

CORRECTION OF LOCALITY CITATIONS IN THE PROTOLOGUE OF NINE NAMES OF CHINESE TAXA

YUN LIN¹ AND ZHI-RONG YANG^{2,3}

Abstract. According to Article 9.2 of International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (Shenzhen Code, 2018), errors in the citation of the locality in the protologues of nine names of Chinese plants, including *Carex melinacra* var. *changningensis* (Cyperaceae), *Celastrus rugosa* (Celastraceae), *Ctenitis changanensis* (Aspidiaceae), *Huodendron tomentosum* (Styracaceae), *Ostodes kuangii* (Euphorbiaceae), *Pleione microphylla* (Orchidaceae), *Rubus rufus* var. *longipedicellatus* (Rosaceae), *Sorbus* (Rosaceae), and *Trichosanthes subrosea* (Cucurbitaceae), were corrected. The holotypes of two names and the isotypes of seven names are deposited in the Harvard University Herbaria; the holotypes of seven names are deposited in the Chinese National Herbarium (PE).

Keywords: Chinese plants, locality errors, protologues, holotype specimens

The Harvard University Herbaria include six integrated herbaria: the Herbarium of the Arnold Arboretum (A); Economic Herbarium of Oakes Ames (ECON); Orchid Herbarium of Oakes Ames (AMES); Farlow Herbarium (FH); Gray Herbarium (GH); and the New England Botanical Club Herbarium (NEBC). The current collections contain more than five million specimens and over 100 thousand type specimens of vascular plants. Of special interest are more than 10,000 type specimens of Chinese plants.

With the support of the National Plant Specimen Resource Center Project (NPSRC) and the Chinese Virtual Herbarium (CVH) project, we undertook a review from 2018 to 2021 of the Chinese type specimens in the Harvard University Herbaria and in the Chinese National Herbarium. During our review we discovered errors in some of the cited localities that need to be corrected. This paper presents the incorrectly cited locality in the protologues and gives the correct citation. Another paper, “Correction of date errors in the protologues of eighteen taxon names from China,” was recently published in this journal (Lin et al., 2021).

We reviewed the literature and examined all the electronic images of type specimens of Chinese plants deposited in A, AMES, and GH. Following ICN Art. 9.2, “If a designation of holotype made in the protologue of the name of a taxon is later found to contain errors (e.g., in locality, date, collector, collection number, herbarium code, specimen identifier, or citation of an illustration), these errors are to be corrected provided that the intent of the original author(s) is not changed” (Turland et al., 2018).

We herewith correct the locality errors in the protologues of nine names of taxa described from China. The nine names are arranged alphabetically by genus, each followed by a brief discussion. Images of the specimens at A, AMES, GH, and PE are linked to the barcodes cited in the following text.

1. *Carex melinacra* Franch. var. *changningensis* S. Yun Liang (Cyperaceae), *Acta Phytotax. Sin.* 37(2): 193. 1999.

TYPE: CHINA. Yunnan Province: Shunning Hsien [Xian] (=Fengqing Hsien [Xian]), alt. 3000 m, 10 June 1938, *T. T. Yu 16205* (Holotype: PE [00030526]; Isotype: A [00248498], image seen).

The name *Carex melinacra* var. *changningensis* (Liang, 1999) was validly published with the type designated as *T. T. Yu 16205* (PE). The collection locality was cited as “Changning,” but the collection locality on the label of the holotype specimen is Shunning (=Fengqing). Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and it is to be corrected.

2. *Celastrus rugosa* Rehder & E. H. Wilson (Celastraceae) in Sargent, *Pl. Wilson.* 2(2): 349. 1915. **TYPE:** CHINA. Sichuan Province: Ebian Hsien [Xian], Wa Shan, alt. 1525–1830 m, June to October 1908, *E. H. Wilson 1106* (Holotype: A [00049665], image seen).

The name *Celastrus rugosa* (Rehder and Wilson, 1915) was validly published with the type designated as *E. H. Wilson 1106* (A). The locality of collection was cited as “Western Szech’uan: west and near Wên-ch’uan Hsien [Xian].” However, we reviewed the image of *E. H. Wilson 1106* in A (A 00049665), and its label indicates that the holotype specimen was collected in Wa-shan, which is in Ebian Hsien [Xian], not in Wên-ch’uan Hsien [Xian]. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and it is to be corrected.

3. *Ctenitis changanensis* Ching (Aspidiaceae), *Bull. Fan Mem. Inst. Biol., Bot. Ser.* 8: 297. 1938. **TYPE:** CHINA. Guangxi: Yung Hsien [Xian] (i.e., Yongfu), Chang’an, alt. 200 m, 23 October 1933, *A. N. Steward & H. C. Chen 1165* (Holotype: PE [00050286]; Isotype: GH [00135558], image seen).

