



## The Masculine Gender of the Generic Name *Styrax* Linnaeus (Styracaceae)

Dan H. Nicolson; George C. Steyskal

*Taxon*, Vol. 25, No. 5/6. (Nov., 1976), pp. 581-587.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0040-0262%28197611%2925%3A5%2F6%3C581%3ATMGOTG%3E2.0.CO%3B2-7>

*Taxon* is currently published by International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT).

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/iapt.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE MASCULINE GENDER OF THE GENERIC NAME STYRAX LINNAEUS (STYRACACEAE)\*

Dan H. Nicolson\*\* and George C. Steyskal\*\*\*

### Summary

Botanists have used *Styrax* in all genders. The etymology of *Styrax*, the problems with its classical and dictionary genders, and arguments for and against the various botanical genders are evaluated. We find that the Linnaean adoption of neuter was a simple error, the use of feminine has only theoretical justification and that masculine gender best fits the wording of our present (Botanical) Code for *Styrax*, as well as *Panax*.

Various highly respected botanical Latinists have treated *Styrax* as neuter (Linnaeus, de Candolle, G. Don), masculine (Sprengel, Pohl, Urban) and feminine (Stearn, Rehder, Fernald). A few authors have solved this problem by using two genders. Gonsoulin (*Sida* 5: 191-258. 1974) used masculine and feminine. The following authors: Lamarck (*Encycl.* 1: 81. 1783), Swartz (*Nov. Gen.* p. 74. 1788), C. B. Clarke (in J. Hooker, *Fl. Brit. Ind.* 3: 588-590. 1882) used both neuter and feminine and Howard (*Sida* 5: 337. 1974), after arguing for neuter, inadvertently used a feminine adjectival varietal epithet, *rediviva*, instead of the neuter form, *redivivum*. All three genders may be found in abundance in the supplements of *Index Kewensis*. It hardly seems possible to argue that a single botanical usage is established and a review of the arguments is in order. First, a discussion of the etymology of *Styrax* is appropriate.

*Etymology:* *Styrax* is commonly regarded as a classical Greek word derived from a Semitic (Arabic) name (cf. Stearn, *Smith's Gard. Dict. Pl. Names*, p. 304. 1972). George Don (*Gen. Hist.* 4: 4. 1837) stated that "the name is a mere alteration of *assthirak* [sic], the Arabic name of *S. officinale*." Pohl (*Pl. Bras.* 2: 53. 1831) noted that Gollius (*Lexicon arabicolatino Lugd. Batav.* p. 117. 1653) suggested ("putavit") *styrax* to be derived from Arabic *asthirak*. However, Pohl was clearly of the opinion that the word was not Arabic in origin, quoting three authors supporting this position. Pohl further suggested, *Pro styrax etiam invenitur storax, quod storeo et strao contractione stro, unde latinum sterno, quia gutta humi sternitur*, literally, "For *styrax* is also found *storax*, derived from *storeo* and *strao*, contracted to *stro*, whence Latin *sterno*, because drops of moisture are scattered." The Greek present, indicative, first person forms (I strew), *storeo*, *strao*, and *stro*, are not found in standard Greek dictionaries, apparently they are primitive. Only the verb forms of *stornymi* (*storennymi*), to spread or strew, and the noun, *storeus*, one who spreads smooth or, metaphorically, one who calms, are found. All this ties into the Indo-European root *ster/stor* which yields Sanskrit *strnami*, Latin *sterno* (I strew), and even English "strew" (past tense "strewn") and "stars" (German "Stern") which are strewn through the sky. This kind of evidence suggests that the word *styrax*, in the sense of drops which are scattered about or, perhaps, calming, is indigenous to Greek, not an introduction.

\* Financial support towards publication is gratefully acknowledged [Ed.].

\*\* Department of Botany, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

\*\*\* Systematic Entomology Laboratory, IIBIII, ARS, USDA, Washington, D.C., Mail address: c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

On the other hand, there is a good deal of evidence that the word, *astirak* (item 1416 in E. Ghaleb, *Dict. Sci. Nat.* 1965) was introduced into Arabic. It uses four consonants, rare in Arabic, especially for supposedly primitive words. It has an initial consonantal cluster of *st*, unknown in Arabic except for introduced words, which requires *alif* to be prefixed. It is alphabetized under *alif*, usual only for introduced words, like *astabil*, meaning "stable". It has a terminal soft *k*, commonly used for transliterating Indo-European words.

