



Proposal (70). To Revise Article 21.3

Author(s): Tarciso S. Filgueiras

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 29, No. 5/6 (Nov., 1980), p. 697

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1220353>

Accessed: 16/08/2012 04:03

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>

PROPOSALS TO REVISE ICBN

Proposal (70). To revise Article 21.3.

The genus *Cenchrus* was described by Linnaeus in 1753. At the time, five species were assigned to it. Of these, only two are considered correct names by recent authors. Twenty-three species are currently included.

The most recent treatment of the genus is by Caro and Sanchez (1967). In their work these authors, based on previous work by Chase (1920), Hitchcock (1951), and DeLisle (1963), very appropriately divided the genus into two subgenera, *Cenchrus* subg. *Cenchrus* and *Cenchrus* subg. *Cenchropsis* (Nash) Caro & Sanchez, the latter subgenus being a transfer of the generic name *Cenchropsis* Nash (in Small, Fl. Southeast U.S. 109, 1327. 1903).

Unfortunately, the combination *Cenchrus* subg. *Cenchropsis* (Nash) Caro & Sanchez is apparently illegitimate under Art. 21.3 which states, "The epithet of a subgenus or section is not to be formed from the name of the genus [*Cenchrus*] to which it belongs by adding the termination *-oides* or *-opsis* [*Cenchropsis*] or the prefix *Eu-*."

I am prepared to propose a new name but there are two questions. In the first place *Cenchrus* subg. *Cenchropsis* is not, strictly speaking, "formed from the name [*Cenchrus*] . . . by adding the termination . . . *-opsis* . . ." It is merely a new combination based on a basionym which happens to be of the same form prohibited by Art. 21.3.

In the second place I see no reason for renaming taxa with such names, at least those with the suffix *-oides* or *-opsis*. If they happen to include the type species of the genus they will fall before the autonym required by Art. 22. If they do not include the type species of the genus, I see no particular value in renaming them. What is wrong with *Cenchrus* subg. *Cenchropsis*?

Obviously there is value in prohibiting subgeneric and sectional names repeating the generic name with the prefix *Eu-*, but I see no value in rejecting subgeneric epithets with the suffix *-opsis* and *-oides*. There seems to be no reason to change the present examples cited under Art. 21.3. Therefore I propose the following text.

Proposal (70): To revise Art. 21.3 to read:

"The epithet of a subgenus or section is inadmissible if it repeats the name of the genus to which it belongs with the prefix *Eu-*."

References

- Caro, J. A. and E. Sanchez. 1967. Las especies de *Cenchrus* (Gramineae) de la República Argentina. *Kurtziana* 4: 95-129.
- Chase, A. 1920. The North American species of *Cenchrus*. *Contr. U.S. Nat. Herb.* 22(1): 45-77.
- DeLisle, D. G. 1963. Taxonomy and distribution of the genus *Cenchrus*. *Iowa State J. Science* 37(3): 259-351.
- Hitchcock, A. S. 1951. *Manual of the Grasses of the United States*, 2nd ed. (Revised by A. Chase.) New York, Dover Publ., Inc. Vol. II.
- Stafleu, F. A. et al. (eds.). 1978. *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature*: I.A.P.T., Utrecht.

Proposed by: Tarciso S. Filgueiras, Reserva Ecológica do IBGE, Divisão de Ecologia Vegetal, Ed. Venâncio II., 70302 Brasília, DF, Brazil.