



Against the Newly Proposed Starting Point in Paleobotany

Author(s): Z. Kvaček

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (May, 1982), p. 319

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1219999>

Accessed: 16/08/2012 05:59

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>

AGAINST THE NEWLY PROPOSED STARTING POINT IN PALEOBOTANY

Z. Kvaček¹

In order to save some widely used specific names of Carboniferous plants for paleobotanical practice Storch (Taxon 30: 209, 1981) proposed the change of the starting point for the nomenclature of fossil plants, namely to 1 Jan 1820 (a proposed arbitrary date of the issue of Schlotheim's "Petrefactenkunde") instead of the 31 Dec 1820 (Sternberg's "Versuch geogn.-botan. Darst.," an arbitrary issue of the fasc. 1—Art. 13 ICBN). However, all generic designations in Schlotheim's Petrefactenkunde are not accompanied by any descriptions, diagnoses or references to a previous effective description (*nomina nuda*) and thus the generic taxa are not defined in sense of Art. 32 and 41 ICBN except the monotypic *Anthotypolites* (descriptio generico-specifica, Art. 42 ICBN). Consequently, even specific names (except *Anthotypolites ranunculiformis*) in Schlotheim cannot be validated by pushing the starting point back, as Storch intends, because the epithets would remain connected with invalidly published generic names (Art. 43 ICBN). *Anthotypolites ranunculiformis* is a taxon of dubious value (teste Storch l.c., p. 215). Thus the proposed emendation of Art. 13j ICBN appears useless.

ERICA CARNEA OR E. HERBACEA?

D. McClintock² and O. Wijnands³

Opinions still differ whether *Erica carnea* or *E. herbacea*, both Linnaean names from 1753, should be used for the dwarf winter-flowering heath of central Europe. The matter has been discussed in print by Ross (1967), McClintock (1969, 1980), and by Wijnands (1979, 1980).

The question centres round the harmony of the protologue and in particular how far the description can differ from the lectotype without invalidating the name in question. Relevant considerations are:

1. Right until Linnaeus' time the green-bud stage and the pink-flowering stage of this species tended to be treated separately. Linnaeus took over this misconception, which causes part of the confusion.

2. Ross (1967) typified *E. carnea* and *E. herbacea* by adjoining woodcuts of Clusius. These choices of lectotypes seem incontrovertible on the evidence Linnaeus gives.

3. Linnaeus' description of *E. carnea* agrees perfectly with the lectotype and with the plant as it actually is. His description of *E. herbacea* however differs in three characters of importance in the classification of the genus, viz: a). *antheris bicornibus*; b) (*antheris*) *inclusis* and c) *foliis ternis*, the anthers being in fact unawned and exserted, and the leaves in fours.

4. The crux of the argument is therefore whether Linnaeus' 1771 choice of *E. herbacea* over *E. carnea* can stand, when there are these vital discordances between description and lectotype. If it can, what is the use of a description? All one needs is a type!

¹ Institute of Geology and Geotechnics, Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Praha, Czechoslovakia.

² Bracken Hill, Platt, Kent, TN15 8JH, U.K.

³ P.O. Box 8010/6700, ED Wageningen, the Netherlands.