TAXON 65 (2) • April 2016: 410–411

(199–201) Proposals to add the term lectoparatype to the *Code*

Danish Husain, Pushpendra Katiyar, Priyanka Agnihotri & Tariq Husain

Plant Diversity, Systematics and Herbarium Division, National Botanical Research Institute, Rana Pratap Marg, Lucknow 226001, India
Author for correspondence: *Danish Husain, husainmohddanish@gmail.com*

DOI http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/652.39

A proposal was made by Linczevski & Gubanov (in Taxon 30: 229–230. 1981; Prop. 123, = Guide for the Determination of Types Prop. A, Voss & Greuter in Taxon 30: 141. 1981) to add a new term "lectoparatype" to the *Code*. The proposal was rejected by the Sydney Congress of 1981 (Greuter in Taxon 30: 910. 1981; Greuter & Voss in Englera 2: 102. 1982). Three years later, Hansen & Seberg (in Taxon 33: 707–711. 1984) proposed a new type term in botany, "paralectotype", but not as a proposal to amend the *Code*. Essentially, both terms were to apply to the remaining syntypes after one of the syntypes had been designated as the lectotype (and excluding isolectotypes in Hansen & Seberg's definition). However, Vorster (in Taxon 35: 316–317. 1986) argued that there is no need to call the remaining syntypes by any term because they have ceased to have value for typification, and they should not be cited with the lectotype, but among those specimens consulted for the taxonomic treatment of the taxon concerned. In response to this, we would say that herbaria or people used to donate, sell, or purchase duplicates and fragments of type material, and citations to clarify the location of such extant material in a formal nomenclature paragraph is of the utmost importance, instead of citing them among other specimens consulted.

Before it was proposed as an additional term in the *Code*, lectoparatype had been used already by Frizzell (in Amer. Midl. Naturalist 14: 655. 1933), Exell & Stace (in Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), Bot. 3: 1–46. 1963), and Brummitt (in Kew Bull. 22: 375–386. 1968). Later on, after the proposal made by Hansen & Seberg (l.c.), the use of the term lectoparatype was further supported by Brummitt (in Taxon 34: 501–502. 1985) and Porter (in Taxon 36: 435–436. 1987). Despite that the *Melbourne Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012) does not provide a special term for the syntypes remaining after designating a lectotype, botanists are using the term lectoparatype (see, e.g., Molloy & St George in New Zealand J. Bot. 32: 415–421. 1994; Molloy & Webb in New Zealand J. Bot. 32: 423–428. 1994; Heenan in New Zealand J. Bot. 33: 439–454. 1995; Belyaeva & Sennikov in Kew Bull. 63: 277–287. 2008; Hopkins & Bradford in Adansonia, sér. 3, 31: 103–135. 2009; Väre in Phytotaxa 47: 1–98. 2012) and other, in our opinion inappropriate terms such as "other syntypes" or "residual syntypes" (see, e.g., Moraes in Harvard Pap. Bot. 19: 143–155. 2011; Wilson in Telopea 16: 9–12. 2014; Briggs in Telopea 18: 217–220. 2015), implying a strong demand to provide any term to address such syntypes.

Version of Record

According to Porter (l.c.), addition of the term lectoparatype to the *Code* will make the process and results of lectotypification more precise. Besides providing an unambiguous status for every specimen pertaining to type material, the term will bring consistency in typification practices and terminology, consequently reducing effort in tracing type material for future lectotypification, should the need arise. We therefore strongly urge the addition of term lectoparatype to the *Code* through a new Article with a new Example and Note.

We propose lectoparatype in a slightly different sense to the term paralectotype used in the *International Code for Zoological Nomenclature* (*ICZN*, ed. 4, International Commission for Zoological Nomenclature, 1999). Art. 73.2.2 of the *ICZN* defines a paralectotype as follows: "Specimens that were syntypes prior to the valid designation of a lectotype … are no longer syntypes after such designation; by that action they become lectotype and paralectotypes …; the latter have no name-bearing function and do not regain status as syntypes if the lectotype is lost or destroyed." For the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants* we do not suggest that a lectoparatype should cease to be eligible as the replacement lectotype should the previously designated lectotype be lost or destroyed.

(199) Insert a new Article after Art. 9.5:

"*9.5bis*. A lectoparatype is any syntype after designation of a lectotype that is neither the lectotype nor an isolectotype (Rec. 9C)."

(200) Add the following Example under the Article of Prop. 199:

"*Ex. n. Aegilops triuncialis* f. *hirsuta* H. Lindb. was lectotypified by Väre (in Phytotaxa 47: 6. 2012) on a specimen from Morocco, *Lindberg 3680* (H-1182940) with three isolectotypes (H-1182941, H-1182942, MPU-009626). The remaining syntype from Spain, *Lindberg 821* (H-1182920), was cited as a lectoparatype."

(201) Add the following Note under the Article of Prop. 199:

"*Note n*. The term lectoparatype is used only on or after designation of a lectotype."

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to the Director, CSIR-NBRI, Lucknow, India, for providing facilities and encouragement and also to Dr. Athar Ali Khan, Department of Botany, AMU Aligarh and Prof. N.K. Dubey, Department of Botany, BHU, Varanasi, for helpful discussions.