polyploid species to which it is ancestral and in which its genomic material is carried and from which the holotype illustration is derived."

This Article will avert any confusion as to the identity of the taxon of genomically preserved plants in cases where the taxon may have contributed a genome to more than one hybrid species.

Proposed by: Charles R. Werth, Department of Biological Sciences, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409, U.S.A.; and David B. Lellinger, Department of Botany MRC-166, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

(150-156) Seven proposals to amend Art. 7 of the Code

The Code does not explicitly indicate the elements that are to be regarded as the original material associated with a name. The footnote to Art. 7.4 of the Berlin Code (Greuter & al., 1988) implies that only specimens and illustrations examined by an author of a name prior to the publication of the name and associated by the author with the concept of the named taxon are original material. Below is a summary of the more important contradictions that exist between this concept of original material and other provisions of the Code.

Art. 7.16 states: "A name validly published by reference to a previously and effectively published description or diagnosis (Art. 32.3) is to be typified by an element selected from the context of the validating description or diagnosis, ...". This conflicts with the concept of original material above since the material may not have been seen by the author of the name. Nevertheless it is current practice to refer to such types as lectotypes and not as neotypes.

An author may also validate a name using a previously unpublished description written by another, or with a description based on a previously unpublished description provided by another, without having examined the material on which that description was based. Although the Code does not clearly indicate the basis for typification of such names, it is customary to typify them (e.g. Poa cilianensis Allioni; see Perry & McNeill, 1986) by an element on which the validating description was based.

The Code does not state that the holotype (Art. 7.3), or the isotype(s) (Art. 7.6), or the syntype(s) (Art. 7.7) must be elements seen by either the author of the name or the author of the validating description. Further, despite the fact that an isotype or a syntype need not be part of the original material and the unequivocal instruction in Art. 7.5 that a lectotype must be selected from the original material, Art. 7.4 states that "An isotype, if such exists, must be chosen as the lectotype. If no isotype exists, the lectotype must be chosen from among the syntypes, if such exist." This means that, under certain circumstances, the Code dictates that an element that is not part of the original material must be designated as the lectotype of the name.
These proposals aim to remove these contradictions and to clarify which material is eligible to be designated as the type of a name when the validating author is not the author of the validating description.

(150) Reword the first sentence of Art. 7.3, as follows:

“7.3. A holotype is the one element (specimen or illustration) designated by the author of a name, at the time of its valid publication, as the nomenclatural type; or if no nomenclatural type were designated at the time of valid publication of a name, it is (a) the one element cited by the author of the validating description of the name or (b) if no element were cited by the author of the validating description, the one element upon which the validating description of the name was based.”

(151) Change Art. 7 Note 1, to read:

“Note 1. Any designation made by the author of a name, if definitely expressed at the time of the valid publication of the name, is final (but see Art. 7.4). If the author of a name did not designate a nomenclatural type, but the author of the validating description cited only one element, then that element must be accepted as the holotype (see Arts. 7.14-7.16 and Art. 37.3-37.4).”

(152) Amend Art. 7.4 by replacing the words “by the author of a name” with “at the time of valid publication of a name”.

(153) Replace the footnote to Art. 7.4 concerning original material with the following:

“1 For the purpose of this Code, “original material” comprises (a) those specimens and illustrations upon which it can be shown that the description validating the name was based; (b) those specimens and illustrations which, even though not seen by the author of the description validating the name, were indicated as type(s) (holotype or syntypes or paratypes) of the name at its valid publication; and (c) the duplicates of the holotype or, when no holotype was indicated, the duplicates of the syntypes of the name irrespective of whether such specimens were seen by either the author of the validating description or the author of the name.”

The above definition would resolve the contradiction between Art. 7.4 and 7.5 referred to earlier by explicitly indicating that the isotypes and syntypes of a name are original material even if they were not seen by either the validating author or the author of the validating description. It would also establish that the material associated with the validating description of a name is always original material of the name. Thus, it would be correct to refer to the element selected from the context of the validating description as lectotype, even if it were not seen by the validating author, as when an author validates a name by using a description written by another, whether previously published or not, or by a description based on one provided by another.

(154) Amend Art. 7.5 by inserting the word “validating” before the word “author” in the fourth line.

(155) Amend Art. 7.7, to read:

“7.7. A syntype is any one of two or more specimens simultaneously designated, by the validating author, as the types of a name at the time of its valid publication, or, if no
type (holotype or syntypes) were designated at the time of valid publication of a name, any one of two or more specimens cited by the author of the validating description of the name.

This would make it clear that when the author of a name is not the author of the validating description and no type (holotype or syntypes) were designated at the time of its valid publication it is the specimens cited by the author of the validating description, and not the specimens cited by the validating author, that are the syntypes of the name.

(156) Amend Art. 7.8 by replacing the words “in the protologue” with “by the author of the validating description”.

This would make it clear that when the author of a name is not the author of the validating description it is the specimens and illustrations cited by the author of the validating description that are the paratypes of the name.
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(157-158) Two proposals to amend Article 8 of the Code

The following proposals are formulated to meet two goals. The first is to retain the provisions of Art. 8.3 (Greuter & al., 1988) as applied to generic names. The second is to permit the continued use of the term “type” in the general sense of original material for species and infraspecific names, as commonly practised for the past 40 years. Supporting arguments are presented in a companion paper (Barrie & al., 1992: 508-512).