

**(003) In order to make clearer that the diaeresis is permissible, amend Articles 60.4, 60.5, and 60.6:**

Add at the end of Art. 60.4: “The diaeresis on *e* is permissible too.”

Add “*e* or *ë*” to the first sentence of Art. 60.5 so that

it reads: “... where the letters *u*, *v*, or *i*, *j*, or *e*, *ë* are used interchangeably ...”.

Add at the end of the second sentence of Art. 60.6 (transcription rules) the clause: “French and Dutch (but not Latin) *ë* becomes *e*.”

**(004) Proposal to recommend citation of herbarium serial numbers of type specimens**

Yu-Min Shui<sup>1</sup> & Jun Wen<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Herbarium of Kunming Institute of Botany, the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanhei Road no. 132, Kunming 650204, Yunnan Province, China. ymshui@mail.kib.ac.cn (author for correspondence)*

<sup>2</sup> *United States National Herbarium, Department of Botany, Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of Natural History, MRC-166, PO Box 37012, Washington, DC 20013-7012, U.S.A.*

As the serial number of a book is more important than the book classification number in managing a library, so the herbarium serial or accession number of a specimen is more important than the collection number of the specimen in managing a herbarium. The herbarium serial number refers to a single sheet of a gathering in a given herbarium and is thus unique, whereas the same collection number may be in several herbaria. The use of the serial number of the specimen may clarify confusion related to a mixed collection when more than one specimen is labelled as the same collection number. For example, *A. Henry 9323* labelled as 00025156 in NY is the type of *Celtis amphibole* Blume, while *A. Henry 9323* in A belongs to *Celtis bungeana* Blume (*Plantae Wilsonianae* 3: 269, 279. 1916). Furthermore, a type specimen is not evidently in the possession of a specific herbarium until it is processed with a serial number. This will ensure timely processing of type material and prevent the situation of unmounted type specimens after the publication of a new name. We therefore propose the following amendment to the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146. 2006):

**(004) Proposal to recommend citation of herbarium serial numbers of type specimens by adding a new paragraph and an Example to Rec. 37A:**

“37A.2. The herbarium serial number of the holotype should be cited following the acronym of its deposited herbarium or institution at the time of publication of a name of a new species and lower taxon. It should also be cited in lectotype, neotype and epitype designations (see Art. 9).”

“*Ex. 1.* When the type specimen of *Sladenia integrifolia* Y.M. Shui & W.H. Chen (*Sladeniaceae*) is designated as *Mo Ming-Zhong, Mao Rong-Hua & Yu Zhi-Yong 05* (holotype, KUN 0735701; isotypes, MO, PE) (in *Novon* 12: 539–542. 2002), the serial number 0735701 is cited following the herbarium acronym “KUN” of Herbarium of Kunming Institute of Botany (see Rec. 7A), showing that the specimen KUN 0735701 is the unique and specific sheet to Herbarium of Kunming Institute of Botany (see Art. 8.3).”

**Acknowledgements**

We thank Prof. Li Xi-Wen (KUN) and Dr. C. I. Peng (HAST) for helpful discussions, and Dr. David E. Boufford (A) for information on some specimens. We are most grateful to Dr. John McNeill for his constructive advice.

**(005) Proposal to add a new Recommendation 37B**

Mithilesh K. Pathak\* & Subir Bandyopadhyay

*Botanical Survey of India, P.O. Botanic Garden, Howrah – 711103, West Bengal, India. \*mithileshkp@yahoo.com (author for correspondence)*

Art. 37.7 states “For the name of a new species or infraspecific taxon published on or after 1 January 1990 of which the type is a specimen or unpublished illustration, the

single herbarium or collection or institution in which the type is conserved must be specified.” In this regard we have found that sometimes the authors of new names delay deposition or

do not deposit the type material(s) in the herbarium (-ia) or collection(s) or institution(s) stated in the protologue. Occasionally due to a lapse on the part of curatorial staff the types are not promptly incorporated in appropriate places and after some time get misplaced and then it becomes very difficult to trace them. These circumstances cause extreme inconvenience to researchers who want to examine type material in order to reach a taxonomic conclusion. Thus we feel that a Recommendation is very much needed in this connection. We propose the following:

**(005) Insert a new Rec. 37B.1:**

“It is strongly recommended that authors publishing the name of a new species or infraspecific taxon submit the holotype and any isotypes to the herbarium (-ia) or

collection(s) or institution(s) stated in the protologue immediately after publication, if not already deposited, and that the curators of such herbaria or collections or institutions ensure that incorporation of these types receives the highest priority.”

