

(205) Proposal to require precedence of isoepitypes in designating a replacement epitype

Jarosław Proćków¹ & Małgorzata Proćków²

1 *Department of Plant Biology, Institute of Biology, Wrocław University of Environmental and Life Sciences, ul. Kozuchowska 5b, 51-631 Wrocław, Poland*

2 *Museum of Natural History, University of Wrocław, ul. Sienkiewicza 21, 50-335 Wrocław, Poland*

Author for correspondence: *Jarosław Proćków, jaroslaw.prockow@up.wroc.pl*

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/652.43>

According to the *Melbourne Code* (ICN, McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012), the author who first designates an epitype must be followed, and a different epitype may be designated only if the original epitype is lost or destroyed (Art. 9.20). However, there is no rule in the *Code* on how to designate the replacement epitype in such a case. It means that anyone can select any specimen for this purpose. If we accept that the first epitype selected is the most important (i.e. “the author who first designates an epitype must be followed”), it follows that isoepitypes, if such exist, should be given precedence in designating a replacement epitype. A similar situation is required in the procedure of lectotype designation, in which “an isotype must be chosen if such exists, or otherwise a syntype if such exists”, or otherwise the lectotype must be chosen “from among the paratypes if such exist” (see Art. 9.12).

We therefore make the following proposal to establish the precedence of any isoepitypes in replacement epitypification:

(205) Amend Art. 9.20 as follows (new text in bold):

“9.20. The author who first designates (Art. 7.9 and 7.10) an epitype must be followed; a different epitype may be designated only if the original epitype is lost or destroyed, **in which case the replacement epitype must be designated from among the isoepitypes, if such exist.** A lectotype or neotype supported by an epitype may be superseded in accordance with Art. 9.19, or in the case of a neotype with Art. 9.18. If it can be shown that an epitype and the type it supports differ taxonomically and that neither Art. 9.18 nor 9.19 applies, the name may be proposed for conservation with a conserved type (Art. 14.9; see also Art. 57).”

Acknowledgement

Special thanks go to Nicholas Turland (B) for valuable remarks in the refining of our manuscript.