Over the years orthography has proven itself a sensitive topic in the Code. At St. Louis in 1999 there was no shortage of proposals, but all proposals concerning Art. 60 s.str. from all sources were dismissed en bloc. Obviously a fresh approach is needed. Proposals on orthography tend to try and effect a policy change, with editorial considerations merely a means toward that purpose. It might be time for the opposite, and to focus on editorial matters only. Perhaps if it is a little more clear what is in the Code it will be easier to think about policy.

The orthography section (Chapter VII. Section 1) does appear in need of editorial attention. The main difficulty is the sprawling nature of Art. 60, which (including recommendations) takes up eight pages to deal with original spelling, correction of spelling, standardization (transcription) of spelling, and guidelines concerning various aspects of new names and epithets. Thus Art. 60 is less readable than is desirable, especially in view of the complexity of the subject.

Another editorial soft spot is how names (sensu Art. 6.3) are referred to, and how these can be distinguished from the “personal, geographical, or vernacular names” which serve as a source of names and epithets sensu the Code. Leaving aside the provisions dealing with epithets only and focusing on names sensu Art. 6.3, the formula “names or epithets” (or a form of it) can be found in Art. 60.1, Rec. 60A, 60G–H and Art. 61.2; however “Latin plant names” is found in Art. 60.4, 60.6, Rec. 60B Note 1 and 60C.3; while the straightforward “names” can be encountered in Art. 60.2–3, 60.5, 61.1 and 61.3–4. On the other hand, the “names” in Rec. 60B Note 2 cannot really be read other than as “personal names”, which is wildly contrary to the rest of the Code. For the sake of uniformity it seems desirable to settle upon a single formula. The formula “name or epithet”, although redundant (all epithets are part of names, and any new epithet is part of a new name, provided a “new name” is not taken to be a nomen novum), has the advantage that it avoids confusion with “personal, geographical, or vernacular names”.

This set of proposals is purely editorial in purpose. Each of the proposals is meant to stand on its own merits and can be implemented independently, with a very few exceptions. Nevertheless, all the proposals work in the same direction following the same guidelines. The common purpose is (1) to arrange this complex subject matter into units that can be overseen, (2) to standardize analogous parts utilizing the clearest phrasing, and (3) to clear up obtuse phrasing in odd corners. Unfortunately, renumbering of articles seems inevitable, but only higher numbers, and only of articles which have held their present number no further back than the Tokyo Code (1994). The general framework proposed is:

Proposed Art. 60: establishing that each name has only one valid spelling (present Art. 61).
Proposed Art. 61: establishing what that one valid spelling should be (present Art. 60.1–3 and 60.7).
Proposed Art. 62: letters and signs allowable in “names and epithets”; transcription (present Art. 60.4–6).
Proposed Art. 63: compound forms (present Art. 60.8–9, 60.12 and Rec. 60G).
Proposed Art. 64: “names and epithets” derived from personal names (present Art. 60.10–11 and Rec. 60B–C).

In addition, it is proposed to bring together all guidelines applying to all “names and epithets” formed de novo in one place, except those dealing with orthography in the strict sense. There are several logical places for such a block of guidelines. The prime candidate is Art. 20, the first place where these guidelines are needed, with Art. 23 the runner-up and Art. 16 a remote contender (as remote as the possibility of forming descriptive names above the rank of family being given a new lease on life). The alternative would be to create a structure analogous to Section 4 in Chapter IV.

To facilitate consideration of these proposals, a composite, showing how the orthography section might come to look in the Vienna Code if these proposals are passed, has been placed online at [http://botgard.bio.uu.nl/taxonomy/ortho.htm](http://botgard.bio.uu.nl/taxonomy/ortho.htm); a back-up should run at [http://www.nehosoc.nl/orthography.htm](http://www.nehosoc.nl/orthography.htm).
(005) Move Art. 61 forward to become the first article of Chapter VII:
It is desirable first firmly to establish that a name or epithet has only a single “valid spelling” before addressing what the “correct spelling” should be.

