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Recently the name Oberonia manipurensis Chowlu & al. was published (Chowlu & al. in Nordic J. Bot. 33: 42. 2015), in which the holotype was designated with two collection numbers: Chowlu 00362 and Chowlu 00441. As required by Art. 40.1 and permitted by Art. 40.2 of the ICN (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012), the name was not validly published because two gatherings were designated as the type and consequently the type was not indicated. In fact, the name has now been validated by Chowlu (in Nordic J. Bot. 34: 384. 2016) with the type citation “India, Manipur, Tamenglong District, Tamenglong (24°48.78′ N, 93°32.77′ E, 403 m asl), 7 Jun 2013, K. Chowlu 00362 (holotype: CAL), K. Chowlu 00441 (isotype: Centre for Orchid Gene Conservation of Eastern Himalayan Region, Herbarium, Hengbung, Manipur).” Because here the holotype and isotype bear different collection numbers, we ask is it permissible for the latter specimen to be an isotype under Art. 9.4 of the ICN?

To this question, we found an answer in Prop. 100 (Sennikov in Taxon 64: 1337–1338. 2015), which proposed a new Note after Art. 8.2: “Field numbers, collection numbers, accession numbers, or barcode numbers alone do not necessarily denote different gatherings.”

Sennikov in his proposal (i.e.) also postulated that “the Code […] does not specify importance of any numbers in citations of specimens”. However, in our opinion, the importance of collection numbers can be felt in Art. 9.4 of the Code, which defines an isotype to be any duplicate of the holotype; “duplicate” not only in the sense of plant material, but also the field details associated with the holotype including collection number or field number. Recently Kurşat & al (in Turkish J. Bot. 39: 89. 2015) validly published Artemisia bashkalensis Kurşat & Civelek with the holotype citation as “C10 Hakkari: 58 km from Hakkari to Van, roadside, slopes, steppe, 20.09.2007, 1805 m, (37°47.817′ N, 44°05.156′ E) M. Kurşat & Ş. Civelek 1057 (FUH)” along with one of paratypes cited as “C10 Hakkari: the highway between Van and Hakkari provinces, 58 km to Hakkari Province, found at roadsides and slopes, steppe, 20.09.2007, 1805 m, (37°47.817′ N, 44°05.156′ E) M. Kurşat & Ş. Civelek 1057.” In this case, all the details pertaining to the “paratype”, including collection number, are the
same as those of the holotype, and hence this “paratype” must in fact be an isotype.

In conclusion, we would say that the change to the definition of gathering currently provided in the Code, as proposed by Zhu (Prop. 030 in Taxon 63: 1145–1146. 2014), is not required, and neither is the addition of a Note, as proposed by Sennikov (l.c.). Instead, we urge the removal of ambiguity associated with the concept of “duplicate” in the Code by deletion of the footnote to Art. 8.3 and the addition of a new paragraph in Art. 8. The footnote also contains the advice “while choosing a lectotype for the name, the possibility of mixed gathering must always be considered by an author”, which we consider would be better transferred to a new paragraph in Rec. 9A.

(305) Add a new paragraph after Art. 8.3:
“8.3bis. A duplicate is part of a single gathering of a single species or infraspecific taxon made by the same collector(s) bearing same collection number and details.”

(306) Add a new paragraph after Rec. 9A.2:
“9A.2bis. The possibility of a mixed gathering must always be considered by an author choosing a lectotype, and corresponding caution used.”

(307) Delete the footnote to Art. 8.3.
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