(269)-(274) Proposals to Rationalize and Make Consistent and Understandable Art. 73.8 and Rec. 73G.1 on Connecting Forms in Epithets Made up of Two Elements
Author(s): F. R. Fosberg
Reviewed work(s):
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Nov., 1986), pp. 850-851
Published by: International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1221679
Accessed: 26/07/2012 14:08

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

of proposals for rejection and to limit rejection to cases that will be more widely acceptable, I will just propose two changes to Article 69. As an alternative, if the first two proposals are not considered effective enough, I propose rejecting Art. 69 altogether.

Proposed by: F. R. Fosberg, Botany Dept., Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

(269)-(274) Proposals to rationalize and make consistent and understandable Art. 73.8 and Rec. 73G.1 on connecting forms in epithets made up of two elements.

Summary

It seems undesirable to have the definition of correctness in an Article in the Code depend on a recommendation, which seems the case with Art. 73.8. It also seems undesirable to require that an epithet should even appear to be ungrammatical. Alternatives are proposed to correct these flaws in Art. 73.8 and Rec. 73G.1; it is also proposed, either to delete Rec. 73G.1 altogether or to revise it to remove inconsistencies and to make it understandable if it is retained in the Code.

(269) Proposal to insert the word *grammatically* before "incorrect", and delete "(see Rec. 73G)" in Art. 73.8.

(270) Proposal to delete Examples 11 and 12 in Art. 73.8 and substitute others which are not incorrect grammatically.

(271) Proposal to delete Rec. 73G.1.

(272) Proposal (alternate) to rewrite Rec. 73G.1 so that it contains neither inconsistencies nor requirement for grammatical incorrectness in compounding forms.

(273) Proposal to amend Rec. 73G.1: Rewrite the definitions of "compound" and "pseudocompound" so that they can be clearly understood by non-linguists, if the proposal to delete the recommendation is not accepted.

(274) Proposal to italicize, for emphasis, the first sentence of Rec. 73G.1.

Rationale: In the Sydney Code some progress has been made toward removing the fault, in previous editions, of referring to a subsequent recommendation as though it had the mandatory force of an article, but the editors did not go far enough. Art. 73.8 still refers to "an incorrect compounding form" with a reference to Rec. 73G as presumably the authority for correctness. Apparently the framers and reframers of Art. 73, even at Sydney, have been unable to make up their minds whether some of the forms prescribed are correct or not. Certainly this is difficult, as most of the forms recommended seem matters of taste and in this the original creators of the names should be followed, unless there is an obviously unintentional typographic or orthographic error.

While feeling that the whole Article may be in need of scrutiny and possible recasting, I will confine my remarks and proposals to the single item. This is the apparent disregard of grammatical correctness in epithets which seem to consist of a feminine generic name with a modifier requiring a genitive to indicate *of,* e.g. *cannaefolius,* and *magnoliaeflora.* I see no difference between these two, yet in Rec. 73G.1(a)(2) the second one is treated as a true compound and is spelled *magnoliiflorus* (why not *magnoliiflora*?), while *cannaefolius* (why not *cannaefolia*?) is used as an example of a pseudocompound. I must confess to classical ignorance, as the explanation of the difference between a compound and a pseudocompound in this case eludes me entirely.

In Rec. 73G.1(b) *cannaefolius* [sic] is used as an example, presumably of correct usage as a pseudocompound, using genitive singular First Declension, yet the last sentence of the paragraph says "The latter use of genitive singular of First Declension for pseudocompounding is treated as an error to be corrected unless it makes an etymological distinction." I am baffled! I note that, except for the "*magnoliifolius*" example, compounds with feminine (First Declension) stems are absent. Yet all of the examples under Art. 73.8 are of this sort.

As one whose Latin education is admittedly weak and 60 years out of date, I probably should not criticize the supposedly well-considered results of deliberations by the proposers of the various intricacies of Art. 73 and by the Editorial Committee. However, my Latin is good enough to make me

cringe when I am asked to write epithets such as *brassicifolia, urticifolia* and *opuntiiflora* when the epithets are supposed to mean having the leaf or flower of *Brassica,* of *Urtica* and of *Opuntia.* This seems an arbitrary and inconsistent requirement, and should not be in the Code.

I propose deletion of Examples 11 and 12 from Art. 73.8 and substitution of others which do not suggest grammatical incorrectness.

I further propose that Rec. 73G.1 be either deleted or rewritten so that it does not contain inconsistencies or grammatically incorrect requirements. I cannot carry my proposal so far as to suggest a rewording, as I do not pretend to understand all of the objectives or even some of the meanings of the recommendation as presently written. I am not sure, either, that the rank and file taxonomists, for whose use the Code exists, understand this recommendation much better than I do.

I hesitate to propose deletion of Art. 73.8, as we should reserve the right to correct true errors, so long as it is clear that they are really errors, such as in grammatical construction. The first sentence of Rec. 73G.1 should be emphasized if the recommendation is retained.

Proposed by: F. R. Fosberg, Botany Dept., Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

(275)-(287) Proposals to amend the Code.

(275) Proposal to add to the Preamble as 10 the following and change existing 10 to 11:

"Should any uncertainty in interpreting the meaning of words used in the Code arise, *An Annotated Glossary of Botanical Nomenclature,* Regnum vegetabile 56 (1969), or its most recent up-date, should be taken as a guide for clarification."

Comment: Many of the conditions which led to the setting up of the special committee that produced *An Annotated Glossary of Botanical Nomenclature,* published as Regnum vegetabile 56 in 1969, and mentioned in its Introduction, still apply today. While this document is very useful in clarifying the meaning of words used in each version of the Code, it has, as the last paragraph in its Introduction states, no official standing under the Code. While there is no intention in this proposal to give that document official standing under the Code by having it mentioned, it or an updated version of it, should be recorded somewhere in the published Code as a guide for clarification. Many users concede that the wording of certain articles, recommendations or examples in the present Code are ambiguous. Reference to the above Glossary goes a long way to interpreting the intent of that wording. This publication is already mentioned in the Preface of the present Code but in connection with another matter.

(276) Proposal to modify Article 7.4 to read:

"7.4. If no holotype was indicated by the author who describes a taxon, or when the holotype has been lost or destroyed, or when a designated holotype is found to consist of material of more than one taxon, a lectotype or a neotype as a substitute for it may be designated. A lectotype always takes precedence over a neotype. An isotype, if such exists and is part of the original material, must be chosen as the lectotype. If no such isotype exists, a lectotype must be chosen from among the syntypes, if such exist. If neither an examined isotype nor a syntype nor any of the original material is extant, a neotype may be selected."

Comment: The proposed wording removes any possible conflict between Art. 7.4 and Art. 7.5. A lectotype has to come from the original material only. Any duplicate including isotypes (Art. 7.6) not seen by the publishing author of a name up to time of publication of that name is not part of the original material. Such an isotype cannot be selected as a lectotype.

(277) Proposal to modify wording of Article 21.3 to read:

"21.3. The epithet of the name of a subgenus or section is not to be formed from the name of the genus to which it belongs by adding the prefix *Eu-*. Names incorporating such epithets are to be rejected as not validly published."