

(030) To make a clearer definition of “gathering”

Xiang-Yun Zhu

State Key Laboratory of Systematic and Evolutionary Botany, The Chinese Academy of Sciences, 20 Nanxincun, Xiangshan, Beijing 100093, China; xiangyunzhu@ibcas.ac.cn

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/635.25>

During the course of his research on legume taxonomy, the present author encountered a publication (Zhu & al. in *J. Wuhan Bot. Res.* 26: 361. 2008) in which the holotype of the name of a new variety, *Glycine soja* var. *cleistogama* C.S. Zhu & S.X. Zhu, was designated as two collection numbers, *C. S. Zhu 060256* and *C. S. Zhu 060257*. Based on the present definition of “gathering” in the Glossary of the *Melbourne Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 154: 156. 2012), two

results could be reached. One is that the two collection numbers belong to one gathering and the name of this variety was validly published. The other is that the name of the variety was not validly published because two gatherings were designated as the type and therefore the type was not indicated as required by Art. 40.1 and as permitted by Art. 40.2. It could be misunderstood that a specimen with two collection numbers must automatically represent two gatherings, but this is not

necessarily so according to the present definition of a gathering. For a clearer understanding of what constitutes a gathering, the present author suggests a small addition to the present Glossary definition.

(030) Amend the Glossary entry for “gathering” as follows (addition shown in boldface):

“*gathering*. [Not defined]—used for a collection of one or more specimens made by the same collector(s) at the one place and time

irrespective of whether it bears one or more collection numbers (Art. 8.2 and 8.3 footnote).”

Acknowledgement

This work is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 31270240 and 30970179).