(006) Reword Art. 61.1:
“61.1. Only one orthographical variant of a name or epithet is treated as validly published (see Art. 60.1).”
Strictly speaking only names can be validly published, but it seems convenient to define here, for purposes of orthography, that epithets can be “treated as validly published”.
It seems unnecessary to have both Art. 60.1 and 61.1 going to considerable lengths to set the original spelling mutatis mutandis as the “valid spelling”; once should be enough, in Art. 60.1, so the rest of 61.1 can be deleted.

(007) Reword the first sentence of Art. 61.4:
“61.4. Any orthographical variant other than the validly published form is to be corrected.”
In principle there are two ways to define orthographical variants. Intuitively it is logical to assume that orthographical variants are all existing forms except the validly published form. The alternative is to equate orthographical variants to all existing forms, including the validly published form. The present definition (in Art. 61.2) is the latter and conflicts with Art. 61.4, which in fact prescribes that all forms including the validly published form are to be corrected. Correcting a form to itself is a never-ending loop and thus not to be prescribed. Altering the definition of orthographical variants to the intuitive approach may be preferable, but it is dubious if this could count as a purely editorial change. Therefore it is here proposed to resolve the conflict by altering Art. 61.4.

(008) Reword the second sentence of Art. 61.4:
Replace “corrected form” by “validly published form”.
This “corrected form” is not defined and might cause unnecessary confusion to the casual reader. There are quite enough forms of “form” in Art. 61 as it is.

(009) Reword Art. 61 Note 1:
“Note 1. For citation of orthographical variants see Rec. 50F.”
The present note is a little unclear in that it might appear to suggest that orthographical variants not in original publications are to be cited, depending on how the reader interprets “original form”. Actually this is not covered in the Code, and a note in Art. 61 is not the right place to treat the matter. It seems wiser to just refer to Rec. 50F and leave it at that.

(010) Reword Art. 60.1:
“60.1. The original spelling of a name or epithet is to be retained as the validly published form (Art. 61.1), excepting (a) conservation of an altered spelling (Art. 14.11, Rec. 14A); (b) standardization imposed by this Code; or (c) typographical or orthographical errors to be corrected (but see Art. 60.3 and 60.7).”
As it now stands Art. 60.1 is neither very readable nor very exact. An explicit link to Art. 61.1 will establish the importance of precision in spelling. In addition it seems wise to list the exceptions completely and concisely, and in order of most to least compelling case.
If proposals 015, 018 and 020 are passed, the new articles can be referred to (also Art. 32.5) for standardization; otherwise move the text of the last two thirds of Art. 60.1 to a new note and fill in the missing parts as follows:

“Note n bis. Standardization is imposed by Art. 60.4 (letters and ligatures foreign to classical Latin), 60.5 (u/v or i/j used interchangeably), 60.6 (diacritical signs and Latin ligatures), 60.8 (compounding forms), 60.9 (hyphens), 60.10 (apostrophes), 60.11 (terminations), and 60.12 (fungal epithets). See also Art. 32.5.”
This listing does not need to be in Art. 60.1 since Art. 60.4–6 and 60.8–12 are rules in their own right.

(011) Add a note below Art. 60.1:
“Note n. In case of more than one original spelling see Art. 61.3.”

(012) Reword Art. 60 Ex. 5 to conform with Rec. 50E.1 and 50F:

(013) Add a note after the examples accompanying Art. 60.1:
“Note n ter. For citation of a name or epithet not retaining the original spelling see Rec. 50E.1 and 50F.”
This could also be part of the reworded Art. 60.1 of proposal 010.

(014) Move Art. 60.7 to immediately before or after Art. 60.3 and reword it:
“60.7. An original spelling that represents a latinization of a personal, geographic(al), or vernacular name is to be retained and is not to be treated as an orthographical error, except when latinization concerns only the termination of an epithet and Art. 60.11 applies.”
Although the examples following Art. 60.7 make it quite clear what is meant, the paragraph itself is not easy to read. The phrase “changes in spelling” suggests that
the paragraph deals with names altered after publication. It seems logical to replace “preserved” by “retained” to reinforce uniformity with Art. 60.1.

