

(099–100) Two more proposals on the definition of specimens

Alexander N. Sennikov

Botanical Museum, Finnish Museum of Natural History, University of Helsinki, Unioninkatu 44, P.O. Box 7, 00014 Helsinki, Finland; and Herbarium, Komarov Botanical Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences, Prof. Popov str. 2, 197376 St. Petersburg, Russia; alexander.sennikov@helsinki.fi

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/646.33>

Recently the name *Oberonia manipurensis* Chowlu & al. (in Nordic J. Bot. 33: 42. 2015) was validly published with the holotype cited as “India, Manipur, Tamenglong District, Tamenglong (24°48.78'N, 93°32.77'E, 403 m a.s.l.), 7 Jun 2013, Chowlu 00362, 00441 (holotype: CAL, isotype: COGCEHR herbarium, Hengbung, Manipur).” This citation was interpreted by the International Plant Names Index (<http://ipni.org/ipni/idPlantNameSearch.do?id=77146539-1>) as publication of a name not validly published, with “2 holotype sheets cited contrary to Art. 8.3 ICN (2012)”, presumably implying that specimens that are numbered differently may not be part of a single gathering.

However, the *Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012) does not specify importance of any numbers in citations of specimens (field numbers, which may be given in the field by collectors, or collection numbers, assigned to collections by curators or monographers, or accession numbers, or barcode numbers, which may be given by curators for entering specimens into a database). When a type of a name of a new species or infraspecific taxon is indicated, as required for valid publication on or after 1 January 1958 (Art. 40.1), an entire, single gathering or part of a single gathering may be cited (Art. 40.2), irrespective of the number of duplicates (Art. 8.3 footnote) that are included.

There is a certain misconception that if a collection of one taxon from one place, made at one time and by the same collector(s), is labelled with different numbers assigned to separate specimens, these specimens are not part of a single gathering but constitute different gatherings. This belief is contrary not only to the requirements of Art. 8 but also to the practice of taxonomic and curatorial work. For example, there are many cases (especially in taxonomically difficult plants) when collectors assigned field numbers to every individual in the field because identification of duplicates was impossible or impractical at the time of collecting. Such field numbers were often discarded in later treatments of collections, especially when duplicates were established and given away. In some cases field numbers may have been deleted, or replaced by collection numbers assigned in further treatments, or retained along with the collection numbers. In some cases field numbers may be indicated in type citations, causing confusion for researchers and curators.

Such type citations are not very rare. Most strikingly there are two cases already mentioned in the *Code*. The first is Art. 40 Ex. 3 and its companion Art. 46 Ex. 20, which concern the name *Baloghia pininsularis* Guillaumin (in Mém. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat., B, Bot. 8: 260. 1962). Article 40 Ex. 3 states that the name was published “with two cited gatherings: *Baumann 13813* and *Baumann 1382*” and “As the author failed to designate one of them as the type, he did not validly publish the name.” Guillaumin provided the following citation in the

protologue: “[Nouvelle-Calédonie.] Ile des Pins : creek sur les pentes S.-O. du Pic N'ga, forêt mésophile, serpentine, 30/V/1951 (*Baumann 13.813, 13.823*).” Thanks to the immense effort of the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris, in digitizing their vast collections and making them publicly available on the Internet, it was easy to verify that the two specimens cited in the protologue of this name are parts of a single gathering, i.e., one taxon collected in a single place at the same time by the same collector, and their numbers are field numbers of that collector. Although that gathering was not designated as type, the name was validly published because, prior to 1 January 1990, a single gathering was cited in the protologue (Art. 40.3). The label data of these specimens are as follows: P00066568: “NOUVELLE-CALÉDONIE : Ile des Pins : creek sur les pentes S. O. du Pic N'ga | 30 / V / 1951 | M. BAUMANN - BODENHEIM | 13.823”; P00066569: “NOUVELLE-CALÉDONIE : Creek sur les pentes S. O. du Pic N'ga (Ile des Pins) | 30 / V / 1951 | M. BAUMANN - BODENHEIM | 13.813”; see <https://science.mnhn.fr/institution/mnhn/collection/p/item/p00066568> and <https://science.mnhn.fr/institution/mnhn/collection/p/item/p00066569>.

The second case is Art. 46 Ex. 21, in which the name *Pancheria humboldtiana* Guillaumin (in Mém. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat., B, Bot. 15: 47. 1964) is treated as not validly published because “no type was indicated”. The protologue includes the following citation: “[Nouvelle-Calédonie.] Mt Humboldt : sommet S., 1 500-1 600 m, 23/IX/1951 (*Baumann 15.515, 15.518*).” Again, images of the specimens are available online; the data on their labels are as follows: P00143076: “No. 15.515 | Arbuste, 1m | Mt Humboldt, sommet S., 1500–1600m | Date 23 / IX / 1951 leg. Baumann”; P05518244: “No. 15.518 | Arbuste, 1m, capitules rouges | Date 23 / IX / 1951 leg. Baumann”; see <https://science.mnhn.fr/institution/mnhn/collection/p/item/p00143076> and <https://science.mnhn.fr/institution/mnhn/collection/p/item/p05518244>. The case of *P. humboldtiana* is parallel to that of *Baloghia pininsularis*. It is evident that the specimens belong to a single gathering. Although the data of the two labels do not exactly match, they do not conflict and there is no evidence that the locality was different.

To correct these erroneous Examples and to clarify the situation, I propose to delete Art. 40 Ex. 3 and Art. 46 Ex. 20 and 21 from the *Code* and introduce after Art. 8.2 a new Note and a new Example (based on the former Art. 46 Ex. 21) to make it clear that in no case may a difference in numbering of specimens alone mean that more than one gathering is present; other data as required by Art. 8.2 should be taken into account.

These proposals complement Prop. 030 on the Glossary (Zhu in Taxon 63: 1145–1146. 2014), by introducing the clarification explicitly into the main text of the *Code*.

(099) Delete Art. 40 Ex. 3 and Art. 46 Ex. 20 and 21**(100) Add a new Note after Art. 8.2 with a new Example:**

“*Note 1.* Field numbers, collection numbers, accession numbers, or barcode numbers alone do not necessarily denote different gatherings.”

“*Ex. Ibis. Pancheria humboldtiana* Guillaumin (in *Mém. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat., B, Bot.* 15: 47. 1964) was validly published with the only gathering cited as “Mt Humboldt : sommet S., 1 500-1 600 m, 23/IX/1951 (*Baumann* 15.515, 15.518).” These are field numbers of

two specimens given by the collector (at P, barcodes P00143076 and P05518244, respectively). Since the taxon, locality, collection date, and collector of the two specimens are the same, they constitute parts of a single gathering in spite of their separate numbering.”

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Germinal Rouhan (Paris) for guiding me through the digital collection of P and transcribing the handwritten French text of the labels of *Pancheria humboldtiana*. Nicholas Turland (Berlin) is warmly thanked for editing the text.