Notes on the typification of five names in Lauraceae

ANAND KUMAR¹

ABSTRACT

This article deals with inadvertent lectotypifications of five names in the Lauraceae, Cryptocarya densiflora, Cryptocarya impressa, Cylicodaphne infectoria, Laurus cubeba and Litsea castanea, that have been previously overlooked.
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INTRODUCTION

The Lauraceae is a pantropical family with a few temperate members and comprises between 2,500 and 3,500 species (Rohwer, 1993). The five names, Cryptocarya densiflora Blume, Cryptocarya impressa Miq., Cylicodaphne infectoria Blume (basionym of Cryptocarya infectoria (Blume) Miq. and synonym of Cryptocarya griffithiana Wight), Litsea castanea Hook.f. and Laurus cubeba Lour. (basionym of Litsea cubeba (Lour.) Pers.), were inadvertently lectotypified by a number of authors (Kostermans, 1970; Allen, 1938; Hyland, 1989) under Art. 7.11 of the Shenzhen Code (Turland et al., 2018; hereafter ‘Code’). Later authors (Ngernsaengsaruay et al., 2005; de Kok, 2015; Singh, 2017), presumably unaware of these inadvertent typifications, either published new and superfluous lectotypifications, or, in three cases, effectively published second-step lectotypifications.

Type specimen images of all names have been studied from online resources. The curator of BO was also consulted for a type image of Cryptocarya densiflora. Details of the inadvertent lectotypifications are given below to ensure the correct future citation of the earliest designated lectotypes.


Notes.— Blume (1826) cited “in sylvis obscurioribus montis Salak” in the protologue. According to de Kok (2015: 323), the species was described based on two gatherings, Blume s.n. and Reinwardt s.n. I have been able to trace three specimens (L0036108, L0036109, L0036110) of Reinwardt s.n. at L which were collected from Gedokan, Java and not from montis Salak. These three specimens are not original material. There is one specimen at BO and it bears a label with the annotation ‘Cryptocarya densiflora Bl’ on the bottom right side and an additional label also at the bottom with the name “Kiteja” and “S” [Salak], all in Blume’s own handwriting. Hyland (1989: 180) cited “Type: C. Blume, Mount Salak, Java (BO)” and the citation of ‘type’ should be accepted as an inadvertent lectotypification under Art. 7.11 of the Code. Later, de Kok (2015: 320) overlooked the lectotypification by Hyland (1989) and designated the specimen L0036111 as lectotype. Therefore, the lectotypification by de Kok (2015) is superfluous.
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Notes.— *Cyllicodaphne infectoria* Blume is a heterotypic synonym of *Cryptocarya griffithiana* Wight. For *Cryptocarya infectoria*, Blume (1856) cited “In Archipelago Indico” in the protologue. Kostermans (1970: 312) cited “Typus: Arch. Ind., Herb. Waitz, fl., fr. (L, 3 sheets)” which is an inadvertent lectotypification under Art. 7.11 of the *Code*. There are three sheets at L, it can be taken as a first-step lectotypification under Art. 9.17 of the *Code*. Later, de Kok (2015: 323) overlooked the lectotypification by Kostermans (1970) and designated *Waitz s.n.* (lectotype L) as lectotype which is an effective second-step lectotypification under Art. 9.10.


Notes.— Hooker (1886) cited “MALACCA, Maingay (Kew Distrib. 1269)” in the protologue. Kostermans (1970: 89) cited “Typus: Maingay, Kew Distr. 1269 (K)” which is an inadvertent lectotypification under Art. 7.11 of the *Code*. There are two specimens at K but these were not distinguished into a lectotype and isolecotype so Kostermans (1970) can be taken as a first-step lectotypification. Later, Ngernsaengsaruay *et al.* (2005) overlooked the lectotypification by Kostermans (1970) and designated *Maingay 1269* (K) as lectotype. The specimen K000797100 bears the annotation “Lectotype of *Litsea castanea* Hook.f. selected by David Middleton in 2005”. Therefore, the lectotypification by Ngernsaengsaruay *et al.* (2005) is accepted here as a second-step lectotypification under Art. 9.10 as David Middleton is one of the coauthors of the paper.


Notes.— Loureiro (1790) cited “Habitat culta, nec rara in agris, & hortis Cochinchinae: puto, quod etiam in Chinâ” in the protologue. Allen (1938: 369) cited “FRENCH INDO-CHINA. TONKIN: J. Loureiro (type not seen, Brit. Mus.)” which is an inadvertent lectotypification under Art. 7.11 of the *Code*. There are two specimens at BM but these are not distinguished into a lectotype and isolecotype so Allen (1938) can be taken as a first-step lectotypification. Later, Singh (2017) overlooked the lectotypification by Allen (1938) and designated *Loureiro s.n.* (BM000793687) as lectotype. Therefore, the lectotypification by Singh (2017) is accepted here as second-step lectotypification under Art. 9.10.
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