

The only paper which rightly considered the priority of *Pteridium psittacinum* over *P. arachnoideum* is Ramos Giacosa & al. (in Bol. Soc. Argent. Bot. 39: 127–128. 2004). But since *P. arachnoideum* (or *P. aquilinum* var. *arachnoideum*) has been so widely applied, a change of names at species rank is undesirable, causing enormous nomenclatural instability to one of the most (if not *the* most) economically important ferns from S Brazil (and the Neotropics)—it poisons cattle and horses, it behaves as a weed in plantations, and people eat its fiddle heads (although poisonous)—going against the recommendation of the ICBN regarding stability of names (Art. 14, McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006).

Additionally, searching Google's international website on 16 December 2010, we found the following score for these species names: "*Pteridium arachnoideum*" appears 4940 times, "*Pteridium psittacinum*" 85 times, "*Aspidium brasilianum*" 5 times, "*Hypolepis brasiliana*" 6 times, "*Cystopteris brasiliana*" 17 times, and "*Pteris*

campestris" 9 times. It is clear that the most commonly applied species name for this taxon is *Pteridium arachnoideum*, and this together with its economic importance are strong reasons for its conservation, as here proposed.

Acknowledgements

The first author thanks Dr. Thomson (NSW) for discussing ideas on *Pteridium*; Ms. Wood and Mr. Franzone (GH) for sending images of the photo-type of *Pteris arachnoidea*; Dr. Stepánek and Dr. Stefánek for the reception and help at PRC; Dr. Sida for the reception and help at PR; Dr. Zappi for the opportunity given to develop part of his thesis and this proposal at K; also to all the staff at K; Dr. Wiersema for corrections and suggestions on this proposal; and CNPq for both Doctoral fellowships given (at Brazil and for the sandwich program abroad).

(1991) Proposal to conserve the name *Pandanus pervilleanus* against *P. boucheanus* (Pandanaeae)

Martin W. Callmander^{1,2} & Nicolas Fumeaux²

¹ Missouri Botanical Garden, P.O. Box 299, St. Louis, Missouri 63166-0299, U.S.A.

² Conservatoire et Jardin botaniques de la Ville de Genève, ch. de l'Impératrice 1, CP 60, 1292 Chambésy, Genève, Switzerland

Author for correspondence: Martin W. Callmander, martin.callmander@mobot.org

- (1991) ***Pandanus pervilleanus*** Solms in Linnaea 42: 35. Feb 1878 [Monocot.: Pandan.], nom. cons. prop.
Lectotypus (hic designatus): [icon] "*Vinsonia pervilleana*" in Gaudichaud, Voy. Bonite, Bot.: t. 31, fig. 1–7. 1841.
- (=) ***Pandanus boucheanus*** K. Koch in Wochenschr. Gärtnerei Pflanzk. 1: 131. 29 Apr 1858, nom. rej. prop.
Neotypus (hic designatus): cult. Hort. Berol., 1882 (B No. 81 0000558 [spirit coll. 177]),

This proposal aims to avoid having to replace the well-known and universally used name *Pandanus pervilleanus*, one of the oldest in the genus for a plant from Madagascar, by a previously ignored and virtually unknown earlier name, *P. boucheanus*.

The screw pine species currently known as *Pandanus pervilleanus* Solms is endemic to the east coast of Madagascar. The name is based on a wonderful drawing published by Gaudichaud (Voy. Bonite, Bot.: t. 31, fig. 1–7. 1841), later reproduced by Stone (in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 63: t. 18A. 1970). Gaudichaud's original designation, "*Vinsonia pervilleana*", is not validly published (under ICBN Art.42.1a) because the simultaneously published new genus "*Vinsonia*", represented on three different illustrations with accompanying analyses (Voy. Bonite, Bot.: t. 17, 23, 31. 1841) but lacking a separate generic description, included several other species and was therefore not monotypic. Later, Kurz (in J. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, Pt. 2, Nat. Hist. 38: 149. 1869) attempted to transfer Gaudichaud's earlier designation to *Pandanus* but in failing to add a description his "*P. pervilleanus*" was not validly published either. *Pandanus pervilleanus* was first validly published by Solms-Laubach (in Linnaea 42: 35. 1878), who supplied a Latin description, explicitly basing it on Gaudichaud's plate and some immature drupes from a plant cultivated in the Amsterdam Botanical

