

(122–134) Some proposals on orthography

Paul van Rijckevorsel

Dipteryx, Postbus 4047, 3502 HA Utrecht, The Netherlands; dipteryx@freeler.nl

Introduction

The 2006, *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146. 2006) saw great change in the matter of Orthography, perhaps more and further-reaching change than ever before. Two so far alien concepts were introduced into the *Code*.

The new Art. 32.1(b) requires that a name be composed of letters of the Latin alphabet. If taken literally, any name that, in the original publication, included an abbreviation employing a full stop (period) is now no longer validly published; resulting in a nomenclatural destabilization of unimaginable and unprecedented proportions (thus supporting the often-held thesis that orthography is the most important and finicky topic in the *Code*). Fortunately this appears easily repairable.

A second radical change was made by the Editorial Committee in Art. 60 Ex. 27 (and the introductory sentence of Rec. 60C.1, a “back-door rule”). Using the given name of a person as an epithet, as a noun in apposition (e.g., *Nigella degenii* subsp. *jenny* after Jenny, the daughter of the author) is not a new concept, but a very old one, going back to the 19th Century, when it was fashionable to name treasured plants after wives, daughters, princesses, etc. From the beginning this has been set aside in the *Code*; and was moved, when that was split off, to the *International code for nomenclature of cultivated plants (ICNCP)*, where it became a cultivar epithet (for example *Aster novibelgii* ‘Jenny’, *Clematis* ‘Jenny’, etc.).

The 1867 *Lois* (Candolle, *Lois Nomencl. Bot.* 1867) explicitly ruled against this (in its Art. 33), prescribing a genitive or adjective (*clusii* or *clusiana*), when honouring a person. The *Lois* dealt with the topic of a modern name used as an epithet (with the example “*Pelargonium zonale Mistress-Pollock*”) in Art. 40 (as different as possible from Latin names). Over time, these provisions became what is Rec. 23A.1 and the back-door rule of Rec. 60C.1 in the *Vienna Code*, on the one hand, and Art. 21.11 in the 2009, 8th edition of the *ICNCP* (Brickell & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 151. 2009), on the other hand. The *ICNCP* kept a phrasing recognizably derived from the *Lois* up to the 6th edition (Trehane & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 133. 1995), at its clearest in the 3rd and 4th edition (Fletcher & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 22. 1961; Gilmour & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 64. 1969): “... must ... be a fancy name, that is, one markedly different from a botanical name in Latin form.” This is still referred to in Art. 28 Note 5 of the *Vienna Code*.

Thus Ex. 27 gives an example of something which, arguably, is disallowed entirely (it was in the past), depending on how Art. 60.11 and Rec. 60C.1 are interpreted. Anyway, this has at least a century of botanical tradition going against it, and most certainly is not recommended.

(122) Add a new paragraph to Art. 20:

“20.4 *bis*. In a combination (Art. 6.7) a generic name may be represented by an abbreviation consisting of the initial letter of the name, or the initial letter and one or more further letters of the name, and a full stop (period), provided this is unambiguous. For nomenclatural purposes such an abbreviation is to be taken as that generic name (written out in full).”

Now that it is a requirement for the valid publication of a botanical name that it is composed only of the letters of the Latin alphabet there might be a problem with names such as *Afzelia bipindensis* Harms, where the original spelling, in this case “*A. bipindensis*”, does not consist only of letters of the Latin alphabet. Taking Art. 32.1(b) literally, these names would appear to be not validly published; thus it is desirable explicitly to provide for this. If this proposal is passed, refer to the new provision in Art. 32.1(b). In addition, it may be a good idea also to refer to it in Art. 21.4 and 24.4, and in Art. 23 *Ex. 19.

