



Lectotypification of *Isoloma* and *Campanea* (Gesn.)

C. V. Morton

Taxon, Vol. 22, No. 2/3. (May, 1973), pp. 317-318.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0040-0262%28197305%2922%3A2%2F3%3C317%3ALOIAAC%28%3E2.0.CO%3B2-U>

Taxon is currently published by International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/iapt.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Adopted generally.

Hymenotheca Salisbury (Hydrocharitaceae) nec non *Hymenotheca* F. Mueller (Gyrostemonaceae): *nomina rejicienda proposita*.

Type species: (Hydrocharitaceae) *Hymenotheca latifolia* Salisbury; (Gyrostemonaceae) *Hymenotheca pyramidalis* F. Mueller.

Recognized almost generally as later synonyms of *Ottelia* Persoon (1805) [Hydrocharitaceae] and *Codonocarpus* A. Cunningham ex Hooker (1830) [Gyrostemonaceae] respectively.

Discussion: As pointed out by C. F. Reed (Taxon 4: 111 [1955]), the generic name *Hymenotheca* H. Potonié should be conserved against *Hymenotheca* Salisbury and *Hymenotheca* F. Mueller. The reason for such an action must be seen in the general interest not to disturb — as far as possible — the stability of the actual paleobotanical nomenclature.

Proposed by: J. PACLT (Bratislava).

LECTOTYPIFICATION OF ISOLOMA AND CAMPANEA (GESN.)

Isoloma (Benth.) Decaisne, Rev. Hort. III, 2: 465. 15 Dec. 1848, non *Isoloma* J. Smith, Journ. Bot. Hook. 3: 414. 1841.

Gesneria sect. *Isoloma* Benth. Pl. Hartw. 230. Apr. 1846.

Isoloma is doubly illegitimate, first because it is a later homonym of the fern genus *Isoloma* J. Smith, and secondly because *Kobleria* Regel (Apr. 1848) is cited as a synonym. It may be objected that Decaisne did not definitely cite the type of *Kobleria*, namely *Gesneria hirsuta* H.B.K., in his account, but Decaisne adopted his name and concept from Bentham; Bentham described or listed several species of *Gesneria*, and then remarked that all of these preceding ones are to form his section *Isoloma*; among these is *G. hirsuta* H.B.K., mentioned in a note under *G. eriantha*. He was separating those *Gesnerias* with a subregular corolla limb from those with a bilabiate limb, his sect. *Corytholoma*. Since Decaisne included *G. eriantha* Benth. in his *Isoloma* and since this was said by Bentham to be close to *G. hirsuta* H. B. K., it is clear that Decaisne was not excluding *G. hirsuta* even though he does not specifically mention this species, and therefore he did include the type of *Kobleria* in his genus. In any case, *Kobleria* is cited as a straight synonym of *Isoloma* without any qualifications. Decaisne undoubtedly adopted *Isoloma* because the name was prior, but it was prior only as a sectional name, which has no priority in present usage over a generic name. Therefore, by Art. 7, Note 4, of the Code, the type of *Isoloma* (Bentham) Decaisne is the same as that of the name *Kobleria* that ought to have been adopted, namely *Isoloma hirsutum* (H.B.K.) Regel (*Gesneria hirsuta* H. B. K.).

Campanea Decaisne ex Planch. Flore des Serres 5: t. 499. 1849 (as "*Capanea*").

The name *Campanea* was first proposed by Decaisne in the Revue Horticole (1849: 241) but the name is technically invalid under the Code because there was no separate generic description. The genus was monotypic and Decaisne provided what might be considered a combined generic and specific description under the name *Campanea grandiflora*. But this can not be considered validly published under the provision of the Code for a combined generic and specific description because the species in question was not a *new* species but was based on the earlier *Besleria grandiflora* H.B.K. Unfortunately, Decaisne spelled the name "*Capanea*" on the plate and "*Campanea*" in the text. In validly publishing the genus a short time later, Planchon used the spelling *Capanea*. In 1858, C. Müller (Ann. Bot. 5: 431) stated that "*Capanea*" was an error for *Campanea*, and this corrected spelling was forthwith adopted by Hanstein and all other workers since that time. In a recent paper, Denham (Baileya 14: 37. 1966) has argued that Planchon and Van Houtte (who also used the spelling *Capanea*)

