EDINBURGH JOURNAL OF BOTANY 70 (3): 487–490 (2013) 
© Trustees of the Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh (2013)
doi:10.1017/S0960428613000176

# LECTOTYPIFICATION OF *PHANERA MACROSTACHYA* BENTH. (LEGUMINOSAE: CAESALPINIOIDEAE)

S. Bandyopadhyay

The name *Phanera macrostachya* (Leguminosae: Caesalpinioideae) is lectotypified here.

*Keywords.* Lectotype, *Phanera macrostachya*.

## Introduction

The name *Phanera macrostachya* Benth., despite the lack of a diagnosis or description, was validly published by Bentham (1852) by reference to '*Bauhinia scandens* Roxb. non Linn.' which indirectly referred to the previously and effectively published description by Roxburgh (1832) (Art. 38.13–14 and Art. 41 Note 3 in McNeill *et al*., 2012). Bentham realised that Roxburgh had misapplied the binomial *Bauhinia scandens* to a taxon that should have been described as a new species. Thus he provided a new name, *Phanera macrostachya*. He also cited '*B. macrostachya* Wall. *Cat*. n. 5774' but validated the name solely by reference to *B. scandens* Roxb. non L. and thus only the material used by Roxburgh qualifies as original material (Art. 9.3 and Art. 7.7 in McNeill *et al.*, 2012). Thothathri (1965), incorrectly, did not consider *Phanera macrostachya* Benth. to be validly published because it was not accompanied by a description.

Roxburgh (1832: 2: 326) cited this species as 'B. *scandens*. *Willd*. 2. 58', a reference to *Bauhinia scandens* L. in Willd., Sp. Pl. 2: 58 (1799). He wrote 'Gund*a*-gilla the vernacular name in Silhet, where it is indigenous in the forests of that province, running up, and over trees of the first magnitude. Flowering in April and the seed ripening in October'. He also cited the pre-Linnaean 'Folium linguæ. *Rumph. Amb*. 5. *p*. 1. *t*. 1', which is now considered to be *Phanera lingua* (DC.) Miq. (see de Wit, 1956 and Larsen & Larsen, 1996, although in the latter publication it was included in *Bauhinia*). However, the description provided by Roxburgh (1832) does not include the morphological features of *Folium linguae* Rumph.

Wallich (1831–1832), being aware that Roxburgh had misidentified this material, provided a new name, *Bauhinia macrostachya* Wall., for his catalogue no. 5774 and cited '*Bauh. scandens* Roxb. [illegible] haud Linn.'. Under 5774 Wallich cited two specimens: 'a a Sillet FD' and 'B *Bauhinia scandens* H. Ham. e Sivapur'. Mabberley

Central National Herbarium, Botanical Survey of India, P.O. Botanic Garden, Howrah – 711103, West Bengal, India. E-mail: subirbandyopadhyay@yahoo.com

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960428613000176 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1980), in a list of the validly published names in Wallich's catalogue, stated 'I have been unable to date the parts of the *Catalogue* dealing with nos. 4878–7683 (1831–1832) with any accuracy, so that there is a handful of names, fewer than a score in number, which may be validly published if those parts were brought out after the relevant volumes of the second edition (Jan., Sept., 1832) of *Flora Indica*'. The exact publication date of Wallich's 5774, therefore, is not known with any accuracy. On the other hand the valid date of publication of the second edition of Roxburgh's *Flora Indica* is 14 January 1832 (Mabberley, 1977). If Wallich (1831–1832) was published after Roxburgh (1832) then *Bauhinia macrostachya* Wall. would have been validly published by reference back to the description provided by Roxburgh. However, in the absence of any evidence to support this it should be assumed that *Bauhinia macrostachya* Wall. is a *nomen nudum*.

Macbride (1919) published a new name, *Bauhinia wallichii* J.F.Macbr., for *B. macrostachya* 'Wall. ex Baker in Hook.' (Baker, 1878) because *B. macrostachya* (Benth.) Baker is a later homonym of *B. macrostachya* Benth. (Bentham, 1840), a quite different taxon. Although Macbride (1919) had overlooked the fact that the combination *Bauhinia macrostachya* for this taxon had already been published earlier, confusingly also by Bentham (1865), *B. wallichii* J.F.Macbr. remains the correct name for this taxon in the genus *Bauhinia*.

Larsen & Larsen (1980) cited the type of *Bauhinia wallichii* J.F.Macbr. as '*Wallich 5774 A*, Inde (holo-, K)'. There are two relevant specimens at K which have been annotated by the Larsens. The first, K000496948, has their determinavit slip with the name '*Bauhinia wallichii* Macbride'. The second, K000496949, bearing the stamp HERBARIUM BENTHAMIANUM 1854, also has their determinavit slip with the name '*Bauhinia wallichii* Macbride' and an additional annotation of 'ISOTYPE' on the determination slip. Larsen & Larsen (1980) suggested that K000496949 is an isotype but they did not indicate a specimen they considered to be the holotype.

Under his catalogue no. 5774 Wallich (1831–1832) cited the specimen from Sillet as: 'a a Sillet FD'. FD is the name of the collector, i.e. Francis de Silva (V. Sampath Kumar and D. J. Nicholas Hind, pers. comm., 2013). This specimen could not have been seen by Roxburgh because Francis de Silva collected specimens for Wallich sometime after 1815 and, therefore, after Roxburgh left India in 1813 and after his death in 1815 (M. F. Watson, pers. comm., 2013). Previously I too have incorrectly cited *Wallich* 5774A as the type (Bandyopadhyay, 2001).

