

## PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CODE

Edited by John McNeill &amp; Nicholas J. Turland

**(078–079) A proposal on the protologue, plus a miscellaneous proposal**

Paul van Rijkevorsel

*Dipteryx, Postbus 4047, 3502 HA Utrecht, The Netherlands; dipteryx@freeler.nl*

It is becoming ever more common for journals to have electronic-only supplements to articles (*Taxon* being an example). To some publishers it may be attractive to adopt a minimalistic approach to publishing new taxa, and to limit the part printed on paper to the bare minimum (say, botanical name, diagnosis, type, location of type) while consigning as much dry detail as possible to the electronic-only part of the article. This raises the question if the material in the electronic-only part of an article (or book) is part of the protologue. It is quite possible that a botanist consulting a journal only sees the printed part, without being aware of, or able to access, the electronic-only part. This could potentially create problems if the electronic-only part were to contain (potentially) nomenclaturally relevant material. It appears safest to rule explicitly on this.

**(078) In the footnote defining protologue (see Rec. 8A.4) include “(as far as effectively published)” after “everything”, so that it reads:**

“Protologue (from Greek πρῶτος, *protos*, first; λόγος, *logos*, discourse): everything (as far as effectively published) associated with a name at its valid publication, i.e., description or diagnosis,

illustrations, references, synonymy, geographical data, citation of specimens, discussion, and comments.”

Also, adjust the Glossary accordingly.

**(079) If proposal 026 is accepted, add an Example to the new Recommendation:**

“*Ex. n.* In the last decades of the 20th Century, an economically significant South American species was indicated by the designations “*Syzygiopsis pachycarpa*” (e.g., by Kukachka in Res. Pap. F.P.L., U.S. Forest Serv. 425. 1982), “*Planchonella pachycarpa*” (e.g., by Teixeira & al. in I.T.T.O. Techn. Ser. 1: 35. 1988), and finally (following the taxonomy by Pennington in Fl. Neotrop. Monogr. 52. 1990) “*Pouteria pachycarpa*”. This final designation was widely used and was even included in a ruling (NY H88385) by the United States International Trade Commission. Such a delay in the valid publication of a name is undesirable, with a high risk of confusion (in this case confusion occurring with *Chrysophyllum lucentifolium* subsp. *pachycarpum* Pires & T.D. Penn. (1990)).”

It appears good to add an example of a name that appears to be not validly published (so far at least), and that nevertheless is commonly used by non-botanists.

**(080–082) Proposals to amend the Code regarding the procedure of lectotype designation**

Jarosław Proćków

*Department of Biodiversity & Plant Cover Protection, Institute of Plant Biology, Wrocław University, ul. Kanonia 6/8, 50-328 Wrocław, Poland; jprockow@biol.uni.wroc.pl*

Article 9.10 of the ICBN (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006) states: “In lectotype designation, an isotype must be chosen if such exists, or otherwise a syntype if such exists. If no isotype, syntype or isosyntype (duplicate of syntype) is extant, the lectotype must be chosen from among the paratypes if such exist. If no cited specimens exist, the lectotype must be chosen from among the uncited specimens and cited and uncited illustrations which comprise the remaining original material, if such exist.”

However, if the specimens cited in the protologue are in conflict with the description they should not have priority in typification before uncited specimens that are not in any conflict, just because as cited specimens they are part of the protologue and thus they cannot be in conflict with it (see Art. 9.17 dealing with supersession of typification). Also, in cases in which the cited specimens are very incomplete with the parts containing the diagnostic features lacking or damaged and uncited original material in good condition still

exists, then the latter should have priority over any cited specimens so long as such choice is clearly explained in the publication. At present in similar situations there is the possibility to designate an epitype (Art. 9.7); however the selection of any uncited but original material seems to be better choice for typification because such specimen(s) was/were available to the author of the name, and, on the contrary, the epitype (expected to be designated later by someone else) was usually not. Nevertheless in this situation material indicated in the protologue by locality information which can be linked to particular specimens (i.e., not merely the limits of distribution for which no specimens are indicated) should have priority over other original material with which it can be shown that the author of the name was familiar. As the two situations described are quite different, and as giving precedence to material with locality information is a separate issue, I therefore present them as separate proposals to amend the *Vienna Code* that can be merged editorially if two or more are successful:

**(080) Add the following sentence after the second sentence of Art. 9.10:**

“However, if it is established in the typifying publication (or in a prior publication), that all the cited specimens are in conflict with the description, and there is other original material that is not in conflict, then preference in choice of lectotype must be given to this uncited material.”

