

(195–197) Proposals with regard to gatherings from cultivated material

Josef Niederle

Kotlářská 2, Brno, Czech Republic; niederle@mail.muni.cz

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/652.37>

Many names of geophytes and succulents are based on cultivated material that was originally collected from the wild. If the original wild collection was made by the same collector(s) at one place and at one time, it qualifies as a single gathering, as implicitly defined in Art. 8.2 and 8.3 footnote of the *Melbourne Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 154. 2012). If the material is preserved permanently, e.g., as one or more herbarium specimens, one of these specimens can be designated as the holotype. If the original wild gathering is instead kept alive and cultivated, either as an individual or as propagated stock, the holotype may not be a living organism (Art. 8.4), but it can be a specimen preserved permanently from a subsequent gathering made from the cultivated material. Such a specimen is not a part of the original wild gathering. So far, this complies with the *Code*. However, it is not an uncommon practice for multiple gatherings to be made from the cultivated material on different dates and put together to create what may seem like a more complete and useful specimen, e.g., one comprising both flowering and fruiting material. However, such a “specimen” cannot be a specimen as defined in the *Code* (Art. 8.2) because it is not “a gathering, or part of a gathering, of a single species or infraspecific taxon made at one time”. Instead, it is more than one specimen. Because it is not a single specimen, it cannot be a holotype, which (when not an illustration) must be a single specimen (Art. 8.1). Moreover, a name published on or after 1 January 1958 is not validly published unless the type is indicated (Art. 40.1). The type may be indicated “by reference to an entire gathering, or a part thereof, even if it consists of two or more specimens” (Art. 40.2), but not by reference to more than one gathering. Therefore, under the current rules, a post-1957 name with a “holotype” that comprises more than one gathering is not validly published. Indeed, to illustrate this, Art. 8 Ex. 1 claims the following:

“*Ex. 1. “Echinocereus sanpedroensis”* (Raudonat & Rischer in *Echinocereenfreund* 8(4): 91–92. 1995) was based on a “holotype” consisting of a complete plant with roots, a detached branch, an entire flower, a flower cut in halves, and two fruits that, according to the label, were taken from the same cultivated individual at different times and preserved, in alcohol, in a single jar. This material belongs to more than one gathering and cannot be accepted as a type. Raudonat & Rischer’s name is not validly published under Art. 40.2.”

Validating such names is certainly a field of activity for individuals who desire to attach their names to the work done previously by others. With access to the JSTOR Global Plants database (<http://plants.jstor.org/>), this can be easily accomplished without any botanical education. In my opinion, such activities are not desirable. Therefore, the following new wording of Art. 40.2, a new Note under Art. 8.2, and an amendment to Art. 8 Ex. 1 are proposed. With these changes, names such as *Echinocereus sanpedroensis* become validly published and the “holotype” becomes syntypes from among which a lectotype may be chosen.

(195) Replace Art. 40.2 with the following:

(195) Replace Art. 40.2 with the following:

“40.2. For the name of a new species or infraspecific taxon, indication of the type as required by Art. 40.1 can be achieved by reference to:

- (a) the holotype (see also Art. 40.7);
- (b) syntypes belonging to one gathering made by the same collector(s) at the same place on the same day (see also Art. 40.7); or
- (c) syntypes belonging to gatherings made by the same collector(s) at the same place from one cultivated individual, or from one cultivated stock that was derived from a single wild gathering, the latter made by the same collector(s) at the same place on the same day (see also Art. 40.7).

Syntypes in (b) and (c) can be referred to simply by indication of the entire gathering, or a part thereof, even if it consists of two or more specimens as defined in Art. 8. Referring to the syntypes described in (c) as the original wild gathering is a correctable error.”

(196) Add a new Note after Art. 8.2:

“*Note 1.* Herbarium specimens prepared from cultivated stock derived from a wild gathering are not parts of that wild gathering.”

(197) Amend Art. 8 Ex. 1 as follows (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough):

“*Ex. 1. “Echinocereus sanpedroensis”* (Raudonat & Rischer in *Echinocereenfreund* 8(4): 91–92. 1995) was based on a “holotype” consisting of a complete plant with roots, a detached branch, an entire flower, a flower cut in halves, and two fruits that, according to the label, were taken from the same cultivated individual at different times and preserved, in alcohol, in a single jar. This material belongs to more than one gathering **made by the same collector(s) at the same place from one cultivated individual, and cannot**~~can therefore~~ be accepted as a type. Raudonat & Rischer’s name is ~~not~~ validly published under Art. 40.2.”