(123) If Proposal 122 is accepted, add an Example to it:

“*Ex. n.* The name of a new species represented as “*A. bipindensis* Harms n. sp.” (in *Bot. Jahrb. Syst.* 49: 426. 1911) followed “*A. bella* Harms n. sp.”, which in turn directly followed the heading “*Afzelia* Sm.” and was therefore unambiguous; for nomenclatural purposes it is to be taken as *Afzelia bipindensis*. The name is validly published, although in the original publication its rendition was not composed only of letters of the Latin alphabet (Art. 32.1(b)).”

(124) Add a new Rule, following Art. 60.10 (or as a second sentence in Art. 60.10):

“60.10 *bis*. The use of a full stop (period) in an epithet that is derived from a personal or geographical name that contained this full stop is treated as an error to be corrected by deletion of the full stop.”

There is now a hard Rule requiring that names may be composed only of letters of the Latin alphabet, except for specified (and mostly to be corrected) exceptions. Over half a dozen names, dedicated to at least two St. Johns, were published with an epithet that contains the full stop of this surname. To allow these to continue to be validly published it is proposed to add a provision in parallel to Art. 60.10. It appears safest to limit the new Rule as much as possible, so as to avoid undesirable side-effects.

(125) If Proposal 124 is accepted, add an Example to the new provision:

“*Ex. 23 bis. Nesoluma* “*St.-Johnianum*” (Lam & Meeuse in *Occas. Pap. Bernice Pauahi Bishop Mus.* 14: 153. 1938), based on material collected by H. St. John and F. R. Fosberg, is to be corrected to *Nesoluma st-johnianum* H. J. Lam & B. Meeuse.”

This name was recently revitalized when a new combination was published, based on it: “*Sideroxylon st.-johnianum*” (Smedmark & Anderberg in *Amer. J. Bot.* 94: 1502. 2007). Thus, it provides a good and current Example. If Proposal 124 is not accepted, this may, instead, become an Example accompanying Art. 32.1(b) of a designation that, retroactively, no longer is validly published.

(126) Add an example to Art. 32.1(b):

“*Ex. n.* The designation “*Grammatophyllum Guilelmi II* Kränzlín” (1894), after the German Emperor Wilhelm II, contains the Roman numeral II, a symbol which is not a letter of the Latin alphabet or a symbol provided for in Art. 60.4, 60.6, 60.9, and 60.10; it is not a validly published name.”

Another consequence of the new Art. 32.1(b). Theoretically it would be possible to add a provision allowing for the conversion of Roman numerals (and Arabic numerals, as in the *International code of zoological nomenclature*), giving in this case “*guilelmi-secundi*”, but there would appear to be no immediate need for such a step, as this appears to be a very rare phenomenon (the designation in the proposed Example is not in current use).

(127) Delete Art. 23 Ex. 14.

Under the new Art. 32.1(b) a Roman (or Arabic) numeral in a designation prevents valid publication, so that the Example has become irrelevant.

(128) Add a Note to Art. 32.1(b):

“*Note n.* The use of typographic signs, numerals or letters of a non-Latin alphabet in the arrangement of taxa (such as Greek letters α , β , γ , etc. in the arrangement of varieties under a species) does not prevent valid publication, as rank-denoting terms and devices are not part of the name.”

The phrasing borrows from Rec. I of the *Vienna rules* (Briquet, Règles Int. Nomencl. Bot. 1906), present up until it was excluded from the *Stockholm Code* (Lanjouw & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 3. 1952).

(129) Add an Example after Art. 60.6:

“*Ex. 10 bis.* Umlaut to be transcribed: “*Lühea*”, dedicated to Carl Emil von der Lüche, is to be corrected to *Luehea* Willd. (1801).”

(130) Delete Art. 60 Ex. 27 and restore the introductory sentence of Rec. 60C.1 to the phrasing of the Saint Louis Code.

See the discussion in the Introduction above.

