



---

Committee to Deal with Urgent Nomenclatural Needs. Memorandum by British Members  
Author(s): J. E. Dandy, J. S. L. Gilmour, T. A. Sprague, E. M. Wakefield  
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 1, No. 5 (May, 1952), pp. 78-80  
Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)  
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1217262>  
Accessed: 18/09/2011 14:17

---

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>

to those terms their correct value so that they can, if necessary, be made the basis for non-mathematical action. Taxonomy is a science of variation, concerned with bring order and system to the assemblage of living organisms. This it does by grouping, naming and classifying in accordance with a body of principles, the majority of which are widely accepted and readily applied but some of which are controversial in their interpretation. Often this results from imperfection of methodology rather than conflict of aims. Just as the debate concerning the place of phylogeny in classification could presumably be finally closed by the revelation of an adequate number of fossil lineages, so one might imagine that the many differences of opinion as to what shall constitute species would be brought nearer reconciliation by an objective enough exposition of the natural populations of which they are built. Most systematists today would agree that they set out to describe and define populations rather than individuals; that they so often do not actually do so in practice is partly due to a failure to adopt methods necessary to acquire a knowledge of the structure of populations, and partly that even if they do themselves acquire such knowledge by years of laborious observation, they have no means of presenting it concisely in a form immediately interpretable by others. Much can be done to meet both shortcomings through the adoption of rational methods of population sampling, and of the elementary statistical techniques necessary to make from these the appropriate deductions.

### Literature cited

- ANDERSON, E. 1936. *Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard.*, 23, p. 511-525.  
ANDERSON, E. & HUBRICHT, L. 1938. *Bot. Gaz.*, 100, p. 312-323.  
ANDERSON, E. & TURRILL, W. B. 1935. *Nature*, 136, p. 986-987.  
ANDERSON, E. & TURRILL, W. B. 1938. *New Phyt.*, 37, p. 160-172.  
ANDERSON, E. & WHITAKER, T. W. 1934. *J. Arn. Arb.*, 15, p. 28-42.  
BAAS BECKING, L. G. M. & DRION, E. F. 1936. *Acta Biotheoret.*, 1—2, p. 133-150.  
DEYL, M. 1946. *Opera Bot. Cechica*, 3, p. 1-256.  
EPLING, K. & DOBZHANSKY, T. 1942. *Genetics*, 27, p. 317-332.  
FISHER, R. A. 1936. *Ann. Eugen.* 7, p. 179-188.  
FISHER, R. A. 1937. *Ann. Eugen.* 7, p. 333-348.  
GREGOR, J. W. 1939. *New Phyt.*, 38, p. 293-322.  
GREGOR, J. W. & LANG, J. M. S. 1950. *New Phyt.*, 49, p. 135-141.  
HARRISON, J. HESLOP, 1948. *Trans. Bot. Soc. Edin.*, 35, p. 26-66.  
HARRISON, J. HESLOP, 1951. *Svensk. Bot. Tidsk.*, 45, p. 608-635.  
MATHER, K. 1946. *Statistical Analysis in Biology*. 2 Ed., London.  
MELVILLE, R. 1937. *Ann. Bot. N. S.* 1, p. 673-680.  
PAVLOVSKA, S. 1947. *Polska Ak. Um. (Doc. Physiog. Poloniae)* Nr. 4, p. 1-48.  
PENROSE, L. S. 1947. *Ann. Eugen.* 13, p. 228-237.  
WOODSON, R. E. 1947. *Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard.*, 34, p. 353-432.

---

## Committee to deal with Urgent Nomenclatural Needs

### Memorandum by British Members

1. We, the undersigned British members of the above Committee, are of the unanimous opinion that, in the interests both of nomenclatural stability and of the continuance of friendly co-operation between taxonomists and other users of the scientific names of plants, it is highly desirable that some alteration in the existing Rules should be made whereby changes in widely used specific names of economic plants, at present rendered necessary by the application of the Rules, may be reduced to a minimum in the future.

2. We are unanimously opposed to the introduction of *nomina specifica conservanda*, for the following reasons:

A. The establishment of a list of *nomina specifica conservanda* would open the door to a flood of names proposed merely because they were the names best known to their proposers. Most of those who have advocated the establishment of such a list have stated that it could be confined to 100 or not more than 200 names. We believe that such limitation would be impracticable.

