

PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CODE

Edited by John McNeill & Nicholas J. Turland

Submission deadlines and change of dates

It was announced in *Taxon* 56: 270–271 (February 2007) (see also http://www.botanik.univie.ac.at/iapt/downloads/guidelines_amend_code.pdf) that *Taxon* would close for proposals to amend the Code on 31 March 2010. Because *Taxon* is publishing six issues in 2010, it has been possible to extend this deadline. Proposals must now be received by 31 May 2010 to be certain of publication. As hitherto, late submissions may be accepted at the editors' discretion if no reviewing or major editing is necessary; these must now be submitted by the end of August 2010.

(104–108) Proposals to amend Article 9.15, add an example to Article 37, and make additions to Appendices III and IV

Wen-Bin Yu,^{1,2} Hong Wang¹ & De-Zhu Li¹

¹ Key Laboratory of Biodiversity and Biogeography, Kunming Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming 650204, People's Republic of China

² Graduate University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, People's Republic of China

Author for correspondence: De-Zhu Li, dzl@mail.kib.ac.cn

(104) Amend Article 9.15, so that it reads as follows (new text in *italic*):

“9.15. A designation of a lectotype or neotype that later is found to refer to a single gathering but to more than one specimen must nevertheless be accepted (subject to Art. 9.17), but may be further narrowed to a single one of these specimens by way of a subsequent lectotypification or neotypification. *On or after 1 January 2013, such designation is not effective unless a unique herbarium barcode or accession number of the sheet is cited after the indication of the herbarium or other collection.*”

During the course of revisionary studies, taxonomists often ascertain only with difficulty which one specific specimen is the actual lectotype or neotype designated by an earlier author or authors when a single gathering contains more than one specimen but the author or authors did not specify which in the previous typification. According to Article 9.15 of the *Vienna Code*, the subsequent typification process is necessary if the previous lectotype or neotype was not precisely indicated. Some researchers have realized that the requirement of typification is deficient in accordance with the *Vienna Code*. Bandyopadhyay & Pathak (in *Taxon* 57: 318–319. 2008) recommended to designate a lectotype or neotype by mentioning the herbarium barcode or accession number of the sheet (also see Shui & Wen in *Taxon* 57: 315. 2008), and, if possible, by publishing a photograph of the specimen, or by any other means. In order to avoid re-typification process of a name, we propose that typification require the citation of a unique herbarium barcode or accession number of the lectotype or neotype after the citation of the herbarium, e.g., by its *Index herbariorum* acronym. This requirement is easily achieved because each herbarium specimen has been given a unique accession number or barcode in increasing number of herbaria. If this proposal is adopted, the typification process will become more precise, and Article 9.17 and Recommendation 9A.2 of the *Code* more easily complied with.

We propose to apply a stricter application of typification from 1 January 2013 after the next International Botanical Congress held in 2011.

(105) Add an example to Article 37:

“Ex. 6. The name “*Holboellia latistaminea*” originally described by T. C. Chen (in *Fl. Reipubl. Popularis Sin.* 29: 307. 2001) was not validly published because two herbaria (IBSC, KUN) were simultaneously listed after the single cited specimen (*W. P. Fang 15449*), and neither was indicated as the place of deposition of the type. The name was validly published by S. Y. Jin (*Cat. Type Spec. Herb. China, Suppl. II*: 112. 2007.) where the specimen conserved in IBSC is indicated as holotype, and the other in KUN as isotype, and a full and direct reference to Chen's previously published Latin diagnosis (Article 45.1) was provided.”

According to Article 37.7, in order for a name to be validly published on or after 1 January 1990, the single herbarium or collection or institution in which the type is conserved must be specified. Article 37 Ex. 4 and Ex. 5 represent two different cases of Article 37.7. However, there is the third case which is not currently exemplified, i.e., two or more herbaria or collections or institutions are simultaneously specified but not indicated that the holotype is conserved in the single herbarium, and isotype or isotypes conserved in the same and/or other herbarium(-a). The name *Holboellia latistaminea* T. Chen falls into the third case, because two herbaria were simultaneously listed after the single cited gathering but the one which housed the holotype was not indicated. In order for a better understanding of this article, we propose to add this example to Article 37.7. This example is also applicable for Article 37.6.

(106) Add “*gend. cons.*” at the beginning of Appendix III, prior to *orth. cons.*

Add the following sentence: “*gend. cons.* gender conservanda, gender to be conserved (Art. 14.11), e.g., masculine, feminine, neuter.”

(107) Add “nom. illeg.” at the beginning of Appendix III, prior to orth. cons. (after gen. cons. as proposed).

Add the following sentence: “nom. illeg. nomen illegitimum, illegitimate name, a validly published name that is not in accordance with one or more rules (Art. 6.4), principally those on superfluity (Art. 52) and homonymy (Art. 53 and 54).”

(108) Add “orth. cons.” at the beginning of Appendix IV, prior to typ. cons.

Add the following: “orth. cons. orthographia conservanda, spelling to be conserved (Art. 14.11).”

In Appendix III, the genus name *Platoma* Schousb. ex F. Schmitz (*A9. Algae: Rhodophyceae*, p. 187) is conserved with “gen. neut. cons.”, and *Celastrus* L. (*E3. Spermatophyta: Dicot.*, p. 313), *Gymnocladus* Lam. (*E3. Spermatophyta: Dicot.*, p. 341) and *Sapindus* L. (*E3. Spermatophyta: Dicot.*, p. 391) are conserved with “gen. masc. cons.”; and the spelling of species names *Synedra nitzschoides* Grun.

