

## (101) Proposal to add a new paragraph to Recommendation 9B

**Subir Bandyopadhyay & Avishek Bhattacharjee**

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

Author for correspondence: *Avishek Bhattacharjee, avibsi@rediffmail.com*

**DOI** <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/646.34>

Authors sometimes designate an epitype without stating why the holotype, lectotype, neotype, or all original material is ambiguous. It is understood that epitypification is done because the holotype, lectotype, previously designated neotype, or all the original material is ambiguous (Art. 9.8 of the *Melbourne Code* – McNeill & al. in *Regum Veg.* 154. 2012), but we feel that it would be better if the authors explained the reason(s) of the ambiguity. For example, Smith & Garland (in *Taxon* 52: 811. 2003) designated as the lectotype of *Pancratium rotatum* Ker Gawl. the illustration in the protologue (*Bot. Mag.* 21: t. 827. 1805) and simultaneously designated a specimen (*R.K. Godfrey* 83870, FSU) as the epitype to support the selected lectotype, but without giving any reason, although the lectotype seems to help in the precise application of the name. However, Dr. Mark A. Garland informed us (pers. comm., 2015) that, although the lectotype shows the flowers and the top parts of two leaves, it does not show the rhizomatous bulbs, the shape of the leaves, the number of ovules

in each locule, the absolute sizes of parts, or other characters that help to delimit the species. That is why Smith & Garland designated an epitype for *P. rotatum*. We feel that the ambiguity in such cases should be clearly explained by the author(s) in their publication when designating an epitype. Thus we are proposing the following new Recommendation.

### **(101) Add a new paragraph to Rec. 9B:**

“9B.2. Authors designating an epitype should state why the holotype, lectotype, neotype, or all original material is ambiguous such that epitypification is necessary.”

### **Acknowledgements**

We thank Dr. Paramjit Singh, Director, Botanical Survey of India for the facilities and Dr. Mark A. Garland for the information. We are also thankful to N.J. Turland for refining the manuscript.