After many a summer . . .

by Harold Hopkins

This issue completes my 10th year as editor, and my last. I've had so much fun with the work that I've asked myself a few times if I'm not out of my mind to give it up. But I must and I must, because doing a good job entails more responsibility and takes more time than I can continue to devote. Ten years is, at least for me, enough. I have other obligations and designs: to my family, to my career, or what's left of it, and finally, to the Magnolia Society itself, which has become what it is, in my opinion, because of the continuing infusion of new blood to carry on its mission and its aims.

It's time for newer members to take over more of the writing and editing chores. We older members, at least this one, can begin to run out of ideas or inspiration, and start paraphrasing what has been said already in one context or another. Letting things go static can deprive the society of new voices, new ways of doing what we've set out to do. It's time to give somebody else a chance at some of the fun I've had.

Fortunately, when I took over ten years ago, the journal was a viable, respected and readable organ, due to the excellence and expertise of its contributors and editors. No changes were needed. Many of the same contributors continued turning out good stuff, and all I needed to do was organize the material and get it to the printer on time. We didn't always print timely, but we got it out, and the readers have been reasonably content with our two issues per year.

MAGNOLIA, our journal, has undergone a few changes in matters such as design and format and in the use of color on the covers, and we've tried one thing or another at times, simply to keep ourselves and the readers from getting bored. Essentially, though, our authors are still providing fresh information about the new Magnolias and the old ones.

The Society has advanced in activities, if not in numbers: Now we meet every year instead of just now and then; we have a going seed counter that permits members to grow their own Magnolias if they wish, and other coordinated activities such as the Robin letters; more and more Magnolia lovers in Europe, Asia and elsewhere have joined our efforts, which is most encouraging: we have good sources for new and old magnolias; this coming spring we expect to have our first sponsored tour-of Magnolia specialist gardens in Cornwall, Great Britain.

I have no concern about stepping down, if indeed I've ever been "up" in the first place. Larry Langford will need your help in fighting the deadlines and publishing worthwhile articles from now on. I'm sure you'll help him as much as you've helped me.

As we see within, and from prior articles, taxonomists and others disagree on the names we should give to plants, and this journal has taken the position that contributing writers may call a plant by any name they wish so long as the reader is left in no doubt as to which plant is meant.

But readers may be mystified at times by the hard-nosery of editorial "style," which as used here means a consistently preferred spelling, punctuation, use of italics, boldface, subheadings, and so on. Young reporters and editors cut their teeth on a publication's stylebook and once their brains are washed, have difficulty violating it unless a new publisher takes over or the reporter or editor get a new job up the street. A publication without a consistent style would have a letters column jammed every issue with scornful notes from eagle-eyed readers.

In practically all U.S. papers, periodicals, even books and dictionaries, the commas and periods (but not other punctuation marks) that follow matter enclosed by quotation marks—whether double or single marks—go inside the quotation marks, never outside, regardless of rules of grammar and without exception. The reason is based on typographical esthetics, and the writer or editor who flouts this practice paddles upstream.

I sometimes get the fantods pronouncing the Latin double "i" ("ih-eye") as used in many plant names because English words with double "i" and double "u" are uncommon, seen only now and then in such words as vacuum, and I don't want to be thought of as aiding and abetting a Roman plot. The species name "liliiflora," with all those lean and lank letters, gives me double vision, and heretofore in editing for style I've outed the "eye" i and left in the "ih" i. But I sometimes know when I'm licked, and in this and future issues-if the new editor, Larry Langford, concurs—the spelling style will be liliiflora. Lily-eye-flora is the way you would say it but I plan, at least for now, to think of a lily when I say it and not of its eye.

Gene Eisenbeiss of the U.S.
National Arboretum passes on an inquiry from Hiram Larew, research entomologist in the USDA's Florist and Nursery Crops Laboratory, U.S. Dept. Agr. BARC East, Beltsville, MD 20705. Mr. Larew wants to hear from people who grow magnolias as to whether they see damage to

magnolias, done by the magnolia leafminer, Phyllocnistis magnoliella, in areas in this country or abroad, such as in Europe and the Orient, where magnolias commonly occur or are cultivated. He's trying to determine the extent of this leaf miner's geographic range before assembling a paper on the biology of the insect. He would like to be sent samples of mined (damaged) leaves and could furnish good identification photos of such damage to those who believe they have seen such damage. Mr. Larew didn't mention whether any special procedure is needed to get possibly infested vegetative materials from abroad through quarantine.

