

well for the first time but was very late starting its new growth. 'Arch of Triumph' is at present against a west facing wall but will have to be moved as it is being blown to pieces.

In conclusion I would say that camellias stand up to wind much better than I expected.

In view of the lack of frost here I hope to get a few *sasanquas* to extend the season.

Any members who are in this area next spring are very welcome to come and look at a new garden, but PLEASE TELEPHONE FIRST.

Camellia nomenclature

Nomenclature des camélias

Nomenclatura de la Camelia

Nomenclatura della camelia

T. J. SAVIGE

International Registrar, Wirlinga, Australia

While the problems of nomenclature and identity are joint ones, they initially need to be handled separately. The first step is to produce as complete a check list of camellia names as possible. This list would include all published names, including synonyms, erroneous names, orthographic variations and abbreviations, so that it can become a guide for the national and international registration authorities in making decisions on the acceptability of names of cultivars put up for registration.

The next step is to add as much detail as can be located regarding each valid publication, and from this a final step would be to establish the identity of camellia cultivars, where possible. As Colonel Durrant points out in his book "The Camellia Story", with adequate library sources priority names can be established without too much difficulty. In fact, the greatest problem is in digesting the mass of reference material to a point where the earliest published name is definitely established.

However, when it comes to identity, considerable problems arise as, except in cases where identity has never been in doubt, such as 'Alba Plena', 'Doncklaeri', 'Elegans', 'Fimbriata', etc, descriptions and illustrations in the old horticultural literature are largely inadequate for positive identification. It also can be said that even modern colour photography can be misleading, particularly when consideration is given to the variability of the flowers of many cultivars in different environments and microclimates.

The ideal would be to have control gardens in various areas, where plants can be brought together for comparison and identification. This would appear impracticable and we are left with the individual efforts of plantmen

and gardeners who do this in a limited sense.

The author, and a number of other dedicated camelliophiles, have travelled the camellia growing countries of the world to study plantings which assist in identifying various cultivars. On this point, it was interesting to examine the "Mathotiana" in the camellia glasshouse at Chatsworth House in England. This camellia is believed to have been planted by Joseph Paxton in about 1854, when head gardener there. The plant was obtained from Mathot. The form of the flower, with its full petalage, is much closer to the Verschaffelt illustration than other clones masquerading under this name. That it is a much superior camellia can be seen in the number of awards it has received at the Royal Horticultural Society Shows, in competition with the form now regarded as 'Grand Sultan'. Occasional plants of this Chatsworth House form of 'Mathotiana' were also seen in the Channel Isles, Portugal and Italy, and while it is not possible to be 100% certain, there is a very high probability that this is indeed the true 'Mathotiana'. It is strange that it has not been more generally distributed.

The process of selection has caused the deletion of a high percentage of the old varieties, but the same process of selection has, by and large, meant that the best have been retained so that the numbers that are available to be dealt with are not as great as it would appear.

However, at the present stage the most urgent consideration is to produce an exhaustive international check list, as required by the International Commission on Nomenclature, and some of the problems are discussed in the following parts of this paper.

Historical notes

In the early issues of the American *Camellia Yearbooks* there are many thoughtful articles recommending procedures for sorting out the then chaotic nomenclature of camellia cultivars.

One of the first was "Camellia Nomenclature — A Glance into the Future" by Dr. Wendell H. Camp in the 1951 Yearbook. Albert Fendig also wrote "Trials and Tribulations of a Nomenclator" in the same issue. In fact, in much of the horticultural literature issued during these years there was considerable concern over this subject.

An outline of the early history of codes of nomenclature for cultivated plants is contained in the introduction to the 1953 Code by Dr. W. T. Stearn, the author of "Botanical Latin".

The 1953 Code was the first drawn up by the International Botanical Congress Committee for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants and the International Committee on Horticultural Nomenclature and Registration at the 13th International Congress held in London, September, 1952.

The International Commission for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants was set up by the International Union of Biological Sciences and made responsible for the following editions of the Cultivated Code. They produced the 1958 revision. A following 1961 edition adopted a few minor changes, but the 1969 edition made many substantial changes after considerable consultation with commercial firms, professional organisations and government authorities concerned with cultivar names. The last edition of the code is the 1980 edition, and supersedes all the earlier editions.

