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more as a guide to acceptable practice than a rule, already exist elsewhere in the Code—see for examples Arts. 28.2, 47.1 and 51.1.

Proposal (71). In Art 61.1 delete “is to” and substitute “may”.

As an alternative, which would be equally acceptable, the Editorial Committee might prefer to reword the Article completely to make it more comparable with Art. 60, as follows: “When a taxon at the rank of family or lower is changed to another such rank, the correct name is the earliest legitimate one available in the new rank”.

On acceptance of either one or other of the above wordings the Editorial Committee might consider adding a further sentence “In no case does the stem of a name have priority outside its own rank”.


Proposals (72-75) affecting Articles 72 and 75 and Recommendations 73C and 73F of ICBN, 1978.

Proposal (72). Art. 72. Add an additional Note, as follows:

The publication of a new name (nomen novum) based on the same type as the rejected name is not appropriate for the replacement of superfluous names.

Comment. Some names are rendered superfluous by an element in the protologue which is of a subsidiary nature, and the central element may then require a name. If a nomen novum is proposed, it will in many cases be typified by the type of the name which ought to have been adopted (Art. 7.11); the new name will therefore be superfluous in exactly the same sense as the one it is intended to replace.

Proposal (73). Art. 75.1. Alter to read as follows:

When two or more generic names are so similar that they are likely to be confused, they are to be treated as variants, which are homonyms when they are based on different types. In judging the degree of likelihood that names will be confused, the relationship of the taxa concerned and other relevant factors may be taken into account.

Comment. The existing wording gives similarity as the reason for likely confusion but then continues with a “because” clause. It seems more logical to separate the similarity factor from the circumstantial ones.

Proposal (74). Rec. 73C.1. Replace “may be latinized” in line 1 by “may be given latinized endings”.

Comment. L. C. Leach (Taxon 28: 602–604, 1979) offers two alternative proposals (40 and 41) for clarifying the Code concerning substantive epithets based on personal names ending in a vowel. His problem is whether the original spelling Euphorbia monteiri Hook. f. is to be retained or altered to E. monteiri in accordance with Art. 73.10. A similar case is provided by Cephalotaxus fortunei Hook. in Curt. Bot. Mag. 76, t. 4499 (1850). This is usually changed to C. fortunei but in some recent publications the original spelling has been used.

Leach’s conclusion is that the spelling monteiri is correct because it is governed by Art. 73.7, which says that intentional latinizations are to be retained. In my opinion, however, the examples to Art. 73.7 show that this paragraph is not relevant to these cases. All non-Latin personal names have to be provided with a Latin termination in order that they may be declined. This necessary bit of latinization has to be done according to the rules (Art. 73.10 and Rec. 73C.1.). The spelling monteiri is a wrong use of a termination because Rec. 73C.1. tells us how the end of the
name is to be latinized. The alterations to the stem of the name on grounds of taste which must be retained under Art. 73.7 are an entirely different matter.

Leach's alternative proposals are based on the assumption that there is a clash between Art. 73.7 and Art. 73.10. I believe this is a mistake and my proposal is intended to emphasize the difference in the scope of the two paragraphs.

Another reason for adopting the spellings *fortuni, monteiri* etc., has been put to me by Dr. D. H. Nicolson (*in litt.*). He states that "Fortune" is merely the English form of the Latin word *fortuna*; as the proper name of a man it would become *Fortunus* and therefore the genitive singular case would be spelled *fortuni*. The example of *Arisaema lourei* (mentioned in the editorial postscript to Leach's proposal) represents for Nicolson the genitive inflection of *loureirus*, which is the implicit Latin antecedent of the modern Portuguese name "Loureiro".

I do not think taxonomists ought to be forced to find out whether a person's name is a *de-latinization* before deciding whether to apply Art. 73.10 (non-Latin names) or Rec. 73C.2 (names already in Latin). I think the examples under discussion should be spelled respectively *monteiroi, fortunei* and *loureiri*. I do not know how the Code would have to be changed to exclude Nicolson's conclusions but I shall try to avoid them in practice, as the Code certainly permits!

Proposal (75). Rec. 73.F. Delete the word "former" (last line).

*Comment. Some current generic names are made to serve as specific epithets, as in *Rosa Rubus*. Proposed by: P. F. Yeo, University Botanic Garden, Cambridge, CB2, 1JF, Great Britain.*

*Continued from p. 702*

*Charles Sauvage*, honorary professor at the Université des sciences et techniques du Languedoc, born 14 August 1909 in Dijon, died 13 June 1980. He was earlier director of the Institut de botanique at the Université de Montpellier and from 1969 to 1974 director of the Centre d'études phytosociologiques et écologiques.

*Reinhold Tüxen*, nestor of Western European phytosociology of the Braun-Blanquet school, died in Rinteln, West Germany where he lived in retirement. 16 May 1980.

*Henning Weimarck*, professor emeritus at the Botanical Museum in Lund, died 12 June 1980 at the age of 77. He had studied several plant groups, especially chemo-taxonomically.

*Llewellyn Williams* was born in Conway Valley, North Wales 6 March 1901 and died 79 years later 23 June 1980. He was a highly respected authority on tropical floras, especially the neotropical. He led the Field Museum's Peruvian/Brazilian expedition in 1929-30 and as an employee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture he had explored and collected in South America, Central and West Africa, and South Asia. Since 1976 when he retired he had lived in Wisconsin.

*Walter Zimmermann*, Emeritus Professor at the University of Tübingen, BRD. born 9 May 1892, died 30 June 1980. He had occupied a special chair in botany and had been a part of the faculty since 1925.