

**(298) Insert a new example to the new Rec. 46E**

“Ex. 1. The citations *Abrothallus* De Not. 1845, and *Acremonium lichenicola* W. Gams 1971 conform to this recommendation.”

This new Recommendation will promote what can only be interpreted as good practice, it will: (1) encourage authors to check personally the background information of names whose authorities they wish to cite, rather than copy author citations from secondary,

tertiary, or even more removed sources, compounding or perpetuating errors; and (2) provide a means of more precisely pin-pointing a particular publication and so facilitating access to the original place of publication of a name.

**Acknowledgement**

This contribution was prepared while I was in receipt of an award from the Programa Ramón y Cajal of the Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología of Spain held at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

**(299) Proposal to amend Article 52.3**

Charles Jeffrey

Komarov Botanical Institute RAN, 2 Prof. Popov St, 197376 St. Petersburg, Russia

The first two clauses of the first sentence of Art. 52.3 read: “A name that was nomenclaturally superfluous when published is not illegitimate...” There follows a conditional clause that will be considered below but, should that condition be fulfilled, can such a name always be “not illegitimate”, as implied by the present wording? What if the name proves to be a later homonym? There would then be a conflict with Art. 53.1. Amendment to the wording is obviously required.

The conditional clause that follows reads “if its basionym is legitimate, or if it is based on the stem of a legitimate generic name”. Art. 33.3 defines the basionym of a name as its “name-bringing or epithet-bringing synonym” but a name can be such only if it be legitimate (Art. 11.4 - “the correct name is the combination of the final epithet of the earliest legitimate name of the taxon in the same rank, with the correct name of the genus or species to which it is assigned...”). The conditional clause in Art.

52.3 - “if its basionym is legitimate” - is consequently nonsensical, for an illegitimate name cannot be a basionym, as it cannot serve as a name-bringing or epithet-bringing synonym, and a basionym is therefore ipso facto always legitimate. Again amendment to the text is required.

The wording of the first sentence of Art. 52.3 consequently requires amendment on two counts. The following proposal is put forward to effect the required amendments.

**(299) Amend the first sentence of Art. 52.3 to read as follows:**

A name that was nomenclaturally superfluous when published is not illegitimate on account of its superfluity if it is a combination based on a name-bringing or epithet-bringing synonym (basionym), or if it is based on the stem of a legitimate generic name.

**(300–301) Proposals to clarify the interpretation of Article 60.7 and its Example 11**

John H. Wiersema<sup>1</sup> & Dan H. Nicolson<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> United States Department of Agriculture/Agricultural Research Service, Systematic Botany & Mycology Laboratory, Bldg. 011A, BARC-West, Beltsville, Maryland 20705, U.S.A. [jwiersema@ars-grin.gov](mailto:jwiersema@ars-grin.gov)

<sup>2</sup> United States National Herbarium, Smithsonian Institution, NMNH, MRC-166, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A. [nicolson.dan@nsmnh.si.edu](mailto:nicolson.dan@nsmnh.si.edu)

**(300) Modify Art. 60.7 to read (changes indicated in bold font):**

60.7. When changes in spelling orthography by earlier authors who adopt personal, geographic, or vernacular names in nomenclature are intentional latinizations, they are to be preserved, except when they concern only the termination of epithets to which Art. 60.11 applies and stem changes to personal names involving (a) omission of a final vowel or final consonant or (b) conversion of a final vowel to a different vowel, which are to be corrected by restoration of the final letter.