The main purpose of the code as far as the Genus *Camellia* is concerned, is to control the nomenclature of the cultivars of camellias. The articles of the code give guidance on the selection of the valid name of a cultivar in many cases, from a number of synonyms and orthographic variations. This basically applies to the names of the old cultivars. It also gives advice on the selection of suitable names for new camellias.

Name validity

The principle of earliest publication of a name of a cultivar establishing the validity of that name is well understood. However, there have been some variations in the articles of the code in this regard.

Firstly, it was originally envisaged that for

valid publication, a name and description should be published in a publication readily available to the public and produced by printing or a similar graphic process.

Due to the number of early lists containing first publication of names without descriptions, these were accepted up to a cut off date of 1st January 1959. After this date, to be valid, the publication must be dated and accompanied by a description or reference to a previously published description.

It was originally held that the spelling of the earliest valid listing should stand, however it was soon realised that those who named cultivated plants are more prone to orthographic errors than systematic botanists.

The procedure has therefore been adopted that the first published spelling is to be retained unless there is definite evidence of error in the original orthography, but all such errors (including those in spelling, grammar and typography) are to be corrected.

The endings of the earlier Latin names has been a source of variation and confusion. Names in botanical Latin have been barred since 1959, but Article 28 of the code covers correct usage and states that the orthography of names in Latin form which are used for cultivar names should be in accordance with the Botanic Code; if not, the spelling should be amended. "Botanical Latin" by Dr William T. Stearn, 1966, 1973, 3rd impression 1980, could be taken as a definitive text.

This causes such corrections as the following:

Correct	Incorrect (including original spelling)
Paeoniiflora	Paeoniflora, Paeoniaflora, Paeonaeflora
Anemoniflora	Anemoneflora
Semiduplex	Semi Duplex
Flore Pleno	Floreplena
Rubra Plena	Rubra Pleno
Chandleri	Chandlerii
Doncklaeri	Donckalari, Donckelaarii, Donckelaeri
Magnoliiflora	Magnoliaeflora
Althaeiflora	Althaeafloa, Althaeiflora, Altheiflora

Also names of related cultivars, which are based on the same cultivar names, must retain the orthography of that basic name. Therefore, we now have for example, 'Paeoniiflora Pallida' and 'Paeoniiflora Rubra' in place of "Paeoniflora Pallida" and "Paeoniaeflora Rubra".

Also, as a guide to incorrectly spelt proper names, it is recommended that names which

are, or are based on, proper names, should follow the accepted spelling of those names. As an example "Ethlington White" should be 'Etherington White'. 'Donckelarii' is a problem as there is no definite evidence as to how he spelt his name. Therefore, the original spelling of that cultivar name should be retained. This is 'Doncklaeri' as published in 'Magasin d'Horticulture, 1833'.

A common infraction of the code is the use of the abbreviation "var" for variegated. The use of the abbreviation "var" is restricted to the Botanical Code for "variety". In the Horticultural Code, to prevent confusion, "var" should be spelt in full as "variegated". Other points where many modern registrations do not follow the recommendations of the code is in the use of abbreviations. In particular it is undesirable to abbreviate words such as Saint, Mount, Doctor, Madame, Professor, or their equivalents in languages other than English. It is also recommended that full christian names be used, rather than initials or abbreviations.

Nomenclature of Oriental Cultivars

An extension to the definition of valid publication as applied to Western camellias permits publication in oriental hand written works to be considered valid if copied by hand from a hand-written original prior to 1st January 1900 or if, before, on, or after this date they were reproduced by mechanical or graphic process from a hand-written original.

This has had the effect of changing some internationally valid names from the Western synonym to the Oriental original.

Article 32 provides that a translation or transliteration is regarded as the original name in a different form and its date is that of the original. This covers the problem of Chinese, Japanese characters, and various scripts such as Arabic and Hebrew.

As far as the Chinese and Japanese characters are concerned, it is expedient to regard the transliterated name as the internationally valid one, the translations in the various languages being regarded as local synonyms.

However, there are a number of transliteration systems in both Chinese and Japanese and to cover the multitude of orthographic variations which proliferated under the old Article 38 which states: "The first legitimate available translation or transliteration of a name is the correct name in a particular language or alphabet", this article was replaced in the 1980 code by recommendation 32B which states "It

is desirable that registration authorities should use one system of transliteration only, in respect of any particular language."