(Note: in the Code “geographical” is more often used than “geographic”.)

(015) Move Art. 60.4–6 to a new article on “letters and ligatures” permissible in “names and epithets”. Rearrange, at the discretion of the Editorial Committee, the provisions on diacritical signs, ligatures and the diaeresis in separate paragraphs or any arrangement of the elements of Art. 60.4 and 60.6 that makes best sense.

The temptation to place Art. 60.10 in the new article should probably be resisted. This new article is of a general nature, applying to all names and epithets. In contrast, Art. 60.10 applies to epithets only and would be quite at home in an article on names and epithets derived from personal names (see proposal 020). In addition, it may not be easy to say something relevant about apostrophes in the names of genera and higher ranks.

(016) Add a new paragraph, either to start the new article of proposal 015 or before Art. 60.4:

“Names and epithets are to be written in the 26 letters of the modern alphabet. A diacritical sign or ligature, present in a name and epithet when published, is to be transcribed as provided for in Art. 60.4 and 60.6 (see also Art. 23.3).”

This will allow the first sentence of Art. 60.4 to be reduced to the status of a note: after all, the letters w; y and k are part of the modern alphabet, and it does not require a rule to establish that. It may or may not be a good idea to include in this proposed first paragraph an extra sentence about the hyphen and diaeresis.

(017) Move the German ß and supporting text from Art. 60.4 to Art. 60.6, which is to be worded:

“60.6. A diacritical sign is to be replaced by the customarily assigned letter(s), for example: ä, ö, ü become, respectively, ae, oe, ue; é, è, ê become e, or sometimes ae; ñ becomes n; ø becomes oe; ð becomes ao. A ligature, indicating that letters are to be pronounced together, is to be replaced by the separate letters: æ becomes ae; ø becomes oe; ß becomes ss. The diaeresis, indicating that a vowel is to be pronounced separately from the preceding vowel (as in Cephaëlis, Isoëtes), is permissible.”

The existing dispersal of diacritical signs and ligatures is quite odd. All the diacritical signs, whether non-Latin or Latin, are in Art. 60.6. On the other hand, the ligatures are split over two paragraphs with the non-Latin ligatures in Art. 60.4 and the Latin ones in Art. 60.6.

The sentence about the diaeresis might look better in a separate paragraph. Also, the sentences on ligatures and diacritical signs could each become separate paragraphs (see proposal 015).

(018) Move Art. 60.8–9, 60.12 and Rec. 60G to a new article on compound forms.

(019) Add a clarifying note at the beginning of the new article of proposal 018:

“Note n. Authors forming a name or epithet which combines elements derived from two or more words can find advice in Rec. 20A.1(d)/23A.3(c)–(d), and Rec. 60G.”

This tries to draw the new article together.

(020) Move Art. 60.10–11 and Rec. 60B–C to a new article on forming names and epithets based on personal names:

Alternatively the new article might be defined more widely: “based on personal and geographical names”. Since only very few provisions can be found in the Code on geographical names, and very many on personal names, it seems preferable to choose the more narrow “based on personal names” and to treat the geographical names elsewhere.

(021) Add a note at the beginning of the new article of proposal 020:

“Note n. Authors forming a name or epithet based on a personal name can find advice in Rec. 60B when forming a generic name, or a subgeneric or sectional epithet, or in Rec 23A.1–2 and Rec. 60C when forming a specific or infraspecific epithet.”

This tries to draw the new article together.

(022) Reword “(but not 60C.2)” in Art. 60.11:

“60.11. The use of a termination (for example -i, -ii, -ae, -iae, -anus, or -ianus) contrary to Rec. 60C.1 is treated as an error to be corrected (see also Art. 32.5). Not to be corrected is a well-established Latin form as indicated in Rec. 60C.2.”