**(301) Rewrite Art. 60 Ex. 11 as follows (changes indicated in bold font):**

Ex. 11. *Acacia* “**brandegeana**”, *Blandfordia* “*backhousii*”,

*Cephalotaxus* “*fortuni*”, *Chenopodium* “*loureiri*”, *Convolvulus* “*loureiri*”, *Glochidion* “*melvilliorum*”, ***Hypericum* “*buckleii*”**, ***Solanum* “*rantonnetii*”**, and *Zygophyllum* “*billardieri*” were published to commemorate T. S. Brandegee, J. Backhouse, R. Fortune, J. de Loureiro, R. Melville and E. F. Melville, S. F. Buckley, V. Rantonnet, and J. J. H. de Labillardière (de la Billardière). The implicit latinizations are Brandegeus, Backhousius, Fortunus, Loureireus or Loureirus, Melvillius, Buckleius, Rantonneus, and Billardierius. The names are correctly cited as *Acacia brandegeana* I. M. Johnst., *B. backhousei* Gunn & Lindl. (1845), *Cephalotaxus fortunei* Hook. (1850), *Chenopodium loureiroi* Steud. (1840), *Convolvulus loureiroi* G. Don (1836), *G. melvilleorum* Airy Shaw (1971), *H. buckleyi* M. A. Curtis, *S. rantonnetii* Carrière, and *Z. billardierei* DC. (1824).

Under Art. 60.7 there is a conflict between the wording of the Article itself and Ex.11. Article 60.7 states that intentional latinizations “are to be preserved, except when they concern only the termination of epithets to which Art. 60.11 applies”. If we consult Art. 60.11 and its associated Rec. 60C.1, it becomes clear (see Note 1 under Rec. 60C) what is meant by a “termination” as distinct from the “stem” of the epithet, and this was further discussed by Nicolson (in *Taxon* 23: 549–561. 1974) where the present version of Rec. 60C.1 was first introduced.

The intentional latinizations that are being rejected in Ex. 11, on the grounds that “they affect only the termination”, actually involve alterations to the stem or to a terminal inflection of the stem, not (or not just) the termination. For the particular cases cited we have backhouse-i [stem-termination] having been changed to backhousi-i, fortune-i to fortuni-i, loreiro-i to loreire-i or loreir-i, melville-orum to melvilli-orum, billardiere-i to billardieri-i. These all involve stem changes of dropping or converting a final vowel that, although each might have an impact on the termination, are not part of the termination itself.

Examining the history of Ex. 10 and Ex. 11, it can be seen that some of the cases cited in these Examples were taken from Perry and Nicolson’s Prop. 146 (in *Taxon* 47: 934. 1998) that also included an accompanying Note specifying the particular cases where intentional latinizations would not be preserved. In particular, when the only change “was (a) the omission of the final vowel or (b), in the case of a name ending in silent or unaccented ‘e’, changing that ‘e’ to an ‘i.’” This covers all of the cases in the current Ex. 11, except loreiro-i to loreire-i, where a final ‘o’ has been changed to an ‘e’. Because this proposal was defeated their Note never entered the Code, leaving the interpretation of the epithets in Ex. 11 without a proper foundation. Our proposal seeks to remedy that shortcoming by accounting in Article 60.7 for each instance treated in Ex. 11.

This proposal does not impact other spelling changes from intentional latinizations that do not match those specified above. Therefore epithets such as “*berteroniana*” from Bertero, “*chamissonis*” from Chamisso, “*linnaei*” from Linné, “*sagraeana*” from Sagra, “*satowi*” from Sato, and “*solandri*” from Solander would continue to be admissible as treated under Rec. 60C.2 or discussed by Nicolson (l.c.). These changes involve either adding terminal letters to the stem or are conversions involving more than a single letter.

The proposal adds three more names to Ex. 11, to provide further clarity and resolve an additional situation. The cases of *Acacia brandegeana* and *Hypericum buckleii* are difficult to interpret in light of current Examples 10 and 11. Example 10 points out that we should accept intentional latinizations when consonants or vowels (of the stem, though this is not expressly stated) were converted to consonants (e.g., ‘u’ to ‘v’ or ‘w’ to ‘v’), but “*brandegeana*” results from dropping a final vowel and “*buckleii*” from converting a final ‘y’ to an ‘i’, more like the cases in Example 11 which are not accepted. And what about cases where a final silent consonant has been dropped, apparently to preserve, when latinized, a particular pronunciation? Recently the case of *Solanum rantonnei* Carrière was brought to our attention by means of a proposal to conserve this name as *S. rantonnetii*, the spelling overwhelmingly used in horticulture. The name commemorates the horticulturist Rantonnet. The practice seemingly employed by Carrière in creating this epithet could lead to epithets like “*auberi*” from Aubert and “*poirei*” from Poiret, making it difficult to determine the original personal (family) name from the epithet. Mandating orthographic correction of such epithets would avoid

