

(360) Proposal to add a new Recommendation that duplicate material on which the name of a taxon is to be based be conserved in different herbaria, collections or institutions

Sandip Kisan Gavade¹ & Manoj Madhwanand Lekhak²

¹ Department of Botany, Shri Swami Vivekanand Shikshan Sanstha's, Dattajirao Kadam Arts, Science and Commerce College, Ichalkaranji 416 115, Maharashtra, India

² Angiosperm Taxonomy Laboratory, Department of Botany, Shivaji University, Kolhapur 416004, Maharashtra, India

Address for correspondence: Sandip Kisan Gavade, skgavadenogra@gmail.com

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.13037>

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

It is not uncommon to encounter protologues wherein authors of new taxa cite the holotype and isotype specimens as conserved in a single herbarium and often do not provide any identifier number. To illustrate the situation, the protologue of *Ischaemum janarthanamii* Bokil & al. (in Ann. Bot. Fenn. 57: 323. 2020) cited "TYPE: India. Goa: South Goa, Devsada near Dharbandora, 85 m a.s.l., 15°22' 32.2"N, 74°07'37.2"E, 10 October 2017, M.N. Datar & S.A. Bokil 530 (holotype AHMA; isotypes AHMA, BSI)." There is no citation of herbarium accession numbers and/or barcodes for the relevant type specimens except for the herbarium accession number "AHMA31964" in Table 1 referring to material of *I. janarthanamii* from "Goa, India" without specifying whether this refers to the holotype or isotype (or the paratype, also from Goa and conserved in AHMA). Because the herbarium AHMA has both the holotype and an isotype and the type specimens do not show any identifying number, it is necessary for the relevant sheets to bear annotations on their type status, without which one may find it hard to distinguish the holotype sheet from the isotype sheet housed together in the same herbarium. Such a situation does exist in many herbaria. Furthermore, for various reasons (including fire), specimens

(including types) in a herbarium may be lost. The present proposal therefore recommends that the authors of new taxa should avoid conserving holotype and isotypes in the same herbarium, collection or institution. The same considerations could also apply, in many circumstances, to duplicates of neotypes or epitypes.

(360) Add a new paragraph under Rec. 7A:

"7A.2. It is strongly recommended, insofar as possible, that duplicate material on which the name of a taxon is to be based, especially of the holotype but also of a neotype or epitype, be conserved in different herbaria, collections, or institutions, preferably in different areas of the world."

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Head, Department of Botany, Shivaji University, Kolhapur and the Principal, Shri Swami Vivekanand Shikshan Sanstha's, Dattajirao Kadam Arts, Science and Commerce College, Ichalkaranji, for providing research facilities. We thank Dr. K.N. Gandhi, Nicholas J. Turland and Dr. John H. Wiersema for support with the manuscript.

(361) Proposal regarding whether elements cited with doubt are original material (Article 9.4)

Michael A. Wisnev

Los Angeles, California 90068, U.S.A.

Address for correspondence: Michael A. Wisnev, miwisne@gmail.com

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.13038>

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

Article 9.4 of the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018) treats specimens cited in the protologue as original material, and cited illustrations are likely original material under Art. 9.4(a). However, the treatment of an element cited with doubt

(e.g. with a "?") is not addressed, and these elements have not been treated consistently in the past. For example, elements cited with doubt were designated as lectotypes for the Linnaean names *Bromelia karatas* L. (Monteiro & Forzza in Taxon 65: 1102. 2016)

and *Phytolacca asiatica* L. (Ridsdale in Manilal, Bot. Hist. Hort. Malab.: 189. 1980). In complete contrast, neotypes were designated for *Cordia glabra* L. (Miller in Taxon 53: 801. 2004) and *Renealmia polystachia* L. (Smith & Downs, Fl. Neotropica 14: 924. 1977) even though their protologues cited illustrations with doubt.

