

## (390) Proposal to preclude homonymy of generic names with names of intergeneric graft-hybrids (chimaeras)

John McNeill,<sup>1</sup> Julian M.H. Shaw<sup>2</sup> & John H. Wiersema<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Royal Botanic Garden, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh EH3 5LR, Scotland, U.K.

<sup>2</sup> Horticultural taxonomy, Royal Horticultural Society, Wisley, Woking, Surrey, GU23 6QB, U.K.

<sup>3</sup> United States Department of Agriculture/Agricultural Research Service, National Germplasm Resources Laboratory, Bldg. 003, Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC-West), Beltsville, Maryland 20705-2350, U.S.A.

Author for correspondence: John McNeill, J.McNeill@rbge.ac.uk

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/655.39>

### (390) Add a new paragraph to Art. 54.1 (with a footnote) to read:

“(c) A name of a genus is treated as an illegitimate later homonym if it is spelled identically with a previously published intergeneric graft hybrid “name” established<sup>1</sup> under the provisions of the *International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants*.”

<sup>1</sup>The term “established” is used by the *ICNCP* for the concept of validly published in the *ICN*.”

### and add to the parenthesis at the end of Art. H.6.1: “and 54.1(c)”.

The Editorial Committee should also consider replacing the words “not treated as algae, fungi, or plants” in Art. 54.1 by “not treated under this *Code*”.

The nomenclature of graft hybrids or chimaeras was first regulated in Art. 32 of the *Cambridge Rules* (Briquet, *Int. Rules Bot. Nomencl.*, ed. 3: 9. 1935), in which the relevant text was as follows:

“Art. 32. Bigeneric hybrids (i. e. hybrids between species of two genera) are also designated by a formula and, whenever it seems useful or necessary, by a name.

The formula consists of the names of the two parents connected by a sign, as in Art. 31.

The name consists of a new “generic” name usually formed by a combination of the names of the parent genera, and a “specific” epithet. All hybrids (whether sexual or asexual) between the same two genera bear the same “generic” name.

(1) *Sexual hybrids*. In the formula the connecting sign × is used. The name is preceded by the sign ×.

(2) *Asexual hybrids*. In the formula the connecting sign + is used. The name is preceded by the sign +. The “specific” epithet is different from that of the corresponding sexual hybrid (if any) between the same species.

Examples of sexual hybrids: ×*Odontioda Boltonii* (*Cochlioda Noezliana* × *Odontoglossum Vuylstekeae*); ×*Pyronia Veitchii* (*Cydonia oblonga* × *Pyrus communis*).

Examples of asexual hybrids: +*Laburnocytisus Adami* (*Laburnum anagyroides* + *Cytisus purpureus*); +*Pyronia Daniellii* (*Cydonia oblonga* + *Pyrus communis*).

This entry was relegated to Appendix III (“Proposed International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants”) in the *Stockholm Code* (Lanjouw & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 3. 1952), and dropped altogether in the *Paris Code* (Lanjouw & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 8: 52. 1956), where it was noted (Art. H.1 Note 3) that “Graft chimaeras [...], being horticultural objects, are dealt with by the International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants”. This survived until the *Leningrad Code* (Stafleu & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 97. 1978), where a more general statement (Art. 28 Note 1) about the function of the *ICNCP*, similar to the current Art. 28 Note 2, replaced it.

Unlike the provision in the *Cambridge Rules*, the Proposed *ICNCP* in the *Stockholm Code* required that “this ‘generic’ name should not be the same as the ‘generic’ name of hybrids between the same genera” and this continues to be the rule (Art. 24.3) in the current, ninth edition of the *ICNCP* (Brickell & al. in *Scripta Hort.* 18. 2016). There is, therefore, an unbalanced situation. Whereas, under the *ICNCP*, the name of an intergeneric graft hybrid may not be the same as a pre-existing generic name or nothogeneric name, under the *ICN* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 154. 2012) there is currently no barrier to the valid publication of a new generic name or nothogeneric name that is spelled the same as the name of an intergeneric graft hybrid established (equivalent to validly published) under Art. 27 of the *ICNCP*.

