

# 樟科豺皮樟基名考证

杨 永

(中国科学院植物研究所系统与进化植物学国家重点实验室, 北京 100093)

**摘要:** *Litsea rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* (Nees) Allen 作为豺皮樟学名被广泛使用, 而 *Iozoste rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* Nees 则长期被认为是其基名, 经研究发现 *Litsea rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* (Nees) Allen 的基名是 *Actinodaphne chinensis* var. *oblongifolia* Nees。

**关键词:** 基名; 中国; 樟科; 豺皮樟; 分类

中图分类号: Q949.747.5

文献标识码: A

文章编号: 1005-3395(2008)03-0271-03

## What is the Basionym of *Litsea rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* (Nees) Allen (Lauraceae)

YANG Yong

(State Key Laboratory of Systematic and Evolutionary Botany, Institute of Botany, the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100093, China)

**Abstract:** The widely used name *Litsea rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* (Nees) Allen has been considered to be based on *Iozoste rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* Nees. This nomenclatural investigation, however, suggested that the basionym of *Litsea rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* is *Actinodaphne chinensis* var. *oblongifolia* Nees though *Actinodaphne chinensis* Nees is a superfluous name when published.

**Key words:** Basionym; China; Lauraceae; *Litsea rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia*; Taxonomy

A taxon of Lauraceae morphologically unique and widely distributed in China (e.g. Hainan, Guangdong, Guangxi, Hunan, Jiangxi, Zhejiang, Fujian, Hong Kong, and Taiwan), and Vietnam<sup>[1-5]</sup>, and considered to be an important plant resource for medicine, phytochemistry, and oil production in industry<sup>[6-8]</sup>, has generally been referred to since Allen's<sup>[1]</sup> studies on Chinese *Litsea* as "*Litsea rotundifolia* Hemsley var. *oblongifolia* (Nees) Allen"<sup>[2-5, 9-11]</sup>. However, although both long and widely used, the basionym of this name is not clearly clarified, even in Allen's<sup>[1]</sup> presentation. Kostemans<sup>[12]</sup> indicated that *Iozoste rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* Nees is the basionym of *Litsea rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* (Nees) Allen, which is, however, not correct. This problem should be clarified before the

publication of Lauraceae part in Flora of China.

The taxon was first recognized and described by Blume<sup>[13]</sup> as *Litsea chinensis* Blume, which is, unfortunately, an illegitimate name under Art. 53.1, because it is a later homonym of *L. chinensis* Lam.<sup>[14]</sup>. Liou<sup>[15]</sup> cited *L. chinensis* Lam. as a synonym of *Litsea sebifera* Pers. [= *Litsea glutinosa* (Lour.) C. B. Rob.]. Nees<sup>[16]</sup> established *Iozoste rotundifolia* Nees based on *Wallich Cat. n. 2591*, and cited *Litsea chinensis* Blume as a synonym. Later, Nees<sup>[17]</sup> transferred *L. chinensis* Blume into *Actinodaphne*, viz. *Actinodaphne chinensis* Nees, citing two collections, one of Blume (*Blume C. L. s.n.*) and another of Wallich (*Cat. no. 2591*). *Actinodaphne chinensis* cannot be a new combination based on *L. chinensis* Blume because the latter name

Received: 2007-11-05

Accepted: 2008-01-15

**Foundation item:** Supported by Plant Specimen Digitization and Chinese Virtual Herbarium Establishment (2005DKA21401); a project from the Chinese Academy of Sciences (KSCX2-YW-Z-067); the National Natural Science Foundation of China (30600035)