Although it is generally understood that the “(but not 60C.2)” is meant to exempt Rec. 60C.2 from the working of Art. 60.11 it is somewhat unhappily phrased. The casual reader will have difficulty with it. It is proposed to write it out in full.

(023) Reword the first paragraph of Rec. 60B.1 and integrate Rec. 60B Note 1 into it:

“60B.1. Authors forming a generic name, or a subgeneric or sectional epithet, based on a personal name
should use a termination as suggested below, but other-
wise should follow the customary spelling of this per-
sonal name, provided this meets with Art. 60.4 and 60.6.”

This rewording aims at uniformity with the analo-
gous paragraph on (infra)specific epithets (see proposal 028). It integrates Rec. 60B Note 1 (of long standing) which is something of a mystery, especially in its recent history. Its intention is quite clear: it is analogous to Rec. 60C.3, which states that the customary spelling of the personal name should be used, provided no conflict exists with either Art. 60.4 or 60.6 and the prescribed ter-
mination is used (also Rec. 60E).

(024) Rewrite Rec. 60B Note 2:
“Note 2. More than one generic name, or subgeneric or sectional epithet, can be based on one and the same personal name, i.e. by adding a prefix or suffix to that personal name or by using an anagram or abbreviation of it.”

This note (although of long standing) is very ambiguously worded. The only clear term here appears to be “name” in the closing phrase “original name” which (most probably) means “name or epithet”. The “words” preceding the “original name” is not a term as used by the Code, but by context would also mean “names or epithets”. On the other hand the “names” at the start of the note, which “may be accompanied by a prefix or suffix”, necessarily refer to stems that can be added to and by context must mean “personal names”. Although Rec. 60B Ex. 1 leaves no doubt as to the meaning of this note, it seems prudent to clean up the text.

(025) Delete from Rec. 60B Ex. 1 the genera dedicated to Martius and add extra genera dedicated to Engler:

“Englerina” Tiegh. (1895)” and “Englerula” Henn. (1904, ‘1905)”

Although the stature of Martius would entitle him to a place here, of the genera dedicated to him only Martiodendron is current; the ING lists Martia as illegiti-
mate. It seems suitable to include instead two extra examples of genera dedicated to Engler: of the five then listed four are in NCU-3 and are more or less current. In view of the turbulent taxonomic history of Sapotaceae, it should not be precluded that Englerella might be revived.

(026) Add a new note to Rec. 60B:
“Note n. This recommendation does not apply to an epithet of a subsection or lower subdivision of a genus, which preferably is a plural adjective (Rec. 21B.1)”

(027) Reformat Rec. 60C as follows:

60Csemm. Rec. 60C.3 (see proposal 028); “60Cbis. A noun in the genitive (a substantival ep-
ithet) should be formed as follows:” with two clauses: Rec. 60C.1(a) and (b);

“60Cter. An adjective should be formed as follows:” with two clauses: Rec. 60C.1(c) and (d);

60Cquater. Rec. 60C.4.
Also adjust wording and position of Note 1.

(028) Rewrite Rec. 60C.3 to become the first paragraph of Rec. 60C:

“60Csemm. Authors forming a specific or infraspe-
cific epithet based on a modern personal name should use a termination and form as suggested in this Rec. 60C, but otherwise should follow the customary spelling of that personal name, provided this meets with Art. 60.4 and 60.6 (for a name already possessing a well-estab-
lished latinized form see Rec. 60C.2)”

This is rephrased for uniformity with the analogous paragraph for generic names, subgeneric and sectional epithets (see proposal 023). The parenthetical clause “(for a name ... see Rec. 60C.2)” might also become a note.

(029) Upgrade the status of the examples listed between parentheses in Rec. 60C (maybe also those in Rec. 60B) to numbered examples:

This listing of examples in the text itself is not reader-
friendy, as evidenced by the fact that the Editorial Committee itself is short of a “)” in Rec. 60C.1(a) after “Hookers (m)”. Readability would be improved if they were set apart as numbered examples.

