

## (1521–1522) Proposals to reject the names *Mitrephora teysmannii* and *Orophea macrocarpa* (Annonaceae)

Aruna D. Weerasooriya<sup>1</sup> & Richard M. K. Saunders

Department of Ecology & Biodiversity, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China. E-mail: saunders@hkucc.hku.hk

<sup>1</sup>Current address: Department of Biology, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 8001 Natural Bridge Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63121, U.S.A. E-mail: weerasooriya@msx.umsl.edu

- (1521) *Mitrephora teysmannii* Scheff., Natuurk. Tijdschr. Ned.-Indië 31: 12. 1869 ('teysmannii') [Dicot.: Annon.], nom. utique rej. prop. Holotypus: Cult. Hort. Bogor. [originally collected in Bangka], R. H. C. C. Scheffer s.n. (BO).

Although most species of *Mitrephora* (Annonaceae) are comparatively narrow endemics, *M. maingayi* Hook. f. & Thomson (Fl. Brit. India 1: 77. 1872) is widespread in wet evergreen forests of Myanmar (Burma), Thailand, Laos, Kampuchea (Cambodia), Peninsular Malaysia, Sumatra and Borneo. This species name has been widely used, but is antedated by the largely overlooked name, *M. teysmannii* Scheff. (Scheffer, l.c.), the type of which has recently been confirmed as conspecific with *M. maingayi*. The present proposal aims to reject the name *M. teysmannii* to prevent an unnecessary nomenclatural change.

The name *M. maingayi* has been widely adopted in many taxonomic revisions, including King (in J. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, part 2, Nat. Hist. 61: 335. 1892; in Ann. Roy. Bot. Gard., (Calcutta) 4: 112. 1893), Finet & Gagnepain (in Bull. Soc. Bot. France, Mém. IV 53: 126. 1906), Ridley (Fl. Malay Penins. 1: 73. 1922), Sinclair (in Gard. Bull. Singapore 14: 464. 1955), Fries (in Melchior, Nat. Pflanzenfam. ed. 2, 17a II: 136. 1959), Kochummen (Tree Fl. Malaya 1: 80. 1972), and P.-H. Hô (Câyco Vietnam 1: 345. 1991). It has also been extensively used in other botanical works, including Brandis (Indian Trees: 19. 1906), Chowdhury & Ghosh (Indian Woods: 20. 1958), Burkill (Dict. Econ. Prod. Malay Penins. 2: 1508. 1966), Klucking (Leaf Venation Patterns 1: 133. 1986), van Heusden (in Blumea, suppl. 7: 111. 1992), van Setten & Koek-Noorman (in Biblioth. Bot. 142: 93. 1992), Sosef (PROSEA 5(3): 386. 1998), and N. H. S. Lee & al. (in J. Nat. Prod. (Lloydia) 62: 1158–1159. 1999). *Mitrephora maingayi* was furthermore used as the basionym for *Kinginda maingayi* (Hook. f. & Thomson) Kuntze (Revis. Gen. Pl. 1: 7. 1891), although the latter combination was never subsequently adopted.

There is no ambiguity over the application of the name *M. maingayi*, since the protologue (Hook. f. & Thomson, l.c.) is detailed, and the type material (BM, K, GH, L) is fertile and of high quality. There has nevertheless been some confusion regarding the correct application of the name in China and Indochina. Ast (in Lecomte, Fl. Indo-Chine, 1 (Suppl.): 100. 1938) erroneously identified many collections of a currently undescribed species of *Mitrephora* as "*M. maingayi*". This error is surprising, since the two species are clearly distinct, but has nevertheless been perpetuated in several recent publications on the floras of China and Vietnam, viz., Y. Tsiang & P.-T. Li (Fl. Reipubl. Popul. Sin. Suppl. 30(2): 58–59. 1979), W.-T. Wang (Icon. Corm. Sin. 1: 523. 1982), P.-T. Li (in W. J. Zheng, Sylva Sin. 1: 567–568. 1983), N. T. Bân (Thuc vật chí Việt Nam 1: 276. 2000), and P.-T. Li & Z.-K. Li (Higher Pl. China 3: 173. 2000). We believe that these errors are the result of failure to appreciate Hooker & Thomson's conception of the species, rather than differing taxonomic opinions regarding species delimitation.

