

(327) Proposal to amend Recommendation 40A.4 to encourage explicit and full citation of data on the label of the type (holotype) specimen of the name of a new species or infraspecific taxon

Sergei L. Mosyakin,¹ Iryna O. Bednarska² & Mykola M. Fedoronchuk¹

¹ M.G. Kholodny Institute of Botany, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Tereshchenkivska Street 2, 01601 Kyiv (Kiev), Ukraine

² Institute of Ecology of the Carpathians, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kozelnytska Street 4, 79026 Lviv, Ukraine

Address for correspondence: Sergei L. Mosyakin, s_mosyakin@hotmail.com

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.13023>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

The present proposal was first considered after our analysis (see Mosyakin & al. in *Phytotaxa* 371: 127–132. 2018) of the nomenclatural situation regarding the valid versus not valid original publication of the name *Festuca ×polovina* Bednarska (in *Ukrayins'k. Bot. Zhurn.* 66: 31. 2009), a hybrid of *F. polesica* Zapal. (in *Bull. Int. Acad. Sci. Cracovie, Cl. Sci. Math.* 1904: 303. 1904) and *F. ovina* L. (Sp. Pl.: 73. 1753). It was initially assumed that the name was not validly published because the author of the original description failed to indicate the type (holotype) specimen (Art. 40.1 of the *Shenzhen Code*: Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018), and because of that Bednarska & Nachychko (in *Phytotaxa* 356: 174–176. 2018) presumably validated that name by citing the holotype deposited at LWKS. However, if we assume that in 2009 the name was not validly published, then it was validated in 2010 by Fedoronchuk & al. (in *Ukrayins'k. Bot. Zhurn.* 67: 217–224. 2010) when these authors cited the type (in fact, syntypes at LWKS, part of the type gathering, see below and Art. 40.1).

Following the advice of the editors and one reviewer, in 2018 Mosyakin & al. (l.c.) concluded that the name *Festuca ×polovina* was validly published in 2009 because Bednarska (l.c.) indicated in the protologue that the holotype is deposited in the LWKS herbarium and mentioned in the text of the article the geographic origin of the taxon (Western Polissya, the northwestern physiographic region of Ukraine), and by this indication she presumably fulfilled the requirements of Art. 40.6 and 40.7. Fedoronchuk & al. (l.c.) cited the label of the type in LWKS but did not mention the existence of three other duplicates in the same herbarium and therefore in fact cited syntypes of the type gathering. The specimen LWKS0030041 (cited as the “holotype” by Bednarska & Nachychko, l.c.) has been designated by Mosyakin & al. (l.c.) as the lectotype of the name *F. ×polovina*.

However, at present, the name *Festuca ×polovina* Bednarska (l.c.) is treated in the International Plant Names Index (IPNI: <https://ipni.org/n/77100837-1>, all online resources accessed 31 Mar 2023) as a name not validly published, with the following explanation: “Status: nom. inval., contrary to Art. 40, Note 2. ICN (2018)”. At the same time, the name *F. ×polovina* Bednarska (in Bednarska & Nachychko, l.c.: 174) is cited in IPNI (<https://ipni.org/n/77186030-1>) as an isonym. In the Plants of the World Online database (POWO: <https://powo.science.kew.org/taxon/77100837-1>), the

name is cited as validly published in 2009. At present, we think that the name was validated in 2010 by Fedoronchuk & al. (l.c.) and properly lectotypified in 2018 by Mosyakin & al. (l.c.).

All these conflicting and partly confusing opinions on the date and conditions of valid publication of the name *Festuca ×polovina* were caused not only by the unintentional omission of a full and direct citation of the type specimen in the 2009 protologue (for which the authors apologize), but also by some lack of clarity in the current wording of some provisions of Art. 40. To avoid such problems and confusion for the future, Mosyakin & al. (l.c.) already concluded that a proposal to amend the *Code* is desirable for encouraging explicit citation and unambiguous indication of types (in particular, holotypes) for names of newly described taxa. Following that conclusion, the relevant amendment of Rec. 40A.4 is proposed here. A similar recommendation (Rec. 73C. Data on the holotype) on the precise citation of the type specimen is present in the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature* (ICZN: Ride & al., *Int. Code Zool. Nomencl.*, ed. 4. 1999 onward; <https://www.iczn.org/the-code/the-code-online/>).

(327) Amend Rec. 40A.4 as follows (new text in bold):

“40A.4. Details of the type specimen of the name of a new species or infraspecific taxon should be published in the Latin alphabet. **The author(s) should provide in the protologue the full and explicit citation of the data on the label accompanying the type (holotype) specimen, including the exact locality (preferably with geographic coordinates, if available), the name(s) of the collector(s), collecting number and date, and other relevant information.**”

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Nicholas J. Turland (Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Museum Berlin, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany) and John H. Wiersema (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.) for their comments and editing. Useful comments by Werner Greuter (Herbarium Mediterraneum, c/o Orto Botanico, Palermo, Italy and Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Museum Berlin, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany) during the preparation of our earlier article (Mosyakin & al., 2018) are also greatly appreciated.