X. THE CORRECT NAME FOR ARCHIDENDRON CLYPEARIA (JACK) NIELSEN VAR. CASAI (BLANCO) NIELSEN (LEGUMINOSAE-MIMOSOIDEAE)

J.F. VELDKAMP

Rijksherbarium/Hortus Botanicus, P.O. Box 9514, NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

Recently Gangopadhyay & Chakrabarty (1993, 1994) proposed the combination *Archidendron clypearia* (Jack) Nielsen var. *montanum* (Benth.) Gang. & T. Chakrab. When I compared this to some papers Nielsen wrote (1984 (et al.); 1992) it would seem that this new combination would be identical with *A. clypearia* var. *casai* (Blanco) Nielsen (1984) allegedly based on *Mimosa scutifera* Blanco var. *casai* Blanco (1837).

When I looked up this basionym with its curious varietal epithet I discovered to my vast surprise that Blanco had not published this combination at all, as had already been observed by Merrill (1918). Blanco (1837, 1845, 1879) merely described an unnamed variety of *Mimosa scutifera* Blanco with 'casai' or 'casay' as one of its vernacular names. Fernandez-Villar (1880) cited the var. *casai* as a synonym under *Pithecellobium montanum* Benth., so the combination was not validly published there, either. Naves (1879) seems to have been responsible for the plate of *Mimosa scutifera* var. *casai*, but in its caption he also cited *P. montanum* Benth. var. *subfalcatum* Miq. (1855). I have found no instance where var. *casai* was validated before Nielsen et al. (1984) used the epithet. Kostermans (1954) without comment cited var. *casai* ('cassai') in the synonymy of *Abarema clypearia* (Jack) Kosterm. He regarded *Merrill Sp. blancoanae* 461 (A, holo, BM, CAL, K, L, NY, P) as the lectotype, but as the combination was then not yet validly published it was of course only a voucher. It became a neotype when Nielsen et al. validated the combination.

A synonym (Kostermans, Nielsen) is *Inga falciformis* Hasskarl (1842a, b), a later homonym of *I. falciformis* DC. (1825). Subsequently Hasskarl renamed his species to *I. falcifolia* Hassk. (1844, no basionym or specimen given, clarified in 1848, still without material). According to Kostermans the type would be either a Hasskarl specimen in BO (l.c. p. 43) or a Reinwardt specimen supposedly in L (l.c. p. 46), but which I failed to find.

Zollinger (1846) mentioned under *I. falcifolia 'Hassk. herb. Zoll. et Mor. N. 2520'*, which indicates the presence of TWO specimens: the Hasskarl one and *Zollinger 2520*. The Hasskarl collection was probably used by Zollinger to identify his own material. Obviously *Zollinger 2520* cannot be the type of *I. falcifolia*, for that specimen was collected near the end of 1844 in the Tengger area. Even if *I. falcifolia* by the lack of reference to a previously published taxon is considered to be heterotypic with *I. falciformis*, the collection was made too late to have been available to Hasskarl for his Catalogue which appeared in October 1844.

Another synonym (Kostermans, Nielsen) is *Inga subfalcata* Zoll. & Mor., actually described by Zollinger (1846) who stated (p. 73): "Java. Vidi in Herb. Hort. Bogor." and regarded by him as a distinct taxon related to *I. falcifolia* Hassk. (l.c. p. 81). Miquel (1855) reduced it to *Pithecellobium montanum* Benth. var. *subfalcatum* ('subfalcata'). Clearly its type cannot be *Zollinger 2520*, but no one has indicated another.

Kostermans therefore erroneously cited Zollinger 2520 as the type for both *I. falcifolia* and *I. subfalcata* (note that he cited '2502' in the synonymy, and, correctly, '2520' in the specimen list).

Misled hereby Nielsen thought that the latter combination was superfluous. He then erred when he thought that a varietal combination based on an illegitimate combination would be illegitimate, too ('nom. rejic.'). This is not so, Miquel could use any epithet he pleased at the varietal level, including one that might have been illegitimate at the specific level.

Yet another synonym (Kostermans, Nielsen) is *P. montanum* var. *variegatum* Miq., which is based on 3 specimens (*Blume 628–640*, L, hololectotype, no. 908.121-879; iso -875, with a fragment in U) (Kostermans cited this combination only in the specimen list for forma *montana*). Nielsen rejected this combination as he thought that a name based on a monstrosity was illegitimate. This was indeed the case until the Leningrad Code (1978, Art. 71).