B. The listing of particular names as con-

served for particular species would entail the determination and designation of their types, and also the precise delimitation of the species concerned. This would be a long and difficult task which would complicate and prolong indefinitely the work of compiling a list of *nomina specifica conservanda*. Further, it is possible that subsequent work on particular species after the list had been published would necessitate alterations of the names in the list, thus increasing instead of reducing undesirable name changes. It is significant that, among the lists proposed to the Cambridge Congress by various botanists (BRIQUET, Rec. Syn. 133-8) were two new combinations (one of which violated Art. 58 of the Rules).

3. We are unanimously of the opinion that the adoption of the principle of *nomina specifica rejicienda* is the most satisfactory means of bringing about the desired reduction in name-changes, and that a sound and practicable method can be devised for incorporating this principle in the Rules.

4. We desire to make it clear that the principle of *nomina specifica rejicienda* must not be applied retro-actively; changes already made in the nomenclature of species in accordance with the Rules, and generally accepted by taxonomists who obey the Rules, must not be reversed. The object of the proposed list of rejected names is solely to prevent highly undesirable changes in the future.

5. We are of the opinion that the existing provisions for rejecting specific epithets should be incorporated with the above principles in a single new article to follow the present Art. 68 and to replace Arts. 62-65, and that a single list of specific names rejected for whatever reason should form an Appendix to the Rules.

6. The following is a suggested draft of such a new article:

#### NEW ARTICLE

(to follow old Art. 68 and to replace old Arts. 62-65).

A name of a species must be rejected if it is included in the list of *nomina specifica rejicienda* (Appendix ..). Names in this list are treated as illegitimate.

The object of the list of *nomina specifica rejicienda* is to further the attainment of stability and unambiguity in the nomenclature of *well-known species, especially familiar species of wide distribution and*

*species of special horticultural, economic or other importance*. The list comprises names which, if not rejected in this way, would by the provisions of these Rules invalidate widely accepted names well established in botanical literature or in commerce, or would prove to be permanent sources of confusion or error. To be eligible for inclusion in the list a name must belong to one or more of the following five categories:

- (1) An overlooked or little-used name which is an earlier synonym of an established name and would invalidate that name. Example: *Lassonia heptapeta* Buc'hoz (Pl. Nouvellem. Découv. 21, t. 19 fig. 1: 1799), which would invalidate *Magnolia denudata* Desr. (apud Lam. in Encycl. Meth., Bot. III. 675: 1791).
- (2) A much-used name which, owing to its use in different meanings, has become a permanent source of confusion or error (*nomen ambiguum*). Examples: *Rosa villosa* L. (Sp. Pl. I. 491: 1753), which has been applied to several different species and so become a source of confusion; *Lavandula spica* L. (Sp. Pl. II. 572: 1758), under which Linnaeus included the two species subsequently known as *L. officinalis* Chaix and *L. latifolia* Vill., and which has been applied almost equally to both of them.
- (3) A name (in current use for a well-known species) which, on examination or re-examination of its type, is found to be applicable to another species and would become the correct name for that species (*nomen ambiguum incipiens*). Example: *Myosotis collina* Hoffm. (Deutsch. Fl. 1791. 61: 1791) has long been the established name for a well-known species of *Myosotis*, but its type is found to be referable to another species, *M. discolor* Pers. (1797), so that the name *M. collina* Hoffm. would have to be transferred from one well-known species (now called *M. hispida* Schlecht.) to another (*M. discolor* Pers.).
- (4) A name of which the original definition was based on two or more entirely discordant elements and which would be a permanent source of confusion (*nomen confusum*). Examples: *Illicium san-ki* Perrott. (in Mem. Soc. Linn. Par. III. 121: 1825), which was based on fruits of *Illicium verum* Hook. f. (1888) and leaves belonging to a very different family (probably *Clausena* in Rutaceae), so that the use of the name *I. san-ki* in place of

*I. verum* could only cause confusion; *Plectronia ventosa* L. (Syst. Nat. ed. 12, II. 183 et Mant. Pl. 52: 1767), based on a confusion of material of *Olinia cymosa* (L.f. 1781) Thunb. with an illustration of *Canthium* (Rubiaceae), so that the use of the epithet *ventosa* for *O. cymosa* would cause confusion, the name *Plectronia ventosa* having also been much used for the species of *Canthium*.

