(276-283) Eight proposals to amend the Code

R. J. F. Henderson

(276) In Art. 32 Ex. 6, change "martini" to "martinii" (three times).

I proposed these corrections in 1986 (Henderson, 1986). The Rapporteurs commented that I had proposed "a correction that would be contrary to Rec. 73C.2 and not covered by Art. 73.10" (Greuter & McNeill, 1987). The proposal was discussed at the nomenclature sessions at the International Botanical Congress in Berlin in 1987 and was referred to the Editorial Committee (Greuter & al., 1989: 81). It was not included by the Committee.

In his catalogue of plants growing in the honourable East India Company’s botanic garden in Calcutta, India, Roxburgh (1814: 7) listed under Andropogon a grass from Balla Ghat under the name 'Andropogon Martinii, R. [Roxburgh]'. It had been sent to the garden by a General Martin who had collected it from the highlands in Balla Ghat while on army service there, and grown on in Lucknow before being forwarded to Calcutta. It is debatable whether or not the combination Andropogon martinii was validly published in Roxburgh’s 1814 publication, but it was definitely validly published in his posthumous Flora indica (Roxburgh, 1820: 277), where the spelling of the epithet had changed to ‘Martini’. There, Roxburgh recorded that the plant concerned was at the time of writing “plentiful in the Company’s Botanic garden, raised from seed sent from thence [Lucknow] by that gentleman [General Martin] whose name I have applied as a specific one for this elegant plant”.

The epithet is thus derived directly from a modern personal name ending in a consonant and Roxburgh decreed that it be substantive in form. Thus Rec. 73C.1.(b) of both the Sydney and Berlin Codes directly applies as to how this epithet should be spelled, while Art. 73.10 further decrees that what Rec. 73C.1 recommends must be followed. Rec. 73C.2 applies to personal names already in Latin or Greek, or possessing a well-established latinised form. The name ‘Martin’ surely does not come within these categories. Even if it did, Rec. 73C.2 goes on to state that “modern personal names are subject to the provisions of Art. 73.10” which would thus again demand that the epithet be spelled with the ‘-ii’ ending, as Roxburgh (while living) originally did.

If it is still considered that the above proposal is not covered by Art. 73.10, I respectfully request the Editorial Committee to dispense with this contentious example and find another to illustrate the point of the example, validation of a combination by indirect reference.

(277) In Art. 46.1, delete the words “unless the provisions for autonyms apply (Arts. 19.3, 22.1, and 26.1; see also Art. 16.1)”, and add “of its validation” after “date”; in Art. 16.1, delete the words “”, but without the citation of an author’s name”; and in Art. 19.3, 22.1 and 26.1, delete the words “”, but not followed by an author’s name”.

These changes are intended to make all validly published botanical names, autonyms included, subject to the provisions of Art. 46 while clarifying what date is
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critical to the citation. The principle enunciated by the new Art. 46 is that by citing the validating author’s name after a botanical name, workers/researchers have a chance of finding where that botanical name was published, something that is critical for saving time in taxonomic revisions. The present convention of not citing validating authors’ names with autonyms is an anachronism created in 1981 when the principle of accepting autonyms as validly published was adopted at the Sydney Congress and incorporated in the Sydney Code (Voss & al., 1983). Validation of autonyms is presently covered by Art. 32.6. Since autonyms now have standing under the Code (Greuter & al., 1988) and their priority dates from the date they were established (Art. 32.6), it is imperative that the author establishing an autonym is associated with it “to be accurate and complete” (Art. 46.1).

How this should be accomplished is debatable. Citation of the author(s) of distinct, ‘non-autonym’ botanical names is easily determined by the current Code. For example, Myrtaceae Juss., Leptospermoideae (DC.) Endl., Eucalyptus L’Hér., Eucalyptus globulus Labill. and Eucalyptus globulus subsp. costata (Maiden, Blakely & Simmonds) J. B. Kirkp. Since Kirkpatrick, in also creating an autonym, in effect recombined Labillardière’s epithet at subspecific rank, and the type of that autonym is the same as the type of the species’ name, I suggest that author citation for the autonym be Eucalyptus globulus subsp. globulus (Labill.) J. B. Kirkp. On the other hand, the autonym created by E. conoidea var. marginata by Bentham in 1867 should be cited as E. conoidea var. conoidea Benth. because he established both the species name (E. conoidea) and the variety name simultaneously, a case specifically covered by Art. 34.3 and illustrated by Art. 34 Ex. 11. Whether or not these names are accepted for the taxa they apply to is irrelevant, that being a taxonomic consideration.