is illegitimate, but it can be treated as a *nomen novum* under Art. 58.1 of the ICBN<sup>[18]</sup>. However, under Art. 52.1 and 52.2, *Actinodaphne chinensis* is a superfluous name and thus is illegitimate because Nees<sup>[17]</sup> definitely included the type of a validly published specific name, viz. *Iozoste rotundifolia* Nees. At the same time, Nees<sup>[17]</sup> described two varieties ( $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ) under *A. chinensis*, viz. ( $\alpha$ ) var. *rotundifolia* (Nees) Nees, based on *Iozoste rotundifolia* Nees<sup>[16]</sup>, and ( $\beta$ ) “var. *oblongifolia*”. The latter was cited as including Blume’s specimen and with *L. chinensis* Blume in synonymy. Under Art. 55.2, the two infraspecific names are legitimate. Since *L. chinensis* Blume represents the nomenclaturally typical element, Nees’s “var. *oblongifolia*” includes the type of *A. chinensis* and under Art. 26.2 should repeat the specific epithet *chinensis* unaltered, however, under Art. 27.2, the finale epithet in the name of an infraspecific taxon may not repeat unchanged the epithet of the species name if that species name is illegitimate. Accordingly, the variety name *Iozoste chinensis* var. *oblongifolia* Nees is a valid name. Blume<sup>[19]</sup> later established another name based on the specimen of *Litsea chinensis* Bl., viz. *Iozoste chinensis* Blume, keeping *Iozoste chinensis* ( $\beta$ ) var. *rotundifolia* Blume as a separate variety while citing *Actinodaphne chinensis* var. *oblongifolia* Nees as one of the synonyms. *Iozoste chinensis* Blume is again a superfluous name and is to be rejected since Blume<sup>[19]</sup> cited *Iozoste rotundifolia* Nees as a synonym under *Iozoste chinensis*. Similar to Blume’s treatment, Meissner<sup>[20]</sup> cited only ( $\beta$ ) var. *rotundifolia*, and did not list “( $\alpha$ ) var. *oblongifolia*” as a variety *A. chinensis*.

Allen<sup>[1]</sup>, Kostemans<sup>[12]</sup>, Chun et al.<sup>[9]</sup>, Yang & Huang<sup>[2]</sup>, Liao<sup>[3]</sup>, Wei et al.<sup>[10]</sup>, and Huang<sup>[11]</sup>, all cited *Iozoste rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* Nees as the basionym of *Litsea rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* (Nees) Allen. This, however, is incorrect. All of these authors clearly made two errors in doing so. Firstly, though the name *Iozoste rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* Nees was ascribed to Nees, Nees never published such a name, the name first appeared in W. J. Hooker and G. Arnott Walker’s *The Botany of Captain*

*Beechey’s Voyage*. Hooker & Arnott<sup>[21]</sup> recorded the name “*Iozoste rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* Nees” as having been published by Nees<sup>[16]</sup> and based on *Litsea chinensis* Blume. No such name appears in Nees<sup>[16]</sup>, but, in so quoting Nees, Hooker and Arnott themselves validly published a *nomen novum*, *I. rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* Hook. f. & Arn. based on *L. chinensis*. As a consequence, the correct citation of the name is *Iozoste rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* Nees ex Hook. & Arnott. Secondly, the note on dates of publication and composition of parts of the book clearly indicates that this name was published in 1837 but not 1836 as cited so by those previous authors. Merrill & Walker<sup>[22]</sup> noted that pp 193 ~ 240 of the book “*The Botany of Captain Beechey’s Voyage*” were published in 1836. This statement, however, is demonstrated to be incorrect later. Based on an exhaustive study on literature and correspondence between Hooker W J and Captain Beechey, Stafleu<sup>[23]</sup> gave more details in the preface of the book “*The Botany of Captain Beechey’s Voyage*” written by Hooker W J & Arnott G A W when it was reprinted. According to publication dates, the book was divided into 10 parts, pp193 ~ 240 & plates 40 ~ 49 belong to part 5 that was published in July ~ Aug. 1837. Stafleu & Cowan<sup>[24]</sup> followed this publication dates. As a result, it is clear now that *Actinodaphne chinensis* var. *oblongifolia* Nees was validly published in 1836<sup>[25]</sup>, a name earlier than *Iozoste rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* Nees ex Hook. & Arnott, and thus, should take priority over the latter name.

