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In the Glossary of the Melbourne Code (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012), the definition of “original material” is incomplete because it does not allow for the fact that if the original material comprises the single specimen or illustration that was used by the author, or was designated by the author as the nomenclatural type, then it is the holotype, not an element that may be designated as the lectotype. To remedy this, we propose the following change to the Glossary:

(042) Add to the definition of “original material” in the Glossary (new text in bold italics):

“original material. The set of specimens and illustrations from which a lectotype may be chosen (see Art. 9.3, 9.12 and Notes 2–4 for details; but see Art. 9.10), or the holotype (see Art. 9.1).”

This discrepancy in the Code was brought to our attention by the typification of Acrostichum crinitum L. In the protologue, Linnaeus (Sp. Pl.: 1068. 1753) cited only the illustration by Petiver (Pter. Amer.: t. 13, f. 14. 1712). Proctor (in Howard, Fl. Lesser Antilles 2: 216. 1977) indicated Petiver’s illustration as a “type”, noting it was copied from Plumier (Traité Foug. Amér.: t. 125. 1705) even though Linnaeus did not cite Plumier’s publication as he often did for other species. Jarvis (Order out of Chaos: 259. 2007) noted that no specimen of A. crinitum exists at LINN and interpreted Proctor’s citation of the Petiver plate as “type” as a lectotypification. Petiver’s illustration, however, is not a lectotype; it is a holotype because it was the only element used (Art. 9.1). Thus in this case, the original material consists of a single illustration that is the holotype, not part of a set of specimens and illustrations from which a lectotype may be chosen, as currently stated in the definition of “original material” in the Glossary of the Code.

This situation with regard to a single element of original material might be emphasized in the Code. Original material may consist of an element or “elements”; that is, a single specimen or illustration, or more than one specimen and/or illustration. Because the term “element” is not defined in any Article of the Code, we propose adding a parenthetical explanation in Art. 9 Note 1 about what comprises an “element”:

(043) Add to Art. 9 Note 1 (new text in bold):

“Note 1. Any designation made by the original author, if definitely expressed at the time of the original publication of the name of the taxon, is final (but see Art. 9.11 and 9.15). If the author used only one element (i.e. specimen or illustration), it must be accepted as the holotype. If a name of a new taxon is validly published solely by reference to a previously published description or diagnosis, the same considerations apply to material used by the author of that description or diagnosis (see Art. 7.7; but see Art. 7.8).”