were in touch with Decaisne and doubtless knew his intentions and that the name was probably intended to commemorate Capaneus, of Greek history, rather than *Campanea*, from the Latin "campana," a bell. The latter would be an appropriate name inasmuch as the corrolas in the genus are indeed campanulate or bell-shaped. In order to determine Decaisne's intention, if possible, I looked in the herbarium in Paris where Decaisne was working at the time, and found that the syntypes of *Besleria grandiflora* in Paris are marked *Campanea* in Decaisne's own hand. This would seem to settle definitely the argument as to Decaisne's intent, and indicate that Planchon was in error in his spelling "*Capanea*." Therefore, the usual spelling *Campanea* should be continued.

C. V. MORTON (†)

PINUS BANKSIANA LAMB. OR PINUS DIVARICATA (AITON) DUMONT?

In 1971 (Can. J. Bot. 49: 573-576) I published a review of the nomenclatural problem surrounding the correct name for Jack Pine and concluded that the name *Pinus divaricata* published in 1802 by Dumont de Courset (*Le botaniste cultivateur*, 1st ed., Paris) antedated the publication of *P. banksiana* Lamb. (*A Description of the Genus Pinus*, London, 1803) and was the correct scientific name for that taxon. Since that time two published notes have attempted to refute that conclusion (E. G. Voss, Mich. Bot. 11: 26-37, 1972 and D. R. Hunt, Taxon 21: 717, 1972). Both Voss and Hunt take the position that Dumont did not intend to publish a new combination but was simply listing *P. divaricata* as a variety of *P. sylvestris* ("Pin sauvage") as Aiton originally had done (*Hortus kewensis*, London, 1789). Dumont's use of the heading "Variétés" preceding the list of five names, including *P. divaricata*, that followed *P. sylvestris* was used to support their view.

I was originally of the opinion, although I neglected to discuss it in 1971, that Dumont was not using the word "Variétés" to mean taxonomic varieties but in a more general sense to mean related entities. This view was supported by two kinds of evidence. One, in the discussion following "2. [Pin] de montagne" (*P. montana*), one of the five "variétés" in question, Dumont used the expression "Cette espèce" and following the two taxa to which scientific names were not assigned ("4. [Pin] d'Haguenau" and "5. [Pin] de Riga") he stated, "Ces deux derniers pins ne sont pas assez distincts pour en constituer même des variétés." In the first example he clearly referred to the taxon as a species and in the other he did not regard the two taxa as even varieties. Could he have intended to treat them all as taxonomic varieties? I do not think so. Hunt's argument that he used the expression "Cette espèce" only when some other author previously referred to the taxon as a species is unconvincing in that it does not explain why he would refer to a taxon, that he presumably regarded as a variety, as a species.

The second kind of evidence was that in the second edition of *Le botaniste cultivateur* (1811) Dumont changed the heading "Variétés" to "Affinités" without significantly changing either the taxa listed thereunder or his discussion of them. I concluded that the word "Affinités" revealed the sense in which he used the word "Variétés" in 1802 and I see no reason to change this conclusion.

Hunt attempts to explain Dumont's use of the binomial, *Pinus divaricata*, by arguing that it was either a mistake ("a slip of the pen") or an abbreviation for *P. sylvatica* [var.] *divaricata*. These arguments are difficult to accept because Dumont often used trinomials, sometimes even following a presumably "abbreviated" trinomial. For example, one of his entries is "2. [Pin] de montagne. Pin mugho. *P. montana*. Miller, H. K. *P. sylvestris montana*, Duhamel" Furthermore, it is unlikely that a "slip of the pen" would have appeared again in the revised 1811 edition. However, if there is a mistake it may be that Dumont did not realize that Aiton recognized five varieties of *Pinus sylvestris*. Previously, Miller (*The*