There seems to be no shortage of two or three consonant words for *styrax* in the various Semitic languages, Arabic, Hebrew, and Syriac. These are more likely as prospects for an ancient Semitic word than *astirak*. Loew (*Fl. Juden* 3: 388-395. 1967) discusses many, such as *nataf*, *abhar*, *lubna*, *sori*, and *hawz*.

In summary, it seems that the word *styrax* is a Greek word which was adopted into Arabic as *astirak*, rather than the other way around.

*Ancient gender of styrax:* Gender used in antiquity is determined by consulting dictionaries of ancient Latin and Greek. One assumes that the dictionaries will agree and that one need only consult a single good dictionary. Unfortunately this is not true with *styrax*. Greek and Roman authors used masculine with one exception, a use of feminine by Herodotus (died 424 B.C.). Various dictionaries may be found which will cite masculine and/or feminine for the various meanings of *styrax*. One innovative lexicographer, Johann Gottlob Schneider (1750-1822), added to the confusion when he quite arbitrarily assigned feminine gender to the tree, masculine to the spear-butt, and *de novo*, neuter to styrax as a resin. Schneider said that his work is based on "den Ernestischen Hedrich." Ernest (Hedrich *Graecum Lexicon Manuale*, ed. 1766) reports no neuter for *styrax*. Schneider's spurious, if we may be so ungenerous, scholarship, i.e., not based on original authors but on his own ideas, is also to be found in dictionaries between 1819 and ca. 1870 which uncritically followed Schneider (*Griechisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch*, 3rd ed. 1819), such as *Donnegal (A new Greek and English Lexicon.* 1832) and the early editions of the well-known *Greek-English Lexicon* of H. G. Liddell and R. Scott (up to their revised 6th edition of 1869).

This dictionary usage of neuter was specifically denied by Rost, Palm, and Kreussler in their revision of Passow's *Handwoerterbuch der Griechische Sprache* (vol. 2(2): 1577. 1857) who flatly stated, "Ein neutr. to *styrax* gibt es nicht." Passow's work is a revision of Schneider. The Rost *et al.* edition is basic for Greek scholars and used by many subsequent lexicographers. From this time on no dictionaries attribute neuter gender to any meaning of *styrax*.

Early editions of Liddell and Scott, previous to the 6th edition of 1869, attribute the use of neuter for *styrax*, as a resin, to Theophrastus (Book 9, Chapter 7, paragraph 3) and Dioscorides (Book 1, Chapter 79; Chapter 64 in Wellman's recension of 1906 which eliminated many accretions). This is an error. Theophrastus used no articles, adjectives or pronouns, merely listing *styrax* as one of many products used in making perfumes, hence, gender cannot be determined in his work. However, Dioscorides described various kinds of styrax, *xanthos* (yellow) and *melas* (black), clearly using masculine gender. Masculine gender for the resin was also used by other Greek authors: Aristotle (*Hist. Animal.* Book 4, Chapter 8), *thymiomenou tou styrakos*, that is, "of the smoke of styrax (masculine, genitive, singular); "Nonnus (1: 382), *katapinomenos ho styrax*, that is, "drunk the styrax (masculine, nominative, singular). Thus, we agree with lexicographers of the last century that the ancient gender of *styrax*, at least as a resin, was masculine and never neuter.

The most recent (9th) edition of Liddell and Scott, by Jones and McKenzie (1940, reprinted 1968) reports three references to *styrax* as a tree in ancient Greek, one using feminine (Herodotus, *Hist. Nat.* Book 3, Chapter 107) and two using masculine (Strabo, *Geograph.* Book 12, Chapter 7 and Plutarch, *Lysander* line 28).

Herodotus (484-424 B.C.) speaks of the marvel of the Arabs gathering frankincense by burning *styrax* (*ten styraka*: feminine, accusative, singular) because

only the smoke of *styrax* (*tes styrakos*: feminine, genitive, singular) drives away the many and various small winged serpents which guard each frankincense tree. Strabo (63 B.C. – 24 A.D.) speaks of the *styrax* (*ho styrax*: masculine, nominative, singular) growing as a tree which is neither large nor straight. Plutarch (46-120 A.D.) speaks of the Cretan *styrax* shrubs (*hoi styrakes*: masculine, nominative, plural) which grow in profusion around a certain place.

