

(2588) Proposal to conserve the name *Emmeorhiza* against *Endlicheria* (*Rubiaceae*)

Joseph H. Kirkbride, Jr.,¹ John H. Wiersema² & Piero G. Delprete³

1 Department of Botany, NMNH – MRC 166, Smithsonian Institution, P.O. Box 37012, Washington, D.C. 20013-7012, U.S.A.

2 USDA-ARS, National Germplasm Resources Laboratory, Bldg. 003, Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC-West), Beltsville, Maryland 20705-2350, U.S.A.

3 Herbar de Guyane, Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD), UMR AMAP (CIRAD, CNRS, INRA, University of Montpellier), Boite Postale 90165, 97323 Cayenne Cedex, Guyane Française (French Guiana), France

Author for correspondence: Joseph H. Kirkbride, Jr., kirkbridej@si.edu

DOI <https://doi.org/10.12705/671.26>

(2588) *Emmeorhiza* Pohl ex Endl., Gen. Pl.: 565. Aug 1838 [*Rub.*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: *Endlicheria brasilensis* C. Presl [= *Emmeorhiza umbellata* (Spreng.) K. Schum. (*Borreria umbellata* Spreng.)].

(≡) *Endlicheria* C. Presl, Symb. Bot. 1: 73. Jan–Feb 1832, nom. rej. prop.

Ludwig von Weldon (in Flora 8: 182–183. 1825) reported that J.B.E. Pohl and H.W. Schott had collected more than 7000 species in Brazil and that Pohl was studying 26 new genera in the collection, one of which was “*Emeorhiza*” Pohl. There were no descriptions of the genera, and none of them were subsequently published by Pohl. All of the new genera, including “*Emeorhiza*”, were nomina nuda. Presl (Symb. Bot. 1: 73–74, t. 49. 1832) published *Endlicheria* C. Presl and *Endlicheria brasiliensis* C. Presl, members of the *Rubiaceae*, and Nees (in Linnæa 8: 37. 1833) published *Endlicheria* Nees, a member of the *Lauraceae*. Endlicher (Gen. Pl.: 565. 1838) then published *Emmeorhiza* Pohl ex Endl. listing two synonyms, “*Emmeorhiza* Pohl” [“*Emeorhiza*”] and *Endlicheria* C. Presl, the latter of which he should have adopted, so *Emmeorhiza* Pohl ex Endl. was a superfluous, illegitimate name.

Kostermans (in Sprague, Prelim. Opin.: 25. 1935) proposed that *Endlicheria* Nees be conserved against *Schauera* Nees and that “*Emeorhiza* Pohl (nomen nudum)” be conserved against *Endlicheria* C. Presl. The Special Committee for Phanerogamae and Pteridophyta appointed by the 6th International Botanical Congress (Sprague in Bull. Misc. Inform. Kew 1940: 82. 1940) reported that *Endlicheria* was conserved, and “*Emeorhiza* Pohl (1825), nomen” was not conserved. The Special Committee concluded that the conservation of *Endlicheria* precluded the adoption of *Endlicheria* and that “*Emeorhiza* Pohl ex Endl. stands without conservation for the Rubiaceae genus concerned”. They also concluded that Endlicher’s spelling of the generic epithet, *Emmeorhiza*, was “a typographical error or ... an unintentional orthographic error” and that “there was no etymological justification for the insertion of an additional *m*”. So according to the Special Committee, the generic name should be spelled “*Emeorhiza*”. However, the name *Emmeorhiza* is probably a compound formed from two Greek words, “*emmeno*” (ἐμμένω), meaning persistent, and “*rhiza*” (ρίζα), meaning root. Since the Greek “ἐμμένω” has a double μ (*m*), as was represented in Endlicher’s original spelling, the correct spelling should be *Emmeorhiza*.

