except that the genitive of names ending in -*opsis* is, in accordance with botanical tradition, always -*opsidis*."

With the recent additions, Art. 18.1 has become rather lengthy: a change of the layout should be beneficial. The rephrasing of the opening sentence borrows from Art. 16.1 and Rec. 16A, and incorporates Prop. 032: adopting this would make Prop. 032 superfluous. What is here represented as clauses (c) and (d) could be moved upwards (dropping the "Likewise, "), if this is felt to be more logical.

(034) Add a paragraph to Art. 19 (somewhere after Art. 19.4), and refer to it in Art. 11.3, 14.5 and Art. 19 Note 2:

"The name of any subdivision of a family that includes the type of a name listed in App. IIB (i.e., a name of a family conserved against all unlisted names, see Art. 14.5) is to be based on the generic name equivalent to that type (Art. 10.6), unless this is contrary to Art. 19.4 (see also 19.7). If more than one such type is included, the correct name is determined by precedence in App. IIB, of the corresponding family names."

This is essentially the same as Prop. 281 submitted to the Vienna Congress (Rijckevorsel in Taxon 53: 1096–1097), Art. 19 Prop. F in the Synopsis of Proposals (McNeill & Turland in Taxon 54: 224), but integrates an amended form of Prop. 285 (Rijckevorsel, l.c.: 1097), Art. 19 Prop. J (McNeill & Turland, l.c.). At Vienna this received moderate support and the issue it addresses remains current, plant taxonomy still being in motion. It offers an avenue to stabilize names of subdivisions of families, at least to some extent, in a way that is much more modest than opening conservation for names at these ranks. Direct beneficiaries are names such as *Maloideae* (rather than *Pyroideae*) and *Epacridoideae* (rather than *Styphelioideae*) An indirect beneficiary could be *Chloridoideae* (rather than *Chondrosoideae*; if the appropriate conservation proposal would be made and passed). It would have effects on the names of subfamilies in *Lecythidaceae*, e.g., *Barringtonioideae* displacing *Planchonioideae*, but if these are felt to be undesirable appropriate conservation proposals could be made.

(035) Add an Example to the paragraph of Prop. 034:

"*Ex. n.* A subfamily in *Rosaceae* including *Malus* Mill. (1754), the type of *Malaceae* Small (1903) a name listed in App. IIB, is to be called *Maloideae* C. Weber (1964), unless it also includes *Rosa* L. (1753), the type of the name of the family, or the type of another name listed in App. IIB that takes precedence over *Malaceae*. This is so, even if this subfamily also includes *Pyrus* L. (1753), because, although *Pyroideae* Burnett (1835) is a name published earlier than *Maloideae* and although *Pyraceae* Vent. (1818) is a name published earlier than *Malaceae*, the name *Pyraceae* is not listed in App. IIB."

This is a rewrite of Prop. 283 (Rijckevorsel, l.c.: 1097), Art. 19 Prop. H (McNeill & Turland, l.c.), submitted to the Vienna Congress.

(036) Add an Example to the paragraph of Prop. 034:

"*Ex. n.* A subfamily in *Ericaceae* including both *Monotropa* L. (1753) and *Pyrola* L. (1753), the types of *Monotropaceae* Nutt. (1818) and *Pyrolaceae* Link (1829), respectively, both listed in App. IIB, is to be called *Pyroloideae* Kostel. (1834), unless it also includes *Erica* L. (1753), the type of the name of the family, or the type of another name listed in App. IIB that takes precedence over *Pyrolaceae*: in App. IIB, *Pyrolaceae* is listed as conserved over *Monotropaceae*."

(037) Proposal to maintain the terminations of plant names cited in a validating Latin description or diagnosis in a new protologue

Tarciso S. Filgueiras & Jefferson Prado

Instituto de Botânica, Herbário, C.P. 3005, CEP 01061-970, São Paulo, SP, Brazil. tfilg@uol.com.br (author for correspondence)

Should scientific plant names maintain their terminations when cited in a validating Latin description or diagnosis in a protologue? This is a question that botanists frequently ask themselves when preparing to write descriptions or diagnoses for new taxa because Art. 36.1 of the *Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006) requires that "… a name of a new taxon …, be accompanied by a Latin description or diagnosis or by a reference to a previously and effectively published Latin description or diagnosis."

