

# Editorial

Somehow, 1995 passed without the *Bulletin* being published. However, here it is. This issue has the remainder of the original submissions for the “Botany of Wellington” and I would like to thank Mike Oates, Carol Leach and Anita Benbrook for assistance with Stan Reid’s Otari paper. Put together, the ten articles (five in each of *Bulletins 46* and *47*) provide an overview of the distribution and ecology of a good proportion of the region’s flora. Of course, the more complete treatment is in “Wellington’s Living Cloak” which is a full colour publication.

Four contributed papers following the “Botany of Wellington” articles complete this issue of the *Bulletin*. I know that many members are actively observing plants and vegetation or are involved in management aimed at improving the outlook for native vegetation and people, so there must be lots to write about. Four papers will not make an issue, so I urge you all to consider sending in an article on any botanical topic. If you are unsure about the value of your contribution, please write to me to check. Remember, all botanical observations are relevant.

The style of the *Bulletin* is not as formal as for refereed botanical journals. Thus, there is no requirement to include scientific names at the first (or any) mention of a plant’s common name. This can cause misunderstandings because common names are a moveable feast whereas scientific names provide the filament of continuity necessary to know exactly what we understand a plant to be. However, common names provide a richness too, and mirror the evolution of language. So, in this issue of the *Bulletin*, readers might note that more than one common name has been used for some species. For example, *Tradescantia fluminensis* has been portrayed as Wandering Jew and wandering willy. Less obvious to me, I wonder if salthorn and glasswort (*Sarcocornia quiqueflora*) are the same thing and, from within one article, are shore ribbonwood and marsh ribbonwood the same, i.e., *Plagianthus divaricatus*? The ruthless editor would, of course, get to the bottom of these differences but then there would be no mystery, no reason to wonder. Thus, I have left things as they are. However, if it is important that there be no misunderstandings about the species that you write about, please include the scientific names.

I thank Jeremy Rolfe for typesetting this issue of the *Bulletin* and look forward to receiving your contribution for the next issue.