

(260) Proposal to clarify and enhance Article 9.14 of the *Code* with respect to the exigencies of subsequent typifications

Jarosław Proćków¹ & Małgorzata Proćków²

¹ Department of Plant Biology, Institute of Biology, Wrocław University of Environmental and Life Sciences, ul. Kozuchowska 5b, 51-631 Wrocław, Poland

² Museum of Natural History, University of Wrocław, ul. Sienkiewicza 21, 50-335 Wrocław, Poland

Author for correspondence: Jarosław Proćków, jaroslaw.prockow@up.wroc.pl

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/653.31>

Article 9.11 of the *Melbourne Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 154, 2012) rules: “[...] when the material designated as type is found to belong to more than one taxon, a lectotype [...] as a substitute for it may be designated.”

In addition, Art. 9.14 rules: “When a type (herbarium sheet or equivalent preparation) contains parts belonging to more than one taxon (see Art. 9.11), the name must remain attached to the part (specimen as defined in Art. 8.2) that corresponds most nearly with the original description or diagnosis.”

Finally, Art. 9.19 rules: “The author who first designates [...] a lectotype or a neotype in conformity with Art. 9.11–9.13 must be followed, but that choice is superseded if [...] (c) it is contrary to Art. 9.14.”

In a case where a holotype, lectotype, or neotype (that is not an illustration) contains parts belonging to more than one taxon, attaching the name to the appropriate specimen, as required by Art. 9.14, is achieved by lectotypification (in the case of a holotype) or by subsequent lectotypification or neotypification in the case of a lectotype or neotype, respectively. However, there is no such wording in Art. 9.14. There is a somewhat analogous situation in Art. 9.17, where the procedure that may be followed is clearly stated: “A designation of a lectotype or neotype that later is found to refer to a single gathering but to more than one specimen [...] may be further narrowed to a

single one of these specimens by way of a subsequent lectotypification or neotypification.”

The case of Art. 9.14 is even more important than that of Art. 9.17 because a type specimen must not contain parts belonging to more than one taxon. In such a case the subsequent typification is crucial to maintain nomenclatural stability. Therefore, in order to clarify and enhance Art. 9.14, we propose to supplement it with the following wording:

(260) Amend Art. 9.14 as follows (new text in bold):

“9.14. When a type (herbarium sheet or equivalent preparation) contains parts belonging to more than one taxon (see Art. 9.11), the name must remain attached to the part (specimen as defined in Art. 8.2) that corresponds most nearly with the original description or diagnosis. **This is achieved by designation of a lectotype when a holotype is taxonomically heterogeneous; or by a subsequent designation of lectotype or neotype, respectively, when a lectotype or neotype is superseded under Art. 9.19(c).**”

Acknowledgement

We gratefully acknowledge Nicholas Turland (B) for suggesting improvements to the text.