does not form part of the name of a taxon and its citation is optional, although customary and often advisable". As far as is known this rule works well. A simplified botanical rule certainly will do, too.

Proposed by: L. Holm and R. Santesson, Institute of Systematic Botany, University of Uppsala, P.O. Box 541, S-751 21 Uppsala, Sweden.

(170) Proposal to add a Note in Art. 73.1 or 75.1 and to add a new Rec. 50G.

The following note should be added in Art. 73.1 or 75.1:

"Note 2. If the sanctioning author of a fungal name, Persoon or Fries (see Art. 13.3(d)), used a spelling different from the form as originally published, the original author must be followed (see Rec. 50G1)."

The necessity of this proposal is discussed in my proposal to conserve the generic name *Schizophyllum* Fr. 1815:Fr. 1821 with the sanctioning author's orthography (see cons. Prop. and Amend. Art. 14 Prop. 165). A new recommendation should be added as follows:

50G1. If a name is adopted by Persoon or Fries (see Art. 13.1(d)) with alterations from the form as originally published, it is desirable that in full citations the exact form used by the sanctioning author should be added, preferably between single quotation marks.


Ex. 3. *Dacryomyces tortus* (Willd.) Fr., Elench. fung. 2: 36. 1828:Fr. ibid. ('*Dacrymyces*').

Petersen (1983: 223) considers—vice versa—the sanctioning author's orthography to be correct if different from the original spelling, and he recommends that the original spelling is to be added in single quotation marks, but this view is in contradiction to Arts. 73.1, 73.2 and 75.1.

Literature Cited


Proposed by: S. Rauschert, Turmstrasse 47, DDR-4020 Halle (Saale), German Democratic Republic. [Deceased.]

(171)–(198) Report of the special committee for orthography with proposals to amend the Code.

For voting purposes, this Committee is composed of K. Adolphi, V. Demoulin (Secretary), Hj. Eichler, P. Isovita, L. A. S. Johnson, A. Kanis, D. Nicolson (Convener) and P. G. Parkinson. These eight voted on the questions posed in the final synthesis and voting percentages were determined from their votes. Ex officio members are W. Greuter (Rapporteur Général) and E. G. Voss (General Committee Secretary) while honorary members are W. G. D'Arcy, S. Rauschert, W. T. Stearn, and J. F. Veldkamp who, for various reasons, could not contribute to the critical final voting. All were on the Committee's mailing list.

All the orthographic problems referred to this Committee by the 13th International Botanical Congress (Sydney) and several others were considered by the Committee, involving circulation of 21 documents. Agreement was not reached on all issues but a significant number of solutions were elaborated into proposals that received support of at least ⅗ (6) of the eight members voting on the final synthesis. These proposals are made here collectively in the Committee's name. The Secretary, V. Demoulin, was the focus of all correspondence and prepared the first draft of this. The submitted draft, with a few changes (mostly expansions), was finalized by the Convener, D. Nicolson, who takes this opportunity to thank all members, particularly Dr. Demoulin, for all their hard work.
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(171) Proposal to replace Art. 18.1 and examples with:

"The name of a family is a plural adjective used as a substantive; it is formed form the genitive singular of a legitimate name of an included genus (see also Art. 10) by replacing the genitive singular inflection (Latin -ae, -ii, -us, -is; transliterated Greek -ou, -os, -es, -as, and -ous, including the latter's equivalent -ēos) with the termination -aceae. For generic names of nonclassical origin, when analogy with classical names is insufficient to determine the genitive singular, -aceae is added to the full word. For generic names with alternative genitives the one implicitly used by the original author must be maintained."

"Ex. Classical: Rosaceae (from Rosa, Rosae), Salicaceae (from Salix, Salicis), Plumbaginaceae (from Plumbago, Plumbaginiis), Rhodophyllaceae [=Entolomataceae] (from Rhodophyllum, Rhodophylli), Rhodophyllidaceae (from Rhodophyllis, Rhodophyllidos), Sclerodermataceae (from Scleroderma, Sclerodermatos), Aextoxicaceae (from Aextxicon, Aextxicoi), Potamogetonaceae (from Potamogeton, Potamogetonos)."