I have been unable to locate any herbarium material that Roxburgh used for his concept of *Bauhinia scandens* despite an exhaustive search. The Roxburgh drawing of *Bauhinia scandens*, no. 2238 at K, shows a flowering specimen and a separately drawn dehisced pod with a mature seed. The drawing at CAL is also the same but with only the outline of the pod and the seed. According to Sealy (1956) the drawings at K can be connected with certainty to Roxburgh's descriptions. Therefore, in the absence of specimens I am lectotypifying the name *Phanera macrostachya* Benth. with the Roxburgh drawing 2238 at K.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960428613000176 Published online by Cambridge University Press

## Lectotypification

**Phanera macrostachya** Benth. in Miq., Pl. Jungh. 262 (1852). − *Bauhinia macrostachya* (Benth.) Benth. in Benth. & Hook.f., Gen. Pl. 1: 576 (1865), non Benth. (1840); Kurz, J. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, Pt. 2, Nat. Hist. 45(2): 288 (1877); Baker in Hook.f., Fl. Brit. India 2: 281 (1878). − *Bauhinia wallichii* J.F.Macbr. in Contr. Gray Herb. 3: 23 (1919). − *Phanera wallichii* (J.F.Macbr.) Thoth. in Bull. Bot. Soc. Bengal 19: 131 (1965). – Type: Flowering specimen in Roxburgh drawing no. 2238 at K, lectotype designated here; isolectotype CAL.

*Bauhinia scandens* auct. non L.: Roxb., Fl. Ind. 2: 326 (1832), p.p., excl. syn. cit. *Folium linguae* Rumph. 1747.

## Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the Director, Botanical Survey of India and Additional Director, Central National Herbarium, BSI for facilities; the curators of A, B-W, BM, BR, C, DBN, E, FI, G, K, LIV, NY, OXF, P, PH and UPS for their help; the Director, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew for access to literature and cibachrome photos of the Kew specimens; and Drs D. J. Nicholas Hind, M. F. Watson, V. Sampath Kumar, the late M. K. Pathak and R. L. Mitra for their help. I am also grateful to Dr J. McNeill and Dr D. J. Middleton for their suggestions.

## References

Baker, J. G. (1878). *Bauhinia*. In: Hooker, J. D., *Flora of British India* 2: 275–285. London: L. Reeve & Co.

Bandyopadhyay, S. (2001). Miscellaneous notes on *Bauhinia* L. (Leguminosae: Caesalpinioideae). *J. Econ. Taxon. Bot.* 25(1): 10–12.

Bentham, G. (1840). IV. – Contributions towards a Flora of South America. – Enumeration of Plants collected by Mr. Schomburgk in British Guiana. *J. Bot. (Hooker)* 2: 38–103.

Bentham, G. (1852). Leguminosae. In: Miquel, F. A. W. (ed.) *Plantae Junghuhnianae*, pp. 205–269. Leiden.

Bentham, G. (1865). Tribus XV. Bauhinieæ. In: Bentham, G. & Hooker, J. D., *Genera Plantarum* 1(2): 575–577. London: Lovell Reeve & Co.

Larsen, K. & Larsen, S. S. (1980). *Bauhinia*. In: Aubréville, A. & Leroy, J.-F. (eds) *Flore du Cambodge du Laos et du Viêt-nam* 18: 146–210. Paris.

Larsen, K. & Larsen, S. S. (1996). *Bauhinia*. In: Kalkman, C., Kirkup, D. W., Nooteboom, H. P., Stevens, P. F. & Wilde, W. J. J. O. de (eds) *Flora Malesiana* 12(2): 442–535. The Netherlands: Rijksherbarium/Hortus Botanicus, Leiden University.

Mabberley, D. J. (1977). Francis Hamilton's Commentaries with particular reference to Meliaceae. *Taxon* 26(5/6): 523–540.

Mabberley, D. J. (1980). A re-examination of the 'Indian Catalogues' with particular reference to Hortus Malabaricus. In: Manilal, K. S. (ed.) *Botany and history of Hortus Malabaricus*, pp. 80–110. New Delhi: Oxford & IBH Pub. Co.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960428613000176 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MACBRIDE, J. F. (1919). Notes on certain Leguminosae. *Contr. Gray Herb.* 3(59): 1–27.
MCNEILL, J., BARRIE, F. R., BUCK, W. R., DEMOULIN, V., GREUTER, W., HAWKSWORTH, D. L. *ET AL.* (eds) (2012). *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (Melbourne Code)*. Adopted by the Eighteenth International Botanical Congress, Melbourne, Australia, July 2011. Ruggell: A. R. G. Gantner Verlag KG/Koeltz Scientific Books [Regnum Veg. 154].
ROXBURGH, W. (1832). *Bauhinia*. *Flora Indica* 2: 318–332. Printed for W. Thacker and Co. Calcutta, and Parbury, Allen and Co. London, Serampore.
SEALY, J. R. (1956). The Roxburgh *Flora Indica* drawings at Kew. *Kew Bull.* 1956: 297–348.
THOTHATHRI, K. (1965). Studies in Leguminosae 5. Taxonomic and nomenclatural notes on the Indo-Burmese species of *Bauhinia* Linn. *Bull. Bot. Soc. Bengal* 19(2): 130–134.
WALLICH, N. (1831–1832). *A numerical list of dried specimens of plants, in the East India Company's Museum, Nos. 4878–6224*. London.
WIT, H. C. D. DE (1956). A revision of Malaysian Bauhinieae. *Reinwardtia* 3(4): 381–539.

*Received 19 February 2013; accepted for publication 8 July 2013*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960428613000176 Published online by Cambridge University Press