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(162) An amendment to a proposal on type material collected at different times

(162) Amend Prop. (159) of Molloy & al. (in this issue) by deleting the phrase:

"... or are stated in the protologue to have been collected from the same individual plant at different times”.

If this amendment is carried, a new sentence is to be added at the end of the suggested Hymenocallis incaica Ravenna example: “Since these materials were preserved at different dates they are considered to be different specimens, and the name was not validly published!”

I support Prop. (159) of Molloy & al., which removes an area of uncertainty from the Code concerning type specimens. However, I cannot accept the definition that the type specimen can comprise pieces preserved at different dates from the same living plant. While admittedly such a practice might permit more complete type specimens to be prepared, it also increases the risk of confusion, since living organisms can change with time, and their labels are more easily lost or switched than herbarium labels. There is less uncertainty if the type specimen is restricted to a gathering preserved at a single point in time. Material preserved at different times from the original plant may, of course, be cited or cross-referenced in the original or subsequent publications, even on the label of the holotype, but should not be considered as part of the holotype itself.