



Use of the Term Paralectotype/Lectoparatype

Author(s): P. Vorster

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (May, 1986), pp. 316-317

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1221277>

Accessed: 23/07/2012 12:36

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Taxon*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

NOMENCLATURE

USE OF THE TERM PARALECTOTYPE/LECTOPARATYPE

*P. Vorster*¹

In Taxon 33: 707–711 (1984a) H. V. Hansen and O. Seberg proposed the term “paralectotype” for those “syntypes” remaining after lectotypification. This was supported by R. K. Brummitt (1985), who preferred, however, the term “lectoparatype.” These were not the first attempts to coin a term for such specimens, previous examples being McVaugh, Ross and Stafleu (1968), Jeffrey (1973), and Hennipman and Roos (1982) who used the term “paratype,” and Frizzell (1933), Exell and Stace (1963), and Brummitt (1968) who used the term “lectoparatype.”

The proposal of these terms apparently stems from a desire to equalize botanical and zoological nomenclatural terms. However, the situations in botanical and zoological nomenclature are not analogous. Whereas botanical nomenclatural rules provide for duplicates of the type (ideally portions of the same plant, but sometimes individuals from the same population), in zoological nomenclature this is not possible because of the nature of zoological specimens, and all zoological specimens other than the holotype which are cited in the original publication are paratypes. In other words, a botanical isotype to some extent equals a zoological paratype in the sense that both terms denote a duplicate (as far as practically possible) of the holotype. In contrast a botanical paratype is not a type at all, but merely any material other than the designated type cited on the occasion of the original description. (When no type is indicated, the cited material collectively comprises syntypes, not paratypes.)

Later in 1984 Hansen and Seberg (Taxon 33: 745) proposed amendments to Art. 7 of the Code, mainly to make provision for the use of the terms “paratype” and “paralectotype.” The 1983 Code only defined “paratype” in the “Guide for the determination of types” (p. 80), not in Art. 7 dealing with types. In my opinion the introduction of these two terms into Art. 7 would complicate the terminology of typification without leading to any practical benefits. It should also be noted that Hansen and Seberg’s (1984b) proposed definition of “paralectotype” implies a change in the status of previous syntypes, but not previous “paratypes,” so that presumably *after* lectotypification one can have both “paratypes” and “paralectotypes,” which may cause confusion. This is an omission, because as explained on p. 80 of the 1983 Code, “paratypes” are equivalent to syntypes when no holotype was designated, and “paratypes” are as important as syntypes when selecting a lectotype in cases where the syntypes may all have been lost.

From Art. 9.1 of the 1983 I.C.B.N. it is abundantly clear that a botanical type consists of *one* specimen or element. For that reason it is unfortunate that the terms “syntype” and “paratype” carry the suffix “-type,” because if Art. 9.1 is applied, the specimens so denoted cannot be types but only sources from which a lectotype can be chosen. Once a lectotype has been chosen from amongst syntypes (or in rarer cases, from amongst “paratypes”), there is no need to call the remaining syntypes or “paratypes” by any term, because they have ceased to have value for typification. They should also not be cited with the type, but amongst those specimens consulted for the taxonomic treatment of the taxon concerned.

It may be reasoned that the remaining syntype or “paratype” specimens may have to be consulted again in the future if the lectotype is lost. In such an eventuality, however, the original publication would be consulted as to cited material, and the terminology if any applied to the original syntype and “paratype” material in the interim period, would be of no consequence and would merely complicate the citation of specimens.

I would therefore propose that no special term be coined for those specimens remaining after a lectotype has been selected from amongst them. This proposal only applies to the situation after

¹ Department of Botany, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch 7600, South Africa.

lectotypification, because prior to lectotypification both syntypes and “paratypes” have distinct value for typification purposes as the source for lectotypes. In cases where “paratypes” are recognized it implies that material was singled out for typification purposes, and it would be preferable to call them “cited specimens” rather than “paratypes.”

Acknowledgments

Prof. P. D. F. Kok of the Department of Botany, University of Pretoria, drew my attention to previous usage of special terminology for syntypes and “paratypes” remaining after designation of lectotypes. Dr. D. H. Nicolson of the Smithsonian Institution sent me a photocopy of Brummitt's 1985 note before it became available at our library.

Literature Cited

- Brummitt, R. K. 1968. A new genus of the tribe Sophoreae (Leguminosae) from western Africa and Borneo. *Kew Bull.* 22: 375–386 (378, 380).
———. 1985. Lectoparatypes? *Taxon* 34: 501–502.
Exell, A. W. and C. A. Stace. 1963. A revision of the genera *Buchenavia* and *Ramatuella*. *Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), Bot.* 3, 1: 1–46 (19–20, 21, 25, 32, 36, 37).
Frizzell, D. L. 1933. Terminology of types. *Amer. Midl. Nat.* 14: 637–668.
Hansen, H. V. and O. Seberg. 1984a. Paralectotype, a new type term in botany. *Taxon* 33: 707–711.
——— and ———. 1984b. Proposals to amend Art. 7 regarding para- and paralectotypes. *Taxon* 33: 745.
Hennipman, E. and M. C. Roos. 1982. A monograph of the fern genus *Platyserium* (Polypodiaceae). *Verh. kongl. Ned. Akad. Wet., Afd. Nat.*, ser. 2, 80: 1–126 (82, 88, 113).
Jeffrey, C. 1973. *Biological nomenclature*, ed. 1: 64. Edward Arnold, London.
McVaugh, R., R. Ross and F. A. Stafleu. 1968. An annotated glossary of botanical nomenclature. *Regnum Veg.* 56: 1–31 (21).

THE HOMEOTYPE: A PLEA FOR RESPECTABILITY

*Alasdair G. Burman*¹

Summary

In view of increasing difficulty of access to type material and the problems of sending type material through the mail, use of correctly prepared homeotypes is suggested as a possible aid to taxonomists.

Introduction

It is perhaps one of the misfortunes of the type system that the later 18th and the entire 19th centuries—an age in which a codified formalization of such a system could hardly have been predicted—was also the age in which so many of the great pioneer collections in the Old and New World tropics were made. Reference through the literature to the wealth of what is now type material in these collections is a daily matter to botanists working with tropical and subtropical plants. It was a natural consequence of such collections, organized and financed in Europe, Russia, and the U.S.A., that the accumulated plant material should be deposited in European, Russian and American herbaria, particularly at a time when developing countries had few scientists and fewer scientific establishments. The present proposal—which, it should be made clear, is purely taxonomical in its intentions—derives from a series of coincidental factors, and attempts at least to initiate changes in a paradoxical situation where, although developing countries have more and better taxonomists than ever before, it is becoming increasingly difficult for them to work effectively.

It will hardly be contested, for so long as the type system persists as a useful means of relating a name to an entity, that “the type is the objective basis to which a given name is permanently linked and it is by the type method that the correct application of names to taxa is objectively and unequivocally determined however much classification may change” (Jeffrey, 1978). For those without direct

¹ a/c Instituto de Botânica, CP 4005, 01000 São Paulo SP, Brazil.