(030) Remove Rec. 60C.2 from Rec. 60C and either give it the status of an independent rec-
ommendation or integrate it in Rec. 23A:

As it stands, Rec. 60C.2, on how to deal with Latin(ized) personal names, seems out of place in Rec. 60C, which otherwise deals with modern personal names. The options are to have it stand on its own (it is substantial enough) or to integrate it with Rec. 23A. The latter is a realistic option since Rec. 60C.2 does not real-
ly deal with orthography but rather with Latin grammar. As the Code now stands, terminations are dealt with in Chapter VII only when guidelines particular to botanical orthography are involved, but otherwise in Chapter III (such as in Art. 23.5), for example if dictated by Latin grammar.

(031) Treat the component parts of Rec. 60C.2 separately:

The first sentence dealing with classical and mediae-
val Latin is distinct from the second sentence dealing with modern names in third declension. It seems logical to give each part an independent status at least as a
clause; the second sentence might also become a note.

(032) (032) Substitute “joannis or johannis from Johannes or Johann, John, Jo o, Jan or Hans” for “hectoris from Hector”:

According to IPNI (www.ipni.org) an epithet spelled hectoris has never been published, so it does not make a good example.

(033) Add an extra name to the examples in the first sentence of Rec. 60C.2:

“... brunonis for Bruno (Robert Brown) ...”

(034) In Rec. 60C.2 expand “; but not “cami” from Edmond Camus or Aimée Camus” to:

“A modern surname, even when originally derived from Latin, should be treated according to Rec. 60C.1: Camus (Edmond Camus or Aimée Camus), not inflected as “cami”, and Magnus (Paul Wilhelm Magnus), not inflected as “magni”.”

The example of Camus was added to the St. Louis Code (2000) to emphasize that existing surnames should not be treated as latinizations. Botanical tradition is quite clear in this respect: existing surnames, even when having come into existence through latinization, should be respected as such and not as latinizations to be inflected. Since this now is in the Code, it might as well be stated more explicitly.

(035) Reword the second sentence of Rec. 60C.2:

“A genitive in third declension has sometimes been used for a modern surname ending on -o or -on, e.g. munronis from Munro, richardsonis from Richardson: such epithets should not be corrected.”

The use of “family names” in Rec. 60C.2 is unhappy. Throughout the Code “family names” is always used in the sense of Art. 18, and there is a viable alternative in “surnames” which is preferable here. With the familiarity with Latin grammar among taxonomists declining it might be good to fill out the text a little. On another note, it might be worth pointing out that only very few taxa appear to be involved: IPNI (http://www.ipni.org) lists one basionym using “richardsonis” versus some 40 using “richardsonii”, and no basionyms using “munronis” versus more than 30 using “munroi”, so the effects of deleting this sentence altogether appear quite limited.

(036) Replace “substantival epithet” in Rec. 60C by “noun in the genitive” so as to conform more closely to Art. 23.1; also reword Art. 60 Note 3:

“Note 3. A genitive inflection inappropriate to the sex and number of the person(s) honoured is contrary to Rec. 60C.1 and is to be corrected.”

The term “substantival epithet” is used only in Rec. 60C (and the one note referring to it), and hinders easy reading, especially to users whose first language is not derived from Latin. For a long time the Code used “substantive” throughout but this has been replaced by “noun” almost everywhere. This is the last hold-out. Note 3 is only a placeholder for the examples following it and should be phrased to conform to the recommendation to which it refers.

(037) Reword Rec. 60E:

“60E.1. Authors forming an epithet should follow the customary spelling of the word or words on which it is based, provided this meets with Art. 60.4 and 60.6. Authors should observe accepted usage of Latin and latinization (see also Art. 23.5).”

