(311–312) Proposals to upgrade Recommendation 9C.1 to a new provision of Article 9, and to amend Article 9.12
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Recently, three proposals were published to amend Art. 9 of the Melbourne Code (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154, 2012) that would use the terms isoneotype, isoepitype, and isolectotype (respectively: Prop. 045 – Ferrer-Gallego & al. in Taxon 64: 650. 2015; Prop. 205 – Proćków & Proćków in Taxon 65: 413. 2016; Prop. 259 – Proćków & Proćków in Taxon 65: 650. 2016). If these proposals...
are accepted in Shenzhen, it would be rather strange for Rec. 9C.1 to recommend use of these terms when at the same time they are applied to elements that have particular significance under the rules in Art. 9 (cf. the Preface of the Melbourne Code: p. xv). In our opinion these terms should be defined in a new provision in Art. 9. This would allow general usage of terminology related to duplicates of type specimens in subsequent provisions of that Article, also avoiding the need to define such terms when they are used, as is currently done for a fourth term, isosyntype, in Art. 9.12. It would be logical to define “isosyntype” also in the new provision rather than retain the existing parenthetical definition in Art. 9.12, especially since the word “isosyntypes” also appears in Art. 9.3 without definition.

Moreover, in Art. 9.12, it is implicit that syntypes and isosyntypes have equal precedence in lectotype designation, although the wording is somewhat unclear. There was a proposal to the Melbourne Congress of 2011 (Art. 9 Prop Z = Prop. 021 – Niederle in Taxon 58: 660. 2009) to amend what is now Art. 9.12 to place syntypes ahead of isosyntypes in the precedence of lectotype designation, but this proposal was defeated in the preliminary mail vote with 79% “no” votes (McNeill & al. in Taxon 60: 1512. 2011). This suggests that the rule had generally not been interpreted in the sense that Niederle wanted to make explicit. We prefer that syntypes and isosyntypes have equal precedence and therefore propose an additional small change to the wording of Art. 9.12 to make this clear.

(311) Upgrade Rec. 9C.1 to an Article in Art. 9, to be placed where the Editorial Committee finds suitable, and reword it as follows (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough):

“9.n. Duplicate specimens of a syntype, lectotype, neotype, and epitype should be referred to as are isosyntypes, isolectotypes, isoneotypes, and isoepitypes, respectively.”

(312) Amend Art. 9.12 as follows (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough):

“9.12. In lectotype designation, an isotype must be chosen if such exists, or otherwise a syntype or isosyntype if such exists. If no isotype, syntype or isosyntype (duplicate of syntype) is extant, the lectotype must be chosen from among the syntypes, if such exist. If no cited specimens exist, the lectotype must be chosen from among the uncited specimens and cited and uncited illustrations that comprise the remaining original material, if such exist.”
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