As far as the transliteration of Chinese is concerned, the only system permitted by the Chinese authorities is "Pinyin". However, it is not uncommon to add the old "Wade-Giles" transliteration in brackets. No doubt this will eventually be discarded entirely.

Unfortunately, ungrammatical, incorrectly spelled and inconsistent transliterations of Japanese names due to the use of the various systems in that country has made it a problem in many cases to decide on the correct internationally valid transliteration.

Prior to 1962, Dr Ralph Philbrick during his investigation into camellia nomenclature, in consultation with Oriental horticulturalists, linguists and scholars representing the Japan Camellia Society, Kyoto University, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Cornell University advocated that, for the Genus Camellia, all Japanese cultivar names be spelled according to the "Hepburn" system, but be written without punctuation aids and as a single unhyphenated word, with the following exceptions:

1. Where names contain species designations, such as "tsubaki", "sazanka", "wabisuke" etc these designations be separated by a hyphen e.g. 'Kuro-tsubaki'.
2. Where names contain modifiers which designate a derivation from another cultivar, the name of which forms the basis of the cultivar name under consideration, these modifiers i.e. "shibori" and "nishiki", should be separated by a hyphen, e.g. 'Shiratama-shibori'.
3. Where adjacent vowels are pronounced in separate syllables they should be separated by a punctuation aid. An apostrophe was recommended but usage has largely settled on a hyphen e.g. 'Shiro-otome'.

It was recommended that other hyphens and all vowel marks be eliminated with the reason given that it is beyond the ability of most, including most Japanese, to correctly apply these pronunciation aids, which had no standard usage.

4. Where the character  = "No" is used in a cultivar name with the meaning of "of", "on", "in", "at", "for" or "to" this can be separated out by a hyphen on each side e.g. 'Hazika-No-Nihonichi'; 'Mizu-No-Kifu' and 'Nihon-No-Homare'.

However, in the 20 years since this recommendation the vowel marks in particular have been standardised in Hepburn. Philbrick

recommended that the Hepburn system as employed in Kenkyūsha's *New Japanese-English Dictionary* 1960 ed. be used. This can now be supported by *The Modern Readers' Japanese-English Character Dictionary*, 2nd ed. 1974, twelfth printing 1981, which includes a complete listing of the changed "Tōyō Kanji"; that is, Chinese characters used in Japanese that have been changed or simplified. In this dictionary vowel marks are given wherever they apply, and their use considerably changes the meaning of a name. A simple example is the two Japanese cultivars with the name 'Kojishi'. The one without the vowel mark over the "o" has the characters 小獅子 and means "lion cub", and the other Kōjishi 紅獅子 means "red lion", and can also be read as 'Benijishi'. The character 糸 can be read in the Japanese "kun" pronunciation as "beni" or in the Chinese "on" pronunciation as "kō". However, the same character in Chinese is actually "hong" and means "red" in this case. There are a great number of these alternative "on-kun" readings and they can be interchangeable in many cases. The problem is to know when.

Therefore, it can be said that even within the Hepburn system all spelling problems cannot be solved by the dictionaries and it is sometimes necessary to consult a bilingual scholar.

The other Japanese transliteration systems used are the "Kunrei" and the "Nippon". "Huzi", "Hudi" are Nippon renditions of the Hepburn "Fuji" and "tabaki" for "tsubaki". In these systems, instead of vowel marks an "h" or a "j" is inserted with the vowel to be modified which increases the length and complexity of the word.

For example, the Chinese character 大 is used in the names of many cultivars with the meaning of large or big. The Chinese Pinyin transliteration is "dai". This is also the Chinese "on" pronunciation in Japanese. The Japanese "kun" pronunciation in Hepburn is written ō — indicating it is usually used as a prefix. However, in Japanese lists the variegated form of 'Akashigata' has been written "Ooniji", "Ohniji", "Oniji" and "Ōniji"! The point is that the "o" without the vowel mark as a transliteration of the character 小 can mean "little".