This would seem to deserve attention: Rec. 60E is of long standing and clearly covers matters not otherwise dealt with in the Code. It would appear that Rec. 60E has a dual purpose and recommends using: (1) the spelling customary for its source (analogous to Rec. 60C.3 and 60B Note 1), and (2) preferred latinized forms.

The latter is the more likely to be controversial. A proposal was made to the 1950 Stockholm Congress to include an appendix in the Code with preferred Latin(ized) spellings, a list having been prepared. This received a highly favourable mail vote (175:32) and was referred to the Editorial Committee (Regnum Veg. 1: 525. 1953). It would have been useful if such a list had appeared in print.

(038) Delete the example in Rec. 60E:

The example “sinensis (not chinensis)” is of very long standing, but it is somewhat anomalous. Not only does it stand alone in a spot where a whole list of examples would be appropriate, but it is a very poor example with both “sinensis” and “chinensis” firmly established in botanical tradition.

(039) Include a note in Rec. 60E:

“Note n. A respected reference on accepted usage of Latin and latinization is W. T. Stearn, Botanical Latin (1966, 1992).”

(040) Move Rec. 60F to a position following Art. 23, with notes referring to the former between Art. 23.1 and 23.2 and between Art. 24.1 and 24.2:

“[Art. 23] Note n. For the initial letter of a specific epithet see Rec. 60F.”

“[Art. 24] Note n. For the initial letter of an infraspecific epithet see Rec. 60F.”
By contents Rec. 60F is a controversial topic. As an historical note, at the 1950 Stockholm Congress the Nomenclature Section voted 62.17% in favour of having this recommendation decapitalized (Regnum Veg. 1: 527. 1953). At St. Louis in 1999 the Section voted 59.25% for decapitalization as part of Art. 23 (Englera 20: 134–137. 2000). However, the matter of placement of this recommendation is editorial only.

Adding these notes may appear overly redundant, but all directions on initial letters included in the Code are primarily for the benefit of non-taxonomic botanists and non-botanical editors. Ease of access matters.

(041) Split Rec. 20A into two new recommendations:

The first to hold the guidelines concerning names and epithets in all ranks, bringing these together from Rec. 20A, 23A, 60A, 60E and 60H. As to location, this does not really need to follow Art. 20, but no clear alternative suggests itself, and it does not look out of place in this traditional placement.

The second to hold all components of Rec. 20A particular to forming the name of a genus.

(042) Give the following form to the first new recommendation from proposal 041 (to be referred to in Rec. 21 and 23 and reworded in singular mode):

“20A.1. Authors forming a name or epithet in any rank should comply with the following suggestions:

(a) To use a Latin termination insofar as possible.
(b) Not to make a name or epithet that is very long or difficult to pronounce in Latin.
(c) The etymology of a new name or epithet should be given, especially when its meaning is not obvious.
(d) Not to make a name or epithet by combining words from different languages.

(e) [Rec. 60A]
(f) [Rec. 60E]

The structure proposed means that Rec. 20A.1(b) “to avoid names not readily adaptable to the Latin language” would move to the new second recommendation (on names of genera) since it is not mirrored in Rec. 23A.3. Because of its general intent it could easily apply to all names and epithets. On the other hand, it is dubious if it has added value over and above Rec. 20A.1(c)/23A.3(b). Also, it is oddly worded: when a name has been published it has already been adapted to the Latin language (or not). Deletion might be the superior option.

(043) Add a new paragraph to Rec. 21B:

“21B.3bis. Recommendations made for forming the name of a genus (Rec. 20A) apply equally to a subgeneric or sectional epithet, except where Rec. 21B recommends otherwise.”

From an editorial point of view this is a desirable construction, allowing guidelines to be stated once and to apply twice. It mirrors Rec. 24A.1 for infraspecific epithets. However, it may have consequences not immediately foreseeable.

(044) Give a new form to Rec. 23A:

Begin the recommendation with “Authors forming a specific epithet should comply with the following suggestions:”; reduce the status of Rec. 23A.1–2 to clauses; include Rec. 60D as a clause; and adjust the wording and position of clauses so as to have them make best sense.

