(029) Proposal to add a new Example after Article 9.1

Avishek Bhattacharjee,[1] Subir Bandyopadhyay[2] & Debabrata Maity[3]

1 *Botanical Survey of India, P.O. Botanic Garden, Howrah, 711 103, West Bengal, India*
2 *23F, Fern Road, Kolkata, 700 019, West Bengal, India*
3 *Department of Botany, University of Calcutta, 35, Ballygunge Circular Road, Kolkata, 700 019, West Bengal, India*
Address for correspondence: *Avishek Bhattacharjee, avibsi@rediffmail.com*

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

From Art. 9 Ex. 2 of the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018) it could be wrongly assumed that for a Linnaean name there cannot be a holotype. However, a very few Linnaean names do have holotypes (see Jarvis, Order out of Chaos: 16. 2007). One such example is *Calycanthus praecox* L. In the protologue of *C. praecox* (Sp. Pl., ed. 2: 718. 1762), Linnaeus cited an illustration by Kaempfer (Amoen. Exot. Fasc.: 879. 1712) and stated that the plant was unknown to him ("Ignota mihi"). There is a specimen in the Linnaean Herbarium at LINN, Herb. Linnaeus No. 660.2, which is annotated by Linnaeus with "*praecox*" at the bottom of the sheet and "india" beneath the right-hand plant on the sheet (http://linnean-online.org/4901/), but, according to Nicely (in Castanea 30: 74. 1965), "The specimen (No. 660.2) in the Linnaean Herbarium, referred to as *praecox* by Savage (1945), is probably *Calycanthus floridus* [L.] on the basis of my observations of the I.D.C. Microfiche No. 346." Linnaeus's annotation of the specimen apparently contradicts his statements in the protologue of *C. praecox*: "*Habitat in* Japonia" and "Ignota mihi". A possible explanation is that the specimen came into Linnaeus's possession after the publication of *C. praecox*. In any case, the specimen can hardly be considered to be original material for the name.

We also note the comment by Jarvis (Order out of Chaos: 17. 2007): "*Calycanthus praecox* L. (1762: 718), however, is arguably an example of a Linnaean name with a holotype because Linnaeus stated that the plant was unknown to him ("*Ignota mihi*"), and cited as the sole source of information a description and illustration (p. 879) from Engelbert Kaempfer's *Amoenitatum Exoticarum* (1712). Kaempfer's illustration is the holotype of this name."

We therefore feel it would be better if this Example is included in the *Code*.

(029) Add a new Example after Art. 9.1:

"***Ex. n.*** In the protologue of *Calycanthus praecox* L. (Sp. Pl., ed. 2: 718. 1762), Linnaeus did not designate a type and cited only one element, an illustration by Kaempfer (Amoen. Exot. Fasc.: 879. 1712); he also stated that the plant was unknown to him ("Ignota mihi"). This is evidence establishing that Linnaeus, when preparing the protologue, used only Kaempfer's illustration, which must therefore be accepted as the holotype."

Acknowledgements

(030–033) Proposals regarding lectotypes, neotypes, and epitypes (amendments to Articles 9 and 10)

Michael Wisnev

Los Angeles, California, U.S.A.
Address for correspondence: *Michael Wisnev, miwisne@gmail.com*

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

Various lectotype rules appear in numerous places in the *Code* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018), often without cross-reference. At best, this is inconvenient; at worst, this may result in an ineffective designation by those who are not well-versed in the intricacies of the *Code*.

Briefly, Art. 9.3 defines a lectotype as a specimen designated from the original material, in conformity with Art. 9.11, if one of three conditions is met. Article 9.11 then repeats the same three conditions (and adds that a lectotype can also be designated if a previously designated lectotype is lost or destroyed) and states that, if they are met, a