Hammel, B.E. 2020. A new combination in *Mespilodaphne* (Lauraceae) for a Costa Rican *Ocotea*. Phytoneuron 2020-84: 1.
Published 18 November 2020. ISSN 2153 733X

A NEW COMBINATION IN *MESPILODAPHNE* (LAURACEAE) FOR A COSTA RICAN *OCOTEA*

BARRY E. HAMMEL
Missouri Botanical Garden
St. Louis, Missouri 63110
barry.hammel@mobot.org

ABSTRACT

In order to conform with recent phylogenetic classification within *Ocotea* as well as the taxonomy used in the Lauraceae treatment in Vol. VI of the *Manual de Plantas de Costa Rica*, the species treated therein as *Ocotea paradoxa* Mez is recognized here as **Mespilodaphne paradoxa** (Mez) Hammel, **comb. nov.**

Mespilodaphne paradoxa (Mez) Hammel **comb. nov.** Basionym: *Ocotea paradoxa* Mez, Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 30 (Beibl. 67): 16. 1901. *Ocotea klepperae* van der Werff; *M. klepperae* (van der Werff) Trofimov.

In light of their taxonomy that includes *Ocotea paradoxa* as a synonym of *Ocotea veraguensis* (Meisn.) Mez, while accomodating "*Ocotea dendrodaphne* group" species into their reinstatement of the mezian genus *Mespilodaphne*, Trofimov et al. (2019) had no reason to transfer said paradoxical *Ocotea* to *Mespilodaphne*. But I do, convinced, as I still am, by the taxonomy that considers *O. paradoxa* an older name for *O. klepperae* (see González & Hammel 2007).

Type material of *Ocotea paradoxa* (*Tonduz 7648*, BR!, CR!) is a good match to that of *O. klepperae* (*Hammel 22068*, CR!, MO!) and the type localities of said names are not far apart, both being from near the boundary between Puntarenas and San José provinces along the middle part of Costa Rica's Pacific coast, southeast of San Jose, in the coastal foothills of the northern part of the Cordillera de Talamanca just above Puerto Quepos. Each of these two species was diagnosed by its author as distinct from *O. veraguensis* using nearly the same words. Mez (1901) considered *O. paradoxa* close to *O. veraguensis* "insigniter toto habitu [frutex ramulis summo apiceo paullo ferrugineo-tomentellis, glabratis brunneis, teretibus, gemmis ferrugineo- vei flavido-tomentellis], inflorescentia pauciflora racemosaque, floris glandulis differt." And then somewhat later, perhaps without taking a second look at *O. paradoxa*, van der Werff (2001) distinguished *O klepperae* "from the other species in this subgenus in its dense indument on twigs, inflorescences, and flowers. *Ocotea klepperae* further differs from the common *O. veraguensis* (Meisn.) Mez and *O. dendrodaphne* Mez in having shorter inflorescences with fewer flowers."

LITERATURE CITED

González, J. and B.E. Hammel. 2007. *Ocotea*. Pp. 129–158, in B.E. Hammel, M.H. Grayum, C. Herrera, & N. Zamora (eds.). Manual de Plantas de Costa Rica. Vol. VI. Dicotiledóneas (Haloragaceae–Phytolaccaceae). Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 111: 1–933.

Mez, C. 1901. Bromeliaceae et Lauraceae novae vel adhuc non satis cognitae. Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 30(Beibl. 67): 1–20.

Trofimov, D., P.L.R. de Moraes, and J.G. Rohwer. 2019. Towards a phylogenetic classification of the *Ocotea* complex (Lauraceae): Classification principles and reinstatement of *Mespilodaphne*. Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 190: 25–50.

van der Werff, H. 2001. New taxa and new combinations in *Ocotea* (Lauraceae) from Central America. Novon 11: 501–511.