"Ex. Nonclassical: Nelumbonaceae (from Nelumbo, Nelumbonis, genitive by analogy with umbro, umbonis), Ginkgoaceae (from indeclinable Ginkgo)."

Comments: This unanimously supported proposal allows Art. 18 to stand independently of Rec. 73G (see Prop. 185) and avoids use of the equivocal stem notion. There are two reasons to avoid "stems": (1) there are two very different concepts of stems, a system used in grammars and a "working base system", underlying this proposal, and (2) "stem" is probably not the grammatically correct word for what we are advocating. Comparison with the Zoological Code shows this is a neat solution.

If proposal 185 on Rec. 73G.1(a) is passed the Editorial Committee might consider eliminating any duplication by cross-references.

Several members agree that conservation proposals should be made to restore Batidaceae (now Bataceae) and Capparidaceae (now Capparaceae).

Given the problem (fortunately rare) of names based on alternative genitives we expect the following anomaly exists: A family name based on one genitive and an infrafamilial name based on the same generic name with an alternative genitive. Two options would eliminate such an anomaly: (1) the form first used could be imposed on the latter form or (2) the form used by the highest ranked name could be imposed on the lower. Two thirds (6) of the Committee members supported the first option but the second was not explicitly considered, perhaps because the taxon might be well-known at an infrafamilial rank but have a little known alternative at family rank. In the absence of known examples, no proposal is made for this problem in either Art. 18 (family names) or Art. 19 (infrafamilial names).

(172) Proposal to Replace Art. 19.1 with:

"The name of a subfamily is a plural adjective used as a substantive; it is formed in the same manner as a family name (Art. 18.1) but with the termination -oideae."

Comments: This unanimously supported proposal avoids the word "stem" and logically follows acceptance of our first proposal but is not necessarily dependent upon its acceptance.

Similarly, Art. 17.1 on formation of names of orders and suborders could be modified by the Editorial Committee to remove the reference to "stem." This could be done by reference to the procedure for forming family names in Art. 18.1, parallel to this proposal.

(173) Proposal in Art. 18.3 to replace:

"... based on the stem of an illegitimate generic name" with "based on an illegitimate generic name." Also, in Art. 19.5 replace "based on the same stem of a generic name" with "based on the same generic name".

Comment: This unanimously supported proposal and the preceding ones aim to eliminate the use of the equivocal word "stem." In case acceptance of other proposals (Parkinson) would modify the concept of legitimacy, wording would, of course, be amended by the Editorial Committee.
(174) Proposal to provide for capitalization of generic names in Art. 20.1 and ensure that this remains a question of typography, not validity, by:

(a) Add a new final phrase (here italicized) to Art. 20.1 so that it reads: “The name of a genus is a substantive in the singular number, or a word treated as such, and is written with an initial capital letter (see Art. 73.2).”
(b) Add a new parenthetic cross reference (here italicized) to the final sentence of Art. 73.2 so that it reads: “They do not refer to the use of an initial capital or smaller letter, this being a matter of typography (see Arts. 20.1, 21.2, Rec. 73F).”

The Committee voted (6–2) in favor of part (a). One member noted that passage could result in devalidation of generic names that happened to have been published without a capital letter (contrary to form in Art. 32.1(d)). As the Code currently stands, capitalization is a matter of typography (Art. 73.2), although this provision normally applies to infrageneric epithets (Art. 21.2) and species (and infraspecific) epithets (Rec. 73F). Therefore, part (b) has been added.

Another member noted that capitalization is not specified for equally appropriate names: infrafamilial names (Art. 19), family names (Art. 18) and suprafamilial names (Arts. 16 and 17). This proposal is made because generic names are often uncapitalized in popular works and explicit guidance seems desirable. Proposals are not made for higher ranked names because they are rarely used in popular works and it avoids adding complexity to the Code.

(175) Proposal to replace the first sentence of Art. 23.1 with:

“The name of a species is a binary combination consisting of the name of the genus followed by a single specific epithet in the form of an adjective, a name in genitive or a word in apposition but not a phrase in ablative.”

Comments: Two thirds of our votes favored this proposal.