(131) Add a new Example in Art. 60:

“*Ex. 27 bis.* Example of a correction that requires effective publication, namely when an epithet formed from the name of a person has a Latin termination that deviates so strongly from that prescribed in Rec. 60C.1 that the correct form is not automatically obvious: *Croton lanjouwii* Jabl. (1965, “*lanjouwensis*”), with *lanjouwii* being chosen over “*lanjouwianus*” (Rijckevorsel in *Taxon* 59: 665. 2010). In such a case the first author who, in an effectively published text, explicitly adopts one of the available correct forms, being (implied) orthographical variants, while rejecting the others (Art. 61.3), must be followed. Similarly *Centaurium maryanniae* B. L. Turner (1994, “*maryannum*”), with *maryanniae* chosen over *maryannianum* (and *maryannae*) (Rijckevorsel, l.c.).”

For *Croton lanjouwensis*, a substitute name for *Croton benthamianus* (Müll. Arg.) Lanjouw (1931) non Müll. Arg. (1873), there is a choice between two correct forms: *lanjouwii* and *lanjouwianus*. The choice for *lanjouwii* being made here and *lanjouwianus* rejected (the genitive being much more frequent in names dedicated to Lanjouw than the adjective). For *Centaurium maryannum*, named after

“Lady” Mary Ann Langford-Taylor, née Glass, there is a choice between *maryannae*, *maryanniae* and *maryannianum*, with the choice for *maryanniae* being made here and *maryannianum* rejected (the adjective being much less frequent in epithets based on feminine given names than the genitive, and *maryannianum* being unwieldy, see Rec. 23A.3(b)). Also rejected is *maryannae*; presumably it is not allowed to correct to a form in accordance with Rec. 60C.2, but anyway it would not be appropriate to use the classical *annae* here as Mary is a modern form.

(132) Delete Art. 60 Ex. 31.

This is not a good example. The protologue of *Codium geppii* Schmidt (in *Biblioth. Bot.* 91: 50. 1923, “*C. Geppii*” and “*C. Geppi*”) shows that it was published as a substitute name (“*nov. nom.*”) for *C. divaricatum* Gepp (Codioc. Siboga Exped.: 145. 1911) non Holmes (in *J. Linn. Soc., Bot.* 31: 250. 1896), without any explicit dedication. The protologue of *C. geppii* does indeed mention an “A. & E. S. Gepp”, namely: “Die Art ist als *C. divaricatum* von A. & E. S. Gepp in Jahre 1911 beschrieben worden”, and indeed the book in which the name *C. divaricatum* and its description appear was written by those two authors. However, both times that the authorship of *G. divaricatum* was given by Schmidt it was explicitly represented as “Gepp”. It is commonplace for substitute names to honour the author of the replaced synonym, in this case “Gepp”, leading to *C. geppii*.

(133) Add an example replacing Art. 60 Ex. 31:

“*Ex. 31. Acacia “Bancroftii”* (Maiden in *Proc. Roy. Soc. Queensland* 30: 26. 1918) “commemorates the Bancrofts, father and son, the former the late Dr. Joseph Bancroft, and the latter Dr. Thomas Lane Bancroft”; it is to be corrected to *Acacia bancroftiorum* Maiden.”

This looks to be a textbook case (<http://biodiversitylibrary.org/page/13901258>), and it is an established correction; it can be found in the *Flora of Australia* (11A: 256. 2001).

(134) Add an Example in Art. 60:

“*Ex. 31 bis. Chamaecrista leonardiae* Britton (1930, “*leonardae*”), *Scolosanthus leonardii* Alain (1968), and *Frankenia leonardiorum* Alain (1968, “*leonardorum*”) were each based on type material collected by Emery C. Leonard and Genevieve M. Leonard (“E. & G. Leonard” in the case of the names by Alain). As there is no explicit dedication these names are to be accepted as dedicated to the person(s) indicated by the termination as published.”

An example that establishes, quite elegantly, that most authors knew exactly what they were doing when they dedicated a name, even if they did not provide an explicit dedication.

Acknowledgement

I wish to thank Nicholas Turland for suffering through more versions of this set of proposals than I had anticipated.