At this point we leave the realm of fact, what the original authors themselves did, and enter the realm of opinion, what others think these authors should have done. Stearn (*Bot. Latin*, p. 76. 1966 or 1973 editions) suggests, "following Greek usage," that *styrax* should be feminine for the tree and masculine for the resin. Since more Greeks used masculine than feminine for the tree the only interpretation that can be made for "following Greek usage," is that Stearn refers to the Greek usage of using feminine for trees.

Hase, Dindorfius, and Dindorfius, in their monumental revision of H. Stephanus' (often catalogued as Estienne) *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (7: 916. 1851) cite the precept of Moeris (p. 357), *styrax thelykos Attikoi, arsenikos Hellenes*, that is, "*styrax* (was) feminine to the Attics, masculine to the Hellenes." This can be understood as saying that *styrax* was feminine before Alexander (died 323 B.C.) and masculine thereafter. The name "Hellenes" is correctly applied to the Greeks after Alexander's unification of Greece, who wrote in what might be termed a homogenization of Greek dialects, known as koine, or common Greek, as opposed to the pure Attic or Athenian Greek that flowered during the previous century. Actually Herodotus, the only author to use feminine for the tree, wrote in the late Ionic (Asiatic) Greek dialect, not in the Athenian or classical Greek dialect. One could argue that Herodotus wrote a more correct Greek than Strabo and Plutarch, who lived three centuries later. On the other hand, one could argue that Herodotus' use of feminine for *styrax* was a dialectic characteristic of the Ionic Greek dialect, which often used different genders than classic or common Greek.

Unabridged Greek dictionaries of the last 125 years cite masculine and feminine or only masculine for *styrax*, most abridged dictionaries cite only masculine but a few cite masculine and feminine. Hase, Dindorfius, and Dindorfius, cited in the previous paragraph, give the gender of *styrax* as "[ho, et] he," that is, "(incorrectly masculine, and) feminine." Their unusually full discussion does not appear to support their proposal that *styrax* should be feminine. In one place they say *genus masc. de arbore, ut thure*, that is, "the masculine gender of the tree, as also the resin (literally, incense)," and again, *Sed verum tantum huic peculiare esse masc., arbori vero et thuri commune est genus utrumque*, that is, "But the fact is that masculine gender is common to both the tree itself and to the resin." On one hand Hase *et al.* indicate that masculine is incorrect but, on the other hand, they state that masculine gender is correct.

It seems that the ancient Greek gender of *styrax*, as a tree, was early feminine (Herodotus) and later masculine (Plutarch and Strabo). About all one can conclude is that *styrax*, as a tree, became masculine in usage, perhaps by association with the use of masculine for *styrax*, as a resin.

What about the Romans? The dictionaries commonly say masculine but some, presumably reflecting Greek usage, say masculine or feminine. The monumental edition (1940) by Conradini and Perin of Forcellini's highly respected *Totius Latinatus Lexicon* reports, "*styrax vel storax, -acis, m. Etiam storaca, -ae et storace, -es, f.*, in other words, "*styrax* or *storax* is masculine but also appears in feminine as *storaca* or *storace*." The widely available editions by Lewis and Short of Harpers' (or Andrew's) Latin Dictionary only attribute masculine to *styrax*.

The Roman authors cited by Lewis and Short, Isidorus, Solinus (*storax*), Vergil (*storace*) and Pliny, were only speaking of the resin, and because they did not use pronouns or adjectives, do not clarify whether they were, in fact, using masculine or feminine gender. For example, Pliny (Book 12, Chapter 55) stated, *Syria supra Phoenicem styracem gignit . . . arbore est eodem nomine, cotoneo malo similis . . .*, in other words, "Syria, beyond Phoenicia, produces *styrax* (accusative,

not neuter, singular) . . . the tree is of the same name, similar to the apple of Crete . . ." and later (Book 24, Chapter 15), *Et styracis naturum in peregrinis arboribus exposimus.*, that is, "And (now) we describe the nature of *styrax* (genitive, indeterminate gender, singular) from trees in foreign places." Thus, it appears that the Romans, a practical people, were more interested in the product of the tree than in the tree itself. If one were to form a conclusion on the Latin gender of *styrax* (or *storax*), it would have to be masculine, although some authors used feminine, but with the spellings *storaca* and *storace*. In any case, all usages refer to the resin, not to the tree.