The necessity of this addition was pointed out by Donk long ago (Taxon 11: 170–173. 1962, discussion of “phrase-epithets”) but no proposal has ever been made. Technically an ablative phrase, such as folis androsaemi (with leaves of androsaemum), is a single epithet and, like noli me tangere (touch me not) or capillus veneris (hair of Venus) could, especially if hyphenated, be part of a binary species name without the proposed addition.

A shorter alternative with the same effect but not giving optional forms (others possible?) would be to add the (here) italicized phrase to the first sentence of Art. 23.1 so that it reads: “The name of a species is a binary combination consisting of the name of the genus followed by a single specific epithet but not a phrase in ablative.”

(176) Proposal to amend Art. 23.3 by adding the italicized text so that it reads:

“Symbols forming part of specific epithets proposed by Linnaeus do not invalidate the relevant names but must be transcribed.”

Comment: Two thirds of the Committee supported a comparable proposal. Its aim is to avoid any potential clash with 32.1(b). One member of the Committee suggested that the provision would be more appropriate to Art. 73.6 on transcription (of diacritic signs).

(177) Proposal to delete the first two sentences of Rec. 50F.

Comment: This was supported by two thirds of our votes. The opening phrase, “Except as provided in Art. 75” makes the recommendation meaningless and the intention is to clarify that no option exists for handling synonyms differently than accepted names.

The opposite intention appears in proposals (199–200) being made by Weber and Adolphi, clearly providing the option for maintaining original spelling for synonyms.

This proposal (as well as Weber and Adolphi’s) is linked with but independent from the following proposal on Art. 75.3.
(178) Proposal to add the italicized cross reference to the first sentence of Art. 75.3 so that it reads:

"The orthographic variants of a name are to be automatically corrected to the validly published form of that name. In full citations it is, however, desirable that the original form should be added (see Rec. 50F.1)."

Comment: This was supported by two thirds of our votes.

(179) Proposal to amend Art. 64.2 by amending the beginning so that it reads:

"When two or more otherwise legitimate names based on different types are so similar that they are likely to be confused . . . ."

Comments: The aim is to remove the option of accepting confusability if the earlier, similarly spelled name is illegitimate. The sense of this proposal was approved by 7 of 8 votes. The proposal removes restriction to "generic, specific or infraspecific names" and applies to names at all ranks.

Parkinson (props. 259–262) deals with the problem of names which are 'simultaneously legitimate and illegitimate' and proposal 260 deals with Art. 64.2 (parahomonymy). The word 'otherwise' has been added to attenuate the problem.

The Committee came within one vote of proposing introducing a term (parahomonym or paronym) for what can be called 'confusingly similar names.'

(180) Proposal to amend Art. 64.2 by incorporating its footnote in the main text and require the Committee decision to invoke confusability.

Comment: A two thirds majority favored having confusing similarity be Committee decided and not left to individual judgment. The Committee members unanimously agreed that confusing similarity should continue to be applied at the species level (as in Solanum saltense/saltsense example).

(181) Proposal to amend Art. 64.2 by replacing "they are to be treated as homonyms" by the italicized text so that it reads:

"When . . . names . . . are so similar that they are likely to be confused, . . . , the later name, unless conserved, is listed in Appendix IV."

Additionally, modify the caption of Appendix IV (rejected names) to make clear that it includes names rejected under both Art. 64.2 (confusable) and 69 (widely misapplied).

Comment: If confusing similarity is decided only by Committee, this provides an alternative for recording decisions to the current listing under Ex. 7. This proposal was unanimously supported by this Committee, although at least one member felt that, for the time being, decisions could continue to be cited in Art. 64.2.

(182) Proposal to add the following to Prop. 181 to amend Art. 64.2 by adding:

". . . , if deemed necessary by the appropriate committee."

Comment: The Committee members were inconclusive on whether every Committee decision necessarily had to be listed in Appendix IV. This proposal would allow an option.

(183) Proposal to amend Art. 73.1 (on correction of orthographic errors) by adding:

". . . and the standardizations imposed by Arts. 73.8 (compounding forms), 73.9 (hyphens) and 73.10 (terminations)."