Hemsley<sup>[26]</sup> published a new name *Litsea rotundifolia* Hemsley based on W. A. Harland s. n. from Guangdong of China, and thus has nothing to do with the previous names in nomenclature, e. g. *Iozoste rotundifolia* Nees and *Actinodaphne chinensis* var. *rotundifolia* (Nees) Nees. Chun et al.<sup>[9]</sup> and Yang et al.<sup>[27]</sup> erroneously indicated that Hemsley<sup>[26]</sup> made a combination, viz. *Litsea rotundifolia* (Nees) Hemsley. Though taxonomically *Litsea rotundifolia* Hemsley is in fact representing a same identity with *Iozoste rotundifolia* Nees<sup>[1]</sup>, *Litsea rotundifolia* Hemsley is thus a legitimate name and available for use. However, it

should be noted that Allen<sup>[1]</sup> made a mistake because she indicated a new type for “var. *oblongifolia*”, viz. *W. Y. Chun 7506* (A), but not one of the specimens mentioned by Nees, nor any of the original material of *L. chinensis* Blume.

I concur with the other authors, quoted above, that *Actinodaphne chinensis* var. *oblongifolia* Nees should be treated at varietal rank under *Litsea rotundifolia* Hems1.

***Litsea rotundifolia* Hemsley var. *oblongifolia* (Nees) Allen** in Ann. MO Bot. Gard. **25**: 386. 1938. — Basionym: *Actinodaphne chinensis* var. *oblongifolia* Nees, Syst. Laur.: 600. 1836. *Litsea chinensis* Blume, Bijdr. Fl. Ned. Ind.: 565. 1825, nom. illeg. (non *Litsea chinensis* Lam., Encycl. **3**: 574. 1792). *Iozoste rotundifolia* Nees var. *oblongifolia* Nees ex Hook. & Arn., Bot. Beechey Voy.: 209. 1837. *Iozoste chinensis* Blume, *Museum Botanicum Lugduno Batavum* **1**: 364. 1851—Type: *Blume C. L. s.n.* (L!).

**Acknowledgements** I am grateful to Nicholas J. Turland of the Missouri Botanical Garden and John McNeill of the Royal Botanical Garden, Edinburgh, for their valuable suggestions on the manuscript. Thanks are also due to Prof. Dr. Henk van der Werff of the Missouri Botanical Garden for his kind and patient help at the beginning of my study of Lauraceae.

## References

- [1] Allen C K. Studies in the Lauraceae. I. Chinese and Indo-Chinese species of *Litsea*, *Neolitsea*, and *Actinodaphne* [J]. Ann Miss Bot Gard, 1938, 25: 361–434.
- [2] Yang Y C(杨衍晋), Huang P H(黄普华). *Litsea* [M]// Li H W(李锡文). Flora Reipublicae Popularis Sinicae Tomus 31. Beijing: Science Press, 1982: 261–336. (in Chinese)
- [3] Liao J C(廖日京). The taxonomic revisions of the family Lauraceae in Taiwan [D]. Taipei: National Taiwan University, 1988: 109.
- [4] Huang P H(黄普华). *Litsea* [M]// Fu L G(付立国), Chen T Q(陈潭清), Lang K Y(郎楷永), et al. Higher Plants of China, Vol. 3. Qingdao: Qingdao Publishing House, 2000: 215–228. (in Chinese)
- [5] Wu T L(吴德邻). Check List of Hong Kong Plants [M]. Guangzhou: Dong Sheng Printing Company, 2002: 45. (in Chinese)
- [6] Wu C Y(吴征镒). A New Synopsis of Chinese Herbs Vol. 1 [M]. Shanghai: Scientific and Technological Education Publishing House, 1988: 90. (in Chinese)
- [7] Zhao Y, Guo Y W, Zhang W. Rotundifolides A and B, two new enol — Derived butenolactones from the bark of *Litsea rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* [J]. 2005, 88(2): 349–353.
- [8] Zhao Y, Zhang W, Chen Y H, et al. Oblongifolinol, a new long chain diol from bark of *Litsea rotundifolia* var. *oblongifolia* [J]. Nat Prod

Res, 2006, 20(2): 107–111.