Acceptance of this principle then leads to Proposal (278) regarding other aspects of Art. 46, and other Articles as indicated.

(278) Add a new Note after Art. 46.1:

“Note 1. In formally citing autonyms at suprageneric rank, only the name of the validating author is cited; for citation of autonyms at ranks below genus, the names of validating authors are preceded by the name, in parentheses, of the author of the genus name for autonyms at ranks above species, or the species name for autonyms at infraspecific rank.”

If this proposal passes, the following changes will be needed: (1) Add author citations after autonyms in Art. 19 Ex. 1 (Rosoideae Endl., Roseae DC.), Art. 19 Ex. 2 (Pooideae A. Braun, Poëae Adans.; see Butzin, 1973), Art. 19 Ex. 3 (Ericoideae Endl., Ericae G. Don), Art.19 Ex. 4 (Asteroideae Solbrig, Astereae Cass., Asterinae Dumort., Cichorieae Dumort., Cichorinae O. Hoffm.), Art. 25 Ex. 1 (Montia parvifolia subsp. parvifolia (DC.) Ferris, based on Claytonia parvifolia DC.), Art. 26 Ex. 1 (Lobelia spicata var. spicata (Lam.) McVaugh, based on L. spicata Lam.), Art. 26 Ex. 2 (Lycopodium inundatum var. inundatum (L.) Tuck., based on L. inundatum L.), Art. 26 Ex. 3 (Utricularia stellaris var. stellaris (L. f.) A. DC., based on U. stellaris L. f.), Art. 57 Ex. 8 (Salix tristis var. tristis (Aiton) Anderson, based on S. tristis Aiton), and Art. 57 Ex. 9 (see Prop. 280); (2) in Art. 46.1 Ex. 1, delete “L.” from the autonym, and add “(L.) Keller” at the end of the autonym; (3) in Art. H.11 Ex.
3, remove “L.” after the first mention of “piperita” and “spicata”, and add “(L.) Harley” after the second mention of “piperita” and “spicata”.

From Art. H.10.1, it is clear that autonyms can also be published for nothotaxa. Therefore the example associated with Art. H.11 also needs modification if the above proposed changes to the method of citation of authors of autonyms are accepted.

(279) In Art. 19 Ex. 3, add the words “the type of” before “Rhododendron” and “Rhodora”; and in Art. 19 Ex. 4, add the words “which includes” after “Aster L.” and “Cichorium L.”

Rhododendron, the taxon included in the tribe Rhodoreae, is not type of the subfamily name. This genus contains the type of the name R. ferrugineum L., which is also type of the genus name Rhododendron and the subfamily name Rhododendroideae. For citation of that type, citation of the name Rhododendron is sufficient (Art. 10.4). A similar situation applies with the type of Rhodora canadensis, which is also the type of the tribal name Rhodoreae. The additional words suggested render sentence two in this example technically correct and consistent with the first sentence.

Similarly, the taxon Aster is not the type of the family name, but it includes the type of A. amellus L. which is the type of its name (Art. 10.1) and also the type of the family name (Art. 10.4). The taxon Cichorium is not the type of the subfamily name Cichorioideae. It includes the type of C. intybus L. which is the type of its name (Art. 10.1) and this subfamily name (Art. 10.4).

Note that though the Code uses italics, it is conventional in biological circles to publish names above generic rank in roman type (e.g. Grayston, 1988; see also Solbrig, 1963) in countries that do not have and use different endings for vernacular plant family names, such as German (-aceen) and French (-acées).

