



The New Rules of Typification

Author(s): J. Lanjouw

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Nov., 1951), pp. 19-21

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1217893>

Accessed: 18/09/2011 12:22

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Taxon*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

sound strange to include qualities usually considered the peculiar attributes of the artist, as necessary to the make-up of the satisfactory taxonomist. Yet, if you consider taxonomic practices it must become clear that quickened appreciation of curves and other outlines and of balance of organs aids comparison at every stage. There is no doubt that many taxonomists are born collectors. This may be interpreted as their being endowed with an undue share of the acquisitive instinct. This needs to be kept under control but, as expressed in herbaria, is at least relatively harmless and may then be regarded as a sublimation of such developments of the acquisitive instinct as shown by many historical figures, from King Solomon to Hitler and Göring. The tremendous symbolic and possessional value ascribed to names from very ancient times, perhaps, explains in part some of the aberrations of nomenclaturists.

Finally, may I express the hope that what I have said here may contribute to the wider understanding of what are the aims and methods of modern plant taxonomy. We taxonomists desire to make our classifications more and more useful and can only do this through co-operation with all our colleagues. We work to serve and ask only for such recognition as we fairly deserve.

Editorial

The editors of "*Taxon*" are well pleased with the approval they have received from so many sides. It may safely be said that the first number has been received with enthusiasm, and this gives the editors the assurance that they are supplying a long-felt want.

Fresh copy for the next issue has been coming in but the flow is not yet sufficient. The editors once again wish to emphasize

the necessity that members and institutes transmit all their information they regard as important to taxonomists. A list — by no means an exclusive one! — of news items and the kinds of articles they want has been given on p. 2 of the first number, and all readers are earnestly requested to study this list.

It is also of importance that we obtain correspondents in all parts of the world and members are invited therefore to volunteer as such.

The new Rules of Typification

by

J. LANJOUW, Rapporteur général

The text of these articles and recommendations (see also *Taxon* Vol. I, no. 1 p. 7) was accepted at Stockholm with the provision that the Editorial Committee was to reconsider certain points, and to reword certain phrases. These amendments and rewordings, which generally are of minor importance are being studied at the moment by the above committee, and this means that the text given here is provisional only.

The articles and recommendations have already been renumbered (in some cases the old numbers have been added in square brackets); they replace Art. 18 and Rec. IV—VII of the 3rd edition of the Rules.

SECTION 2. THE TYPE METHOD

Article 18

The application of names of taxa is determined by means of *nomenclatural types*. A nomenclatural type (typus) is that constituent

element of a taxon to which the name of the taxon is permanently attached, whether as an accepted name or a synonym. It follows that the name of a taxon must be changed if the type of the name is excluded (see art. 81 [66]).

Note 1.: The nomenclatural type is not necessarily the most typical or representative element of a taxon; it is merely that element with which the name is permanently associated.

Note 2: A *holotype* ("type") is the one specimen or other element used by the author or designated by him as the nomenclatural type (that is, the element to which the name of the taxon is permanently attached).

Note 3: If no holotype has been indicated by the author who described a taxon, or when the holotype is lost or destroyed, a substitute for it must be chosen. The author who makes this choice must be followed unless it can

be proved that the choice was not made in accordance with Art. 19. The substitute may be either a *lectotype* or a *neotype*. A *lectotype* always takes precedence over a *neotype*.

A *lectotype* is a specimen or other element selected from the *original material* to serve as nomenclatural type when the holotype was not designated at the time of publication or so long as it is missing.

When two or more specimens have been designated as types by the author of a name (i.e. male and female, flowering and fruiting etc.) one of them must be chosen as *lectotype*.

A *neotype* is a specimen selected to serve as nomenclatural type so long as all of the material on which the name of the taxon was based is missing.

Recommendation III

For other specimens of special interest the following terms are recommended:

A *paratype* is a specimen other than the holotype cited with the original description. An *isotype* is a specimen which is (exact wording under discussion) a duplicate of the holotype. A *syntype* is one of two or more specimens or elements used by the author when no holotype was designated, or one of two or more specimens simultaneously designated as type.

Recommendation IV

It cannot be too strongly recommended that the original material, especially the holotype, of a taxon be deposited in a permanent responsible institution and that it be scrupulously cared for and preserved. When living material has been designated as type, it should be immediately preserved, whether it be a living plant in garden or greenhouse, or a culture in vitro.

Article 19

The choice of a lectotype or neotype is not binding if the original material is rediscovered, or if it can be shown that the *choice was based* on misinterpretation of the original description.

Article 20

Names based on types derived from modern material, *Algae* excepted, always take precedence over names based on fossil or sub-fossil specimens.

Note: Names based on fossil types cannot be used again for modern plants in violation of the rule excluding later homonyms (see art. 77 [61]).

