

## PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CODE

Edited by Nicholas J. Turland & John H. Wiersema

## (096–098) Three proposals to disambiguate certain cases of lectotypification and neotypification

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/10.12705/646.32>

### (096) Add a new paragraph to Art. 7 (and editorially in Note 2 replace “Art. 7.9 and 7.10” with “Art. 7.9–7.11”):

“7.11. For purposes of priority (Art. 9.19 and 10.5), designation of a type (lectotype, neotype) may be achieved by referring to the typified name, a later usage or isonym of that name, a new combination, name at new rank, or replacement name based upon that name, or an invalidly published designation that was supposed to be that name, as long as the designated type conforms with the provisions of Art. 9.11–9.13 and 10.2 when the actual protologue is considered.”

### (097) Add two new Examples under Art. 7.11 (conditional text in square brackets):

“Ex. 14. Pfeiffer (Nomencl. Bot. 2: 1200. 1874) indicated *Sorbus domestica* L. as the generic type (lectotype) of “*Sorbus* Medik.” referring directly to the revised treatment of *Sorbus* L. in Medikus (Gesch. Bot.: 86. 1793). Since the type of *Sorbus* was not explicitly excluded by Medikus, this lectotypification was effective [and had to be followed until a proposal to conserve the name *Sorbus* L. with a different type was ratified by the XIX International Botanical Congress in Shenzhen in 2017].”

“Ex. 15. *Allium savranicum* (Nyman) Oxner was lectotypified by Krytzka & al. (in Ukrayins’k. Bot. Zhurn. 57: 695. 2000) in the mistaken belief that this name was validly published as the name of new species by Besser (Enum. Pl.: 55. 1822). However, the first validly published name for this taxon was *A. globosum* var. *savranicum* Nyman (Consp. Fl. Eur. 4: 741. 1882), in the protologue of which Nyman indirectly referred to Besser’s description of the taxon that appeared without a validly published name in a note under *A. caucasicum* M. Bieb. (Schultes & Schultes, Syst. Veg. 7: 1054. 1830). The typification of Krytzka & al. accords with the provisions of Art. 9.11 and 9.12 and is therefore effective when Nyman’s protologue is considered.”

There are many cases when earlier or later instances of valid publication, other than previously believed, were discovered for names at the rank of species and below. Some of such names may already have been typified from contexts other than those currently considered as the places of valid publication, and it is logical to accept those typifications if they are found to be correct when the actual protologues are evaluated.

This new provision may be viewed as self-understood, but I feel there is some uncertainty in those cases when a typifying author cites a name of a new taxon from a publication other than the actual place of valid publication. Such lecto- or neotypifications are nevertheless effective provided that the lectotype is selected from the original

material of the name or, in the case of a neotype, no original material is extant or it is missing, but they will still be subject to revision under Art. 9.19 and 10.5.

The first of the new Examples illustrates a case when a type was designated from a later context of the same name. The text in square brackets is added in the hope that the relevant proposal (Sennikov in Taxon 63: 1139–1140. 2014) will be accepted by the Congress. The second Example, in which the actual protologue was discovered subsequent to the lectotypification, is treated in detail elsewhere (Sennikov & Seregin in Phytotaxa 161: 97–100. 2014).

### (098) Add a new Example under Art. 7.10:

“Ex. 13bis. Pfeiffer (Nomencl. Bot. 1: [Praefatio, p. 2]. 1873) explained that he cited species names when he intended to indicate type species for names of genera and sections. This explanation stands as clear indication of the type status for every type designation in this book, even though this indication was not provided for each type designation separately.”

Pfeiffer mentioned in the Preface to his *Nomenclator* (see <http://biodiversitylibrary.org/page/11291737>) that he indicated type species of genera and subdivisions of genera cited as originally described or in their revised circumscriptions. He stated in the original Latin: “Species plantarum in libro meo omnino negliguntur, excepta indicatione illarum, quae typum generis novi aut novo modo circumscripti vel sectionis offerunt.” In my English translation: “Plant species are completely omitted in my book, except for those that provide types for new or newly circumscribed genera and sections.”

Pfeiffer’s *Nomenclator* has been widely used as a valuable index to names of families, subdivisions of families, genera, and subdivisions of genera, all of which are provided there with full and direct references to their protologues and major revisionary treatments. But the second major importance of this book is its being “the first reference book to indicate type species in the sense of the International Code of Nomenclature in a more or less systematic way” (Stafleu & Cowan in Regnum Veg. 110: 224. 1983). Pfeiffer provided many effective designations of generic types, which have priority but are frequently overlooked because of the little attention paid to typifications in the past. Besides, the explanatory note on the mentions of the species in the *Nomenclator* is rather cryptic because a single sentence in the Preface stands for the status of all the type designations in the whole book, in which the term “type” or its equivalent (Art. 7.10) is not added separately next to each mention of the type species (and, unfortunately, the Preface is not included in every bound copy of the book; Stafleu & Cowan, l.c.).

---

Including this Example directly into the *Code* will hopefully bring attention to Pfeiffer's typifications and reduce the number of superfluous type designations in the future.

**Acknowledgement**

I am grateful to Nicholas Turland (Berlin) for commenting upon critical issues and for editing the text.

---