Some examples where the use of the Hepburn system together with the regulations on the hyphen, alter generally accepted Japanese romanisation:

Preferred	Other Readings
Hinode	Hi-no-de, Hino-de
Kamohonami	Kamo-hon-ami, Kamohon-ami
Arajishibeni	Arejishi-beni
Sodekakushi	Sode-kakushi, Sodegakushi
Akashigata	Akashi Gata
Hakurakuten	Haku-Rakuten
Hinomaru	Hi-no-maru
Kishutsukasa	Kishu-Tsukasa
Tarōan	Taro-an
Hinodekumo	Hino de Gumo, Hinode-gumo
Fukutsutsumu	Fukuzutsumu
Monjusu	Monjisu

The transliteration of Chinese characters by Pinyin is simpler, there is usually only the one way to write the transliteration of a character and, as far as the camellia names are concerned, the recommendation is again to write a single unhyphenated word except where characters can be logically grouped into single concepts, such as leaf form, petal colour, or locality or common names. The use of the character 茶 "cha" = camellia has been mostly accepted as a part of a cultivar name as is "tsubaki" — *Camellia japonica* in Japanese, although it is rejected as a part of Western camellia nomenclature.

The most definitive dictionary in the Pinyin transliteration at present is *A Chinese-English Dictionary*, Editor-in-Chief, Professor Wu Jingrong of the Beijing Foreign Languages Institute, published 1979 by The Commercial Press, Beijing; Hong Kong.

There are a number of problems inherent in character transliteration which devolve around the fact that a number of different characters having different meanings can have the same transliteration and, conversely that as the Chinese and Japanese use a great many common characters having the same or nearly the same meaning in both Chinese and Japanese these have a different transliteration in each language. For example, both Japan and China have a camellia known by the characters 白牡丹 (White Peony). This is 'Baimudan' in Chinese and 'Shirobotan' in Japanese. It is not known if it is the same cultivar or not.

An example of a number of characters with one transliteration is as follows:

白洋茶	White Foreign Camellia	Baiyang Cha
白秧茶	White Garden Camellia	Baiyang Cha

Luckily these are all synonyms of one cultivar 'Alba Plena' (which retains priority) but this is not always the case. Actually there are 21 different characters called "Yang" so it is not surprising that this kind of duplication can occur.

However, most of this is rather academic for the average gardener who only wants a name he can get his tongue around, and to know it is not the same as some other plant he has in his collection under a different synonym.

Article 35 of the code is there to cover this problem. It says that each cultivar has one correct cultivar name, the single name by which it is internationally known. For these Oriental varieties this is, in most cases, the valid transliterated name.

Now for the ordinary gardener — "It may also have one or more legitimate synonyms. A commercial synonym is an alternative name of a cultivar which may be used instead of its correct name under restricted particular circumstances, for instance when a name is commercially unacceptable in a particular country such as if it is unpronounceable or has an undesirable implication or connotation". The key word here is "legitimate" and to be legitimate it must conform to the code in the same manner as the original valid name. It should also be approved by the Registration authorities. In looking at this matter as a whole it is interesting to see the national trends on the necessity of such commercial synonyms.

Most of the early introductions from the Orient up to the year 1900 were given Western names, often Latinized. However, since then most Japanese introductions have retained their Japanese names abroad. Conversely, particularly since 1945, the Japanese have largely retained the Western names of camellias they have imported from U.S.A. and Australia.

On the other hand, virtually all Chinese cultivars introduced to the West have received Western synonyms and similarly the Chinese have given Chinese synonyms to the few they have imported.

A serious problem with the Japanese names is that so many of them apply to more than one cultivar. For example 'Hagoroma' appears to apply to as many as five different camellias.

Some Japanese authorities have endeavoured to differentiate between them by including the name of the area from which a particular clone was obtained, such as Tokyo, Kyoto, Kansai, etc. and/or included the name of the group such as "Higo" and "sasanqua" but there still remains a large number of undifferentiated duplications.

One of the main reasons for the development of the Nomenclature Code was to prevent duplication, but even with national registration authorities a number of duplications still occur. This is usually because these authorities do not have sufficient records on a world-wide basis of names that have been already applied to camellias.

It is in this context that the International Check List of Camellia Cultivars will fulfil a useful purpose. It is not the new cultivars' names that are the problem, it is the old, obscure names of varieties of little or only very local distribution where lies the trouble.

A check list showing all synonyms, errors, orthographic variations and abbreviations that have been listed in horticultural literature on a world-wide basis will enable registration authorities to make better decisions on the acceptability of a name put up for registration.

As the code states in Article 5, "This code has no force beyond that deriving from the free assent of those concerned with cultivated plants".

The desirability of such a code is self-evident and all who are responsible for the approval and use of cultivar names are urged to follow the articles and recommendations of the code.