battles over confusability should both this version and the orthographically correct version come into the same genus, where they may or may not be viewed as homonyms.

The impact of this latter change to Ex.11 on current usage has been assessed by searching the *International Plant Names Index* (IPNI: [www.ipni.org](http://www.ipni.org)) for other epithets resulting from a similar latinization of French personal names. No instances of “*poirei*” (from Poiret), “*franchei*” (from Franchet), and “*aublet*” (from Aublet), or “*briquei*” (from Briquet) were found. In fact, for 38 botanical authors whose names end in “-et” or “-ert” not a single epithet in IPNI was found which followed Carrière’s practice of latinization by dropping a silent consonant. One can therefore infer that eliminating this practice should have very minimal impact on existing nomenclature, and, in at least one case, obviate a conservation proposal.

The impact to existing nomenclature of the other two cases to be added to Ex. 11 is somewhat greater, although right now their present interpretation, given the current wording of the Example, is unclear. To evaluate botanical usage for the case of converting ‘y’ to ‘i’, a list of 1561 botanical authors with names ending in ‘y’ was generated from an IPNI author query and epithets derived from these surnames from only the *Index Kewensis* (IK) database were examined. This avoided duplication of records across the three datasets in IPNI, and excluded many of the infraspecific records found in the Gray Cards data that were not under consideration. For 54 surnames most represented among epithets, which included among others Bailey, Delavay, Gay, Gentry, Gray, Harley, Harvey, Hemsley, Henry, Kotschy, Lindley, Murray, Parry, Remy, Ridley, Standley, Torrey, and Tracy, a total of 4,069 entries were recovered which preserved intact the spelling of the surname in the epithet. This compares with only 75 instances, less than 2 percent of cases, in which the final ‘y’ was converted to an ‘i’ in forming the epithet. Epithets based on the name Gregory, which possess a well-established latinized form acceptable under Rec. 60C.2, were excluded from this figure. Among the epithets of this type are *Maurandya barclaiana* (and its basionym *Asarina barclaiana*) *Enterolobium barnebianum*, *Mimosa barnebiana*, *Hypericum buckleii*, *Cuscuta choisiana*, *Ipomoea choisiana*, *Hypericum choisianum*, *Selago choisiana*, *Tacca choudhuriana*, *Oxalis dudleii*, *Tabernaemontana gentriana*, *Mollinedia gentrii*, *Erica harveiana*, *Lythrum kennedeanum*, *Trifolium kennedeanum*, *Caragana korshinskii*, *Nerium kotschii*, *Trigonella lipskii*, *Erica mackaiana*, *Pycnanthemum torrei*, *Drimys vickeriana*, *Tasmannia vickeriana*, *Sagittaria weatherbiana*, and *Bupleurum zoharii*. While corrections to some of these already appear in the literature and are widely adopted, others have never been corrected.

A similar procedure isolated 124 authors from IPNI with names ending ‘ee’, with epithets found for only Brandegee, Demaree, Fée, Feuillée, Lavallée, Lawalrée, Lee, Mukerjee, Nee, Plée, Rowlee, and Schnee among these. Tallies indicated that among these epithets 134 resulted from dropping the final ‘e’ and 180 preserved the name intact. Epithets based on Brandegee made up over 75 percent of the cases of the first type, with epithets commemorating Feuillée and Lavallée also tending to be formed in this manner. Names such as Fée, Nee, and Plée were consistently preserved in their epithets.