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(91-92) Two proposals to amend Art. 8.3

At the Berlin Congress Art. 8 Prop. C (to introduce the requirement that the term 'type' or an equivalent be used) was treated as alternative to Art. 8 Prop. P (my proposal to have a formal acceptance of the "residue method"). Through this procedure, acceptance of Prop. C automatically implied rejection of Prop. P. There was no consideration of the possibility that either use of the term "type" or use of the "residue method" could constitute lectotypification.

Prop. P was referred to the new Subcommittee on Lectotypification. Within this Subcommittee it was not discussed. I would prefer to have the "residue method" accepted prior to 1958, an end-date chosen in view of Art. 37.

A "residue lectotype" is the one specimen or other element from the original material retained in a taxon by an author who treated in a single publication all original elements of a taxon and specifically excluded from the taxon each of the other original elements. This definition does not cover everything that has been treated by some people as lectotypes (see Zijlstra, Taxon 35: 858-860. 1986). The method is not always as time-consuming as suggested by its opponents. Moreover, an author who wants to lectotypify a name must find out anyway which elements have been excluded already.

Many "residue lectotypes" have been firmly established. The case of *Stapelia* is a famous one, figuring in almost all earlier discussions on this topic. The editors of the Berlin Code used it, in Art. 8 Ex. 3, to illustrate that Haworth's "residue lectotype" cannot be accepted. Apparently they were not aware of the fact that *Orbea* is in use. Now conservation of *Stapelia* is necessary (for details see Jarvis, 1992). A number of proposals, in Jarvis's report, to conserve a generic name with a conserved type would not have been necessary if the "residue lectotype" method had been accepted: *Achyranthes, Angelica, Apium, Cerbera* and *Picris*.

Another report (Brummitt, Taxon 38: 302. 1989) shows how firmly the residue method is set. For the proposal to reject *Utricularia caerulea*, the Committee for Spermatophyta did not consider Burman to have lectotypified that name, but they accepted Smith's choice, without realizing that the latter is a "residue" lectotype!

(91) Add a second sentence to Art. 8.3:

"As an exception to this rule, if an author before 1 Jan. 1958 in a single publication explicitly retained only one of the original elements of a taxon, and specifically excluded all the other original elements, his or her action constitutes lectotypification, even if he or she did not use the term (lecto)type."

If this proposal is accepted, Art. 8 Ex. 3 is to be reworded: "When originally described, *Stapelia* included two species, *S. variegata* and *S. hirsuta*. Haworth (Syn. Pl. Succ. 19, 40. 1812) transferred the former to his new genus *Orbea*, retaining the latter in *Stapelia*. His action constitutes lectotypification under Art. 8.3."

(92) Amend the first sentence of Art. 8.3, as follows:

After "type" add "(lecto- or neotype)" and before "equivalent" add "linguistic".

If this proposal is accepted, Art. 8 Ex. 2 should be reworded: replace "as equivalent to 'type'" by "as a linguistic equivalent of lectotype".
In their comments to Art. 8 Prop. C, the Berlin Rapporteurs suggested the proposers' intention might be "linguistic equivalent". In the discussion at Berlin, a much wider interpretation was mentioned: an expression such as "This name is based on ...". This interpretation was not decided upon, and I would reject it for cases in which not all original elements, except one, are excluded. To avoid the different interpretations that might evolve, the restriction "linguistic" is proposed.

The need for this restriction is even more obvious if one considers a case in which an author states that a previously published genus is "monotypic" and mentions the name of the only species, with one or several species names in synonymy. If the correct species name and a synonym both are names of originally included species, in my opinion this presentation does not imply an explicit choice for the correct name to provide the type. Maybe the author simply followed somebody who already before united these species. Those who think a name included as a synonym should not provide the type could misuse the term "monotypic" to argue that there is a type indication. This view was rejected by the Rapporteurs' comment (Taxon 36: 200. 1987).
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