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 corollas 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 (“Pins 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. sylvestrica [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
gardeners dictionary, 6th ed., London, 1752) treated three of these varieties as species (P. tartarica, P. montana and P. maritima) and Dumont may have assumed that Aiton's names, including P. divaricata, were also binomials.

If there is an argument for rejecting Dumont's name, P. divaricata, it may be found in the general inconsistency with which he used scientific nomenclature and the confusion which results from this inconsistency. For example, in the genus Ulmus he cited Ulmus campestris as a species followed by seven “VARIÉTÉS” six of which were assigned binomials and one of which was assigned a trinomial. He did not cite authorities for any of these names including the Linnaean U. campestris. In Pinus he gave P. sylvestris as the first Latin binomial for “Pin sauvage” followed by P. rubra, as a second Latin name, and then later he again used the name P. sylvestris as the first Latin binomial for “P. [Pin] pinastre” followed by P. maritima and P. maritima major. On a re-examination of Le botaniste cultivateur I find that I cannot clearly understand his use of scientific names in this work and there does seem to be a case for maintaining that he did not intend to publish any new combinations.

The question of whether or not Pinus divaricata was published in 1802 is not as simple as I had thought in 1971 nor is the answer as unequivocal as argued by Voss and Hunt. The problem cannot be regarded as having been solved one way or the other and the question will arise again and again. A final solution may require a decision by a nomenclature committee. Until this is accomplished I will withdraw my recommendation that the name P. divaricata be used as the correct name for Jack Pine and I will continue to use the name P. banksiana. I am taking this action not because I agree that P. divaricata is an incorrect name but because the cloud of doubt surrounding this name is sufficiently dark that a decision to change a familiar, widely used name for a new name is inadvisable.

GEORGE ARGUS*

PAXILLITRILETES, A NEW NAME FOR FOSSIL MEGASPORES
HITHERTO INVALIDLY NAMED THOMSONIA

In 1954 Mädler created the generic name Thomsonia for dispersed fossil megaspores having conspicuous protuberances along the laesurae or their vicinity, a narrow equatorial zona, and laesurae reaching the margin of the spore or even extending beyond it. He believed that megaspores of this type were allied to Azolla, but there is no evidence to substantiate this opinion; prevailing opinion is that they are lycopodiaceous megaspores. Their stratigraphic range is from Lower Jurassic to Upper Cretaceous.

However, Thomsonia Mädler is clearly a later homonym of Thomsonia Wallich (1830, 1: 83), an extant member of the angiosperm family Araceae. A new name is required for Thomsonia Mädler; the name Paxillitriletes is proposed, from the Latin paxillus, a small rod or stake, in reference to the rod-like structural elements along the trilete mark, and Triletes, the form genus in which many diverse elements, including this taxon, were referred (from the prefix tri, three, and the Greek suffix -letes, hidden).

Genus Paxillitriletes Hall and Nicolson, nom. nov. Thomsonia Mädler, 1954, p. 150, pl. 5, fig. 15; not Thomsonia Wallich, 1830, 1: 83, pl. 99.

Type species. – Paxillitriletes reticulatus (Mädler) comb. nov. Thomsonia reticulata Mädler, 1954, p. 150, pl. 5, fig. 15. Wealden (Lower Cretaceous), Germany.

Assigned species.
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