Comments: Seven (of 8) voted for this proposal. The point is that Arts. 73.8–10 do not involve outright errors in a historical or grammatical sense. Rather, they deal with what is better regarded as
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a standardization for nomenclatural purposes, a way to establish consistency in botanical Latin by which it differs from often inconsistent earlier Latin.

If this proposal passes, it would be appropriate to reword Arts. 73.8–10 by deleting, from each, the phrase: "is treated as an orthographic error to be corrected." This could be replaced by: "is to be changed." The Committee unanimously voted that, if the wording of the proposal is unacceptable, the Editorial Committee should find alternative wording with the same sense.

(184) Proposal to replace Art. 73.8 by:

"Usage of a First Declension genitive singular (-ae) in an epithet (pseudocompound) is to be changed to -i-. Exceptions are: well-established genitive pseudocompounds (as aquaeductus, Tabernaemontanus) and those revealing an etymological difference (as carcaefolius, not caricifolius, from Carica vs. cariciolus (from Carex)."

"Note 1: The use of -ae as a latinization of Greek -ai- is not a genitive pseudocompound and is not to be changed (e.g., chamaebuxus)."

Comments: A majority (5–3) of the Committee supported deletion of Arts. 73.8 and 73.10 but this failed to meet the required 2/3 vote for a proposal. Six (of 8) voted for the above compromise that clearly limits the standardization to its sense of more than 50 years (cf. Art. 70, Note 2 and its reference to Rec. XLIV in the 1930 Cambridge Code, J. Bot. Suppl. 1934).

One problem with the current language (eliminated in this proposal) is that "incorrect compounding form" undesirably brings stems into question, such as pteroides (from nominative Pteris) vs. pteridoides (from genitive Pteridis). The current language (introduced in the 1975 Code) was not meant to affect original spelling of such cases.

It should be noted that this proposal eliminates the 'backdoor' reference to Rec. 73G to which many have objected.

Another consequence of this proposal (both in dropping 'incorrect compounding form' and breaking the connection to Rec. 73G) is that Hedysarum nummularifolium L. (Sp. Pl. 746. 1753, from nummulariae folio) is not 'correctable' to H. nummularifolium. If it had been published as 'nummulariae folium' it remains 'correctable' to nummularifolium.

(185) Proposal to replace Rec. 73G.1(a) with:

"In a true compound, a noun or adjective in nonfinal position appears as a combining form generally obtained by: (1) removing the case ending of the genitive singular (Latin -ae, -i, -us, -is; Greek -os, -es, -es, -ous and the latter's equivalent -o0s) and (2) before a consonant, adding a connecting vowel (-i- for Latin elements, -o- for Greek elements). Exceptions are common and one should review earlier usages of a particular combining form."

Comments: The proposed text was unanimously supported by the Committee. This apparently radical shortening of the current text does not materially affect the sense of the current complicated text. Aside from simplification, its main advantage is elimination of the current complicated, albeit linguistically correct, use of 'stems' and replacement by a simpler system that most working botanists instinctively expect. The proposed simplified system is subject to a few more exceptions than the current complicated system (especially for Greek elements) but all of us agree that the advantages of the simplified system far outweigh the relatively minor disadvantage of a few more exceptions. The warning to beware of exceptions is necessary even for the current system.

Some of the language of Prop. 171 (above) is duplicated in this proposal and could be reduced by cross reference.

(186) Proposal to amend Rec. 73G.1(b) by replacing the sentence "Some irregular forms... purpureus cum atro" with:
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“In epithets where tingeing is expressed, the modifying initial colour often is in ablative because the preposition e, ex is implicit, e.g., atropurpureus from ex atro purpureus (blackish purple from purple tinged with black).”

Start the next sentence by “Other irregular forms . . .”

Comments: It was unanimously agreed that the erroneous discussion of atropurpureus should be corrected (cf. Stearn, Bot. Latin 253. 1973).

(187) Proposal to replace Art. 73.10 with:

“Epithets derived from modern personal names (not already Latin or possessing a well established latinization) must be formed with the addition of an -i- (stem augmentation) if the personal name ends in a consonant (see Rec. 73C.1), with the exception of substantive epithets formed from names ending in -er for which a Second Declension genitive is used on the model of puer, pueri (hookeri for Hooker) or ager, agrī (solandri for Solander). Epithets differently formed are to be treated as orthographic errors, except for the use of Third Declension genitives (in -is) which should be discouraged but cannot be a posteriori modified.”

