

(095–096) Proposals to amend Art. 53 *Ex. 9 & *Ex. 10Wen-Bin Yu,^{1,2} Hong Wang¹ & De-Zhu Li¹

1 Key Laboratory of Biodiversity and Biogeography, Kunming Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming 650204, People's Republic of China

2 Graduate University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100039, People's Republic of China

Authors for correspondence: Hong Wang, wanghong@mail.kib.ac.cn; De-Zhu Li, dzl@mail.kib.ac.cn

(095) Add the following text to Art. 53 voted Ex. 9:

“*thibeticus* (-a -um) and *tibeticus* (-a -um), *thibetensis* and *tibetensis*, *thibetanus* and *tibetanus*.”

(096) Add the following text to Art. 53 voted Ex. 10:

“*Astragalus tibetanus* Benth. ex Bunge (1868) and *A. tibeticola* Podlech & L. R. Xu (2004); *Berberis thibetica* C. K. Schneid. (1909) and *B. tibetensis* Lafrr. (1997).”

Explanation

Historically, the word ‘Tibet’ applied to a plateau region in south-central Asia between the Himalaya and Kunlun mountains, mostly in the modern Xizang Autonomous Region of China but extending into Xinjiang Uygur, Qinghai, and Sichuan, where it is also named as the Qingzang Plateau. An alternative spelling is ‘Thibet’ and this is found in some publications, particularly older ones. As there is no established Latinization of ‘Tibet’ (or ‘Thibet’), adjectival epithets derived from the geographical names ‘Tibet’ and ‘Thibet’ have been formed in several different ways, e.g., the form *tibetica* or *thibetica*, *tibeticum* or *thibeticum*, and *tibeticus*, the form *tibetensis* or *thibetensis*, the form *tibetanum* or *thibetanum*, *tibetanus* or *thibetanus*, and *tibetana*, and the form *tibeticanicum*. In addition the substantive *tibeticola* (growing in Tibet) has also been used as an epithet. Based on databases of IPNI (<http://www.ipni.org/index.html>) and TROPICOS (<http://www.tropicos.org/Home.aspx>), over 400 such epithets are known to have been used to name the native plants from this area by many Chinese and western botanists. Of these about 360 records are at species rank and about 40 records at infraspecific ranks.

We are confused that in some cases the same form of epithet derived from ‘Tibet’ and ‘Thibet’ exists in a single genus (e.g., *Rubus tibetanus* Franch. and *R. tibetanus* Focke, *Saussurea thibetica* Franch. and *S. tibetica* C. Winkl, and *Spiraea thibetica* Bur. & Franch. and *Sp. tibetica* T. Yu & L.T. Lu). We believe that this is quite confusing for Asian (and other) botanists (e.g., Lu in *Acta Phytotax. Sin.* 38: 276. 2000). Therefore, we propose to add the sets of derivative epithets from ‘Tibet’ or ‘Thibet’ to Art. 53.3 Ex. 9 in accordance with the Code’s Art. 53.3.

Additionally, we find that different forms of epithets derived from ‘Tibet’ and/or ‘Thibet’ are sometimes used in the same genus (e.g., *Astragalus tibetanus* Benth. ex Bunge and *A. tibeticola* Podlech & L. Xu, *Berberis thibetica* C.K. Schneid. and *B. tibetensis* Lafrr., and *Poa thibeticola* Bor. and *P. tibetica* Munro ex Stapf.), but these pairs have a clearly different spelling, and pronunciation and somewhat different Latin derivation. Therefore, we propose to add related pairs with differently formed epithets derived from ‘Tibet’ and/or ‘Thibet’ to Article 53.3 Ex. 10. However, we propose that the use of the different form of ‘Tibet’ and/or ‘Thibet’ to designate two different species within the same genus should be avoided in the future in accordance with the Code’s Recommendation 23A.2.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to Prof. John McNeill, editor of the ICBN (*Vienna Code*) for his advice and assistance. This study was supported by grants from National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program, No. 2007CB411600), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 30670160, 40830209), and the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (No. 2005DKA21006).

(097) Proposal to revise Art. 60 Ex. 21 and add a new ExampleRichard K. Rabeler¹ & Kanchi N. Gandhi²

1 University of Michigan Herbarium, 3600 Varsity Drive, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48108-2228, U.S.A.

2 Harvard University Herbaria, 22 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138, U.S.A.

Author for correspondence: Richard K. Rabeler, rabeler@umich.edu

Under Art. 60.9 of the Code (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146. 2006), concerning hyphenation of compound epithets, the wording of Ex. 21 (“Hyphen to be maintained: ...”) may be misleading. Regarding the usage of a compound epithet consisting of two or more words, Art. 23.1 permits an established practice, as quoted here: “If an epithet consists of two or more words, these are to be united or hyphenated. An epithet not so joined when originally published is not to be rejected but, when used, is to be united or hyphenated, as specified in Art. 60.9.”

Article 60.9 states that “the use of a hyphen in a compound epithet is treated as an error to be corrected by deletion of the hyphen, unless the epithet is formed of words that usually stand independently or the letters before and after the hyphen are the same, when a hyphen is permitted (see Arts. 23.1 and 23.3)”. Two examples are presented, Ex. 20 dealing with “Hyphen to be omitted”, and Ex. 21 “Hyphen to be maintained.” This implies that an Example, consistent with Art. 23.1 where the words of the epithets “are to be united” and a hyphen needs to be inserted, is wanting.