(193) Proposal to add a new Example to illustrate Article 7.10 and Article 9.23
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Article 9.23 of the Melbourne Code (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012) requires that “On or after 1 January 2001, lectotypification or neotypification of a name of a species or infraspecific taxon is not effected unless indicated by use of the term “lectotypus” or “neotypus”, its abbreviation, or its equivalent in a modern language …” and Art. 7.10 requires that “… designation of a type is achieved only
…, on or after 1 January 2001, if the typification statement includes the phrase “designated here” (hic designatus) or an equivalent.” However, in many monographic and taxonomic works published on or after 1 January 2001 the requirements of Art. 7.10 and 9.23 were not met, and this may yet happen in the future. I am therefore proposing to include a new Example under Art. 9.23 to help taxonomic workers better understand the requirements of the above-mentioned two Articles for publication of effective lectotypifications or neotypifications on or after 1 January 2001.

(193) Add one of the following paragraphs as a new Example under Art. 9.23:

“Ex. n. Bentham (Labiat. Gen. Spec.: 744. 1835) described Leucas longifolia Benth. based on material collected by Jacquemont from near “Pounah” and mentioning specimen(s) from Paris, but without designating a type. The original material comprises three specimens of Jacquemont 343, two at P and one at K, hence a lectotype may be designated under Art. 9.11. When V. Singh (in J. Econ. Taxon. Bot., Addit. Ser., 20: 110. 2001) wrote “Holotype: India, Poona, Jacquemont 343 (P)”, this citation of “holotype” cannot be corrected to a (first-step, see Art. 9.17) designation of lectotype under Art. 9.9 because the phrase “designated here” or an equivalent (Art. 7.10) was not used. R.K. Singh (in Telopea 18: 410. 2015) designated the lectotype with the statement “Lectotype (here designated): India, Maharashtra state, Poonah [Pune], without date, V. Jacquemont 343 (P351887!); isolectotypes: K929516! and P351886!”.

“Ex. n. Hooker (Fl. Brit. India 5: 159. 1886) described Litsea membranifolia Hook. f. based on material from “Upper Assam; Mishmi Hills, and woods at Yen”, mentioning specimen(s) collected by Griffith and distributed by Kew (“Kew Distrib. 4310”), but without designating a type. Three relevant specimens collected by Griffith are extant, two at K and one at GH, hence a lectotype may be designated under Art. 9.11. When Ngermsaengsaruay & al. (in Thai Forest Bull., Bot. 39: 72. 2011) wrote “Type: India, East Bengal, Griffith 4310 (holotype K!)”, this citation of “holotype” cannot be corrected to a (first-step, see Art. 9.17) designation of lectotype under Art. 9.9 because the phrase “designated here” or an equivalent (Art. 7.10) was not used. Singh & al. (in Bangladesh J. Pl. Taxon. 22: 78. 2015) later designated the lectotype with the statement “Type: India. Arunachal Pradesh, Dibang Valley, Mishmi Hills, s.d., W. Griffith s.n. [Kew Distrib. 4310] (lectotype K-000357530!, here designated; isolectotypes K-000793176!, GH-00415039!).”
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