

(043–044) Later homonyms

Paul van Rijckevorsel

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

At Yokohama (1993) the rule that is now Art. 53.1, on later homonyms, and their illegitimacy, was changed by the inclusion of “of a family, genus or species” (cf. *Tokyo Code*, Greuter & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 131. 1994). This happened on the proposal by Greuter (in *Taxon* 41: 778, 780. 1992), as amended in the “Synopsis of Proposals” (in *Taxon* 42: 258. 1993). The intent of this change was to prevent hypothetical problems that might arise from what is now Art. 19.4 which might lead to (mandatory) names of subdivisions of families with the same spelling. The examples used were the (hypothetical) names “*Caricoideae*” and “*Cariceae*” formed from *Carica* L. (1753) which would be blocked by the existence of the (actual) names *Caricoideae* Pax (1888) and *Cariceae* Dumort. (1827) formed from *Carex* L. (1753). The change adopted at Yokohama means that a later homonym is no longer illegitimate in all ranks (but only in the rank of family, genus and species, and the other ranks below genus, see Art. 53.4). This was a departure from time-honoured practice: a later homonym (unless conserved or sanctioned) had been illegitimate since the introduction of the term illegitimate in the *Cambridge Rules* (Briquet, *Int. Rules Bot. Nomencl.*, ed. 3. 1935).

The *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146. 2006) saw a change with regard to homonymy: Art. 18.1 was changed, allowing more freedom in the formation of names, with the explicit purpose to avoid unwanted homonymy in the names of families. This equally affects names of subdivi-

sions of families (Art. 19.1 and 19.3). The limitation in Art. 53.1 therefore is no longer necessary, so that the provision may be restored to its traditional form. The possibility of simultaneously having two correct names with the spelling *Cariceae*, applying to different taxa, is at odds with Preamble 1 and Principle IV.

(043) Restore Art. 53.1 to the pre-Tokyo Code version by deleting “of a family, genus or species”, so that it reads as follows:

“53.1. A name, unless conserved (Art. 14) or sanctioned (Art. 15), is illegitimate if it is a later homonym, that is, if it is spelled exactly like a name based on a different type that was previously and validly published for a taxon of the same rank (see also Art. 6 Note 2, and Art. 53.2 and 53.4).”

Note that, from a practical perspective, it would help if the proposal submitted for Art. 19 (Prop. 034, Rijckevorsel in *Taxon* 58: 663. 2009) would be passed, making it possible to conserve, say, the name *Carexaceae*, in that spelling, and thereby fixing *Carexoideae*, *Carexae*, etc., if the need should ever arise.

(044) If Prop. 043 is passed, in the Glossary, in the entry on later homonym, add a second sentence:

“Note: a later homonym is illegitimate (unless conserved or sanctioned).”

(045–047) Proposals regarding epithets derived from acronyms

Laurence J. Dorr

Department of Botany, National Museum of Natural History, MRC-166, Smithsonian Institution, P.O. Box 37012, Washington, D.C. 20013-7012, U.S.A. dorrl@si.edu

The following proposals are presented to standardize the way in which epithets are formed from acronyms.

(045) Add a new Recommendation:

“60I.1. An epithet derived from an acronym should be treated as if it was an adjective and agree in gender with the generic name (see Rec. 60C.1).”

(046) Amend Recommendation 60C.1 as follows:

“60C.1. When personal names or acronyms are given Latin terminations in order to form specific and infraspe-

cific epithets formation of those epithets is as follows (but see Rec. 60C.2), except substantial epithets should not be formed from acronyms:

“(c) If the personal name or acronym ends with a vowel, adjectival epithets are formed by adding *-an-* plus the nominative singular inflection appropriate to the gender of the generic name (e.g. *Cyperus heyne-anus* for Heyne, *Vanda lindley-ana* for Lindley, *Aspidium berterio-anum* for Bertero), except when the personal name or acronym ends with *-a* in which case *-n-* plus the appropriate inflection is added (e.g. *balansa-nus* (m), *balansa-na* (f),

and *balansa-num* (n) for Balansa, *Lophopteryx inpa-na* (f) for INPA).

“(d) If the personal name or acronym ends with a consonant, adjectival epithets are formed by adding *-i-* (stem augmentation) plus *-an-* (stem of adjectival suffix) plus the nominative singular inflection appropriate to the gender of the generic name (e.g. *Rosa webb-iana* for Webb, *Desmodium griffith-ianum* for Griffith, *Verbena hassler-iana* for Hassler, *Uladendron codesur-ianum* for CODESUR).”

(047) Rephrase Art. 60 Ex. 26:

“Ex. 26. *Uladendron “codesuri”* Marc.-Berti (1971) is not to be changed to *U. “codesurii”* (as by Brenan in Index Kew., Suppl. 16: 296. 1981) but to *U. codesurianum*, since the epithet does not commemorate a person but derives from an acronym (CODESUR, Comisión para el Desarrollo del Sur de Venezuela).”

