The icacinaceous *Hosiea* was named after Alexander Hosie, a British diplomat in China, and included two species in China and Japan. The verbenaceous *Hosea* was named after Bishop Hose of Kuching, and includes a single species from Borneo. The Committee recommends that they be not treated as homonyms.

Unpublished request for decision on whether *Malanea* Aubl., Hist. Pl. Guiane: 106. 1775 *(Rubiaceae)* and *Malania* Chun & S. K. Lee in Bull. Bot. Res., Harbin 1980(6): 67. 1980 *(Olacaceae)* should be treated as homonyms. Submmitted by NCU project. Votes: 6 : 6 (decision now to be taken by General Committee).

Malanea includes about 20 species of rutaceous lianes in tropical America. *Malania,* named only in 1980, includes a single species of *Olacaceae* from China. The derivation of neither name is explained in their protologues. This Committee is evenly divided on whether they should be treated as homonyms, and defers now to the General Committee.

Unpublished request for opinion on whether the name *Cleistogenes* Keng in Sinensia 5: 147. 1934 *(Gramineae)* should be regarded as coincident with a technical term and so in contravention of Art. 20.2 and invalid under Art. 32.1(b). Submitted by NCU project. Votes: 9 : 3 (invalid).

Packer in Bot. Notiser 113: 291. 1960 published a new name *Kengia* to replace *Cleistogenes* Keng on the grounds that the latter is coincident with a technical term 'cleistogenes' and so is invalid because contrary to Art. 20.2. Since then there has been more or less equal usage of the two names *Cleistogenes* and *Kengia* and vigorous debate on the issue – see Cope in Kew Bull. 35: 701. 1980 for references. 'Cleistogene' is a term employed by Agnes Chase in 1908 for a cleistogamous spikelet, which is exactly the character which distinguishes the genus concerned. The Examples to Art. 20.2 all quote technical terms in Latin form in the singular, whereas 'cleistogenes' would be an English language word in the plural. However, the Article does not rule that only technical terms in Latin should be considered, and a majority of the Committee has voted that Art. 20.2 is infringed by *Cleistogenes*. Their recommendation, therefore, is that *Kengia,* validated by Packer by reference to the Latin description and type published by Keng, is the correct name for the genus.

Request by Anderson for an opinion on the correctability of the spelling of names in *Malpighiaceae* ending in *-pteris* or *-pteryx* to *-pterys*. The text considered by the Committee, submitted by Anderson, follows. Votes: 10 : 2 that all such names and epithets in *Malpighiaceae*, at any rank, should be consistently spelled with a *-pterys* ending. This vote includes a formal recommendation that two present entries in Appendix IIIA be amended as to spelling: 4222. *Rhyssopteris* to *Ryssopterys* and 4226. *Heteropteris* to *Heteropterys*.

Appendix: The problem of *-pterys* vs. *-pteris* in the *Malpighiaceae* (by W. R. Anderson)

Linnaeus first used the suffix *-pteris* in a generic name, *Triopteris,* in 1753; he used it in the sense of the Greek word *pteryx* (wing), not *pteris* (fern), to refer to the three-winged samara. Cavanilles followed his lead with *Tetrapteris* (1790) as did Kunth (1822) with *Heteropteris* (his name denoted the fact that the wing bent the opposite way from that of the samara in what he called *Banisteria,* now *Banisteri-*

opsis). In the earliest work where he used these names, the treatment of the *Malpighiaceae* for Saint-Hilaire's *Flora brasiliae meridionalis*, Jussieu (1833) spelled *Heteropteris* and *Tetrapteris* with *-pteris,* but sometime between then and 1838 he changed his mind, and (Jussieu, 1838) published four generic names with the spelling *-pterys (Brachypterys, Diplopterys, Lophopterys,* and *Ryssopterys).* I can find among Jussieu's writings no explanation of that change, and can only speculate that he made it to distinguish names in the *Malpighiaceae* from names of pteridophytes. In any case, he used *-pterys* consistently in his *Synopsis* (Jussieu, 1840) and his *Monographie* (Jussieu, 1843), not only for his own genera (including the additional ones *Aspidopterys* and *Echinopterys*) but for the earlier names *Triopterys, Tetrapterys,* and *Heteropterys* as well. Because of his stature as the first monographer of the family and the very high quality of his work, many 19th-century authors followed Jussieu, e.g., Hooker (1858). The most notable exception was Grisebach (1858), who, in his treatment for Martius's *Flora brasiliensis,* spelled all such generic names *-pteris,* not only the ones that were originally published with that spelling, but also the names of Jussieu that were originally spelled *-pterys.* I do not know why he refused to follow the lead of Jussieu, but I assume he adopted a uniform spelling for convenience and consistency.

