

by nomenclatural tradition. Thus, there is no need to assign a gender by conservation.” Given this confusion, the primacy of the explicit rule in the *Code* must be made clear.

(189) Add a new qualifying sentence in Art. 62.2, so that it reads (new text in bold):

“62.2. Compound generic names take the gender of the last word in the nominative case in the compound (but see Art. 14.11). If the termination is altered, however, the gender is altered accordingly. **An exception is made for compounds, with endings other than those listed in (a), (b), or (c), that were classical Latin words and in which tradition has adopted the classical Latin gender of that word even although the gender of the last word differs in the original language (usually Greek). In such cases the classical Latin gender is adopted.**”

The following suggestions exemplify the addition to Art. 62.2:

“*Ex. 6bis.* The classical Latin feminine noun *polygala*, applied to the herb milkwort, was derived from the Greek word with the same meaning, πολυγάλλον (*polygalon*), itself a compound of πολυ- (poly-), many, and γάλα (*gala*), milk, a neuter noun. Linnaeus (Sp. Pl.: 701–706. 1753) adopted the classical Latin feminine gender for *Polygala* and that is to be maintained.”

“*Ex. 6ter.* The classical gender both of the Latin *onosma* and the original Greek ὄνοσμα (*onosma*) is neuter. Linnaeus (Sp. Pl., ed. 2: 196. 1762), in taking up the name for a new genus, treated *Onosma* as feminine; in this he was followed by some botanists but more adopted the classical neuter gender. Because the ending *-osma* is listed in Art. 62.2(b) as feminine, *Onosma* maintains its feminine gender.”

(190) Make the following additions to Art. 62.2 (a) & (c) (new text in bold):

“(a) Compounds ending in *-botrys*, *-codon*, ***-dens***, *-myces*, *-odon*, *-panax*, *-pogon*, *-stemon*, and other masculine words, are masculine.”

“(c) Compounds ending in *-ceras*, *-dendron*, ***-derma***, ***-doma***, *-nema*, ***-sperma***, *-stigma*, *-stoma*, and other neuter words, are neuter.”

Because Art. 62 Ex. 7 notes that *Bidens* has been conserved with feminine gender, the addition of *-dens* in (a) will make it clear that generic names ending in *-dens*, other than *Bidens*, retain masculine gender.

Further, given that Greek is becoming increasingly unfamiliar, it is proposed to add to (c) *-derma* and *-sperma*, frequent word elements but ones that occasionally confuse those who tend to attribute feminine gender to all words ending in *-a*, and also *-doma*, not so frequently used, but that has had contrasting usages even in the same work and was the trigger for the present review of the rules on gender.

(191) Transfer the ending *-anthes* from Art. 62.4 to Art. 62.2(b).

The inclusion of *-anthes* in Art. 62.4 is the result of a proposal by Stearn (in *Taxon* 41: 786. 1992). While the proposal that names ending in *-anthes* should be feminine was approved without problem, the proposer, and later the Editorial Committee for the *Tokyo Code*, overlooked that it was inappropriate to include it in what was then Art. 76.4, now Art. 62.4. Prior to that, this Article, or its earlier equivalent Recommendations, was reserved for suffixes that were not derived from a word that could stand independently (i.e. ones such as *-oides* or *-ites*), whereas those that were derived from such a word were dealt with in the present Art. 62.2. The ending *-anthes*, like *-anthos* and *-anthus* (see Art. 62.2(c)), is derived from the Greek ἄνθος (*anthos*), blossom, flower, and so it is more appropriate to transfer *-anthes* to Art. 62.2(b), maintaining the feminine gender but making clear the difference between Art. 62.2 and Art. 62.4, which had been obscured by its inclusion in Art. 62.4.

Acknowledgements

As always, we are very grateful to Paul van Rijkevorsel for the facility provided by his “Overview of editions of the *Code*” (<https://www.iapt-taxon.org/historic/index.htm>) to locate rapidly when particular provisions of the *Code* were introduced or modified.

(192) Insert a new Chapter E in Division II on a Code of Ethics

Veronica Malavasi & Pavel Škaloud

Faculty of Science, Department of Botany, Charles University, Benatska 2, Prague 128 00, Czech Republic

Address for correspondence: Veronica Malavasi, veronica.malavasi80@gmail.com

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12854>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

Issues of an ethical nature may arise from any scientific work. The principles of self-regulation based on ethical values and standards of scientific integrity do not always work. To solve such problems, we are proposing the addition of a new Chapter E in Division II to the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants* (*Shenzhen Code*; Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018) inspired by, and adapted from, the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature* (Ride & al., *Int. Code Zool. Nomencl.*, ed. 4. 1999)

Code of Ethics (Appendix A: see at <https://code.iczn.org/appendices/appendix-a-code-of-ethics/>). We believe that this code should be applied not only by zoologists but by all scientists. Moreover, it is important to note that there have also been cases related to the botanical field: e.g. one of the early patronymic insults is *Sigesbeckia*, “the unpleasant small-flowered weed”, named by Linnaeus for Johann G. Siegesbeck (McClellan in *Historical Biol.* 33: 354–370. 2019). In our opinion, such a code would be a good tool

to define proper ethical practice in nomenclatural research and to establish procedures of conduct in situations when a threat to scientific integrity could occur. Based on the above comments, we are proposing the following addition to the *Shenzhen Code*.