Garden (spirit specimens provided to him by Oudemans) and listing Kurz's earlier usage in synonymy. Since then, the epithet *pervilleanus* has been commonly applied to this species. Unfortunately, the living specimen in Amsterdam died before Solms had the opportunity to examine it, and we were not able to locate any fruits that he might have seen, neither in Solms's herbarium (GOET) nor in that of Oudemans (GRO). As a consequence, we herewith designate Gaudichaud's plate as the lectotype of *P. pervilleanus* Solms.

Koch described *Pandanus boucheanus* based on cultivated plants from the Berlin Botanical Garden in 1858 (in Wochenschr. Gärtnerei Pflanzk. 1: 131). He believed that these plants were probably conspecific with "*Vinsonia pervilleana*" but he was not certain that this name was properly published, and therefore considered that it could not be maintained. In an attempt to avoid confusion, Koch redescribed this entity as a new species, which has not hitherto been typified. Unfortunately, Koch's herbarium (in B) was destroyed in 1943, but recent investigations have located two syncarps in the spirit collection at B (nos. 177 and 178; digital specimen images with barcodes B 81 0000558 and B 81 0000557 available at <http://ww2.bgbm.org/herbarium>, 2010), which were collected in 1882 from a plant growing in the Berlin Garden three years after Koch's death. The original labels on the jars containing these specimens indicate "*P. boucheanus*" and the material is filed under this name. New labels with the erroneous identification *P. vandamii* Martelli & Pic. Serm. were added much later (see below). All indications suggest that these spirit specimens represent material taken from the original plant on which Koch based his name. The collection no. 177 is therefore designated here as the neotype of *P. boucheanus* (Koch could never have seen these syncarps by 1858, which would have developed even after his death in 1879 so they cannot be original material). Collection no. 177 is chosen

here because it bears a handwritten indication that the syncarps were growing in 1882. Furthermore, a drawing in the Herbarium Centrale Italicum in Firenze (FI), based on a specimen cultivated in Berlin (“ex horto Berol.”) and deposited in Saint Petersburg (LE), also refers to *P. boucheanus*. These three collections closely match Gaudichaud’s drawing, leaving little doubt that *P. boucheanus* and *P. pervilleanus* are conspecific.

With a single exception, at no time during the last 150 years has the epithet *boucheanus* been used when referring to the taxon currently known as *Pandanus pervilleanus* (e.g., Stone in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 63: 116. 1970; Guillaumet in Webbia 28: 509. 1973; Styger & al. in Agric. Systems 46: 298. 1999; Huynh in Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 122: 208. 2000; Callmander & al. in Oryx 41: app. 4. 2007). General compilations of plant names (e.g., Index Kew. 3: 533. 1894) and comprehensive lists of *Pandanaceae* (e.g., Martelli in Webbia 4: 8. 1913) have consistently treated *P. boucheanus* as a synonym of *P. pervilleanus* despite the fact that it is the older name. Warburg (in Engler, Pflanzenz. IV.9 (Heft 3): 61. 1900) appears to be the only author to have accepted *P. boucheanus* over *P. pervilleanus*. Although questions remain concerning the material Warburg used for the interpretation of this taxon in his monograph of the family, Martelli & Pichi-Sermolli (in Mém. Inst. Sci. Madagascar, Sér. B, Biol. Vég.: 3: 44–45. 1951) believed that he based his description on a mix of herbarium collections and Gaudichaud’s original illustration, and they therefore regarded Warburg’s concept of *P. boucheanus* as comprising two

distinct entities: *P. pervilleanus* (= *P. boucheanus*) and a new species drawn in Warburg’s monograph (l.c. 1900: 59, fig. 16H–J). Based on this conclusion, Martelli & Pichi-Sermolli described a new species, *P. vandamii* Martelli & Pic. Serm., typified by three collections of Perrier de la Bâthie (from which a lectotype will be selected in a separate publication) and placed *P. boucheanus* sensu Warb., pro parte, non K. Koch in synonymy under their new species.

