDR.

(443) **Orchis latifolia**, *nomen rejiciendum propositum.*
At Leningrad, Article 69 was changed (TAXON 24, p. 226, art. 69) to include a list of *nomina rejicienda.*
I request that the name *Orchis latifolia* L. appear on the list of *nomina rejicienda* on the following considerations: I am convinced that *O. latifolia* L. on the ground of the protologue, of circumscription and of taxonomy, is the same as the later *Orchis sambucina* Linnaeus.
(Flora Suecica ed. 2 sub 803, 1755). If *O. latifolia* has to be typified, then this has to be done in the sense of the present *O. sambucina.* In the description of *O. latifolia* there is no demonstrable element of what later was named *latifolia* (= *Orchis majalis* Rchb. p.) with the exception of a superficial acquaintance to the plants of Vaillant.

Reference

VERMEULEN, P. 1976 – Was ist Orchis latifolia?. Acta bot. Neerl. 25: 371-379.

Proposed by: P. Vermeulen, De Blomhof 3, Heiloo, The Netherlands.

CORRECTION

Dr. J. A. Leussink has brought to my attention that two separate proposals for *nomina conservanda* were numbered as 424. Henceforth, please refer to the proposal by Hoogland (on *Saurauia*) as number 424, and the proposal by Compère (on *Tetraëdron*, Taxon 26: 331) as number 424 bis.
R. H. Petersen, Nomenclature Editor

DID LINNAEUS EVER INDICATE A TYPE?

*M. Guédès**

In rejecting my choice of a lecto- or neotype for *Paspalum distichum* L. in accordance with Linnaeus's description and long-followed usage, R. E. Fosberg (1977) states that no such procedure is legitimate, for Linnaeus himself "did indicate a type".

In my view, Linnaeus never indicated any type of any taxon, for the rather compelling reason that, in Stearn's words (1957: 125) "the type-method developed during the first half of the twentieth century was, of course, unknown to Linnaeus".

Indicating a type is mentioning in a published outlet that one specimen definitely singled out as such is deposited in some definite place. Only this is strictly applying the Code, as Fosberg rightly has us do, and this is what Linnaeus never did.

---

* Lab. de Phanérogamie, 16 Rue Buffon, Paris, France

The type is a holotype when it is indicated by the author himself as the element from which his own protologue was drafted. Lecto- and neotypes may be indicated by the author himself or, mostly, by others.

There is no holotype for any Linnaean taxon. All Linnaean types have been or have to be chosen by others. At best they are lectotypes, selected from the material studied by Linnaeus himself when preparing his protologue. The situation, I believe, still is basically identical when that material was made up of only one specimen. The latter is no true holotype since it was not indicated as a type by Linnaeus. The first to discover that there is only one specimen in say the Burser herbarium, of a Linnaean taxon based on that herbarium, has the duty to select it as a lectotype and to publish his choice. Otherwise the taxon remains untypified.

Now, when Linnaeus states that he received *a plant* from somebody, that does not mean that he received but one specimen. If one sheet in his herbarium, with a mixture of species, has "Br" nearer to one specimen, this is no assurance that the nearest specimen only was received from Browne. Most of all, this is no designation of a type, for Br cannot be taken as an abbreviation for T Y P U S, and no indication was published by Linnaeus as to the location of any type.

And when Linnaeus repeatedly states that among two spikes one is *sub-sessilis* or *sessilis*, no vast amount of speculation is needed to reach the conclusion that his description hardly applies to a plant with two pedunculate spikes. In our eagerness, then, strictly to apply the Code we have to choose a lecto- or neotype, and to choose it in accordance with Linnaeus's own description. So we choose a specimen of everybody's *Paspalum distichum.*

References

FOSBERG, F. R. 1977 – *Paspalum distichum* again. Taxon 26: 201-202.

STEARN, W. T. 1957 – An introduction to the *Species plantarum* ... In C. Linnaeus. Species plantarum. A facsimile of the first edition 1753. 1. London.

NOMENCLATURAL NOTES ON DRYOPTERIS ADANS.

*C. R. Fraser-Jenkins and A. C. Jermy**

Summary

The publication in October, 1873, of *Polystichum pyrenaicum* Miégeville in an obscure journal [Revue catholique du diocèse de Tarbes No 41: 764] predates the binomial *Dryopteris oreades* Fomin proposed for the taxon previously known as *Dryopteris abbreviata* (DC.) Newm. (Fraser-Jenkins & Jermy, 1976). However Miégeville states that he uses *Polystichum pyrenaicum* as a "*nom provisoire*", and after examination of his earlier papers which explain what he meant by this term, we conclude that Miégeville, was not prepared to draw any conclusion regarding the rank of his "species" and did not thereby accept his own nomenclature. Thus Miégeville's names, being not accepted at species rank by the author, are not valid according to Article 34, provision 1, of the ICBN (Stafleu et al., 1972) and the name *Dryopteris oreades* still stands.

Two additions and one deletion are made to the synonymy of *D. oreades* as given in Fraser-Jenkins & Jermy (1976); the latter being *Aspidium distans* Viviani, which in fact refers to *D. pseudomas* (Woll.) Holub & Pouzar as shown by Pichi-Sermolli (1960).

Since the publication of our first paper on this subject (Fraser-Jenkins & Jermy 1976), information has come to light concerning the name *Polystichum pyrenaicum* Miégeville

* Botany Dept., British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, England.