- (5) A name based on a monstrosity which would invalidate a name based on a normal (non-monstrous) plant. Example: *Ornithogalum fragiferum* Vill. (Hist. Pl. Dauph. II. 270: 1787), based on a monstrosity, which would invalidate the name *Gagea liotardi* (Sternb.) J. A. & J. H. Schult. = *Ornithogalum liotardi* Sternb. (1818).

Before a name can be included in the list of *nomina specifica rejicienda* it must be recommended for such inclusion by the Special Committee for the group concerned, whose decision is subject to confirmation by the Advisory Board and to ratification by the next ensuing International Botanical

Congress. The submission of a name for consideration by the Special Committee must be accompanied by a full statement of the case for its rejection.

Note 1. This Article must not be applied retroactively. Names recently brought into use which have become established in botanical literature (e.g. *Bromelia comosa* L., the basis of *Ananas comosus* (L.) Merr. replacing *A. sativus* Lindl.) are not eligible for rejection.

Note 2. *Nomina specifica rejicienda*, when cited as synonyms, should be followed by the explanatory words „*nomen rejiciendum*” or „*nom. rejic.*”.

Note 3. If a *nomen specificum rejiciendum* is an earlier homonym it retains its status as such.

Note 4. When the placing of a name on the list of *nomina specifica rejicienda* has been recommended by the Special Committee and confirmed by the Advisory Board, the name may be rejected pending decision by the next ensuing Congress.

J. E. DANDY  
J. S. L. GILMOUR

T. A. SPRAGUE  
E. M. WAKEFIELD

## Special Committee for Hepaticae

*Secretary:* Dr MARGARET FULFORD, Department of Botany, Biology Building, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati 21, Ohio, U.S.A.

The Special Committee has adopted (by favorable vote) the following *Nomina Conservanda*:

NOMINA CONSERVANDA	NOMINA REJICIENDA
<i>Adelanthus</i> Mitt.	<i>Adelanthus</i> Endl.
	<i>Adelocolea</i> Mitt.
<i>Androcryphia</i> Nees	<i>Noteroclada</i> Tayl.
<i>Diplophyllum</i> Dumort.	<i>Diplophyllum</i> Lehm.
	<i>Diplophylleia</i> Trev.
<i>Gymnomitrium</i> Corda	<i>Cesius</i> S. F. Gray
<i>Plagiochasma</i> Lehm. & Lindenb.	<i>Aytonia</i> Forst & Forst
	<i>Aitonia</i> Thunb.
	<i>Rupinia</i> L.f.
<i>Radula</i> Dumort.	<i>Martinellius</i> S. F. Gray
	<i>Martinellius</i> S. F. Gray
<i>Scapania</i> Dumort.	<i>Lembidium</i> Koerber
<i>Lembidium</i> Mitt.	<i>Mastigophora</i> Nees 1833
<i>Leptodoxia</i> (Dumort.) Dumort.	<i>Mastigophora</i> Nees 1833
<i>Mastigophora</i> Nees 1838	

### NOMINA CONSERVANDA

*Reboulia*  
Raddi corr. Nees

*Treubia* Goeb.

*Trichocolea*  
Dumort. corr. Nees

*Bazzania* S. F. Gray  
corr. Carringt.

*Herberta* S. F. Gray  
corr. Lindb.

*Marchesinia* S. F. Gray  
corr. Carringt.

*Mylia* S. F. Gray  
corr. Lindb.

*Nardia* S. F. Gray  
corr. Carringt.

### NOMINA REJICIENDA

*Strozzius* S. F. Gray

*Rhakiocarpon*  
Corda in Opiz

*Otionea*  
Corda in Opiz

*Achiton*  
Corda in Opiz

*Treubia*  
Pierre ex Boerlage

*Thricolea* Dumort.

*Tricolea* Dumort.

*Bazzanius* S. F. Gray

*Donnia* S. F. Gray

*Herpetium* Nees

*Herbertus* S. F. Gray

*Herbertia* S. F. Gray  
corr. Garringt.

*Herbertia* Sweet

*Marchesinius*  
S. F. Gray

*Phragmicoma*  
Dumort.

*Mylia* Leman

*Mylus* S. F. Gray

*Nardius* S. F. Gray

*Mesophylla* Dumort.