(192) Add a new Chapter E in Division II:

“1. Authors proposing new names should observe the following principles, which together constitute a Code of Ethics.

2. An author should not publish a new name if he or she has reason to believe that another person has already recognized the same taxon and intends to establish a name for it (or that the taxon is to be named in a posthumous work). An author in such a position should communicate with the other person (or their representatives) and only feel free to establish a new name if that person has failed to do so in a reasonable period (not less than a year).

3. An author should not publish a new replacement name (nomen novum) or other substitute name for a junior homonym when

the author of the latter is alive; that author should be informed of the homonymy and be allowed a reasonable time (at least a year) in which to establish a substitute name.

4. No author should propose a name that, to his or her knowledge or reasonable belief, would be likely to give offence on any grounds.

5. Intemperate language should not be used in any discussion or writing which involves nomenclature, and all debates should be conducted in a courteous and friendly manner.

6. Editors and others responsible for the publication of scientific papers should avoid publishing any material which appears to them to contain a breach of the above principles.

7. The observation of these principles is a matter for the proper feelings and conscience of individual scientists, and none of the Permanent Nomenclature Committees (Div. III Prov. 7.1) is empowered to investigate or rule upon alleged breaches of them.”

(193) Proposal to democratize aspects of the governance of the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants*

Gideon F. Smith,¹ Estrela Figueiredo,¹ Gerry Moore,² Leslie R. Landrum,³ Roy E. Gereau,⁴ Jefferson Prado,⁵ Sebsebe Demissew,⁶ Wendy Applequist,⁴ Alejandro Quintanar,⁷ Renée Fortunato,⁸ Alina Freire-Fierro,^{9,10} Jun Wen¹¹ & Yun-Fei Deng¹²

1 *Ria Olivier Herbarium, Department of Botany, Nelson Mandela University, P.O. Box 77000, Gqeberha, 6031 South Africa*

2 *National Plant Data Team, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 2901 East Gate City Blvd., Greensboro, North Carolina, U.S.A.*

3 *Natural History Collections, School of Life Sciences, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-4108, U.S.A.*

4 *Missouri Botanical Garden, 4344 Shaw Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63110-2291, U.S.A.*

5 *Instituto de Pesquisas Ambientais (IPA), Herbário SP, Av. Miguel Estéfano, 3687, 04301-012, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil*

6 *National Herbarium, Department of Plant Biology and Biodiversity Management, College of Natural Sciences, Addis Ababa University, P.O. Box 3434, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia*

7 *Herbarium MA, Unidad de Herbarios, Real Jardín Botánico de Madrid CSIC, 28014 Madrid, Spain*

8 *Instituto de Botánica Darwinion (CONICET/ANCEFYN), Labardén 200, Casilla de Correo 22, B1642HYD San Isidro, Buenos Aires, Argentina*

9 *CAS President's International Fellowship Initiative, South China Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No.723, Xingke Road, Tianhe District, Guangzhou, 510650, China*

10 *Universidad Regional Amazónica Ikiam, Via a Muyuna km 7, Tena, Ecuador*

11 *Department of Botany, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20013-7012, U.S.A.*

12 *Key Laboratory of Plant Resources Conservation and Sustainable Utilization, South China Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No.723, Xingke Road, Tianhe District, Guangzhou, 510650, China*

Address for correspondence: Gideon F. Smith, smithgideon1@gmail.com

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12855>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

The *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (Code)* specifies that the approval of the General Committee (GC) of certain proposals (for conservation or rejection of a name or for suppression of a publication) is “subject to the decision of a later International Botanical Congress” (Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159: Art. 14.15, 34.2, 56.3; see also Art. 38.4, 53.4. 2018). The governance mechanisms included in Division III of the *Code*

were discussed by the Special Committee on By-laws for the Nomenclature Section (By-laws Committee) in the years prior to the Nomenclature Section (NS) held in July 2017 at the XIX International Botanical Congress (IBC) in Shenzhen, China. The By-laws Committee's discussions culminated in a proposal and report (Knapp & al. in *Taxon* 65: 661–664, 665–669. 2016) that substantially revised the governance of the *Code*.