Strict application of the principles of priority (ICBN Art. 11) would require using the long-overlooked name *Pandanus boucheanus* K. Koch for the species currently referred to *P. pervilleanus*. In an effort to promote nomenclatural stability, we therefore propose to conserve, under ICBN Art. 14, the unambiguously typified name *P. pervilleanus*, which has been used almost exclusively for well over a century and represents one of the oldest names applied to members of the genus for Madagascar.

Acknowledgments

We thank Robert Vogt (Curator, Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Museum Berlin-Dahlem) and Ulrike Starck (Berlin herbarium) for their help in finding the material of *P. boucheanus*. We are also grateful to Porter P. Lowry II (Missouri Botanical Garden based at the Muséum d’Histoire naturelle in Paris) and John Wiersema (United States Department of Agriculture in Beltsville, U.S.A.) for improving an earlier version of the manuscript.

(1992) Proposal to conserve the name *Encicosanthum* against *Monoon* (*Annonaceae*)

Richard M.K. Saunders & Bine Xue

School of Biological Sciences, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China

Author for correspondence: Richard M.K. Saunders, saunders@hkucc.hku.hk

(1992) *Encicosanthum* Becc. in Nuovo Giorn. Bot. Ital. 3: 183. 1871 [*Dicot.: Annon.*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: *E. paradoxum* Becc.

(=) *Monoon* Miq. in Ann. Mus. Bot. Lugduno-Batavum 2: 15. 23 May 1865, nom. rej. prop.

Typus (hic designatus): *M. lateriflorum* (Blume) Miq. (*Guatteria lateriflora* Blume).

The genus *Polyalthia* Blume (Fl. Javae 28–29 [Anon.]: 68. 1830) is one of the largest palaeotropical genera in *Annonaceae*, with over 300 published names listed in the *International Plant Name Index* (IPNI; <http://www.ipni.org>), of which approximately 130 are still in use according to the internationally coordinated *Annonaceae* checklist (<http://herbarium.botanik.univie.ac.at/annonaceae/listTax.php>). Several molecular phylogenetic studies have demonstrated that the genus, as currently delimited, is highly polyphyletic, with species scattered in at least five distinct clades (e.g., Mols & al. in Amer. J. Bot. 91: 590–600. 2004; Xue & al. in Syst. Biodivers., in press). One of these clades also includes species of *Encicosanthum* Becc., indicating that the delimitation of *Encicosanthum* should be expanded to include the associated *Polyalthia* species. The name *Encicosanthum* is antedated by the name *Monoon* Miq. (l.c.), which has long been

recognised as a synonym of *Polyalthia*. The precise application of the name *Monoon* has been unclear since it has never been typified, and whichever species is selected as the type will have significant nomenclatural ramifications. In order to maintain consistency in the application of the name *Monoon* we have here selected *M. lateriflorum* (Blume) Miq. as the type. This typification renders the names *Monoon* and *Encicosanthum* synonymous by this new classification of the latter genus, necessitating conservation of the name *Encicosanthum* in order to prevent the overturning of a widely used and long-established name.

The generic name *Monoon* Miq. (l.c.) was initially published with 18 species, without any subsequent attempt to designate a type. Taxonomic and phylogenetic research (e.g., Mols & al., l.c.) has revealed that the *Monoon* species recognised by Miquel represent several different genera, including *Desmos*, *Friesodielsia*, *Maasia*, *Marsypopetalum* and *Phaeanthus* as well as at least three different clades within *Polyalthia* (*Polyalthia* s.str., the ‘*Encicosanthum* group’ and the ‘*Marsypopetalum* group’).

Hooker & Thomson (in Hooker, Fl. Brit. India 1: 45–94. 1872) subsequently reduced *Monoon* to a section within *Polyalthia* (as *Polyalthia* sect. *Monoon* (Miq.) Hook. f. & Thomson), restricting the delimitation of the taxon to include only those species with a solitary,