

(259) Proposal to require precedence of isolectotypes when a previously designated lectotype has been lost or destroyed

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/10.12705/653.30>

According to Art. 9.11 of the *Melbourne Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 154. 2012), a lectotype may be designated in the following three cases: (1) if no holotype was indicated by the author of a name of a species or infraspecific taxon; (2) when the holotype or previously designated lectotype has been lost or destroyed; or (3) when the material designated as type is found to belong to more than one taxon. According to Art. 9.19, the author who first designates a lectotype must be followed (so long as the exceptions stipulated in Art. 9.19 do not apply). Moreover, in Art. 9.12 there are clear rules on precedence in designating a lectotype:

“9.12. In lectotype designation an isotype must be chosen if such exists, or otherwise a syntype if such exists. If no isotype, syntype or isosyntype (duplicate of syntype) is extant, the lectotype must be chosen from among the paratypes if such exist. If no cited specimens exist, the lectotype must be chosen from among the uncited specimens and cited and uncited illustrations that comprise the remaining original material, if such exist.”

We propose that in the case when a previously designated lectotype has been lost or destroyed, the replacement lectotype must be designated from among the isolectotypes (duplicates of lectotypes), if such exist, or otherwise according to Art. 9.12 (see above). In this way, existing isolectotypes have precedence over all other kinds of

types and other original material listed in sequence in Art. 9.12. The proposed procedure parallels the requirement to designate a lectotype firstly from among isotypes, if such exist (Art. 9.12) and accords with the rule that the author who first designates a lectotype must be followed (Art. 9.19). This proposal will strengthen nomenclatural stability, as the replacement lectotype will be a duplicate specimen (if such exists) of the previous lectotype. This proposal also parallels Prop. 045 (Ferrer-Gallego & al. in *Taxon* 64: 650. 2015), in which a substitute neotype must be designated firstly from among isoneotypes, if such exist.

(259) Add a new Article after Art. 9.15 and include a reference to it at the end of Art. 9.12:

“9.15bis. When the previously designated lectotype has been lost or destroyed, the replacement lectotype must be designated from among the isolectotypes (Rec. 9C.1), if such exist, or otherwise according to Art. 9.12.”

“9.12. [...]. See also Art. 9.15bis.”

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to Nicholas Turland (B) for valuable suggestions that greatly improved our manuscript.