One simple and effective way to provide a diagnosis is to compare the characteristics of the new taxon with those of another, similar taxon. For that, it is common practice to use expressions such as "allied to", "similar to", etc., which are generally translated into Latin using the adjectives "affinis", "similis", etc., to establish a direct comparison. These Latin adjectives require that the word (or words)—i.e., the plant name—with which the subject of the sentence is being compared take the dative (rarely the genitive) case (Stearn, Bot. Latin, ed. 4. 1992). Examples: "similar to *Qualea grandiflora* Mart." and "akin to *Andropogon bicornis* L." could be translated as "similis *Qualeae grandiflorae* Mart." and "affinis *Andropogoni bicorni* L.", respectively; and "This genus is similar to *Arthropogon* Nees", "It differs from *Adiantum petiolatum* Desv." and "This species is similar to *Selaginella*

verrucosa Baker" could be translated as "Hoc genus simile *Arthropogoni* Nees", "Ab *Adianto petiolato* Desv. *differt*" and "Haec species affinis *Selaginellae verrucosae* Baker", respectively. The reader will notice the slight change in the terminations of the generic names and of the epithets. The reason for this is that all botanical names are to be treated as Latin (Prin. V of the *Code*) and, therefore, are subject to the grammatical rules of that language.

When an author submits for publication a protologue of a name of a new taxon, usually the validating Latin diagnosis contains one of the two possibilities, i.e., the terminations of the name(s) included therein may or may not have been changed according to case. However, when the manuscript is sent back to the author following peer review, it may come with the reviewers' suggestion that the author alter the terminations of those names. It can be a no-win situation. Editors tend to agree with reviewers' recommendations. To our knowledge, no major scientific journal has established clear rules regarding this matter. In practice, this question is resolved according to the reviewers' opinion. The author may be caught between his or her own practice and the recommendation of a reviewer.

Two problems arise when the terminations of botanical names are altered. Firstly, not all names are as easily declined as the ones presented above. There are words not easily declined (try, for example, *Abies georgei*, *Chiodecton sclerachnes*). To accomplish that with proficiency, much linguistic training is required from the botanist. Not everyone is capable of doing that nowadays, because botanical Latin is, regrettably, a dying art (McNeill in Taxon 46: 751–757. 1997).

The second problem is that, having successfully achieved the correct case endings for the desired words, the new forms of the names do not correspond to the names found in the standard databases available through the web or in the printed indexes. Try to find, for instance, *Qualeae grandiflorae* Mart., *Andropogoni bicorni* L., *Arthropogoni* Nees, *Adianto petiolato* Desv., or *Selaginellae verrucosae* Baker. They simply cannot be found. The indexes and databases register only the nominative case of names, not the dative or genitive. This can become a source of confusion and perplexity for the young and inexperienced botanist. It can be even more confusing for the general user of botanical scientific names.

Perhaps it is now the time to ask again why we use Latin in our descriptions and diagnoses. The use of Latin is defendable on the grounds that it facilitates communication amongst scientists throughout the world, regardless of which languages they happen to speak or read. If any other modern language is used for this purpose instead of Latin, that language would necessarily be associated with a certain culture or even certain economic system (Filgueiras in Taxon 46: 747–749. 1997). By using Latin, all botanists around the world have to face the same challenges of mastering that language. At the same time, by using Latin we avoid showing preference to any living language.

For the reasons discussed above, we argue that botanical names should not be declined. That is, their form should never change, especially in a protologue. Such a practice would be quite advantageous to the international botanical community. Firstly, it would make things much easier for the average botanist who tries to find the correct case endings for the words used. Secondly, names would generally be spelled as in their place of valid publication, indexes, and in the databases. Furthermore, it would prevent a reader from misinterpreting an apparent "new form" of a name as an orthographical variant (Art. 61.2 of the *Code*).

By adopting this proposal for a new Recommendation to be added to Rec. 36A, many questions and much confusion would be avoided, not to mention the waste of precious research time.

(037) Insert a new Recommendation to follow Rec. 36A.1:

"*36A.2.* Authors citing names of taxa within validating Latin descriptions or diagnoses should not change the terminations of those names to accord with case."

Acknowledgements

We gratefully thank Dr. Dan Nicolson and Nicholas Turland for critically reviewing the manuscript. Filgueiras thanks his many students of botanical Latin who made him aware of their difficulty in adding the proper case endings to scientific names and, having achieved that, could not find those "new names" in the standard indexes and databases.

(038) Proposal to broaden the scope of Art. 37.5 allowing an illustration as a type when it is "impossible" to preserve a specimen

Pankaj Kumar[1], Gopal Singh Rawat[1] & J.F. Veldkamp[2]

[1] *Habitat Ecology Department, Wildlife Institute of India, Post Box #18, Dehra Dun – 248001, Uttarakhand, India. *pankajsahani@rediffmail.com (author for correspondence)*
[2] *Nationaal Herbarium Nederland, Leiden University branch, P.O. Box 9514, 2300 RA Leiden, TheNetherlands*

In the *Saint Louis Code* (Greuter & al. in Regnum Veg. 138. 2000) Art. 37.4 allowed the type of a name of a new species or infraspecific taxon of non-fossil plants to be an illustration "if, and only if, it is impossible to preserve a specimen". At the Vienna IBC in 2005, Art. 37.4 was reworded (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006) so that such a