- [9] Chun W Y(陈焕镛), Lee S K(李树刚), Lau L F(刘兰芳). Lauraceae [M]// Chun W Y(陈焕镛), Chang C C(张肇骞), Chen F H(陈封怀). Flora Hainanica, Vol. 1. Beijing: Science Press, 1964: 259–301. (in Chinese)
- [10] Wei Y Z(韦裕宗), Wei F N(韦发南), Li G Z(李光照). Lauraceae [M]// Lee S K(李树刚), Liang C F(梁畴芬). Flora of Guangxi Vol. 1. Nanning: Guangxi Science and Technology Publishing House, 1991: 156–260. (in Chinese)
- [11] Huang P H(黄普华). *Litsea* [M]// Fu L G(付立国), Hong T(洪涛). Higher Plants of China Vol. 3. Qingdao: Qingdao Publishing House, 2000: 215–228. (in Chinese)
- [12] Kostermans A J G H. Bibliographia Lauracearum [M]. Bogor: P. T. Djulie ‘Archipel’, 1964: 873.
- [13] Blume C L. *Bijdragen tot de Flora van Nederlandsch Indië*, Part 11 [M]. Batavia: Lands Drukkerij, 1825: 565.
- [14] Lamarck M C. Encyclopédie Méthodique. Botanique. Vol. 3, Part 2 [M]. Liège: Chez Plomteux, 1792: 574.
- [15] Liou H. Lauracées de Chine et d’Indochine [M]. Paris: Hermann & C, Éditeurs, 1934: 196.
- [16] Nees C G. Plantae Asiaticae Rariores, Vol. 2, Part 8 [M]. London: Treuttel & W rtz, 1831: 63.
- [17] Nees C G. Systema Laurinarum [M]. Berolini [Berlin]: Sumtibus Veitii et Sociorum, 1836: 600.
- [18] McNeill J, Barrie F R, Burdet H M, et al. International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (Vienna Code) adopted by the Seventeenth International Botanical Congress Vienna, Austria, July 2005 [M]. Liechtenstein: A. R. G. Gantner Verlag, Ruggell. [*Regnum Veg.* 146]. 2006.
- [19] Blume C L. *Museum Botanicum Lugduno-Batavum*, Vol. 1, Part 27 [M]. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1851: 463.
- [20] Meissner C F. Lauraceae [M]// Candolle A P. Prodrum Systematis Naturalis Regni Vegetabilis, Pars 15(1) [M]. Paris: Sumptibus Victoris Masson et Filii, 1864: 1–260.
- [21] Hooker W J, Arnott G A W. The Botany of Captain Beechey’s Voyage, Part 5 [M]. Weinheim: J. Cramer, 1837 [reprinted in 1965]: 193–240, pls. 40–49.
- [22] Merrill E D, Walker E H. A bibliography of Eastern Asiatic Botany [M]. Jamaica Plain: The Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, 1938: 193.
- [23] Stafleu F A. Dates of publication and composition of parts [M]// Hooker W J, Arnott G A W. The Botany of Captain Beechey’s Voyage (reprint) [M]. Weinheim: J. Cramer. 1965.
- [24] Stafleu F A, Cowan R S. Taxonomic Literature Vol. 2 [M]. Utrecht: Dr. W. Junk b.v., Publishers, The Hague, 1979: 291.
- [25] Stafleu F A, Cowan R S. Taxonomic Literature, Vol. 3 [M]. Utrecht: Dr. W. Junk b.v., Publishers, The Hague, 1981: 711.
- [26] Forbes F B, Hemsley W B. An enumeration of all the plants known from China proper, Formosa, Hainan, the Corea, the Luchu Archipelago, and the island of Hong Kong together with their distribution and synonymy [J]. Bot J Linn Soc, 1891, 26: 370–393.
- [27] Yang Y C(杨衍晋), Li H W(李锡文), Lee S K(李树刚), et al. Lauraceae [M]// Cheng W C(郑万钧). *Silva Sinica*, Vol. 1. Beijing: China Forestry Publishing House, 1983: 606–893. (in Chinese)