

(1912) Proposal to conserve the name *Loxsoma* (*Loxsomataceae*) with that spelling

Ahmed H. Alfarhan, M. Sivadasan & Jacob Thomas

Department of Botany & Microbiology, College of Science, King Saud University, P.O. Box 2455, Riyadh – 11451, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. drmsivadasan@rediffmail.com (author for correspondence)

(1912) *Loxsoma* R. Br. ex A. Cunn. in Companion Bot. Mag. 2: 366. 1 Jul 1837 (*Loxoma*), nom. & orth. cons. prop.

Typus: *Loxsoma cunninghamii* R. Br. ex A. Cunn.

A survey of literature revealed that the generic name *Loxsoma* R. Br. ex A. Cunn. and the family name *Loxsomataceae* C. Presl, both with that corrected spelling, have been in use for several decades. Past efforts had been made to conserve the above names to bring stability to their nomenclature, but this process was never completed. Contrary to the earlier consistent and wide use of the above orthographies, Tryon & Tryon (Ferns Allied Pl.: 125. 1982) and Kramer (in Kubitzki, Fam. Gen. Vasc. Pl. 1: 172–173. 1990) reverted to the original spellings *Loxoma* and *Loxomataceae* for the genus and family respectively, and their usage has been followed by some later workers, including Smith & al. (in Taxon 55: 705–731. 2006; in Ranker & Haufler, Biol. Evol. Ferns Lycophytes: 419–469. 2008).

The generic name was published as *Loxoma* by Cunningham (l.c.: 366, and t. xxxi & xxxii. – the former mis-numbered in the text as xxii) for an endemic fern genus of New Zealand. The following year Hooker (Gen. Filic.: t. 15. 1838) corrected the generic spelling to *Loxsoma* citing Cunningham's paper "where by an error it is printed *Loxoma*." The reason for this correction might presumably be because Hooker had access to Robert Brown's manuscript and possibly he was simply restoring what R. Brown actually wrote, but he did not state this.

Article 60.3 of the ICBN (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006) says that the liberty (granted by Art. 60.1) of correcting a name is limited, "especially if it affects the first syllable and, above all, the first letter of the name." The implication is that if the first syllable is not affected, people are freer to make such corrections (Nicolson in Taxon 33: 122. 1984). Accordingly the Code would seem to allow *Loxoma* to be replaced by *Loxsoma* if this could be seen as a correction of a typographical/orthographical error. Under Art. 61.1, *Loxsoma* would then be the validly published form of the name, and under Art. 18.1 this spelling in turn forms the basis for the family *Loxsomataceae* C. Presl (Gefässbündel Farrn: 31. 1847, "*Loxsomaceae*").

But can the original spelling *Loxoma* be taken as a typographical or orthographic error? The former does not seem possible, in view of the fact that this spelling was used consistently by Cunningham, three times in the text and on both plates. As pointed out in correspondence to Prof. John McNeill (pers. comm.) by some pteridologists, the name is derived from the Greek λοξός (loxos – oblique) and σῶμα

(soma – body), doubtless referring to the sporangia of the plant. A more etymologically correct orthography for this epithet, following Rec. 60G.1, would have been "*Loxosoma*", which does not match the correction of Hooker, making it more difficult to view his action as an allowable orthographic correction. In view of these considerations, the only sure way to resolve this issue is through a proposal under Art. 14.11 to conserve the name *Loxsoma* R. Br. ex A. Cunn. with its commonly used spelling and thereby also preserve, in light of Art. 18.1, the family spelling *Loxsomataceae* C. Presl.

A perusal of earlier activities of the Committee for Pteridophyta (summarized in Taxon 35: 686–691. 1986) indicates that at one time a list of family names of *Pteridophyta* was compiled by a Subcommittee headed by Pichi Sermolli for possible inclusion among the conserved family names in Appendix II of the ICBN (Stafleu & al. in Regnum Veg. 82. 1972). The resulting list, which had included this family as "*Loxsomataceae*", its type listed as "*Loxsoma*" (see Taxon 30: 166. 1981), was later rejected for various reasons by the General Committee and ultimately the desire for a complete pteridophyte family list in Appendix II was abandoned by the pteridophyte Committee (see Taxon 35: 686–691. 1986). There has never been an attempt to conserve the generic spelling, presumably because most botanists believed that Hooker's correction was permitted under the ICBN (Nicolson, l.c.).

A perusal of the publications by Pichi Sermolli clearly revealed his stand on the use of the names *Loxsoma* and *Loxsomataceae*. During the course of his bibliographical research as part of the preparation of the list, Pichi Sermolli (in Webbia 31: 313–512. 1977) accepted *Loxsoma* and *Loxsomaceae*. In 1981 (in Taxon 31: 166) and 1982 (in Webbia 35: 233) he adopted *Loxsomataceae* for *Loxsomaceae* arguing that linguistically it is more correct. Later (in Webbia 47: 136. 1993) he provided more detailed arguments on this same issue drawing identical conclusions to his position of 1982.

Despite the conflicting usage reported above, the spellings *Loxsoma* and *Loxsomataceae* still appear as correct in most important nomenclatural references and databases [IPNI online (<http://www.ipni.org/>, accessed 22 Sep 2009); Farr & Zijlstra, Index Nom. Gen. 2: 1009–1010. 1979 and ING online (<http://botany.si.edu/ing/>, accessed 22 Sep 2009); Brummitt, Vasc. Pl. Fam. Gen.: 471. 1992 and RBG Kew Vasc. Pl. Fam. Gen. database (<http://data.kew.org/cgi-bin/vpfg1992/vascplnt.html>, accessed 22 Sep 2009); Greuter & al. in Regnum Veg. 129(NCU-3): 653. 1993 and NCU-e (<http://www.bgbm.org/iapt/ncu/Default.htm>, accessed 22 Sep 2009); Airy Shaw, Willis's Dict. Flow. Pl. Ferns, ed. 8: 690. 1973; Mabberley, Pl.-Book: 343. 1987, ed. 2: 443.