Although the name *M. maingayi* has been widely applied, it is antedated by *M. teysmannii* Scheff. (Scheffer, l.c.), a name that has only been adopted by Boerlage (in Icon. Bogor. 1: 2–3. 1899) and in annotations to some herbarium collections from Bangka and Sumatra. The name *M. teysmannii* has long been recognised as a synonym of *M. maingayi*, initially by King (l.c. 1892, presumably overlooking its priority) and subsequently by Sinclair (l.c.) and N. T. Bân (l.c.). There is no doubt that this taxonomic interpretation is correct.

Strict application of the principle of priority would require adoption of the name *M. teysmannii*; in order to maintain nomenclatural stability, however, we propose that this name be formally rejected under Art. 56 of the ICBN (Greuter & al., Regnum Veg. 138. 2000), enabling the continued use of the name *M. maingayi*. We do not believe that recent misconceptions regarding the application of the name *M. maingayi* are significant enough to prevent its use in preference to *M. teysmannii*.

- (1522) *Orophea macrocarpa* Miq., Ann. Mus. Lugd.-Bat. 2: 26. 1865 [*Dicot.: Annon.*], *nom. utique rej. prop.*  
Lectotypus (vide Keßler in Blumea 33: 68. 1988): Celebes [= Sulawesi], 1859–1860, *J. E. Teysmann s.n.* (L No. 898.62-107; isotypi: B, L, U).

*Mitrephora celebica* Scheff. (Scheffer, in *Natuurk. Tijdschr. Ned.-Indië* 32: 389. 1871) has a restricted distribution in Sulawesi, but has been widely discussed in the taxonomic literature since it exhibits several unusual morphological features within the genus, including very large fruits and inflorescences with branched rachides. Following the publication of the protologue of *M. celebica*, the name was cited in taxonomic studies by Scheffer (in *Ann. Jard. Bot. Buitenzorg* 11: 19. 1885), Boerlage (in *Icon. Bogor.* 1: pl. 46. 1899), Fries (in Melchior, *Nat. Pflanzenfam.* ed. 2, 17a II: 135–136 *M. celebica*. 1959) and van Heusden (in *Blumea suppl.* 7: 110–111. 1992); it has also been mentioned in other publications that are not specifically taxonomic, including a palynological study by Mitroiu (in *Lucr. Grâd. Bot. Bucuresti* 1969: 14, 126. 1970), and a cytological study by Okada & Ueda (in *Pl. Syst. Evol.* 144: 165–177. 1984).

The name *M. celebica* is antedated, however, by *Orophea macrocarpa* Miq. (Miquel, l.c.). This name has never been used since its publication, nor has it been used as a basionym for subsequent combinations. It clearly does not refer to a species of *Orophea*. Keßler (in *Blumea* 33: 68. 1988) suggested that the name was referable to a species of *Pseuduvaria*, but E. C. H. van Heusden, in annotations to the lectotype dated 1992, determined it as a synonym of *M. celebica*. There is no doubt that the latter identification is correct.

Strict application of the principle of priority would require the publication and use of a new combination in *Mitrephora* based on *O. macrocarpa* (Art. 11.4). In order to maintain nomenclatural stability, however, we recommend that the name *Orophea macrocarpa* be formally rejected under Art. 56, thereby enabling continued use of the widely used name *M. celebica*.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Financial support for this project was provided by a grant from The University of Hong Kong Research Committee, awarded to RMKS. We are grateful to John McNeill for his invaluable comments on the manuscript.