AN EARLIER NAME FOR PARMOTREMA PERLATUM "(HUDS.) CHOISY"
(ASCOMYCOTINA: PARMELIACEAE)

Mason E. Hale1 and Teuvo Ahti2

Parmotrema perlatum "(Huds.) Choisy" (Parmelia perlatata "(Huds.) Ach.") is a common, easily recognized foliose lichen in temperate zones of both hemispheres. The name is based on Lichen perlatus Huds. (1762), which Hale (1961) lectotypified with Dillenius' (1742, p. 147) phrase name "lichenoides glaucum perlatum, subtus nigrum et cirrosus" and the associated specimen in OXF illustrated in table 20, fig. 39B.

In perusing the older Scandinavian literature, however, the second author (aided by Dr. P. Isoviita) discovered a book published in Swedish (later also in German and English) by Pehr Osbeck (1757) which validated the name Lichen chinensis. While we have not examined the actual specimen from China which Osbeck collected, if indeed it is still extant, the name is to be typified by an element selected from the context of the validating description (Art. 32.2, ICBN). This is in fact the same Dillenian phrase name that Hudson used. We consider Lichen perlatus Huds. to be an illegitimate name (see Art. 63, ICBN) and to be automatically typified on the type of the name (L. chinensis) that ought to have been adopted. Consequently the correct name for this common, long-recognized lichen must be changed to Parmotrema chinense, with changes in author citations of synonyms, as follows:

Parmotrema chinense (Osbeck) Hale and Ahti, comb. nov.

Lichen chinensis Osbeck, Ostindisk resa, 221, 1757.

Type: Specimen in the Dillenian herbarium (OXF) (illustrated in pl. 20, fig. 39B of Dillenius, Hist. Musc. 147, 1742).


Parmelia perlatata Ach., Meth. Lich. 216. 1803, nom. illeg. (incl. type of L. chinensis Osbeck). [Note: Under Art. 49, parenthetic author citation is correct only if the epithet-bringing name is legitimate. Under Art. 72, Note 1 and Ex. 2-3, parenthetic author citation is deleted if the epithet-bringing name is illegitimate.]


Parmelia coriacea var. perlatata Eschw. in Martius, Fl. Bras. 1(1): 206. 1833. Type: Same as Lichen chinensis Osbeck. [Note: This trinomial is legitimate, Lichen chinensis having no priority at this rank.]


TYPIFICATION OF NAMES IN ZAMIA L. AND AULACOPHYLLUM REGEL (ZAMIACEAE)

Dennis Wm. Stevenson¹ and Sergio Sabato²

Summary

All valid combinations in the genera Zamia and Aulacophyllum are presented exclusive of those for West Indian species. The holotypes are identified, and, in those cases where no holotype has been found, a lectotype or neotype is designated.

We have been conducting extensive studies on these genera in preparation for various floras with the additional goal of producing a monograph. However, we have been unable to proceed any further until the nomenclature is clarified and the types established for those combinations that were validly published as legitimate names. The most recent monograph of Zamia L. (including the segregate genus Aulacophyllum Regel) is that of Schuster (1932) in Das Pflanzenreich. This work contains no type concept and generally contravenes any idea of nomenclatural priority. This may be, in part, because the official publication of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (ICBN) of the 1930 Cambridge Congress did not appear until the third edition in 1935 after the Amsterdam Congress. Thus, because the second edition was an unofficial draft, produced by Rendle, Schuster (1932) may simply have chosen to ignore it.

One of the major problems that we have encountered in our studies of these genera is that most of the names published in the nineteenth century were based on horticultural material cultivated in various European gardens and private collections, often without reference to the original source in nature. In many instances, no herbarium specimens were made, and descriptions were published in horticultural catalogues simply offering plants for sale. This has made typification most difficult.

Fortunately, the herbaria of the earlier monographers (Miquel, 1842, 1849, 1861, 1869; Regel, 1857, 1876; de Candolle, 1868) are fairly complete.

We have excluded the West Indian taxa of Zamia because they have been recently and thoroughly treated by Eckenwalder (1980). However, we would like to note that Miquel's types are not in L as indicated by Eckenwalder (he did not actually see the specimens), but rather in U where we found them. This confusion is probably due to the fact that although Miquel worked at L at the time he published most of his combinations of West Indian taxa, his herbarium formed the basis of the herbarium at U (Stafleu, 1966; C. Kalkman, pers. comm.). Moreover, the types on which many of Schuster's combinations are based, which Eckenwalder gives as being at B but did not see, were destroyed along with all other specimens of Zamia, except those in the Willdenow Herbarium. The destruction of these specimens is most unfortunate because Schuster (1932) based his monograph mainly on material at B, LE, P, and K. However, he did not annotate any specimens and any attempt to understand his treatment is obfuscated by the loss of the B material.

In determining types, we have made an extensive herbarium search (for a list of herbaria see the acknowledgments). Where only one specimen exists that is mentioned either directly or indirectly in the protologue, we have designated it as the holotype. In the absence of a clear holotype, we have chosen a lectotype or neotype. In many cases (especially for those combinations and descriptions published in horticultural catalogues), we have been forced to lectotypify with the description because the descriptions do not match any specimens and the localities are unclear. In these cases, we think
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