The second great student of the family was Niedenzu. In the few publications on *Malpighiaceae* that he published before 1900, most importantly the treatment in *Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien* (Niedenzu, 1890), he followed Grisebach and spelled all names with *-pteris,* regardless of how they were spelled in the original publications. But he then published the name *Rhinopteryx* (Niedenzu, 1896), without explaining the spelling (he later changed it to *Rhinopterys*: Niedenzu, 1915), and from 1900 on he consistently spelled all names *-pterys.* In the monumental monograph in *Das Pflanzenreich* (Niedenzu, 1928: 18) he explained that he had adopted that spelling to distinguish between the Greek words for fern and wing. In the years between 1900 and 1928, Niedenzu published dozens of species with generic names spelled with *-pterys,* and dozens of infrageneric epithets ending in *-pterys,* not only in the genera discussed here, but also in other genera of wing-fruited *Malpighiaceae.* His monograph became the authoritative reference on the family, it is still the starting point for work on most of the large genera (including *Heteropterys* and *Tetrapterys*), and it will continue to have that dominant importance for decades to come. Not surprisingly, many herbaria around the world have followed Niedenzu's spellings, as have many local floras.

In his only publication on the *Malpighiaceae*, the treatment for the *North American Flora*, Small (1910) spelled all generic names as in the original publications, so he had a mixture of spellings *(Triopteris, Tetrapteris, Brachypterys,* and *Echinopterys*; he used the older name *Banisteria* instead of *Heteropteris).* In the *Flora of Suriname*, Kostermans (1936) also used a mixture of *-pteris* and *-pterys,* spelling all names as originally published. Cuatrecasas (1958) used *Heteropteris* and *Tetrapteris* and proposed the new genus *Skoliopteris,* which soon sank into synonymy; his flora did not contain any of the plants whose names were originally spelled *-pterys.* In *The genera of flowering plants*, Hutchinson (1967) followed Niedenzu and spelled all names with *-pterys.*

Two of these names are conserved, both with *-pteris. Heteropteris* was conserved in order to protect it against the older name *Banisteria* L.; presumably it was conserved with the spelling *-pteris* because that was the original spelling. (One has to

suspect that in the political atmosphere of the decade following World War I, the fact that the German monographer Niedenzu used the spelling *-pterys* may have carried little weight with the British botanists Sprague and Green.) Also conserved is the spelling *Rhyssopteris*, for the sole purpose of "protecting" it against the original spelling *Ryssopterys*. This conserved spelling has been widely ignored; for example, in *Flora of Java*, Backer & Bakhuizen van den Brink (1963) use the original spelling and state in a footnote: "The conservation of *Rhyssopteris* Bl. corr. Wittst. is inadmissible." The following note by Rickett & Stafleu (1959) about the problem of "*Rhyssopteris*" is as apt today as when they published it: "We have not been able to find a place where the etymologically correct form of the name, as conserved here, is used. The rejected spelling *Ryssopterys* is in general use (see also Niedenzu's monograph in Pflanzenreich 93: 281. 1928). Since conservation is meant to preserve usage of the past rather than dictate usage of the future this case of conservation seems ill-advised to us."

When I first became interested in the *Malpighiaceae*, I assumed that one should use the original or conserved spellings in every case, but as I came to realise what that would mean in this family I had to reconsider that assumption. Such a practice would mean a lifetime of switching back and forth between *-pteris* in three genera and *-pterys* in five or more other genera. It would mean constantly explaining and defending the patent absurdity of having two suffixes in the same family, both meaning exactly the same thing. Perhaps worst of all, one would inevitably have to use infrageneric epithets ending in *-pterys* within genera ending in *-pteris*! Stepping back from the details and considering the family as a whole, I was struck by the fact that only two monographs had ever been published for it, and in both the authors chose to spell all such names with *-pterys*. I had no interest in the etymological niceties of the case; it is really too late to argue about what spellings Linnaeus or Jussieu should have used. I simply wanted to pick the single spelling that would be as non-disruptive as possible. It was clear that I would be damned whatever I decided, but in the end I found it best to stay in the tradition of Jussieu and Niedenzu and spell all names *-pterys,* even if they were published as *-pteris* and even if they were conserved! Since making that decision, I have adhered to it consistently. I have published over 30 new species in *Heteropterys* and *Tetrapterys,* and the new genus *Ectopopterys* (Anderson, 1980), and another new genus whose name ends in *-pterys* will soon go to press. I have used *-pterys* in all my publications, most notably the 285-page treatment of the *Malpighiaceae* of the Guayana Highland (Anderson, 1981) and the treatment of the family in *Flora of the Lesser Antilles* (Anderson, 1988). And the many floristic contributions now in preparation for areas from Mexico to Paraguay will all spell all names *-pterys*. I have done this not because I relish being a nomenclatural outlaw, but because I consider it really outrageous for non-specialists to be expected to use both *-pteris* and *-pterys* in the same family. It would have been better if Jussieu had never departed from *-pteris,* but he did, and Niedenzu followed him, and now I think the need for consistency requires that we do the same.