Comments: This proposal was supported by 6 (of 8) members. Article 73.10 absorbed more of the Committee’s attention than any other. A majority (5 of 8), just short of ⅔ required to make the proposal, favored deletion of Art. 73.10 and the effort went into trying to find a compromise. The question of gender and number for substantive epithets based on personal names has been separated as proposal 188 (following).

The Committee tried, without success, to apply Art. 73.10 in a way that would not upset usage. Only for names ending in a consonant was it found that a standardization could be acceptable, and this only if well established latinizations are respected. Examples were considered, such as blumei vs. blumii (for Blume), sprucei vs. sprucii (for Spruce), rheedei vs. rheedii (for Rheed), georgei vs. georgii (for George), rivieri vs. rivierei (for Riviere), billardieri vs. billardierei vs. billardierii (for Labillardière), gerardi vs. gerardii (for Gerard), etc.

(188) Proposal to add to the preceding proposal:

“Substantive epithets based on personal names with terminations inappropriate for the gender or number of the person(s) to whom the name is dedicated are to be treated as correctable.”

Comments: This was only favored by half of the Committee and opposed by the other half. It should thus not be a Committee proposal, but it is the status quo and since the preceding proposal does not include it (otherwise the proposal would have had insufficient support), it should be voted upon separately.

Three examples were considered: Astragalus matthewsii Kirchoff & Podlech (1974) is a later homonym of A. matthewsii Watson (1883) but, unlike the latter, is named for a woman, Victoria Matthews, and is either A. matthewsiae (not a later homonym but possibly a confusingly similar name) or A. victoriae Kirchoff & Podlech (1976). Some felt the later homonym stood as published (A. victoriae correct), others felt that ‘matthewsii’ was an orthographic variant under Art. 75 Note 1 (inflectional form), automatically correctable to matthewsiae under Art. 75.3. One half of the Committee (including Nicolson) believes matthewsiae correct under current Code and supports this proposal, while the other half (including the first author) opposes the proposal.

The second example concerned Russula turci Bresadola, named for “Baronissae Juliae Turco Lazzeri”. One member, at least (a separate vote was not taken), felt the epithet should be changed to ‘turcae’ (or barbaric ‘turcoae’). Others felt that turci (masculine) was correct because Turco is a masculine form in Italian and turcae, in Latin, would mean “of the Turk” or “the Turks,” turca (the Turk) being a feminine form for a masculine word. Two Latin scholars agreed that Bresadola, a 19th century priest and skilled in Latin, had made no error. Both authors agree that turci is correct as a special case.
The third example (Henderson and Reynolds, Austral. Syst. Bot. Newsletter 43: 22. 1985) concerned 'Cupania cordieri' F. Mueller. (now placed in Synima), named for the Cordier brothers (fratrisbo Cordier). The correct epithet under the current Code was found to be debatable but under the present proposal is cordierorum.

Some feel strongly that major modifications of names are a source of confusion, scientifically undesirable, and that cordieri(), like matthewsii, must be considered deliberate latinizations to be respected. It was also pointed out that a posteriori changing of gender of substantive epithets would create problems in the case of persons having changed sex, at least two cases of this type having been recorded among taxonomists.

Those who oppose this proposal consider it unscientific to oblige taxonomists to examine the biography of persons to whom an epithet has been dedicated. The original spelling is the only objectively and easily determined one and should stay, as is the case under the Zoological Code. Correcting, a posteriori, epithets for gender and number of persons would be equivalent to correcting for geographical epithets (Scilla peruviana), and similar cases, corrections rightfully banned under Art. 62.1.

Those who support the proposal consider it desirable to maintain the classically correct usage of appropriate gender and number for substantive epithets named for people. This has long been part of the Code. Using correct gender was early a Recommendation XII (1906 Vienna Code) and became an option (may be corrected) under Article 82 (as last example of orthographic errors in the Stockholm 1952 Code, also as Rec. 82D). The thrust of current Art. 73.10 first appeared as Art. 73 Note 3 (1956 Paris Code), cross-referencing Rec. 73. Current Art. 73.10 first appeared in the Leningrad (1978) Code.