This new Recommendation, if followed sincerely, would surely help the researchers to locate type specimens more easily.

**Acknowledgements**

We are grateful to the Director, Botanical Survey of India for his help and encouragement and to Dr. John McNeill, Edinburgh for his kind help in refining the proposed Recommendation.

## (006–008) Proposals to amend the *Code* regarding orthographic conservation

**Gerry Moore & Catherine Rushworth**

*Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 1000 Washington Avenue, Brooklyn, New York, U.S.A. 11225. gerrymoore@bbg.org (author for correspondence)*

Besides conserving a name itself, Art. 14 of the ICBN (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146: 29–32. 2006) also permits the conservation of a name's type (Art. 14.9), spelling (Art. 14.11), and gender (Art. 14.11). The *Code* is clear that the listed type of a conserved name may not be changed, except as outlined under Art. 14.12 (see Art. 14.8). Therefore, the type cited in the *Code* for a conserved name must be retained, even if it is determined that this type would not be the type under the rules of the *Code*. The “typ. cons.” designation given to some entries in Appendix III simply indicates the reason for the original conservation proposal.

The *Code* is less clear regarding the orthographic status of a conserved name. In cases where the spelling of a conserved name is not the original spelling or might warrant correction under Arts. 60–62, is such correction permissible? Is an *orthographia conservanda* proposal needed to preserve the spelling given for the conserved name? The listing of “orth. cons.” for some names and not others may certainly lead some to conclude that the spelling of names without the “orth. cons.” listing can be subject to correction as required under Arts. 60–62. Unlike types, the lack of any explicit language in the rules or the appendices for orthography could give the impression that the spellings of conserved names are not conserved.

For example, Nuttall (*Gen. N. Amer. Pl.* 2: 115. 1818) published the genus name *Wisteria* in honour of Caspar Wistar “late professor of anatomy in the University of Pennsylvania and for many years president of the American Philosophical Society”. In the past, some have corrected

this spelling to *Wistaria*, e.g., Smith (in *Science* 1: 77–78. 1895), Halsted (in *Bull. Torr. Bot. Club* 24: 48–50. 1897), Sumner (in *Science* 29: 698–699. 1909), Bigelow (in *Science* 46: 16–17. 1917), while others, such as Nicolson (*Taxon* 33: 121–122. 1984), have argued against changing the original spelling. While the spelling *Wisteria* clearly has predominant usage, the *Wisteria/Wistaria* debate continues today. Valder's (*Wisterias Comprehensive Guide*: 11–19. 1995) first chapter is entitled “*Wisteria* or *Wistaria*?”, even though the name is listed as *Wisteria* in Appendix III of the *Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146: 414. 2006). In California there is also an annual Sierra Madre *Wistaria* Vine Festival ([www.sierramadrenews.net/wistaria.htm](http://www.sierramadrenews.net/wistaria.htm)).

Given the problem of various interpretations of the application of Arts. 60–62 as overviewed by Zijlstra (in *Greuter & al.* in *Englera* 20: 210. 2000), it makes sense to treat the spellings of conserved names as conserved, even when the original proposal was not an *orthographia conservanda*. Furthermore, it is understood by current plant nomenclaturalists that the spellings of listed conserved names are indeed de facto conserved regardless of the original reasons for conservation (Richard Brummitt, Werner Greuter, John McNeill, Dan Nicolson, Nick Turland, pers. comm.). Further evidence of this understanding is that “orth. cons.” and “typ. cons.” have been added to existing entries without the publication and approval of additional *orthographia conservanda* and *typus conservandus proposita*.

The proposals here would prevent changing a conserved name's spelling except by the procedure outlined in Art.