Under the present rules the creation of varieties under *P. montanum* automatically generates the autonym *P. montanum* Benth. var. *montanum* (Art. 26.3), which even when not mentioned originally takes priority over the others when considered to refer to the same taxon (Art. 11.6).

All this in fact makes A. clypearia var. casai superfluous. Even more surprisingly, the combination we are forced by the Code to use is one that has only recently been mentioned in print at the varietal level:

Archidendron clypearia (Jack) Nielsen var. montanum (Benth.) Gangopadhyay & Chakrabarty, J. Econ. Tax. Bot. 17 (1993) 688; ibid. 18 (1994) 223. — Pithecellobium montanum Benth., London J. Bot. 3 (1844) 209. — Pithecellobium montanum Benth. var. montanum: Miq., Fl. Ned. Ind. 1, 1 (1855) 37 (by implication, based on P. montanum Benth.). — Abarema clypearia (Jack) Kosterm. forma montana (Benth.) Kosterm., Bull. Organ. Natuurw. Onderz. Indon. 20 (1954) 45. — Type: Spanoghe s.n. (K, holo).

This result may perhaps be surprising to the authors themselves!

In their second paper Gangopadhyay & Chakrabarty corrected a printer's error in the first one, where the epithet of the basionym had been omitted. However, the Code (Art. 33.2) only requires that the "basionym ... is clearly *indicated* and a full and direct reference (is) given to its author and place of valid publication ...", but strangely enough it is not said here (or elsewhere) that the basionym *itself* must be given! In general the Article is interpreted that the basionym must be given completely, but the Code says 'indicated', a more vague term. The article does not explicitly state whether the basionym should be in the form of 'Pithecellobium montanum', or whether 'P. montanum' would do as well. The requirements for author and publication are all fully fulfilled. It can therefore be concluded that in the first publication the article's conditions were met. The omission of the epithet of the basionym may be regarded as either a bibliographic error (Art. 33.2, cf. Exx. 4-6), or as a typographic one (Art. 60.1, cf. Ex. 2 and 3) to be corrected. Strictly speaking, it would therefore seem that the combination was already validly published in the first paper.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. I. Nielsen (AAU) kindly read through the various stages of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Blanco, F.M. 1837. Fl. Filip.: 736. Manila.

Blanco, F.M. 1845. Fl. Filip., ed. 2: 502. Manila.

Blanco, F.M. 1879. Fl. Filip., ed. 3, 3: 138, t. 447 (by A. Naves). Manila.

Fernandez-Villar, C. 1880. Novissima appendix: 76. Manila.

Gangopadhyay, M. & T. Chakrabarty. 1993. The genus Archidendron F. v. Mueller (Mimosaceae) in India. J. Econ. Tax. Bot. 17: 688.

Gangopadhyay, M. & T. Chakrabarty. 1994. Archidendron clypearia var. montanum comb. & stat. nov. - corrigendum. J. Econ. Tax. Bot. 18: 223.

Hasskarl, J. K. 1842a. Plantarum genera et species novae aut reformatae javensis. Flora 25, Beibl. 2/4: 54.

Hasskarl, J. K. 1842b. Leguminosarum quarundam javensium descriptiones novae aut emendatae. Flora 25, Beibl. 2/7: 104.

Hasskarl, J. K. Oct. 1844. Catalogus plantarum in horto botanica bogoriensi cultarum alter: 291. Batavia. Hasskarl, J. K. 1848. Plantae javanicae rariores; 418. Berlin.

Kostermans, A.J.G.H. 1954. A monograph of the Asiatic, Malaysian, Australian and Pacific species of Mimosaceae, formerly included in Pithecelobium (!) Mart. Bull. Organ. Natuurw. Onderz. Indonesië 20: 42-47.

Merrill, E.D. 1918, Species blancoanae: 165, Manila.

Merrill, E.D. 1923. An enumeration of Philippine flowering plants 2: 245. Manila.

Miquel, F. A. W. 1855. Flora van Nederlandsch Indië 1: 36-37. Utrecht.

Nielsen, I. 1992. Mimosaceae (Leguminosae-Mimosoideae). Flora Malesiana I, 11: 98. Leiden.

Nielsen, I., T. Baretta-Kuipers & P. Guinet. 1984. The genus Archidendron (Leguminosae-Mimosoideae). Opera Bot. 76: 52-57.

Vidal y Soler, S. 1886. Revision de plantas vasculares filipinas: 121. Manila.

Zollinger, H. 1846. Observationes phytographicae etc. 2. Nat. Geneesk. Arch. Ned. Ind. 3: 73, 81.