In view of the honest disagreement within the committee, each voter must decide whether appropriate gender and number should continue to be imposed for substantive epithets named for people (vote for this proposal) or abandoned (vote against the proposal) and abide by the decision.

(189) Proposal to delete Art. 73 Note 2 and, at the end of Art. 73.6, replace 'the diaeresis, however, is permissible' by:

"... the diaeresis, indicating that the vowel is to be pronounced separately from the preceding vowel (Cephaelis, Isoetes), and the ligatures -ae- and -ae- (Arisema, Schanus), indicating that the letters are to be pronounced together, are permissible but seldom used nowadays."

Comments: Unanimously supported. No change in the sense of the current sense of the Code is involved but the proposal adds the other ligature -ae- and clarifies the distinction between a ligature and a diaeresis. It should be noted that the diaeresis can be correctly used whenever two vowels come together and are to be pronounced separately, even when not appearing in the original publication, e.g., Aizœn (from aei + zoœ, ever-living) as done by Airy Shaw.

Consideration was given to inserting a provision for deleting apostrophes, as in l'heritieri (not barbaric heritieri), but only 2 of 8 votes favored this. A technical problem arose in dealing with Irish names, such as O'Kelly, when it was understood that Irish O' does not involve an apostrophe replacing 'f' in 'of' but an anglicization of an accented Irish word ó.

(190) Proposal to add a new sentence to Art. 73.4:

"Other letters, appearing in some modern alphabets, are to be transcribed. Ex. German ß in blossfeldiana becomes blossfeldiana."

Comment: Unanimously supported. The addition takes care of one known case and will, by extension, cover other possibilities not now addressed by the Code.

(191) Proposal to delete Note 4 and reword 73.9 as: "The use of a hyphen in a compounded epithet is treated as an orthographic error to be deleted but is permitted if the epithet is formed of words that usually stand independently (see Art. 23.1 and 23.3)."

Comments: Unanimously supported. The proposal combines Art. 73.9 (deletion of hyphens) with Note 3 (when hyphen is permitted).
Note (by Nicolson) that nowhere (current or proposed) is it said that a hyphen must be added, even if the original epithet involved two words that could stand independently. Article 23.1 says, "If an epithet consists of two or more words, these are to be united or hyphened. An epithet not so joined when originally published is not to be rejected but, when used, is to be united or hyphened (see Art. 73.9)." *Amaryllis* 'Bella donna' L. and *Atropa* 'Bella donna' L. are covered by this. Thus, it is possible to have 'Bella donna' become either *belladonna* (united, usual in *Amaryllis*) or *bella-donna* (hyphened, cited in Art. 23, Ex. 1 for *Atropa*).

(192) Proposal to delete from Rec. 73B.1(b):

"... except when the name ends in -er, when a is added (e.g. *Kernera* after Kernera)."

Comments: Unanimously supported. *Sesleria* or *Gesneria* are regarded as better constructions than *Kernera* and accord with comparable construction of adjectives, *seslerianus, gesnerianus* in Rec. 73C.1(d).

(193) Proposal to delete the last sentence of Rec. 73B.1(b) and add to Rec. 73B.1 a new paragraph (c):

"In latinized personal names ending in -us this termination is dropped (*Dillenia for Dillenius*) before applying the procedure described in (a) and (b)."

Comments: Unanimously approved. This proposal supports the convention now in Rec. 73B.1(b) but clarifies that the action (deletion of -us of *Dillenius*) should have the product (*Dilleni-*) handled under 73B.1(a), add -a, not under 73B.1(b), add -ia. Literal reading would result in barbarous 'Dilleniia'.

(194) Add a new sentence to Art. 75, Note 1:

"Confusingly similar names based on the same type are to be treated as orthographic variants."

Comments: The Committee voted 7-1 for this proposal. The intent is to extend the reach of orthographic variants (based on the same type) to cases that might not, otherwise, fit the definition in Art. 75, Note 1. For example, it is not clear that *Rhodomenia* (nom. rej.) vs. *Rhodymenia* (nom. et orth. cons.) are orthographic variants under a strict reading of Art. 75, Note 1. The Committee feels that the broadest possible extension of orthographic variants is appropriate for cases involving the same type. The further extension is made, the fewer superfluous renamings have to be dealt with under Art. 63.

