

(111) Proposal to amend Recommendation 40A.3

Suchandra Dutta¹ & K.M. Manudev²

¹ Department of Botany, R. D. & S. H. National College, Bandra (W), Mumbai 400050, India

² Department of Botany, St. Joseph's College, Devagiri, Kozhikode, Kerala 673008, India

Author for correspondence: Suchandra Dutta, suchandra.dutta@gmail.com

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/646.38>

When, on or after 1 January 1990, an author fulfils all requirements for valid publication of a name of a new species or infraspecific taxon but fails to specify the name of the herbarium or collection or institution in which the holotype (specimen or unpublished illustration) is conserved, the name is considered to be not validly published according to Art. 40.7 of the *Melbourne Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 154. 2012). If the herbarium or collection or institution is specified, but the type is not in fact conserved there (perhaps because it has yet to be deposited), presently there is no nomenclatural consequence in the *Code* and the name may nevertheless be validly published. When such a name is validly published but its type cannot be found, this creates a problem for future research. Recommendation 40A.3 addresses this problem by recommending citation in the protologue of “any available number permanently identifying the

holotype specimen”. The present proposal aims to strengthen that advice by explicitly stating that the type should already be conserved in the specified location.

(111) Amend Rec. 40A.3 as follows (new text in bold):

“40A.3. Specification of the herbarium or collection or institution of deposition (see Art. 40 Note 4) **should not be done unless and until the specimen is actually deposited there and** should be followed by any available number permanently identifying the holotype specimen (see also Rec. 9D.1).”

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank N.J. Turland for his suggestions and for refining the manuscript.