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(136-144) Nine proposals to remove condensed formulae and their equivalents from competition with names of non-hybrid taxa

It seems not generally realized that there are entities which are not names, require no descriptions or diagnoses in order to validate their publication, have no types, and are always written in a way such that they cannot, when written, be confused with names, yet which are allowed by the *Code* to compete with names for the purposes of priority and homonymy. These entities are, of course, condensed formulae and their equivalents designating intergeneric hybrids (and hybrids between members of supraspecific taxa within a genus). That they are allowed so to compete is an illogicality of the *Code* that should be eliminated. The illogicality stems from the fact that, since homonyms are defined as names based on different types and the nothotaxonomic condensed formulae do not have types, it is logically impossible for them, being typeless, to be homonyms of typified names. What they can be, of course, is identical in spelling (apart from the ×) and sound with generic names, and the problems caused by this possibility need to be provided for.

Otherwise, the two categories of appellation should be treated as distinct by the *Code*, and proposals are here made to this effect. The potential number of such hybrid designations is immense, and to have them as the equivalents of generic names would seriously complicate the establishment and maintenance of generic databases.

(136) *Add a new Art. 13.7, as follows:*

"13.7. The provisions of Art. H.6.5 Note 2 excepted, condensed formulae and their equivalents designating hybrids between genera and between supraspecific taxa within genera do not compete for priority with names of non-hybrid taxa."

This is an addition consequent upon the changes proposed for Appendix 1, see below.

(137) *In Art. 20.4, add a new section (c), as follows:*

"(c) Condensed formulae and their equivalents designating hybrids:"

Acceptance of the above proposal will necessitate the following editorial changes:

In Art. 20, Note 1: for “The names of” read “The condensed formulae designating”.

In Art. H.3.1: for “name of” (line 3) substitute “condensed formula or equivalent designating” and for “3.2” read “1.2”.

Amend Art. H.6.1 to read: “Hybrids between representatives of 2 or more taxa above specific and up to generic rank may be denoted by a condensed formula or its equivalent”.

In Art. H.7.1: in line 1, for “name” read “designation”; in line 3, for “nothogenic name” read “nothogenic condensed formula”.

In Art. H.8.1: Delete “When ... formation” and substitute: “The parental names used in the formation of a condensed formula denoting a taxon (Arts. H.6 & H.7)”.

In Art H.8.1: for “Names” read “Designations”.

In Art. H.9.1: for “name ... genus” read “condensed formula designating a nothogenus or nothotaxon intermediate in rank between genus and species”; in Ex. 1, for “names” read “designations”.

In Art. H.11.1: for “name” (line 3) read “condensed formula or equivalent ”.
(138) *Add a new Art. 37.6 and example*, as follows:

"37.6. On or after 1 Jan. 1996, a name proposed for a non-hybrid taxon but formed in the manner of a condensed formula designating a hybrid taxon at generic or infrageneric supraspecific rank (i.e., by combining 2 or more existing names in the rank concerned in accordance with Arts. H.6 and H.7) is not validly published"

"Ex. 1. *Lactucusonchus* (Sch.Bip.) Svent. (Ind. Sem. Agron. Investig. Nat. Hispan. Inst. 1968: 53. 1969), a name published for a non-hybrid genus in the tribe *Lactuceae* of the *Compositae*, which also includes the genera *Lactuca* L. and *Sonchus* L., is validly published, as its date of effective publication is before 1 Jan. 1996 and the other criteria of valid publication are satisfied”

Acceptance of the above proposal will necessitate an editorial change: Delete Rec. 20A(j).

(139) *Add a new Art. 64.6 and example*, as follows:

"64.6. When a name and a condensed formula designating a hybrid are identical in spelling, apart from the indication of hybridity, or are so similar that they are likely to be confused (see footnote to Art. 64.3) and the existence of both is considered likely to cause confusion, one may be conserved over the other, or a replacement for the condensed formula may be adopted, unless Art. H.6.5 Note 2 applies”.

"Ex. 1. The condensed formula ×*Hordelymus* Bacht. & Darevskaja (1950), identical in spelling to the generic name *Hordelymus* (Jessen) Jessen (1885), has been correctly rejected in an effective publication before 1 Jan. 1996 under Art. H.6.5 Note 2 and ×*Elyhordeum* Mansf. ex Tsitsin & Petrova (1955) has been adopted in its place”


(141) *In Art. H.3.4*, after ““notho””, add “in the names of nothospecies and nothotaxa of lower rank”.

(142) *Amend Art. H.6.2*, as follows:

Delete “The nothogeneric ... single word” and replace by: “The nothogeneric condensed formula of a bigeneric hybrid is formed by combining the names adopted for the parental genera into a single word” and add at end “, and placing the multiplication sign × before it”.

Acceptance of the above proposal will necessitate editorial changes: in Arts. H.6.3 and H.6.4 change “name” to “designation”.

(143) *Add a new Art. H.6.5, with two Notes and one example*, as follows:

"H.6.5. For purposes of priority, epithets in names of hybrids of specific rank and below first validly published in combination with validly published nothogeneric condensed formulae also compete with those first validly published in combination with generic names. However, condensed formulae designating hybrids between genera and between taxa intermediate in rank between genus and species do not compete with names published for non-hybrid taxa in the same ranks, but only with one another, unless Note 2 of this Article applies”
"Note 1. If the existence of identically spelt condensed formulae and generic names is considered likely to cause confusion, one may be proposed for conservation over the other (see Art. 64.6)."

"Note 2. A name or condensed formula, correctly rejected before 1 Jan. 1996 in an effective publication as a later homonym of a condensed formula or name respectively, is not to be reinstated."

"Ex. 1. ×Hordelymus Bacht. & Darevskaja (1950) (= Elymus L. × Hordeum L.) has been rejected as a later homonym of Hordelymus (Jessen) Jessen (1885) in accordance with the provisions of Art. H.6.5 Note 2 and is therefore not to be reinstated."

Acceptance of the above proposal will necessitate an editorial change: in Art. H.3 delete Ex. 2 and renumber Ex. 3. as Ex. 2.

(I44) Reword Art. H.9 Note 1, to read:

"Note 1. Since the designations of nothogenera and nothotaxa intermediate in rank between genus and species are condensed formulae or are treated as such, they do not have types and do not establish autonyms nor form homonyms:"

In Ex. 2, for “name” read “condensed formula” (line 3).
In Ex. 3, for “name” read “condensed formula”; and for “available for” read “applicable to”.
In Note 2, after “names” insert “and condensed formulae”.

Proposed by: C. Jeffrey, Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AE, U.K.

Three editorial suggestions to reorganize the Code


The term “protologue” is first used in Art. 7.8 (p. 8) but not defined until Art. 8.1 (p. 11).

Editorial suggestion (2): Interchange present Arts. 9.3 and 9.5.

It is logical to establish the permanent status of types (now Art. 9.5) before establishing procedures when there is a problem (now Art. 9.3).

Editorial suggestion (3): Interchange present Arts. 11 and 12.

Present Art. 12, dealing with the requirement of valid publication for a name to have any status, logically precedes present Art. 11, defining correct names under priority.

Proposed by: C. Jeffrey, Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AE, U.K.