The second author (Nicolson) favored a shorter version, add the (here) italicized text to the first sentence of Art. 75 Note 1 so that it reads: "Orthographic variants are the various spelling, compounding, and inflectional forms of a name or epithet (including typographic errors and confusingly similar forms), only one type being involved." However, the first author (Demoulin) objected and his original proposal is made.

(195) Proposal to replace Art. 75.2 with:

"If orthographic variants of a name appear in the original publication, the one which heads the description (or diagnosis) or is most closely associated with it is to be retained."

Comments: The Committee voted 7-1 for this proposal. The current text makes two provisions for selecting from simultaneously published orthographic variants: (1) retain the one that best conforms to the rules and best suits the recommendation of Art. 73 and (2) otherwise follow the first author to choose one and reject the other. The Committee feels that the latter provision should be avoided and replaced by something that provides a solution by study of the original publication without going to subsequent literature.
The former provision was considered unnecessary since the rules and Art. 73 (specifically paragraphs 4—10) apply to any name.

(196) Proposal to convert Rec. 75A into Art. 76.

Comment: The Committee voted 7–1 for this proposal. This is really what it is. Much the same language was Art. 72 in the Cambridge Code but was shifted to a Recommendation at the Amsterdam Congress (1936, cf. Britonia 6: 28. 1947). It is noted that some workers use the current strong language of Rec. 75 to make gender corrections while others ignore it, leading to contemporary works having different genders for the same name. The proposal will solve this by restoring the Recommendation to the status of an Article. While this will not solve all gender problems, it will help.

Parkinson (Taxon 33: 348. 1984) makes a similar proposal (5) to convert Rec. 75A into an Article but with restructuring and some new details. Elements are in the following proposal.

(197) Proposal to replace Rec. 75A.1 and examples with:

“A generic name retains the gender assigned to it by its author, unless this is contrary to botanical tradition. Botanical tradition usually consists of maintaining the classical gender of a Greek or Latin word, when this was well established. The following names, however, must be treated as feminine in accordance with botanical custom, irrespective of classical usage or the author’s original usage: Adonis, Diospyros, Hemerocallis, Orchis, Stachys and Strychnos. Lotus and Melilotus must be treated as masculine.”

“Ex. 1 Cedrus and Fagus are feminine like other classical tree names, despite their -us ending; this is also true of Rhamnus, despite the fact that Linnaeus gave it masculine gender. Eucalyptus is also feminine, a neologism retaining the gender assigned by its author. Phyteuma (neuter), Sicyos (masculine), Erigeron (masculine) are other cases where botanical usage has re-established the classical gender despite another choice by Linnaeus. The classical gender of Atriplex varied (feminine in Columella, neuter in Pliny) and Linnaeus’ choice of feminine stands.”

Comments: This proposal was inspired by study of Parkinson’s proposal (5, Taxon 33: 348. 1984) and incorporates some examples from him, as well as all in the current text. It introduces the concept of botanical usage overriding classical usage for stated cases (feminine Adonis, Diospyros, etc., adding masculine Lotus and Melilotus from Parkinson). The idea that gender, as in Phyteuma (neuter) and Sicyos (masculine), rests not on the classical gender but on botanical usage is new. It is supported by Stearn’s point (Bot. Latin p. 6. 1973) that “Botanical Latin is . . . a modern Romance language . . . , derived from Renaissance Latin with much plundering of ancient Greek, which has evolved, mainly since 1700 and primarily through the work of Carl Linnaeus . . . .” Therefore, we should be prepared to solve gender problems by preserving botanical usage and neither impose classical usage (that may have fallen) nor Linnaean usage (often in error, particularly in assigning feminine to names ending in -ma and neuter to names ending in -ðn).

The Committee could not accept the whole of Parkinson’s proposal. Objection was made to his proposed Art. 76.6, that the Note concerning feminine names of vines ending in -us should be deleted or better examples found. Convolvulus is masculine in classical and botanical Latin. Greek kissos is masculine, Pliny used cissos as feminine, and Cissus is feminine in botanical Latin. Rubus dubiously qualifies as a vine, even if clearly masculine.