The concept of legitimacy was introduced in the 1935 *International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature* adopted at the Fifth International Botanical Congress, Cambridge, 1930 (Rendle, English version 1935). Article 60 stipulated that an illegitimate name must be rejected and not considered for purposes of priority. One type of illegitimate name was a superfluous name, which was defined as having an earlier, valid name for the group to which it was applied. What was not clear was whether a superfluous name could become legitimate by rejection of the earlier validly published and legitimate name. In the case of *Emmeorhiza*, the Special Committee for Phanerogamae and Pteridophyta had concluded that a superfluous name could become legitimate. In 1980, the Committee for Spermatophyta (Brummitt in *Taxon* 30: 160–161. 1980) considered this question and concluded that an illegitimate name can only become legitimate through conservation. They proposed that the phrase “A name which was illegitimate when published cannot become legitimate, unless it is conserved” be added to the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* (ICBN), and it became part of Art. 6.4 of the *Sydney Code* (Voss & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 111: 6. 1983) where it has remained up through the current Melbourne edition of the *Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 154. 2012). The decision by the Special Committee for Phanerogamae and Pteridophyta in 1940 that *Emmeorhiza* was an available legitimate name is no longer tenable. *Emmeorhiza* was illegitimate when published and will remain so unless it is conserved.

This monotypic genus is widely distributed in cool, wet forests of South America, except for Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay, and also occurs in Trinidad. Schumann (in Martius, *Fl. Bras.* 6(6): 37–39. 1888, 6(6): 408. 1889) at first accepted *Endlichera brasiliensis* as the specific name for the species of this genus, but in his addendum he changed the name of the species to *Emmeorhiza umbellata* (Spreng.) K. Schum. (“*Emmeorrhiza*”), based on *Borreria umbellata* Spreng. (*Neue Entd.* 2: 144. 1821). He considered Pohl’s “*Emeorhiza*”, although a nomen nudum, to be the earliest name available for the genus and adopted the earliest available epithet for the species. Since then, *Emmeorhiza*

umbellata has been consistently and widely used as the correct name for this species.

There is no later, available name for the genus, which would require that a new generic name be coined and the earliest specific epithet, *umbellata*, transferred into it. Since Schumann (l.c. 1889), *Emmeorhiza* and *E. umbellata* have appeared in numerous publications and online sources. Our searches have discovered them in 16 printed floras (e.g., Standley, *Publ. Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Bot. Ser.* 7(1): 159. 1930; Macbride, *Publ. Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Bot. Ser.* 13(6): 242. 1936; Gentry, *Field Guide Fam. Gen. Woody Pl. NW S. Amer.*: 721. 1993; Taylor & Steyermark in Berry & al., *Fl. Venez. Guayana* 8: 588–589. 2004; Bacigalupo & Cabral in Wanderley & al., *Fl. Faner. Est. São Paulo* 5: 318. 2007; Delprete in Rizzo, *Fl. Est. Goiás Tocantins* 40: 389–395. 2010), 20 printed checklists (e.g., Andersson, *Provis. Checkl. Neotrop. Rubiac.* [Scripta Bot. Belg. 1]: 108. 1992; Brako & Zarucchi, *Catal. Flow. Pl. Gymnosp. Peru* [Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 45]: 1023. 1993; Dubs, *Prodr. Fl. Matogrossensis*: 255. 1998; Funk & al., *Checkl. Pl. Guiana Shield* [Contr. U.S. Natl. Herb. 55]: 481. 2007; Hokche, *Nuev. Catál. Fl. Vasc. Venez.*: 580. 2008; Jørgensen, *Catál. Pl. Vasc. Bolivia* [Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 127]: 1149. 2014), 19 online check lists (Catál. Pl. Líquen. Colombia, <http://catalogoplantasdecolombia.unal.edu.co>; Flora do Brasil 2020, <http://floradobrasil.jbrj.gov.br/>; USDA Germplasm Resources Information Network, <https://npgsweb.ars-grin.gov/gringlobal/taxon/taxonomy/simple.aspx>; Global Biodiversity Information Facility, <http://gbif.org>; Peru Checklist, <http://www.tropicos.org/Project/PEC>; World Checkl. Sel. Pl. Fam., <http://wesp.science.kew.org>), and numerous herbarium databases (K, MO, NY, P, US, W). A Google search for *Emmeorhiza* resulted in more than 53,000 hits, and a Google search for *Emeorhiza* resulted in only 110 hits. To avoid disrupting a long-standing and widely used generic name and revisit an earlier unsustainable decision by a phanerogamic nomenclatural committee, *Emmeorhiza* Pohl ex Endl. is here proposed for conservation against *Endlichera* C. Presl.