**(081) Add the following sentence after the second sentence of Art. 9.10:**

“However, if it is established in the typifying publication (or in a prior publication), that all the cited specimens lack important diagnostic features, and there is other original material that does not lack such features, then preference in choice of lectotype must be given to this uncited material.”

**(082) If either or both Props. 080 and 081 are accepted, add the following qualification after ‘uncited material’ at the end of the proposed new sentence(s) of Art. 9.10:**

“, with the proviso that, within this category, specimens indicated in the protologue by locality information have precedence over other original material.”

**Acknowledgements**

Special thanks go to the Nomenclature Editor, Prof. John McNeill for his valuable remarks which caused refining of my early proposal. In the case that the proposals are accepted by the Nomenclature Section of the next Congress, the Editorial Committee is thanked for combining them together.

**(083) Proposal to include the terms “isolectotype”, “isoneotype”, and “isoepitype” in the Code**

**Jefferson Prado,<sup>1</sup> Kanchi N. Gandhi,<sup>2</sup> Michael Sundue<sup>3</sup> & Robbin C. Moran<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Instituto de Botânica, C.P. 3005, 01061-970 São Paulo, SP, Brazil

<sup>2</sup> Harvard University Herbaria, 22 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138-2094, U.S.A.

<sup>3</sup> The New York Botanical Garden, Bronx, 200th St. and Southern Blvd., New York 10456-5126, U.S.A.

Author for correspondence: Jefferson Prado, [jprado.01@uol.com.br](mailto:jprado.01@uol.com.br)

A proposal was made from the floor in the Vienna Congress to include the terms isolectotype, isoneotype, and isoepitype. The proposal was referred to the Editorial Committee (see Taxon 55: 1063. 2005); however, the Committee did not include the three terms in the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146. 2006).

From Arts. 9.3 and 9.10 and the Glossary (p. 487), one might infer that duplicates of lecto-, neo-, and epitypes would be termed, respectively, as isolecto-, isoneo-, and isoepitypes. Nevertheless, some botanists, indexers, and journal editors have been reluctant to use the three terms because the terms are not mentioned in *Code*. These botanists substitute the terms “isotype” or “duplicate (type)” to refer to isolecto-, isoneo-, and isoepitype. Since the term “isotype” has been defined as a duplicate of a holotype (Art. 9.3; Glossary p. 487), its usage is incorrect for referring to non-holotype duplicates. Likewise, the term “duplicate (type)” is vague because may refer to any of the six categories (duplicates of holo-, lecto-, neo-, epi-, syn-, and paratype).

In contrast, at least two major indices (viz., International Plant Name Index and TROPICOS) and papers in several journals (e.g.,

Novon 14: 124. 2004; Amer. Fern J. 97: 144. 2007; Taxon 57: 972. 2008; Harvard Pap. Bot. 13: 225. 2008) embrace the terms isolectotype, isoneotype, and isoepitypes. These three terms are analogous to those defined in the *Code* to designate duplicates of a holotype (i.e., isotype) and of a syntype (i.e., isosyntype). For universal application of these three terms, we propose that they be added in a note to Art. 9.10 and to the Glossary of the *Code*.

**(083) Insert a new Note following Art. 9.10 and add the terms defined therein to the Glossary:**

*Note 5:* Isolectotypes, isoneotypes, and isoepitypes are duplicate specimens of a lectotype, neotype and epitype, respectively.

Glossary (App. VII) entries:

**isolectotype.** A duplicate specimen of the lectotype (Art. 9.10, Note 5).

**isoneotype.** A duplicate specimen of the neotype (Art. 9.10, Note 5).

**isoepitype.** A duplicate specimen of the epitype (Art. 9.10, Note 5).