For these reasons, I propose that we use *-pterys* for all generic names in *Malpighiaceae* ending in *-pteris, -pterys,* or *-pteryx.* In order to make this completely in accordance with the *Code*, we would need to change the spellings in the present list of 'Nomina generica conservanda' from *Heteropteris* to *Heteropterys* and *Rhyssopteris* to *Ryssopterys,* and we would also need to conserve *Triopterys* L. against *Triopteris* L. and *Tetrapterys* Cav. against *Tetrapteris* Cav.

Literature cited

Anderson, W. R. 1980. *Ectopopterys,* a new genus of *Malpighiaceae* from Colombia and Peru. *Contr. Univ. Michigan Herb.* 14: 11-15.
– 1981. *Malpighiaceae.* [*In:* The botany of the Guayana Highland, XI.] *Mem. New York Bot. Gard.* 32: 21-305.
– 1988. *Malpighiaceae.* Pp. 596-633 *in:* Howard, R. A., *Flora of the Lesser Antilles,* 4. Jamaica Plain.
Backer, C. A. & Bakhuizen van den Brink, R. C. 1963. *Flora of Java,* 1. Groningen.
Cavanilles, A. J. 1790. *Nona dissertatio botanica.* Madrid.
Cuatrecasas, J. 1958. Prima flora Colombiana. 2. *Malpighiaceae. Webbia* 13: 343-664.
Grisebach, A. H. R. 1858. *Malpighiaceae.* Pp. 1-123 *in:* Martius, C. F. P. von (ed.) 1858-1889. *Flora brasiliensis,* 12(1). Leipzig.
Hooker, J. D. 1858. *Malpighiaceae.* Pp. 247-262 *in:* Bentham, G. & Hooker, J. D. (ed.), *Genera plantarum,* 1(1). London.
Hutchinson, J. 1967. *Malpighiaceae.* Pp. 569-592 *in:* Hutchinson, J. (ed.), *The genera of flowering plants,* 2. Oxford.
Jussieu, Adr.de, 1833. *Malpighiaceae.* In Saint-Hilaire, A. de & Cambessèdes, J., *Flora brasiliae meridionalis,* 3: 5-86.
– 1838. *Malpighiaceae.* Pp. 18-21 in: Delessert, J. P. B. (ed.), *Icones selectae plantarum,* 3. Paris.
– 1840. Malpighiacearum synopsis, monographiae mox edendae prodromus. *Ann. Sci. Nat. Bot.,* ser. 2, 13: 247-291, 321-338.
– 1843. Monographie de la famille des Malpighiacées. *Arch. Mus. Hist. Nat.* 3: 5-151, 255-616, *t.* 1-23.
Kostermans, A. J. G .H. 1936. *Malpighiaceae.* Pp. 146-243 *in:* Pulle, A. (ed.), *Flora of Suriname,* 2(1). Amsterdam.
Kunth, C. S. 1822. *Malpighiaceae.* Pp. 145-174 in: Humboldt, F. W. H. A. von, Bonpland, A. J. A. & Kunth, C. S., *Nova genera et species plantarum* [quarto ed.], 5. Paris.
Linnaeus, C. 1753. *Species plantarum.* Stockholm.
Niedenzu, F. 1890. *Malpighiaceae.* Pp. 41-74 in: Engler, A. (ed.), *Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien,* 3(4). Leipzig.
– 1896. *Malpighiaceae.* Pp. 352-353 in: Engler, A. (ed.), *Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien,* 3(4). Leipzig.
– 1915. *Malpighiaceae* palaeotropicae. *Arbeiten Bot. Inst. Königl. Lyceums Hosianum Braunsberg* 6: 1-63.
– 1928. *Malpighiaceae.* Pp. 1-870 *in:* Engler, A. (ed.), *Das Pflanzenreich,* IV.141. Leipzig.
Rickett, H. W. & Stafleu, F. A. 1959. Nomina generica conservanda et rejicienda spermatophytorum. III. *Taxon* 8: 282-304.
Small, J. K. 1910. *Malpighiaceae.* Pp. 117-171 *in:* Britton, N. L. & Underwood, L. M. (ed.), *North American Flora,* 25. New York.