1997, ed. 3: 504. 2008]. Contrary to these other sources, TROPICOS (<http://www.tropicos.org/>, accessed 22 Sep 2009) adopts *Loxoma* and *Loxomataceae*.

In the broader scientific literature, the same trend is apparent. Searching Google Scholar (http://scholar.google.com/advanced_scholar_search?, accessed 24 Sep 2009) for *Loxsoma* or *Loxoma* and at least one of the terms “fern”, “ferns” or “pteridophyte” (to eliminate references to the orchid genus *Loxoma* Garay) favors the former by 147 to 39, although curiously the reverse trend is seen with the corresponding family spellings (22 to 40). Searching BIOSIS-Previews for these generic spellings yields citations favouring *Loxsoma* by 14 to 1, the only citation of *Loxoma* being that of Kramer (l.c.).

In the course of discussion on the use of *Loxsoma* vs. *Loxoma*, Prof. John McNeill (pers. comm.) provided the view of one pteridologist who indicated his philosophy was to retain the original spelling of a generic or specific name, even when there might be some (orthographic) reason to do otherwise. But such a stand, though most welcome, should not undo what has already been done and been widely followed. Tryon & Tryon (l.c.) and Kramer (l.c.) had adopted *Loxoma* and *Loxomataceae* in contrast to earlier wide usage. Smith & al. (l.c. 2006, l.c. 2008) also used these same spellings in their papers, with an admission (pers. comm. to Prof. John McNeill) that not everybody agreed! It has been expressed in these discussions that “perhaps something needs to be written up and set in stone on this [issue despite the] uncomfortable feeling that, already, too much has been written about a very obscure matter, affecting a minuscule number of people.”

The use of both *Loxoma* and *Loxsoma* for this generic name, and *Loxsomaceae*, *Loxomataceae*, and *Loxsomataceae* for this family by various pteridologists has created a state of uncertainty and ambiguity in the nomenclature. Even though it concerns a small family with a single genus

and species, whether it affects only “a minuscule” or a large number of people the problem of instability and inconsistent use needs to be settled. If this proposal to conserve the orthography *Loxsoma* is approved and adopted, both this spelling and that of the family *Loxsomataceae* will remain universally consistent and correct in use. They will also remain consistent with that of the only other genus in the family, *Loxsomopsis* Christ.

This proposal touches on another issue that could be clarified. Gunn & al. (in U.S.D.A. Techn. Bull. 1796: 228. 1992) recognized *Loxoma* Garay (in Bot. Mus. Leaflet. 23: 183. 1972) as a validly published correct name for an orchid, specifying it as “not a later homonym”, indirectly indicating their belief in the absence of an earlier homonym. This was obviously because *Loxoma* R. Br. ex A. Cunn. was then considered an orthographic variant of the correct *Loxsoma* and not deemed to exist as a validly published name under Art. 61. Consistent with the interpretation that the original spelling *Loxoma* R. Br. ex A. Cunn. is not correctible under Art. 60, *Loxoma* Garay is an illegitimate later homonym, and will remain so (Art. 6.4) even if our proposal to conserve the former name as *Loxsoma* is adopted.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express their gratitude towards the Rector, King Saud University, Riyadh for providing a research grant, under the Center of Excellence in Biodiversity Research for the study of biodiversity of wetlands of Saudi Arabia, during the period when the present nomenclatural problem was encountered and this article prepared. Sincere thanks are expressed to Drs. Dan H. Nicolson and John H. Wiersma, Profs. John McNeill and Werner Greuter, and some anonymous pteridologists for their expert opinion and critical comments at various stages of formulation of the proposal.

(1913) Proposal to conserve the name *Cerinthe glabra* (Boraginaceae) with a conserved type

Federico Selvi & Lorenzo Cecchi

Dipartimento di Biologia Vegetale dell'Università, Sezione Botanica Sistematica, Via La Pira 4, 50121, Firenze, Italy. selvi@unifi.it (author for correspondence)

- (1913) *Cerinthe glabra* Mill., Gard. Dict., ed. 8: no. 2. 1768, nom. cons. prop.
 Typus: Italy, Piedmont, Valle Gesso (prov. Cuneo), SS. Trinità di Entracque, margini di bosco umido nella valletta del Rio Prer, 1080 m, F. Selvi 06.25 (FI; isotypus: K), typ. cons. prop.

The name *Cerinthe glabra* Mill. was published in the 8th edition of the Miller's Gardener's Dictionary (Miller, l.c.) and has been used since Candolle's *Prodromus* (Prodr. 10: 3. 1846) for a well-known alpine species distributed

from the Pyrenees to the Caucasus, with a main range in the Alps and Carpathians. A broadly accepted heterotypic synonym is *C. alpina* Kit., that was described posthumously by Paul Kitaibel (in Schultes, Oesterr. Fl., ed. 2., 1: 353. 1814) based on material from the Hungarian Carpathians and corresponding to Kitaibel's herbarium sheet no. 68 (at BPI; see also Kanitz in Linnaea 32: 639. 1863). By contrast, no original material of *C. glabra* seems to exist today so that this name can only be typified by Miller's plate no. 91 (1760), which was prepared on the basis of annual plants