In conclusion, it appears that the classical Greek and Latin gender of *styrax* was consistently masculine with the one exception that Herodotus used feminine for the tree. Some later authors, commenting on the original authors, have felt that feminine should have been used for the tree but actual usage was almost unanimously masculine. A few dictionaries have proposed use of neuter for the resin but this is spurious and not supported by any of the ancient authors.

*The botanical gender of Styrax:* Stearn (*Bot. Latin*, p. 6. 1966 & 1973) made the point that botanical Latin is not the same as classical Latin when he described botanical Latin as "a modern Romance language of special technical application, derived from Renaissance Latin with much plundering of ancient Greek . . ." The Code (Recommendation 75A), which really ought to be an article if its forceful language is to have any meaning, gives us examples that the gender of certain generic names should follow botanical custom, not classical gender, citing *Adonis*, *Diospyros*, *Strychnos*, *Orchis*, and *Stachys*, which are classically masculine, but botanically feminine. In the case of *Styrax* botanical custom seems even in greater disarray, using neuter, masculine and feminine, than classical custom, which was mostly masculine but feminine once. The balance of this paper will attempt to put forth the arguments for each gender and to select the gender which is best supported by the present Code.

*On using neuter for Styrax:* The most obvious argument for neuter is that this was the gender adopted by Linnaeus (*Sp. Pl.* p. 444. 1753) when the generic name was first validly published (*Styrax officinale*). Other authors using neuter are: Gaertner (*Fruct.* 1: 284. 1788), Kunth (in Humboldt, Bonpland and Kunth, *Nov. Gen.* 3: 261. 1819), G. Don (*Gen. Hist.* 4: 4. 1837), de Candolle (*Prod.* 8: 259. 1844), Seubert (in Martius, *Fl. Bras.* 7: 186-196. 1868), Boissier (*Fl. Orient.* 4: 35. 1875), van Steenis (*Fl. Mal.* 4: 50-56. 1949), and Airy Shaw (*Willis' Dict. Fl. Pl. & Ferns*, p. 1116. 1973).

The argument against the above is that Linnaeus did make mistakes, such as using *Andropogon* in neuter instead of masculine, and *Melastoma* in feminine instead of neuter. One of the most interesting cases, because of its similarity to *Styrax*, is that Linnaeus used *Panax* in neuter and this is almost universally accepted botanically as masculine, the classical gender. Indeed, Recommendation 75A(2) states that "Modern compounds ending in *-codon*, . . ., *-panax*, . . ., and other masculine words should be masculine." In the case of *Styrax* it seems reasonable to consider that Linnaeus made an error when he adopted neuter.

Wood (*J. Arnold Arb.* 41: 24. 1960) and Howard (*Sida* 5: 334-337. 1974) present a more subtle case for neuter. Following a dictionary that only attributed feminine gender to the tree, they seem to accept the possibility that Linnaeus made an error of using neuter when one would expect feminine. However, they say that, in this instance "it could be argued that there was a choice." They appeal to Recommendation 75A(1) which not only states, "A Greek or Latin word adopted as a generic name should retain its gender," but also says, "When the gender varies the author should choose one of the alternative genders." Wood (l.c.) believes that neuter was one of the alternatives available to Linnaeus.

Can it be argued that neuter was a gender of *styrax* that was available to Linnaeus, can it be demonstrated that any author or dictionary before 1753 used neuter? We think not. So far as we can determine, Schneider (born 1750) was

the first to put neuter for *styrax* in a dictionary. No pre-Linnaean botanists have been found who used neuter. No Latin dictionary, before or after 1753, has been found that cites neuter. We consulted the 1572 edition of Stephanus' (Estienne's) *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* and found that *styrax* appears as masculine for the spear-butt, feminine for the tree, and no gender is mentioned for the resin. J. Scapula (*Lexicon Graecolatinum*. 1609) cited only masculine for *styrax*. We do not know what classical dictionaries Linnaeus used. None are cited in his library which is incorporated in the published catalogue of the Linnaean Society of London. What evidence we have found is that pre-1753 dictionaries did not cite neuter and that the neuter option only materialized after 1800. We conclude that neuter was not one of the alternative genders available to Linnaeus and this his adoption of neuter for *Styrax* was simply an error, the same as his adoption of neuter for *Panax*.