As names of intergeneric graft hybrids are in every way comparable with generic names and nothogeneric names governed by the *ICN*, precluding duplication between them is clearly desirable. The above proposal will achieve this and can be likened to the provisions in Art. 16.3, 17.1, 19.3, and 20.1 that ensure that there can be no confusion between names governed by the *ICN* and names of viruses.

Currently, although two cases are known of homonymy between names of intergeneric graft hybrids correctly formed under the provisions of the *ICNCP* and names validly published under the *ICN* (both nothogeneric names), because the latter have priority, neither of the names of the inter-generic graft hybrids is established under the provisions of the *ICNCP* (Art. 24.3 final sentence with Art. 27.1(c)). These are ×*Amygdalopersica* Duhamel (“*Amygdalo-persica*”) (1768) and +*Amygdalopersica* L.L. Daniel (1915), and ×*Laburnocytisus* C.K. Schneid. (1907) and +*Laburnocytisus* Trel. (1933). [The material studied by Schneider in naming ×*Laburnocytisus* was in fact a graft-hybrid, but Schneider believed it to be a sexual hybrid and accordingly published a nothogeneric name.] There is also a case of homonymy between ×*Pyronia* Trabut. (1916) and +*Pyronia* Ramsbottom & al. (1929), but as the latter is not formed from the full name of the second component generic name as required by *ICNCP* Art. 27.4, first sentence, it is not an established name for that reason also.

In order to facilitate application of the rule if the amendment is accepted we append a list, compiled by one of us (JMHS) of all the names of intergeneric graft hybrids known to have been established under the *ICNCP*. There are a number of other names that have been applied to intergeneric graft hybrids that are not established under the *ICNCP* either because they do not terminate in the full name of one of the component genera or because they appeared in an electronic-only medium; for details see Shaw (in *Plantsman* 15: 162–166. 2016).

**List of established names for intergeneric chimaeras**

- +**Arioechinopsis** Mottram, Generitaxa Cactaceae: 24. 29 Jun 2016 = *Ariocarpus* + *Echinopsis*.
- +**Coryopuntia** Mottram, Generitaxa Cactaceae: 76. 29 Jun 2016 = *Coryphantha* + *Opuntia*.
- +**Crataegomespilus** Simon-Louis in Rev. Hort. (Paris) 71: 403. Sep 1899 ('*Crataego-mespilus*') = *Crataegus* + *Mespilus*.
- +**Echinogymnocalycium** Mottram, Generitaxa Cactaceae: 103. 29 Jun 2016 = *Echinopsis* + *Gymnocalycium*.
- +**Epigymnocalycium** Mottram, Generitaxa Cactaceae: 110. 29 Jun 2016 = *Epiphyllum* + *Gymnocalycium*.
- +**Hylogymnocalycium** G.D. Rowley in Brit. Cactus Succ. J. 23(1): 12. 2005 = *Gymnocalycium* + *Hylocereus*.
- +**Myrtigymnocalycium** Mottram, Generitaxa Cactaceae: 218–219. 29 Jun 2016 = *Gymnocalycium* + *Myrtillocactus*.
- +**Pyrocrataegus** L.L. Daniel in Rev. Gén. Bot. 27: 37. 1915 ('*Pirocrataegus*') = *Crataegus* + *Pyrus*.
- +**Pyrocydonia** H.K.A. Winkl. ex L.L. Daniel in Compt. Rend. Hebd. Séances Acad. Sci. 157: 995. 1913 ('*Pirocydonia*') = *Cydonia* + *Pyrus*.
- +**Uebelechinopsis** G.D. Rowley in Teratopia 101–102: 280. 2006 = *Echinopsis* + *Uebelmannia*.

Note: the five names for intergeneric graft hybrids published by Mottram first appeared in volume 4 of the electronic-only publication, *The Cactician*, available online on 26 Mar 2014. The names were only established under the *ICNCP* when two printed copies were deposited, one in the Library of the Royal Horticultural Society at Wisley and the other in that of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (*ICNCP* Art. 25 and 26) on 29 Jun 2016.