

## (203) Proposal to add two new Examples to Article 9.19

Jefferson Prado & Regina Y. Hirai

Instituto de Botânica, Herbário, C.P. 68041, CEP 04045-972, São Paulo, SP, Brazil

Author for correspondence: Jefferson Prado, [jprado.01@uol.com.br](mailto:jprado.01@uol.com.br)

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/652.41>

Article 9.19 of the *Melbourne Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 154. 2012) provides the requirements to supersede a choice of a lectotype or a neotype. Three main conditions are established for it: “... if (a) the holotype or, in the case of a neotype, any of the original material is rediscovered; the choice may also be superseded if one can show that (b) it is in serious conflict with the protologue and another element is available that is not in conflict with the protologue, or that (c) it is contrary to Art. 9.14”.

Example 13, under Art. 9.19, exemplifies the situation where a type designation did not conform to Art. 9.12, that stipulates which original material is required to be chosen and the order of choice in a lectotype designation. As this Example indicates, designations that contravene Art. 9.11–9.13 of the *Code* have no standing and can be ignored.

However, there are no Examples under this Article of the supersession of a previously designated lectotype or neotype. In order to demonstrate the application of provision (b) and (c) of Art. 9.19, below we are proposing two new Examples to be added:

### (203) Add two new Examples after Art. 19.9:

“*Ex. 13bis.* (b) Fischer (in Feddes Repert. 108: 115. 1997) designated Herb. Linnaeus No. 26.58 (LINN) as lectotype of *Veronica agrestis* L. (1753). However, Martínez-Ortega & al. (in *Taxon* 51: 763. 2002) established that the designated lectotype was in serious conflict with Linnaeus’s diagnosis and that three sheets of original material not conflicting with the protologue were available in the Celsius herbarium. One of them was designated as the new lectotype of *V. agrestis*, superseding the choice of Fischer.”

“*Ex. 13ter.* (c) Navarro & Rosúa (in *Candollea* 45: 584. 1990) designated a sheet at G-DC as lectotype of *Teucrium gnaphalodes* L’Hér. (1788), but this preparation contains more than one gathering and a heterogeneous mixture of more than one species, not all of which matched L’Héritier’s diagnosis. Ferrer-Gallego & al. (in *Candollea* 67: 38. 2012) superseded the previous lectotype in choosing one of the specimens on the same preparation that corresponds most nearly with the original diagnosis.”

### Acknowledgement

We thank John Wiersema for help in improving this manuscript.