Article 21

The nomenclatural type (holotype, lectotype or neotype) of a species or taxon below the rank of species is a single specimen or other element except in the following case:

For small herbaceous plants and for most non-vascular plants the type may consist of more than one individual, which ought to be conserved permanently and assembled on one herbarium sheet or preparation. If it is later proved that such a type herbarium sheet or preparation contains parts belonging to more than one taxon, the name must remain attached to that part (lectotype) which corresponds most nearly with the original description.

Notes:

- 1) For plants of which it is impossible to preserve a type specimen, the type may be a figure and/or a description.
- 2) In a species without a type specimen, the type may be a description or figure.
- 3) If a taxon is divided into a number of taxa of the same rank, the nomenclatural type of the original taxon must be the type of one of them.
- 4) If a taxon includes subordinate taxa, its nomenclatural type must be or include the type of one of the taxa in each subordinate rank.

Article 22

The nomenclatural type of an order and of taxa between order and family is a family, that of a family and of taxa between family and genus is a genus, and that of a genus and of taxa between genus and species is a species. The nomenclatural type of a taxon above the rank of genus, to the rank of order, whose name is formed in accordance with the Rules, is always the lower taxon whose name was derived from the same root (generic name).

Note: It is not felt that the type method can, at present be applied profitably to the nomenclature of taxa above the rank of order.

Recommendation V

Guide for the determination of types

The following set of suggestions is intended both as a guide to the application of the Rules and as an indication of sound practice in the determination or selection of the nomenclatural types of previously published taxa.

Where the application of a rule is embodied in a suggestion, reference is made to the appropriate article.

1. The choice of the original author, if definitely expressed at the time of the original publication of the name of the taxon, is final. If he included only one element, that one must always be accepted as the holotype (see Arts. 18, 21). If a new name is based on a previously published description of the taxon, the same considerations apply to material cited by the earlier author.

2. When a new name was published as an avowed substitute (*nomen novum*) for an older one (a new name based on the description accompanying an illegitimate or incorrect one) the type of the new name is automatically that of the old one.

3. A lectotype may be chosen only when an author failed to designate a holotype, or when, for species or taxa of lower rank, the type has been lost or destroyed (Art. 18 note 3).

4. Designation of a lectotype should be undertaken only in the light of an understanding of the group concerned. Mechanical systems, such as the automatic selection of the first species or specimen cited or of a specimen collected by the person after whom a species is named should be avoided as unscientific and productive of possible future confusion and further change. The original description of the taxon concerned should be the basic guide (Art. 19).

a. In choosing a lectotype any indication of intent by the author of a name should be given preference unless it is contrary to his description and remarks. Such indications are manuscript notes, annotations on herbarium sheets, recognizable figures, epithets such as *typicus*, *genuinus*, *vulgaris*, *communis* etc.

b. A lectotype must be chosen from among elements that were definitely studied by the author up to the time the taxon was published and included in it when it was published (Art. 18 note 3).

c. Other things being equal, specimens

should be given preference over pre-Linnean or other cited descriptions or plates when lectotypes of species are designated.

d. In cases when two or more elements were included in or cited with the original description the reviewer must use his own judgment in selection of a lectotype, but if another author has already segregated out one or two elements as other taxa, the residue or part of it should be designated as the type if its essential characters correspond to the original description. If it can be shown that the element best fitting the whole published original account has been removed, it shall be restored and treated as lectotype (Art. 19). Whenever the type material of a taxon is heterogeneous the lectotype should be selected so as to preserve current usage if possible.

e. The first choice of a lectotype should be followed by subsequent workers unless it can be shown that the choice does not fit the original description so well as another of the original elements (specimens, species, higher taxa etc.) (Art. 19).

5. In selecting a *neotype* even more care and critical knowledge are essential, since the reviewer has usually no guide except his own judgment to what best fits the original description. If his selection is faulty it will inevitably result in further change. The *neotype* may be selected only when all original material is believed lost or destroyed (Art. 18 note 3, Art. 20).

6. For names of fossil species the lectotype when one is needed should, if possible be a specimen illustrated at the time of the first valid publication.

7. The nomenclatural typification of organ genera, form genera, of genera based on plant microfossils (pollen, spores etc.), genera of imperfect fungi, or any other analogous genera, or lower taxa, does not differ from that recommended above.

FLORA MALESIANA

Present and prospects

by

C. G. G. J. VAN STEENIS (Leiden)

"Flora Malesiana" is a regional Flora covering the mainly insular area i.e. Malaysia (in other languages "Malesia"), between the continents of Asia and Australia; it consists of the *Malay Peninsula, Indonesia, the British*

parts of Borneo, the Philippines, Portuguese Timor, Christmas Island (Ind. Ocean), and the island of New Guinea.

As I have shown elsewhere¹⁾, the very rich flora of this region forms a tolerably

1) Tijdschr. Kon. Ned. Aardr. Gen. 65 (1948) 193—208; Fl. Mal. 1, 1 (1950) lxx—lxxv.