

## PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CODE

Edited by John McNeill & Nicholas J. Turland

### (001) Proposal to require prior deposition of types

Roy Mottram<sup>1</sup> & Root Gorelick<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Whitestone Gardens, Sutton, Thirsk, North Yorkshire YO7 2PZ, England, U.K. roy@whitestn.demon.co.uk (author for correspondence)*

<sup>2</sup> *Department of Biology, Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5B6, Canada*

#### (001) Add the following sentence to Art. 37.7:

“On or after 1 Jan 2012, such a type must be lodged as specified no later than the effective publication date of the new taxon.”

A number of cases have come to light where holotype specimens have not been deposited until after publication, occasionally well after, and sometimes accompanied by a reprint of the actual published paper. Clearly in such cases,

there is an interval of time during which a new taxon description has been published but no type specimen is extant, and the taxon is therefore technically not validly published until deposition has been achieved (Art. 45.1).

This proposal allows such examples to be recognised as validly published before 2012, but not so after that date unless deposition has taken place before or at the date of publication of the new taxon, thereby completing all the conditions of valid publication simultaneously.

### (002–003) Proposals to recommend usage of the diaeresis mark on the letter e (ë) in Latin names

Jacek Drobnik & Barbara Bacler

*Department of Pharmaceutical Botany and Herbalism, Medical University of Silesia, ul. Ostrogorska 30, 41-200 Sosnowiec, Poland. drobnik@onet.pl (author for correspondence)*

Article 60.6 of the ICBN (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006) states that the diaeresis (e.g., on the letter e), indicating that a vowel is to be pronounced separately from the preceding vowel (as in *Cephaëlis*), is *permissible*.

In fact, *ë* exists in botanical Latin on purpose. The diaeresis mark plays an important role in botanical Latin:

(1) It detaches some prefixes and suffixes from roots which begin or end with the vowels *a* or *e*, e.g., *neo-*, *pseudo-* in *Ficus neoëbudarum* Summerh., *Pseudoërnestia* (Cogn.) Krasser.; *-ensis* in *Limonium tarcoëense* Arrigoni & Diana.

(2) The use of *ë* indicates Greek origin of roots of which names are built, e.g., Greek *aër-* (“air”) is not Latin *aer-* (“bronze”), Greek *phaë-* (“glittering”) is not Greek *phae-* (“brown, sombre”).

(3) The letter *ë* could also differentiate the pronunciation, and it really does so, when a Latin name is read by users of a language in which it is possible to imitate the classic pronunciation.

Simplified spelling is discordant with the original authors’ intentions. The first taxonomists did use the diaeresis in their validly published names (see for example some Lin-

naean names: *Aloë* L. 1753, Sp. Pl.: 319–323, *Hippophaë* L., l.c.: 1023–1024, and *Isoëtes* L. l.c.: 1100). Omitting the diaeresis mark makes impossible the proper understanding of the scientific names etymology, because it deforms their Greek, Latin or Latinised roots. According to Rec. 60H.1, the etymology of names should be clear. Moreover, Rec. 60A.1 states that names derived from Greek should be transliterated in conformity with classical usage. Given this, the ICBN should at least recommend usage of *ë* (it is merely *permitted* under Art. 60.6).

#### (002) Add a new Recommendation 60H.2 and associated Example:

“60H.2. For better understanding of names, use of *ë* is recommended in order to: (1) detach groups of letters *ae* and *oe* which belong to different roots; (2) distinguish some roots derived from Greek; and (3) facilitate appropriate pronunciation.”

“Ex. 1. *Pseudoërnestia*, *Ficus neoëbudarum*, *Limonium tarcoëense*, *Aëranthes*, *Aloë*, *Isoëtes* is a better spelling than *Pseudoernestia*, *Ficus neoebudarum*, *Limonium tarcoense*, *Aeranthos*, *Aloe*, *Isoetes*, respectively.”

**(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](mailto: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](mailto: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