



## Validation of the name *Persea himalayensis* (Lauraceae)

VENKATACHALAM SAMPATH KUMAR<sup>1</sup> & MOHAN GANGOPADHYAY<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AE, England.

E-mail: V.Kumar@kew.org & vskumar10@rediffmail.com

<sup>2</sup>SHRC, Botanical Survey of India, P.O. Raj Bhavan, Gangtok 737 103, Sikkim, India. E-mail: mgangopadhyay555@gmail.com

In the publication of the new species “*Persea himalayaensis*”, Gangopadhyay (2006) did not cite a nomenclatural type and thus the species name was not validly published. In an attempt to correct the situation, we (Gangopadhyay & Kumar 2009) referred to the 2006 publication and republished “*Persea himalayaensis*”. At that time, it was assumed that for validation of such names lectotypification was necessary. Accordingly, we designated “Wall. Num. List no. 2607B” (CAL) as the “lectotype”. We did not realize that our validation attempt amounted to publishing the name of a new species and that a holotype citation was essential (Vienna Code Art. 37.6 ICBN, McNeill *et al.* 2006).

The International Plant Names Index (IPNI) correctly treated our attempt as the publication of the name of a new species and by citing the Vienna Code Art. 9.8, IPNI (2010) treated our lectotype designation as a correctable error for a holotype citation and indexed “*Persea himalayaensis* M.Gangop. ex M.Gangop. & V.S.Kumar, Nelumbo 51: 254. 2009” as a validly published name!

In January 2013, Kanchi N. Gandhi of the Harvard University Herbaria conducted a Botanical Nomenclature Workshop at Kolkata (formerly Calcutta), India, especially to encourage the young researchers in the field of Plant taxonomy. After the workshop, it occurred to Subir Bandyopadhyay and late Mithilesh K. Pathak of the Botanical Survey of India, Kolkata, that “*Persea himalayaensis* M. Gangop. ex M. Gangop. & V. S. Kumar” might not have been validly published and consulted Gandhi on the same. Gandhi agreed with them stating that for names of new taxa at the rank of species and below published after 1990, the usage of the term “type” or “holotype” (or their equivalents) is mandatory (Vienna Code Art. 37.6 ICBN, McNeill *et al.* 2006; Melbourne Code Art. 40.6 ICN, McNeill *et al.* 2012) and that any error in the usage of the term, such as lectotype, is not correctable [Melbourne Code Arts. 9.9 Note 6 and 40.6 Ex. 5 (not present in the Vienna Code)]. Accordingly, “*Persea himalayaensis* M.Gangop. ex M.Gangop. & V.S.Kumar” (in Nelumbo 51: 254. 2009) was not validly published. Presently, IPNI (2013) also shows the same. Bandyopadhyay as well as Gandhi communicated the same to us separately to validate this species.

As per their suggestion, we herewith republish the name with a type citation. Furthermore, we revise the previous specific epithet “*himalayaensis*” to “*himalayensis*”.

*Persea himalayensis* M. Gangop. & V. S. Kumar, *sp. nov.*

*Machilus odoratissima* Nees von Esenbeck (1831: 70), *pro min. parte, quoad* var.  $\beta$  Nees; Hooker (1886: 139), *pro parte. Persea himalayaensis* Gangopadhyay (2006: 135), *nom. inval.* (holotype was not designated).

*Persea himalayaensis* M. Gangop. ex Gangopadhyay & Kumar (2009: 254), *nom. inval.* (lectotype was designated erroneously rather than holotype).

Allied to *P. odoratissima* (Nees von Esenbeck 1831: 70) Kostermans (1952: 116), but differs in having glabrous inflorescence and oblong, ovoid-oblong or ellipsoid-oblong fruit.

Type:—INDIA. Uttarakhand: Montes prope Deyra Dhoon [Dehra Dun], *Wallich 2607B* (holotype CAL!; isotype K-W!).