If proposal 042 passes, then clauses (a), (b) and (c) should be deleted here, and there should be a reference to the new Rec. 20A. This leaves room for new clauses. Judging by content, Rec. 23A.1–2 would not look out of place among the clauses of Rec. 23A.3. There is no reason why Rec. 60D cannot be moved here, since the “epithets” in Rec. 60D can only be specific and infraspecific epithets. This would bring together for easy reference all the general guidelines concerning specific (and infraspecific) epithets.

(045) Delete from Rec. 23A.1 the part on geographical names, perhaps to be moved to a note:

There is a discrepancy between Rec. 23A.1 and Rec. 60D. The former states that specific epithets based on names of “countries and localities ... should take the form of nouns in the genitive ... or of adjectives ...”. The latter recommends that an epithet “derived from a geographical name is preferably an adjective ...”. Since Rec. 60D is an independent recommendation, standing out clearly, and is apparently uncontested (e.g., grudgingly accepted in Stearn’s *Botanical Latin*), then presumably this reflects current botanical practice. The contents of Rec. 23A.1 may well have escaped notice, even by those not supporting it. A note could be added to clarify the status of geographical genitives. Alternatively geographical genitives could be maintained and integrated with Rec. 60D (this could be put to a 50% vote).

(046) Reword Rec. 23A.1, perhaps integrating the first sentence of Rec. 60C.2. If proposal 044 and 045 pass it will be a clause and might be worded:

“To give an epithet based on the name of a person the form of a noun in the genitive (*clusii*) or of an adjective (*clusianus*). An epithet based on a modern personal name should be formed according to Rec. 60C. If a personal name is already in Greek or Latin, or possesses a well-established latinized form, it can be used in the appropriate Latin genitive [examples not included.
If Rec. 60C.2 is not integrated into Rec. 23A.1 there should be a reference to it.

**(047)** Adjust Rec. 50E.1 to include conserved spelling:

“50E.1. If a name of a family, genus or species is accepted as a nomen conservandum (see Art. 14 and App. II–III) the abbreviation “nom. cons.” or, in the case of a conserved spelling (see Art. 14.11), “orth. cons.” should be added in a full citation.”

The Code uses “orth. cons.” in its appendices to indicate a conserved spelling. This appears to serve its purpose. It is proposed to formalize this.

**(048)** Adjust Rec. 50F to take account of the possibility of more than one original form:

“50F.1. If the form, or one of the forms, of a name or epithet as originally published differs from the validly published form as set in Art. 60.1 and 61.1 it is desirable that in full citations the exact original form(s) should be added, preferably between single or double quotation marks.”

**(049)** Add to Rec. 50F a classic example of a name with more than one form in the original publication:


**(050)** Add to Rec. 50F a modern example of a name with more than one form in the original publication:


**(051)** Reword the first two sentences of Art. 18.1:

“18.1. The name of a family is treated as a noun in the plural and is written with an initial capital letter (see Art. 4 Note 1). It is a plural adjective formed from ...”

The intent is to standardize the initial sentences of Art. 16.1, 18.1 and 19.1. Initial capital letters have been in and out of the Code. At the 1950 Stockholm Congress a proposal “Names or epithets of taxonomic groups higher than species are written with an initial capital letter” was condemned as “superfluous” by the Rapporteur (Synopsis of Proposals: 202. 1950) and rejected on an unfavourable mail vote (44:169, Regnum Veg. 1: 524. 1953). Nevertheless the Stockholm Code (1952) did see a change in this regard: the Editorial Committee on its own initiative eliminated capitalization of names of genera (part of the Code since the Vienna Rules, 1905). Rules on capitalization were then restricted to subsectional and serial epithets (preferably adjectival in form), apparently on the theory that botanists would automatically capitalize “substantives”. Note that this natural urge to capitalize nouns is alive in the discussions on the initial letter of (infra)specific epithets (see also proposal 040).