In anticipation of the following discussions we might say that a case could be made for neuter, because when botanical usage is not established one might as well adopt the gender used by the original author (neuter), whether possibly an error or not. This would be a general principle and, because of that, it should be seriously considered. A clear statement of this principle possibly would be: "In cases where botanical and classical usage is mixed the gender adopted by the author first validly publishing a generic name should be accepted." However, this principle is not in our Code, indeed, we do not think it should be, because it is contrary to the present thrust of Recommendation 75A which strongly supports classical custom unless it contradicts botanical custom. Solving controversial problems by accepting the decision of the original author would mean that *Andropogon*, *Dendromecon*, *Panax*, etc., all of which are somewhat controversial, might shift back to the genders, presently treated as in error, which were used by original authors.

In summary, we feel that the botanical use of neuter for *Styrax*, as for *Panax*, was an error, a correctable error, originally made by Linnaeus and followed by many authors.

*On using feminine for Styrax:* The most obvious argument for feminine is that the Greeks and Romans generally treated trees as feminine, presumably because they were associated with feminine wood nymphs (dryads). However, there are exceptions to this rule, such as *Acer* (neuter) and *Rhamnus* (masculine). Among the authors using feminine for *Styrax* are: Roxburgh (*Fl. Ind.* 2: 415. 1832), Copeland (*Amer. J. Bot.* 25: 771-780. 1938), Rehder (*Man. Cult. Trees*, p. 761. 1940), Fernald (*Gray's Man. Bot.* p. 1146. 1950), Gleason (*Illustr. Fl. NE. U.S.* 3: 47. 1952), Chittenden (*Royal Hort. Soc. Dict. Gard.* 4: 3052. 1956), Encke (*Pareys Blumengaertn.* 2: 344. 1960), Li (*Woody Fl. Taiwan*, p. 750. 1963), Melchior (*Englers Syllab. Pflanzenfam.* 2: 401. 1964), Ohwi (*Fl. Jap.* p. 727. 1956), Correll & Johnston (*Man. Vasc. Pl. Texas*, p. 1190. 1970), Encke & Buchheim (*Zanders Handwoerterb. Pflanzennam.* p. 495. 1972), and Stearn (*Smith's Gard. Dict. Pl. Names*, p. 304. 1972).

Those who support the use of feminine, such as Stearn (*Bot. Latin*, p. 76. 1966 & 1973), would also add that treating the tree as feminine leaves masculine gender for the resin (*storax*) from the tree. The argument for feminine could be expanded into a principle which might be stated, "In cases where there is mixed classical and botanical usage for the gender of a generic name, feminine should be preferred, particularly for the gender of a genus of trees." This would parallel Article 30(a) (i) (2) of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature which states, "A noun of variable gender, masculine or feminine, is to be treated as masculine unless its author states, when he first published the name, that it is feminine, or so treats it in combination with an adjectival specific name." However, we do not have any such principle in our Code.

If one accepts the idea that generic names of trees need not necessarily be feminine one might still contend that Herodotus, the earliest author, correctly used feminine and that all later authors using masculine were incorrect. This would

mean rejecting what all but one author used, masculine, in favor of what that one author used, feminine. It seems more reasonable to regard actual preponderant usage as "correct" and to regard the one usage of feminine as a simple exception, rather than speculate that it is anything more or less.

Had Linnaeus used feminine, this would have provided a real reason for accepting feminine. It appears that there are only theoretical and speculative reasons for treating *Styrax* as feminine and no real reasons for doing so.

*On using masculine for Styrax:* Although it is easy to overlook an earlier publication it appears that the first publication after Linnaeus not to use neuter was Kurt Sprengel (*Syst. Veg.* 2: 285-286. 1825, 4(2): 405. 1827), who adopted masculine. This must be given some consideration because Sprengel was not only a botanist but a Greek scholar who published a German translation of Dioscorides (1822) and a Greek recension of Theophrastus' *Materia Medica* (1829-1830). Sprengel probably had a part in the scholarly discussion of the etymology of *Styrax* in Pohl (*Pl. Bras.* 2: 52. 1830), who also adopted masculine gender. Among the other authors who adopted masculine gender are: Presl (*Rel. Haenk.* 2: 60. 1835), W. Hooker & Arnott (*Bot. Capt. Beechey*, p. 196. 1841), Grisebach (*Fl. Brit. W. Ind.* p. 403. 1861), Perkins (*Englers Pflanzenr.* IV. 241: 1-111. 1907), Urban (*Symb. Ant.* 7: 331. 1912; 8: 532. 1921), van Steenis (*Bull. Jard. Bot. Buitenzorg*, ser. 3, 12: 212-272. 1932), Guillaumin (in Lecomte, *Fl. Gen. Indochine* 3: 979-987. 1933), and Standley & Williams, (*Fl. Guatemala*, part 8: 258-261. 1967).