(*A. Algae*, p. 423), *Agaricus lycoperdoides* Bull. (*B. Fungi*, p. 424), *Anemone narcissiflora* L. (*E. Spermatophyta*, p. 440), *Centaurea pumilio* L. (*E. Spermatophyta*, p. 445) and *Phaseolus helvolus* L. (*E. Spermatophyta*, p. 458) is conserved (i.e., orth. cons.) in Appendix IV. Additionally, “nom. illeg.” is frequently used in Appendix III. However, these abbreviations are not explained at the beginning of the appendices. Therefore, we propose to add “gen. cons.” and “nom. illeg.”, and “orth. cons.” to Appendices III and IV, respectively, for a better understanding of the names listed in the Appendix III and IV.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Prof. John McNeill, Nomenclature Editor of *Taxon* and chair of the Editorial Committee for the *Vienna Code* for his valuable suggestions and for refining the proposals. This study was supported by grants from the National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program, No. 2007CB411600), and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 30670160 and 40830209).

(109) Proposal to add a new paragraph to Recommendation 9A

Soumen Kumar Basu, Partha Pratim Ghoshal, Subir Bandyopadhyay & Md. Nehal Aziz

Botanical Survey of India, P.O.: Botanic Garden, Howrah – 711103, West Bengal, India

Author for correspondence: *Partha Pratim Ghoshal, pp_ghoshal@rediffmail.com*

Biswas (in J. Econ. Taxon. Bot. 15: 38–39. 1991) designated “MEGHALAYA Barapani, July 6, 1959, G.K. Deka 4568 (ASSAM)” as the holotype of *Microlepia brevistrigosa* A. Biswas, but, at our request, Dr. R. Gogoi has searched for the aforesaid specimen and has kindly informed us (pers. comm., 2009) that it is not present either in the type or general herbarium at ASSAM. We have, however, found a specimen of *G.K. Deka s.n.* at CAL with the herbarium accession number 4568 that bears the name ‘*Microlepia brevistrigosa* Biswas’ and is inscribed as “holotype” in Dr. Biswas’s own handwriting. For clarification we approached Dr. Biswas and learnt that this specimen is indeed the holotype. She confirmed (pers. comm., 2009) that she had made a mistake by writing ASSAM instead of CAL, as the place of deposition of the type, because the sheet at CAL had printed on it “Botanical Survey of India, Eastern Circle Herbarium, Shillong”.

The data related to the type specimen given in the protologue are confusing in many aspects because the type is at CAL instead of ASSAM, the year of collection is 1939, not 1959 and 4568 is the accession number of the sheet and not G.K. Deka’s field number. In fact no field number of G.K. Deka appears on the sheet. Fraser-Jenkins (*Taxon. Rev. Indian Subcont. Pterid.*: 82. 2008) stated ‘*M. brevistrigosa* A. Biswas (type, CAL!)’ and did not mention anything about examining the holotype or any of the paratypes or about the aforesaid discrepancies.

Ghosh in Ghosh & al., *Pterid. Fl. East. India* 1: 338. 2004 cited ‘MANIPUR: I.T. Road, Tamenlong Dist. March 9, 1984, *B. Ghosh* 16443’ as the type of *Pteris linearis* Poir. var. *manipurensis* S.R. Ghosh. A line drawing (fig. 100) in the aforesaid book (p. 339) was also provided. This new variety was, however, not validly published as he did not state the place of deposition of the type. We could locate the specimen at CAL on which the line drawing is based. It has the same details as given by Ghosh (l.c.) for the intended type except that the collection number is *B. Ghosh* 16463 instead of 16443. It is also

annotated by Mr. S.R. Ghosh in his own handwriting as “*Pteris linearis* Poir. var. *manipurensis* S.R. Ghosh”. At our request Mr. Ghosh (pers. comm., 2009) kindly informed us that the line drawing given in the publication is indeed based on *B. Ghosh* 16463 and that collection was intended as the type specimen, the discrepancy in the collector’s number is because of a typographic error. There is a specimen, *B. Ghosh* 16443 (CAL!), that was collected on “8.3.1984 from 1400 m, Tamenglong, Manipur” and that is identified on the sheet as “*Asplenium cheilosorum* Kunze ex Mett.”.

To avoid any kind of confusion regarding recognition of type specimens we are proposing a new Recommendation as follows:

(109) Insert a new Recommendation 9A.6:

“9A.6. It is recommended that authors of names who discover an error or errors in the data published in the protologue, either because of personal inadvertence or due to typographical mistakes, should publish a correction and attach the reference to that publication to type sheet. If publication is not possible, authors in those circumstances should at least record the error(s) along with their full names and signatures, especially for those errors that would otherwise be seriously misleading.”

This new Recommendation, if sincerely followed, would help future workers to recognize type specimens without the slightest confusion even if the type details given in the protologue vary considerably from the actual facts.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Director, Botanical Survey of India for his encouragement, to Dr. John McNeill for his suggestions and for refining the manuscript and to Drs. M.K. Pathak, R. Gogoi and Silpi Das, Botanical Survey of India for their help.