

(021) Proposal to amend Art. 9.10 to fill a logical gap

Josef Niederle

Janáčkovo náměstí 2a, Brno, Czech Republic. niederle@math.muni.cz

There is a logical gap in Art. 9.10. I propose that a sentence be added in Art. 9.10 of the *Vienna Code*. The present wording is as follows (my emphasis):

“9.10. 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 which comprise the remaining original material, if such exist.”

The second sentence refers to the non-availability of isosyntypes, but there is no indication of the action if isosyn-

types are available. My proposal merely clarifies the existing codification without changing its meaning.

(021) Insert the italicized sentence in Art. 9.10 as indicated:

“9.10. In lectotype designation, an isotype must be chosen if such exists, or otherwise a syntype if such exists. *If no isotype or syntype is available, and an isosyntype exists, the lectotype must be chosen from among isosyntypes.* 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, ...”

(022–027) Miscellaneous proposals, mostly related to the Glossary

Paul van Rijckevorsel

Dipteryx, Postbus 4047, 3502 HA Utrecht, The Netherlands. dipteryx@freeler.nl

This set contains miscellaneous proposals. Mostly these arose when reviewing the Glossary (App. VII) of the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146. 2006), and they are arranged alphabetically by the term under which the item is included in the Glossary. Two unrelated miscellaneous proposals have been added.

(022) Delete Art. II Ex. 4.

This Example (introduced in its present wording in the *Tokyo Code*—Greuter & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 131. 1994), adapted from an earlier example present since the *Seattle Code*—Stafleu & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 82. 1972) states “the two varieties constituting *Hemerocallis lilioasphodelus* L. (1753), var. *flava* L. and var. *fulva* L.” Under the present *Code*, when Linnaeus published the names of these two varieties this automatically established the corresponding autonym (Art. 26.3), so that there are three varietal names in this species with priority as of 1753, but with the autonym having priority over the other two (Art. 11.6). Thus, priority at the varietal level closely parallels that at the species level (cf. Art. 25 Ex. 1, Art. 26 Ex. 3 and 7).

(023) In Art. 33.4, in “(when a new name is proposed)”, replace “new name” by “nomen novum” (or by “avowed substitute” or by “replacement name”).

The phrase “a new name” is imprecise. What is meant here is a nomen novum (avowed substitute, replacement name).

(024) In Art. 9, correct and rephrase Ex. 4, so that it reads as follows:

“Ex. 4. Throughout the 20th Century, *Butyrospermum parkii* (G. Don) Kotschy (1865) was the well-known name for a species of which the seeds are of economic importance (yielding shea butter), with a lesser-known taxon being included later as an eastern subspecies, *Butyrospermum parkii* subsp. *niloticum* (Kotschy) J. H. Hemsl. (1961). The holotype of the name *Vitellaria paradoxa* C. F. Gaertn. (1807), a seed of unknown provenance (P), clearly belongs to this same species. This name has priority and therefore is the correct name for this species. However, the two subspecies recognized within the species can only be distinguished by characters of foliage or inflorescence. The type of *Bassia parkii* G. Don (1838), the basionym of the well-known name, *Mungo Park* (BM), was designated by Hall & Hindle (in *Taxon* 44: 410. 1995) as the epitype (with foliage) of *V. paradoxa*. This fixes the application of the name of the typical subspecies and preserves at least some continuity of nomenclature, with the eastern subspecies retaining the epithet *nilotica*, as *V. paradoxa* subsp. *nilotica* (Kotschy) A. N. Henry & al. (1983).”

This Example, as presently phrased, is inaccurate: a proposal to conserve *Butyrospermum* over *Vitellaria* was

submitted (Hepper in Taxon 11: 226–227. 1962), with the combination *B. paradoxum* (C.F. Gaertn.) Hepper made in anticipation of the acceptance of the proposal. The proposal failed (McVaugh in Taxon 16: 229. 1967) and the currently correct name is *Vitellaria paradoxa*. Going by the results of a “Google” search (<http://www.google.com>), *Butyrospermum parkii* is comfortably the better-known name, even today, so it is worth going into some detail, explaining how a seed came to be holotype.