At present, there are no rules that apply to the formation of epithets from acronyms. A single example (Art. 60 Ex. 26) in the *Code* implies that names formed from acronyms are not to be corrected. This seems unsatisfactory since in a review of the use of acronyms no clear pattern emerges apart from what appears to be an attempt by most (but not all) authors to create an epithet that agrees in gender with the generic name. In addition, most (but not all) authors form epithets as if the acronym were a personal name.

The earliest use of an acronym for a specific epithet that I have traced is *Symplocos ifsiana* C.E.C. Fisch. (in Bull. Misc. Inform. Kew 1940: 37. 1940), where the specific epithet honours “the Indian Forest Service (I.F.S.)”. This adjectival epithet was formed with the nominative singular inflection appropriate to the feminine gender of *Symplocos* Jacq.

The specific epithet for *Uladendron codesuri* Marc.-Berti (in Pittieria 3: 10. 1971) was treated by Brenan (Index Kew., Suppl. 16: 296. 1981) as being a personal name (masculine) correctable to “*codesurii*” until it was noted that the epithet was derived from CODESUR, an acronym for Comisión para el Desarrollo del Sur de Venezuela. This prompted the introduction of a new example (non-voted) in the *Saint Louis Code* (i.e., Art. 60 Ex. 26; unchanged in the *Vienna Code*) that clarified that epithets derived from acronyms are not to be corrected as if they were personal names. If, however, we adopt the proposals put forward here the epithet would be corrected to “*codesurianum*” in agreement with the nominative singular inflection appropriate to the neuter gender of *Uladendron* Marc.-Berti.

The most frequently used acronym for forming specific epithets appears to be INPA, which stands for Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia (Manaus, Brazil). With respect to INPA the practice seems to be that the epithet is formed so that it agrees in gender with the generic name;

“*inpaë*” (*Monopteryx inpaë* W.A. Rodrigues in Acta Amazonica 5(2): 153. 1975 and *Iryanthera inpaë* W.A. Rodrigues in Acta Amazonica 11(4): 852. 1981); and “*inpana*” (*Lophopteryx inpana* W.R. Anderson in Contr. Univ. Michigan Herb. 17: 46. 1990) have been employed. The first two epithets appear to use “INPA” as a personal name, and substantival epithets were formed by adding the genitive inflection appropriate to the sex and number of the “person(s)” honoured. The third example differs only in that an adjectival epithet was formed with the nominative singular inflection appropriate to the feminine gender of *Lophopteryx*. Another epithet “*inpai*” (*Echinodorus inpai* Rataj in Akvár. Terár. 24(6): 20. 1981) does not appear to follow any rule, except perhaps one could argue that there was an attempt to form the epithet as in the first two examples but the author overlooked the exception created when a name ends with *-a* (Rec. 60C.1(a)). Adopting the current proposals, the first two of these names derived from INPA would be corrected to *Monopteryx inpana* (feminine) and *Iryanthera inpana* (feminine), the third would remain unchanged, and the fourth would be corrected to *Echinodorus inpana* (masculine).

In describing the orchid *Habenaria unellezii* Foldats (in BioLlania 7: 27. 1990) the author did not explain the etymology of the epithet, merely indicating that the type locality was “terrenos de UNELLEZ”. The introduction to volume seven of this journal, however, makes it clear that UNELLEZ is an acronym, which stands for “Universidad Nacional Experimental de los Llanos Occidentales ‘Ezequiel Zamora’” (also the publisher of the journal). *Habenaria* Willd. is a feminine genus and under the present proposals the specific epithet would be corrected to “*unelleziana*”.

In two instances, new species were discovered in post-congress excursions sponsored by the Association pour l’Étude de la Flore de l’Afrique Tropicale and specific epithets were formed with its acronym, AETFAT, as the base. The species are *Ornithogalum aetfatense* U. Müll.-Doblies & D. Müll.-Doblies (in Feddes Repert. 107: 459. 1996) and *Senecio aetfatensis* B. Nord. (in Novon 9: 245. 1999). In both these instances, the specific epithets were formed as if they were based on a geographical name but this is clearly not the case. Adopting the present proposals, the epithets would be corrected to *Ornithogalum aetfatianum* (neuter) and *Senecio aetfatianus* (masculine).

In each example cited above (except that of Foldats) the author explicitly stated that the epithet was derived from an acronym and followed Rec. 60H.1 with respect to explaining the etymology of a new name when its meaning is not obvious.

Acknowledgements

Discussion with Dan Nicolson helped me crystallize this argument. Nicholas Turland provided useful suggestions for better integrating these proposals into the *Code*.