Reintroduction of capitalization of names of genera was proposed to the 1964 Congress but rejected (“by a considerable majority”) on concerns about validity of names published with a lower case initial letter (frequent in early French literature; Regnum Veg. 44: 22–23. 1966). It was voted into the Berlin Code (1988) with a “(see Art. 60.2)” (Art. 73.2 at the time) to emphasize that typography does not affect validity. At the time it was felt that names of genera “are often uncapitalized in popular works and explicit guidance seems desirable. Proposals are not made for higher ranks because they are rarely used in popular works and it avoids adding complexity to the Code.” (Taxon 35: 796. 1986). Nevertheless names of genera were joined in capitalization by names above the rank of family (Art. 16.1) in the St. Louis Code (2000), curiously without the “(see Art. 60.2)” As the Code now stands, families and subdivisions of families are the only ranks with names not (explicitly) written with an initial capital letter.

**(052)** Reword Art. 19.1 and integrate Art. 19.3 into it:

“19.1. The name of any subdivision of a family (Art. 4 Note 1) is treated as a noun in the plural and is written with an initial capital letter (see Art. 60.2). It is formed in the same manner as the name of a family (Art. 18.1) but the termination is -oideae for a subfamily, -eae for a tribe and -inae (but not -virinae) for a subtribe.”

See the analogous proposal 051 for Art. 18.1. The terminations of subdivisions of families might as well be brought together into the same sentence.

**(053)** Reword Art. 20.2 (and adjust Ex. 2–3):

“20.2. The name of a genus may not coincide with a technical term currently used in morphology unless (a) it was published before 1 January 1912 and (b) in that publication it was used in the name of a species, in a combination conforming to Art. 33.1.”

The phrase “binary system of Linnaeus” (prior to the Seattle Code, 1972: “binary method”, certainly more accurate) is not something that is defined, or otherwise mentioned, in the Code. It thus is an unfortunate phrase (the more so in these days of debate on the PhyloCode).

Historically it is interesting that a proposal to the 1950 Stockholm Congress to rename the Code the Linnaean System of Botanical Nomenclature received a mail vote of 36:245 but was nevertheless raised again
from the floor to be rejected on a card vote (with only two votes in favour, Regnum Veg. 1: 461–462. 1953).

(054) Add a new paragraph to Art. 32 directly before or after Art. 32.5, and refer to it in Art. 60.2 (or 16.1, 20.1 and 21.2), 60.4 and 60.6:

“32.4bis. Valid publication requires a name (and diagnosis) written in an alphabet accepted in botanical usage at the time of publication, but otherwise is not affected by matters of orthography or typography, such as (a) lower case or capital letters (at variance with Art. 16.1, 20.1, 21.2 and Rec. 60F); (b) presence or absence of a diaeresis; (c) a letter or sign that is to be transcribed or deleted following standardization imposed by this Code (Art. 60.4–6 and 60.8–12); or (d) an orthographical or typographical error to be corrected (Art. 60.1). For names by Linnaeus see Art. 23.3.”

This addresses an overlooked detail. When capitalization of names of genera was reintroduced into the Berlin Code (1988) it was stressed that this was a “matter of typography”, with cross-referencing between Art. 20.1 and 60.2 as the appointed means of ensuring that a name of a genus published with an initial lower case letter remained a valid name, if it otherwise met the requirements. Although this tacit agreement gives no overt problems, it seems wise to be a little more explicit, just to be on the safe side. If proposals 051 and 052 pass, this paragraph should also refer to Art. 18.1 and 19.1.

(055) Adjust Art. 16.1–2, 17.1–2, 18.2, 19.2, Rec. 20A.1, 21B.2, Art. 23.3, 23.6–7, Rec. 23A.1, 23A.3, Art. 24.2–3 and 28.1 to use singular mode throughout when referring to a name or epithet:

Most of Chapter III refers to names in singular mode, so it is logical to use this throughout wherever the choice exists. Also any author dealing with names or epithets will usually handle them one at a time.