Article 52 Note 1 states that the “inclusion, with an expression of doubt, of an element in a new taxon, e.g. the citation of a name with a question mark [...] does not make the name of the new taxon nomenclaturally superfluous.” This Note makes sense in light of the fact that a name is only superfluous if the author “definitely included” the type of another name; a citation with doubt is not a definite inclusion. Similarly, Prop. 185 (Wiersema & al. in Taxon 71: 1339–1340. 2022) proposes that the inclusion of a name with doubt “is not in itself considered exclusion of its type” for purposes of Art. 48. While not expressly stated, this proposal and the suggested Example would provide that a name cited with doubt can be treated as the basionym. This also makes sense, because the author obviously “based” the new combination on that name by using the same epithet.

Because Art. 9.4 does not use “definitely cited”, one can argue that the better answer is that a specimen cited with doubt is original material. In addition, illustrations cited with doubt would appear to meet the criteria set forth in Art. 9.4(a) that the author “associated” the element with the name. However, a new rule mandating that elements cited with doubt are original material could result in nomencla-

tural disruption if there are no other elements of original material. Likewise, a rule that elements cited with doubt cannot be original material would be problematic if the only other element(s) of original material would result in nomenclatural disruption. Finally, the adoption of either rule would require new typifications for those names that had previously been typified in a contrary manner.

Rather than implement a blanket rule, the approach used in Art. 6.13 should be implemented here. Article 6.13 allows certain names to be treated as either names of new taxa or replacement names, depending upon their later typification. This approach would preserve previous typifications and would allow future authors to best decide how to treat elements cited with doubt.

(361) Add the following sentence at the end of Art. 9.4:

“9.4. [...]. If an author cites an element with an expression of doubt (e.g. the citation of a specimen or illustration with a question mark), the element may be treated as a syntype (if it is a specimen), an element under Art 9.4(a) (if it is an illustration) or not as original material. Decision on the status of such an element is to be effected by means of the appropriate type designation.”

Acknowledgements

I thank Jefferson Prado for his review of an earlier draft of this proposal. I also thank Nicholas J. Turland and John H. Wiersema for their assistance.

(362) Proposal to specify that in lectotype designation precedence be given to a part of the holotype that is not in conflict with the validating description or diagnosis

Jarosław Proćków¹ & Małgorzata Proćków²

1 Department of Plant Biology, Institute of Environmental Biology, Wrocław University of Environmental and Life Sciences, ul. Koźuchowska 5b, 51-631 Wrocław, Poland

2 Museum of Natural History, University of Wrocław, ul. Sienkiewicza 21, 50-335 Wrocław, Poland

Address for correspondence: Jarosław Proćków, jaroslaw.prockow@upwr.edu.pl

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.13039>

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

The procedure for choosing a lectotype is specified in Art. 9.12 of the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018), which rules that “In lectotype designation, an isotype must be chosen if such exists, or otherwise a syntype or isosyntype if such exists. If no isotype, syntype or isosyntype is extant, the lectotype must be chosen from among the paratypes if such exist. If none of the above specimens exists, the lectotype must be chosen from among the uncited specimens and cited and uncited illustrations that comprise the remaining original material, if such exist.”

However, Art. 9.12 does not provide for a situation where there is an existing holotype (e.g. one herbarium sheet) that is taxonomically mixed, consisting of (e.g.) two elements: one that fits the

validating description or diagnosis and the other that is in conflict with it. Therefore, a part of the holotype that fits the validating description or diagnosis should take precedence in lectotype designation over any other existing elements listed in Art. 9.12, including isotypes, syntypes, etc. We propose to amend the Article accordingly.

(362) Amend Article 9.12 as follows (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough):

“9.12. In lectotype designation, a **part of the holotype (if it is taxonomically mixed) that is not in conflict with the validating description or diagnosis must be chosen if such exists, or otherwise an isotype ~~must be chosen~~** if such exists, or otherwise a syntype