Nomenclatural notes and lectotypification in the monotypic genus *Getonia* (Combretaceae)

S.C. Patil  
Botanical Survey of India, Northern Regional Centre, 192 Kaulagarh Road, Dehradun, Uttarakhand – 248 195, India.  
E-mail: sameerpatil.c@gmail.com

**Abstract:** Nomenclature confusion between the names *Getonia* and *Calycopteris* is discussed and clarified. J.P. Rottler’s specimen at Kew is designated here as the lectotype of the name *Getonia floribunda* Roxb.
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**Introduction**

The name *Getonia* Roxb. is currently used for the monotypic genus of Combretaceae distributed in the Indo-Malayan region (Mabberly, 2018). It is a common undergrowth of low-lying tropical evergreen forests. The plant is well known among local people, medicinal practitioners and ethno-botanists for its medicinal uses (Dey *et al*., 2007; Pavithra *et al*., 2013; Asma & Afidam, 2014; Glory *et al*., 2016; Vantamuri *et al*., 2017). *Calycopteris* Lam. is another name used for this genus which is invalid (IPNI, 2020). The name *Calycopteris* first appeared in 1793 by Lamarck whereas the name *Getonia* appeared firstly through Roxburgh in 1798. Considering the principle of priority Art. 11.3 (Turland *et al*., 2018), *Calycopteris* is to be the preferred name over *Getonia*. While preparing notes for the Flora of Pushpagiri Wildlife Sanctuary, Karnataka, a study of historical specimens and literature revealed that the nomenclature of both names was incorrectly understood and needs to be elucidated.

**Nomenclature**

Lamarck (1793) published “*Calycopteris*”, in tome 1, volume 2, part 2, fig. 357, which was published on 11 February 1793 (Stafleu & Cowan, 1979). The name appeared in the plate with an analysis, but not in the printed pages that would have been published at the same time. According to Art. 38.7, any name is validly published prior to 1 January 1908, if accompanied by illustration with analysis and no description; but the article is restricted only for a monotypic genus (i.e., genus name + a single species name), and not for only genus name. Since, the name *Calycopteris* was published without any species it does not satisfy the Art. 38.7, thus is invalidly published.

The name appeared with a proper diagnosis in tome 2, volume 5, part 2, page 461, which was published later, on 31 October 1819. Along with it, the name *Calycopteris floribunda* also appeared in the same book on page 485, and so was also published on the same day in 1819, thus making it a case of valid publication to be considered under Art. 38.5. Roxburgh (1798), perhaps unaware of Lamarck’s publication described the same taxon as “*Getonia*” providing a detailed description of the only species within the genus *i.e.* *Getonia floribunda* Roxb. making it a valid publication according to the Code. However, before *Getonia floribunda* Roxb. was validated *Calycopteris* by transferring Roxburgh’s *G. floribunda* to the genus, thus providing a reference to it. Hence, based on the above discussion, the name *Calycopteris* was introduced invalidly in a plate in 1793, but the analysis and
description was published in 1819. The validation would date to 1819, except that it was validated by Poiret in 1811 and that name is thus illegitimate and superfluous because Getonia had been validly published earlier in 1798.

The name Calycopteris floribunda was accepted until late 2000 by many authors (Clarke, 1878; Birdwood, 1887; Cooke, 1903; Talbot, 1911; Gamble, 1919; Craib, 1931; Exell, 1954; Sharma et al., 1984; Diwakar, 2001; Murthy & Nair, 2018). It was Mabberly (2008) who first pointed out that Getonia has priority over Calycopteris. Nevertheless, many online databases use the name Getonia over Calycopteris. This is now followed by some recent authors (Punekar & Lakshminarasimhan, 2011; Datar & Lakshminarasimhan, 2013; Paul et al., 2015; Mabberly, 2018).


Getonia nitida Roth, Nov. Sp. Pl. 217. 1821 (type destroyed and no other original material exists).


Typification

Roxburgh (1798) while publishing Getonia floribunda did not cite any specimen in the protologue. The author consulted BM, BR, E, G, LIV where the majority of Roxburgh’s specimens are reportedly located. However, the search proved to be unfruitful for tracing any original material connected with Roxburgh’s annotations. However, a specimen in Kew (Herbarium Rottleriannum) with barcode K000786130 (Fig. 1) shows an annotation “Getonia floribunda Roxb. Pl. Coromandel. Decandria. Roxburgh. Plant. Coromandel. 1, 87.” which matches with Roxburgh’s handwriting. J.P. Rottler (1749-1836) a French missionary in Tranquebar, had correspondence and exchange of material with Roxburgh (Matthew, 1993). His materials now referred to as ‘Herbarium Rottleriannum’ were sent to King’s College London by Sir H. Cleghorn and later transferred to RBG, Kew (Foulkes, 1861). The note mentioned above clearly indicates that Roxburgh was referring to his protologue [Roxburgh (1: 61, t. 87. 1798)]. It may be considered as the original material for the basis of the species description.

Gangopadhyay and Chakrabarty (1997) treated Getonia floribunda Roxb. as a synonym of Calycopteris floribunda Lam.. They cited the type as “Type: Roxburgh, Pl. Corom.: t. 87 & Icon. 140 (CAL)”. According to Dr. John McNeill (pers. comm., 2020) the plate t. 87 in Roxburgh’s Plants...
of the Coast of Coromandel is, although derived from the drawings numbered 140 at K and CAL, a separate element so far as typification is concerned. Therefore, the ‘type’ citation by Gangopadhyay and Chakrabarty (1997) cannot be accepted as an inadvertent lectotypification (see Art. 7.11; Turland et al., 2018). If they had cited one of the two drawings then it would have been an effective lectotypification being before 2000 according to Art. 7.11 (Turland et al., 2018). Thus, in the context of the original material referred and annotated by Roxburgh found here to exist, it is hereby designated as the lectotype following Art. 9.19 (Turland et al., 2018).

Acknowledgements
I am thankful to Director, Botanical Survey of India, Kolkata for facilities and encouragement. I am also thankful to Dr. Kanchi Gandhi, Harvard, USA and to Dr. John McNeill, Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh for their valuable comments on improving the manuscript. Thanks are also due to curators of K, BM, BR, E, G and LIV for providing herbarium image access.

Literature Cited