One should note that, in the Parkinson proposal, the Cordyceps example in proposed Art. 76.9 is incorrect, not taking into account the 1753 starting point in use for fungi since the Sydney Congress. Under that starting point Cordyceps Fries (1818) can retain the traditional feminine gender used by Fries and most mycologists.

In correspondence (before and after seeing the above finalized proposal) Parkinson, indicated willingness to modify elements of his proposal (including vines and Cordyceps). It was not possible to comply with Parkinson’s request to generate a revision of his proposal (5) as an alternative. Such a revision would be very similar to the present proposal.

Note (Nicolson) added at the last minute: Dr. E. G. Voss, Secretary of the General Committee (who gets copies of all Committee reports) specifically objected to imposition of masculine gender for Lotus and Melilotus. Linnaeus (1753) used both feminine (7 species) and masculine (4 species) for Lotus and his synonymy reveals prior mixed usage. Greek used masculine but Latin used feminine (with
occasional masculine, perhaps because of Greek influence). Voss (in litt.) commented that Latin usage is complicated by the fact that *Lotus* (or *Lotos*) was applied to several plants, apparently more frequently using masculine for the waterlily and feminine for the legume. My study of Latin usage (Georges, Ausführ. Lat.-Deutsches Handw., 14th ed., 1976) revealed that feminine was used for five senses (including waterlily and legume) but masculine was only sometimes used.

In view of the continuing controversy (Stearn, A. W. Smith Gardener's Dict. Pl. Names, ed. 2. 1975, uses feminine but Encke and Buchheim, Zander Handw. Pflanzennamen, ed. 10. 1972 uses masculine and the Flora Europaea compromised, using *Lotus* as masculine and *Melilotus* as feminine) of these genera, it is urgent to have the gender of *Lotus* and *Melilotus* specified in the Code. Those who oppose masculine gender for one or both should not oppose the proposal but should propose an amendment.

(198) Proposal to reword the first sentence of Rec. 75A.2 to read:

“Compounded generic names take the gender of the last word in the nominative case in the compound.”

Comments: Unanimously supported. The Committee believes that the application should not be limited to Greek or Latin words. Another problem that this proposal addresses are rare cases like *Cornucopiae*, involving a neuter noun in nominative singular (*cornu*) and a feminine noun in genitive singular (*copiae*), literally horn of plenty. Linnaeus correctly used neuter (*C. cucullatum*) and the provision should not provide that feminine is correct.

Submitted by: V. Demoulin, Département de Botanique, Université de Liège, Sart Tilman, B-4000 Liège, Belgium and Dan H. Nicolson, Department of Botany NHB166, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

(199)-(200) Citations of synonyms (Rec. 50F and Art. 75.3).

Proposal (199) Change Rec. 50F.1 to read:

“Names should be spelled exactly as originally published except for changes imposed by the rules but names cited in synonymy may be maintained in their original spelling. If a name is cited with alterations from the form originally published, it is desirable that in full citations the exact original form be added, preferably between quotation marks.


Ex. 3: *Spathiphyllum* *solomonense* Nicolson, Amer. J. Bot. 54: 496 (1967), ‘*solomonensis*’.


Proposal (200) Add to Art. 75.3 the following sentence:

“For citation of variants of accepted names and synonyms, see Rec. 50F.1.”

Comments: Form and spelling of names are ruled in various Articles of the Code (Art. 16–28, 32, 73, 75). The spelling used in the original publication is to be maintained (Art. 73, 75) unless incorrect Latin terminations (Art. 32.5) and other spellings contrary to the rules (Art. 73, 75) are to be corrected.

But Recommendation 50F says: “Except as provided in Art. 75, a name cited in synonymy should be spelled exactly as published by its author”. Obviously the citing of synonyms is intended to be done in a manner different from citing a name that is accepted as the correct one under the Code. Otherwise the Recommendation makes no sense. Indeed a difference must be made between the names that are used because they have been accepted as the correct name for a taxon and those names that are regarded as synonyms and are therefore out of use.
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