The most obvious argument for use of masculine for *Styrax* is that it is the only gender found in most Latin dictionaries and the predominant gender found in Greek dictionaries. In addition, the principle of the first reviser supports masculine because masculine is the first gender used in place of neuter.

Principle V of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature states that "Scientific names of taxonomic groups are treated as Latin regardless of their derivation." One interpretation of this, which makes this case easy to solve, is that we should treat words used in Latin as did the Romans, regardless of how they were treated by the Greeks. A classic and parallel example of this is *calyx*, which we treat as masculine, as did the Romans, even though the Greeks generally used *kalyx* as feminine. In the case of *Styrax* it appears that the Romans are understood as having used masculine, as did at least eleven Greeks, although one (Herodotus) used feminine.

We consider that *styrax*, even though it at one time might have been correctly feminine, became masculine, as reflected by the dictionaries. This is also indicated by the fact that *styrax* is found to be masculine in dictionaries of modern languages which inflect for gender, German (*der Styrax*), French (*le aliboufier*), and Spanish (*el estoraque*), although at least one language, Italian (*la storace*), uses feminine, but in a form parallel to one of the feminine Latin forms (*storace, -es*).

*Conclusion:* A case can be made for use of any gender for *Styrax*; this is reflected by the fact each gender has been used by any number of highly respected botanists. It can be argued that masculine is justified because that is what most ancient authors used, feminine is justified because in a controversial case one might expect that the classical usage of feminine for trees would control, and neuter can be justified since that is what the original author used and, in a controversial case, original usage would control, even if it might have been an error. It seems to us that one must attempt to carefully apply exactly what the Code says, to try to determine and apply the exact letter of the Code.

We find that the only part of the Code that addresses this issue of gender is Recommendation 75A (1), "A Greek or Latin word adopted as a generic name should retain its gender." We assume "its gender" refers to its usual gender, as given in dictionaries, and particularly in Latin dictionaries, in accordance with Principle V, "Scientific names of taxonomic groups are treated as Latin regardless

of their derivation." We find that the usual gender given in Latin dictionaries for *styrax* is masculine and that Greek dictionaries overwhelmingly favor masculine for this word.

We reject application of "When the gender varies the author should choose one of the alternative genders," put forward as an argument for neuter, because we conclude that neuter was not one of the genders available for *Styrax*. We would accept application of this sentence to decide between the alternative genders masculine and feminine. The first author to choose one of the available genders was Sprengel and he chose masculine.

We reject the application of the provision, "In doubtful cases general usage should be followed," because we do not find that any general usage has been established.

Finally, we reject application of the provision, "The following names, however, whose classical gender is masculine, should be treated as feminine in accordance with botanical custom . . .," because the phraseology of this provision restricts it only to the names actually cited.

Until more convincing arguments are put forward, or Recommendation 75A (1) is modified, we advocate that *Styrax* should be treated as masculine, i.e. *Styrax americanus*, *S. glaber*, *S. japonicus*, *S. officinalis*, etc., in accord with standard Latin dictionaries.

*Epilogue:* It seems unnecessary or undesirable for scientists to solve gender or other classical grammatical problems by going beyond dictionaries into consultation of ancient literature. Yet, some dictionaries give erroneous information, such as those that say the ancients used *styrax* in neuter. We invite correspondence with classically oriented scientists to suggest Greek and Latin dictionaries in various languages which are both widely available and reliable which could be accepted as standard references for solving grammatical problems. For sample problems to test reliability and completeness we suggest *hemerocallis* (feminine) vs. *hemerocalles* (neuter), *nouphar*, *styrax*, and the rare Latin adjective *colonus* (-a, -um), used by Linnaeus in *Panicum colonum*.

*Addendum:* We note that M. L. Greene (Kew Bull. 1935: 77. 1935), who proposed much of the language of what is now Recommendation 75A, considered that the effect of her proposals "will be to standardize the gender of classical generic names . . . altering the gender of Linnaean generic names in only 15 cases . . . masculine: . . . *Panax*, *Styrax* . . ." In addition, she argued that the use of "correct classical gender . . . will be in conformity with modern compounds based on them . . . *Afrostryax*, *Nothopanax*." We would add that *Anthostyrax* and *Pterostyrax*, originally published in neuter, should be treated as masculine.