(280) Reword Art. 57 Ex. 9, to read:

“Ex. 9. In the classification adopted by Rollins and Shaw, the taxon called Lesquerella lasiocarpa (Hooker ex A. Gray) S. Watson is composed of two subspecies, subsp. lasiocarpa (which includes the type of the name of the species and whose name is cited as L. lasiocarpa var. lasiocarpa (Hooker ex A. Gray) Rollins & E. Shaw), and subsp. berlandieri whose name is cited as L. lasiocarpa subsp. berlandieri (A. Gray) Rollins & E. Shaw. The latter subspecies is composed of two varieties. In this classification the correct citation of the name of the variety which includes the type of the name L. lasiocarpa subsp. berlandieri is L. lasiocarpa var. berlandieri (A. Gray) Payson (1922), not L. lasiocarpa var. berlandieri (cited without an author) or L. lasiocarpa var. hispida (S. Watson) Rollins & E. Shaw (1972), based on Sinthopsis berlandieri var. hispida S. Watson (1882), since publication of the latter name established the autonym Sinthopsis berlandieri var. berlandieri (A. Gray) S. Watson which, at varietal rank, is treated as having priority over Sinthopsis berlandieri var. hispida S. Watson.”

The present wording of this example in the Code renders its intent difficult to comprehend because taxonomy (subspecies and varieties they contain) has been confused with nomenclature (names of the various taxa). For example, “... two subspecies, subsp. lasiocarpa (which includes the type of the name of the species and is cited without an author) ... ” and “... the autonym ... is treated as having
priority over var. *hispida.*” This confounds taxa with names. Taxa do not have types as such. Their names have types which have sometimes been called “nomenclatural types of taxa” which means ‘types of names of taxa’. Taxa do not have author citations, their names do. A name cannot have priority over a taxon! Art. 24.1 defines what the name of a variety is. The suggested rewording aims to clarify these concepts and render the text technically correct.

(281) *In Art. 68.2, delete the words “autonyms excepted (Art. 26.1)”, and add “species” after “illegitimate”.*

This proposal, though related to autonyms, results not from the proposals above but from the effects of Art. 32.6 which grants autonyms equal standing with ‘non-autonyms’ at the same rank, and Art. 57.3 which decrees they have priority over the names that created them.

From a comparison of the wording of Art. 68.2 in both the Sydney *Code* (Voss & al., 1983) and the Berlin *Code* (Greuter & al., 1988), and Greuter & McNeill’s commentary on proposed changes to the Sydney *Code* (1987), it appears that the words in this article regarding autonyms in the Berlin *Code* are an editorial addition not specifically voted upon by the 1987 Nomenclature Section. As the effect of excluding autonyms from the provisions of Art. 68.2 denies or ignores the validity and standing of autonyms under Art. 32.6 and 57.3, the additional words editorially inserted appear to have created a philosophical inconsistency. To remove this inconsistency, the wording of Art. 68.2 should revert to that in the Sydney *Code*, and basically that in the Leningrad *Code* (Stafleu & al., 1978) before it. The word “species” should be added after “illegitimate” because, for an infraspecific name, the final epithet can only be associated with a species name (Art. 24.1).

(282) *Reword Art. 6.8, to read:*

“6.8. Autonyms are such names as can be established automatically under Arts. 19.4, 22.2, 26.2 and H.3, whether they are formally cited in the publication where they are created or not.”

From Art. H.3 and Art. H.11 Ex. 3 it is clear that autonyms can also be validated by naming certain hybrids at infraspecific rank. Therefore this possibility needs to be acknowledged in Art. 6.8. Though dealing with autonyms, this proposal is quite independent of Prop. (277).

The word “formally” is irrelevant in this context as autonyms when created are created automatically by the operation of Art. 19.4, 22.2, 26.2 and H.3. I take the intent of the present wording “formally created” to be whether or not the autonym appears in print in the publication where it is created (Art. 32.6). Whether or not this is so here, the wording of Art. 6.8 needs clarification.

(283) *Reword Art. H.11.2, to read (additions in italics):*

“H.11.2. The *infraspecific* epithet in the *name* of an infraspecific nothotaxon, of which the postulated or known parental taxa are assigned to *two or more* different taxa at a higher rank, may be placed subordinate to the name of a nothotaxon at that higher rank (see Art. 24.1). If this higher-ranking nothotaxon is a nothospecies, the
name of the subordinate nothotaxon is a combination of an *infraspecific* epithet with the nothospecific name *connected by a term to denote its rank*.”

The suggested addition of words is to make Art. H.11.2 technically correct and consistent with the wording in Art. H.11.1 and 24.1. A taxon does not have an epithet, its name does. The word “different” is ambiguous; “two or more” has been added to clarify what I understand is intended. Perhaps this is wrong? Art. 24.1 defines an infraspecific combination as consisting of four words.
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