(025) In Art. 9.5 replace “a specimen” by “any specimen”, so that Art 9.5 reads as follows:

“9.5. A paratype is any specimen cited in the protologue that is neither the holotype nor an isotype, nor one of the syntypes if two or more specimens were simultaneously designated as types.”

This will bring Art. 9.5 in line with Art. 9.3 and 9.4. Also, adjust the Glossary accordingly.

(026) Add a new Recommendation, to follow after Art. 32 (or Art. 34):

“Authors who have discovered, or recognized, a new taxon of plants should publish a name for it under this Code

as soon as reasonably possible. Prior to valid publication, they should avoid circulating a name they intend to publish, especially in print.”

This has been part of the Code since the *Vienna Rules* (Briquet, Règles Int. Nomencl. Bot. 1906, where it was Rec. XX), up to and including the *Saint Louis Code* (Greuter & al. in Regnum Veg. 138. 2000, where it was Rec. 45A.1), although the wording was adjusted over time. Initially it formed a pair with what was Rec. XIX in 1906 and is now Rec. 34A.1, on unpublished names and the undesirability of mentioning them. It was eliminated at the XVII IBC in Vienna, apparently because of too-archaic wording; hence it is rephrased here.

(027) In Art. 53 Ex. 18, delete “extant” and “fossil”:

Copying the decision of the General Committee as published (Voss in Taxon 36: 429. 1987), Ex. 18 assumes *Cathaya* to belong to “fossil *Pinaceae*”. Although there appear to be several combinations for fossil species in *Cathaya*, the type of the generic name is the extant *Cathaya argyrophylla* (see the listing in the ING at <http://botany.si.edu/ing/ingForm.cfm>). Thus, *Cathaya* is not a fossil taxon (see Preamble 7, footnote).

(028–029) Proposals to add two new paragraphs to Recommendation 9A

Subir Bandyopadhyay* & Mithilesh Kumar Pathak

Botanical Survey of India, P.O.: Botanic Garden, Howrah – 711103, West Bengal, India.

**subirbandyopadhyay@yahoo.com (author for correspondence)*

Du Puy & Rabevohitra (in Du Puy, Legum. Madagascar 121. 2002) cited the type of *Bauhinia monandra* Kurz as “SE Asia, Burma, Martaban, *Brandis*; hol: CAL, n.v.” but despite a thorough search we could not locate the said type specimen at CAL. We are of the opinion that it would have been better if the authors had stated whether they had cited CAL on the basis of (1) an earlier publication, (2) following TL-2, (3) receiving information from the Curator, Central National Herbarium, Howrah, West Bengal, India, (4) knowing that the types of Kurz’s names are likely to be at CAL, or by any other means, because then we could have been able to assess how likely it was that the specimen is actually conserved at CAL and thus chance of its being found here. Hence we are proposing a new Recommendation as follows:

(028) Insert a new Rec. 9A.6.

“9A.6. It is recommended that if authors cite a herbarium as the place of conservation of the type of a name without actually examining that type, then the basis for the citation should be stated, e.g., an earlier published typification, a reference work such as TL-2, information from the Curator of the herbarium concerned, an assumption on the basis

of the working practices of the author of the name, or any other basis.”

This new Recommendation, if sincerely followed, would help future workers to assess how certain it is that the type specimen is actually conserved in the stated herbarium and the probabilities of its being found there. It would also help to arrive at a conclusion that it was ‘missing’ if it was stated to have been examined earlier but was presently untraceable.

We have seen that even in some detailed taxonomic publications authors cite a lectotype, epitype or neotype of a name designated by others but do not mention the name of the author(s) by whom the type has been designated and the place of its publication. It would be very convenient to future workers if authors mention by whom the type has been designated and the reference to the publication and also whether it has been corrected under Art. 9.8. Hence we are proposing a new Recommendation as follows:

(029) Insert a new Rec. 9A.7:

“9A.7. It is recommended that when citing a lectotype, epitype or neotype designated by others, the name of the author(s) designating the type should be cited along with