

Phyton (Horn, Austria)	<b>Vol. 54</b>	Fasc. 2	233–234	28. 11. 2014
------------------------	----------------	---------	---------	--------------

DOI: 10.12905/0380.phyton54(2)2014-0233

## Once More Isoholotype

By

Herwig TEPPNER\*)

Received March 1, 2014

Key words: Holotype, isoholotype, isotype, paratype, plant nomenclature.

### Summary

TEPPNER H. 2014. Once more isoholotype. – *Phyton* (Horn, Austria) 54(2): 233–234.

Definition and reasons for the term isoholotype (for specimens which are parts of the same individual as the holotype) proposed in *Phyton* 53(2): 188 are provided in more detail.

### Zusammenfassung

TEPPNER H. 2014. Once more isoholotype. [Noch einmal Isoholotypus]. – *Phyton* (Horn, Austria) 54(2): 233–234.

Definition und Gründe für den Terminus Isoholotypus (für Belege, die Teil desselben Individuums wie der Holotypus sind), der in *Phyton* 53(2): 188 vorgeschlagen worden ist, werden detaillierter dargestellt.

In a paper on *Onosma* (TEPPNER & KARL 2013:188), in which we proposed the term isoholotype we did not intend to make a too long nomenclatural excursus, thus the text of the definition probably proved to be too short.

My principal intention was to provide a term for the special case [of “actual” isotypes] that a number of specimens (duplicates) was taken from the same plant individual as the holotype; so they would be distinctly separated from “ordinary” isotypes collected from a number of different individuals or of unknown collecting mode. Usually, a respective declaration of the collector will be necessary, except for the later divisions (as, for e. g., Code Art. 8.3.Ex.5).

---

\*) Pens. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Herwig TEPPNER, Institute of Plant Sciences, Division of Systematics and Geobotany, Karl-Franzens-University Graz, Holteigasse 6, 8010 Graz, Austria, Europe; e-mail: herwig.teppner@uni-graz.at

The so-called isoholotypes would represent another quality than that what remains isotypes according the Code and this would also have practical importance: The study of the next available isoholotype makes the efforts for reaching the holotype not obligatory. At present, duplicates of the holotype are always isotypes, even when they are parts of the holotype-individual and even when preserved in the same herbarium as the holotype. If the term isoholotype should be accepted, all specimens derived from the same individual as the holotype would be apparently declared.

If the origin from one and the same individual as the holotype is the most important part of the definition of isoholotypes, then a next step (revolution?) for the definition of isoholotypes should be worth to be considered. Could different collection dates be permitted for isoholotypes contrary to the Code, Art. 8.2. and Ex.1? This would lead to the possibility for including e. g. flowers and fruits in the holotype material, even when not appearing at the same time on the plant. In the case of bulbs or corms with only one flower or inflorescence, two different seasons would be needed. Otherwise, the specimens with different date would be paratypes according to the actual rules, even when collected from the same individual as the holotype.

If one enters “isoholotype” into the Google database, a low number of c. 130–150 items is shown (last access on March 1, 2014: 138). The majority of the entries are herbarium labels [with comments] from herbarium databases. Others are references from the literature. The term is apparently used (without indicated definition) in the sense of isotype. Also both terms can appear in the same paper for the same specimen (SPOONER & al. 1998: 237, 238).

All this cannot hinder to give the term isoholotype a precise definition and to use it henceforth in a restricted sense as defined above.

#### Acknowledgements

Critical and constructive comments to our proposal by John McNEILL and Roman BUSINSKÝ are gratefully acknowledged. Many thanks go to Univ.-Doz. Dr. Wolfgang SCHUEHLY for the revision of the language.

#### References

- Code = McNeill & al 2013.  
 McNEILL J. & al. 2013. (“2012”). International code of nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (Melbourne code) ... – Regnum vegetabile 154. – Koeltz Scientific Books, Königstein, Germany.  
 SPOONER B. M., LODGE D. J. & LÆSSØE T. 1998. A new *Sorokina* (*Leotiales*) from Puerto Rico. – Kew Bull. 53(1): 237–241.  
 TEPPNER H. & KARL R. 2013. *Onosma pseudoeuboica* spec. nova, *O. euboica* and notes on *O. heterophylla* (*Boraginaceae-Lithospermeae*) from Central Greece. – Phytion (Horn, Austria) 53(2): 221–239.