The name *Ctenitis changanensis* (Ching, 1938) was validly published with the type designated as *A. N. Steward & H. C. Chen 1165* (PE). The collection locality was cited as “Kweichow: Chang-an, Yung Hsien [Xian].” However, the

We thank the Harvard University Herbaria for providing electronic images of Chinese specimens to the Chinese Virtual Herbarium (<http://www.cvh.ac.cn/>) (CVH) and for allowing their display on the CVH website. This work was supported by the National Plant Specimen Resource Center Project (NPSRC) (E0117G1001) and the Plant Specimen Digitization and Chinese Virtual Herbarium Establishment (CVH) (Grant No. 2005DKA21401).

¹Hunan Medication Vestibule School, Hunan Food and Drug Vocational College, Changsha 410208, People’s Republic of China.

²Chinese National Herbarium (PE), Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Xiangshan, Beijing 100093, People’s Republic of China.

³Corresponding author: zry@ibcas.ac.cn

collection locality on the label of the holotype specimens is “Kwangsi Province, Chang-an, Yung Hsien [Xian].” Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and it is to be corrected.

4. *Huodendron tomentosum* Y. C. Tang ex S. M. Hwang (Styracaceae), Acta Phytotax. Sin. 18(2): 164, f. 4. 1980. TYPE: CHINA. Yunnan: Gongshan Hsien [Xian], alt. 1900 m, 7 July 1938, *T. T. Yu 19219* (Holotype: PE [00857020]; Isotype: A [00277411], image seen).

Huodendron tomentosum (Hwang, 1980) was validly published with the type designated as *T. T. Yu 19219* (PE). The collection locality was cited as “Ruili.” However, the collection locality on the label of the holotype specimens is “Salwin-kiukiang Divide [Salwin-Nu Jiang divide], Newahlung.” In fact, the Salwin-kiukiang Divide is located in Gongshan Xian, not Ruili Xian. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and it is to be corrected.

5. *Ostodes kuangii* Y. T. Chang (Euphorbiaceae), Acta Phytotax. Sin. 20(2): 224. 1982. TYPE: CHINA. Yunnan: Che-li Hsien [Xian] (=Jinghong City), alt. 1800 m, September 1936, *C. W. Wang 78509* (Holotype: PE [00935324]; Isotype: A [00217463], image seen).

Ostodes kuangii (Chang, 1982) was validly published with the type designated as *C. W. Wang 78509* (PE). The locality of collection was cited as “Menghai.” However, the collection locality on the label of the holotype specimen is Meng-soong, Dahmeng-lung, Che-li Hsien [Xian] (=Jinghong Xian). Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and it is to be corrected.

6. *Pleione microphylla* S. C. Chen & Z. H. Tsi (Orchidaceae), Acta Phytotax. Sin. 38(2): 182, f. 1. 2000. TYPE: China. Guangdong: Boluo Hsien [Xian], Luofu Shan, 25 April 1936, *F. P. Metcalf 18230* (Holotype: AMES [00243089], image seen).

Pleione microphylla (Chen and Tsi, 2000) was validly published with the type designated as *F. P. Metcalf 18230* (AMES). The locality of the collection was cited as “China. Guangdong: Zengcheng, Luofushan.” We reviewed the image of *F. P. Metcalf 18230* (AMES 00243089). Its label indicates that the holotype specimen was collected on Loh

Fau Shan [Luofu Shan], which is in Boluo Hsien [Xian], not in Zengcheng Hsien [Xian]. The original type citation is therefore erroneous and it is to be corrected.

7. *Rubus rufus* Focke var. *longipedicellatus* T. T. Yu & L. T. Lu (Rosaceae), Acta Phytotax. Sin. 20(4): 457. 1982. TYPE: CHINA. Yunnan: Shangpa Hsien [Xian] (i.e., Fugong Xian), alt. 2800 m, 20 October 1934, *H. T. Tsai 58804* (Holotype: PE [00020797]; Isotype: A [00133140], image seen).

Rubus rufus var. *longipedicellatus* (Yu and Lu, 1982) was validly published with the type designated as *H. T. Tsai 58804* (PE). The locality of collection was cited as “Yunnan: Shuangbai.” However, the collection locality on the label of the holotype specimen is “Shang-pa”, which is in Fugong Hsien [Xian], not Shuangbai Hsien [Xian]. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and it is to be corrected.

8. *Sorbus rubiginosa* T. T. Yu (Rosaceae), Acta Phytotax. Sin. 8(3): 209, 223. 1963. TYPE: CHINA. Yunnan: Nan-Chiao Hsien [Xian] (i.e. Menghai Hsien [Xian]), alt. 1900 m, June 1936, *C. W. Wang 75374* (Holotype: PE [00934282]; Isotype, A [00135437], image seen).

Sorbus rubiginosa (Yu and Kuan, 1963) was validly published with the type designated as *C. W. Wang 75374* (PH [i.e., PE]). The locality of collection was cited as “Zhenkang.” However, the collection locality on the label of the holotype specimen is Nan-Chiao, which is in Menghai Hsien [Xian], not Zhenkang Hsien [Xian]. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and it is to be corrected.

9. *Trichosanthes subrosea* C. Y. Cheng & C. H. Yueh (Cucurbitaceae), Acta Phytotax. Sin. 18(3): 349, pl. 5: 7, 6: 15. 1980. TYPE: CHINA. Yunnan: Gongshan Hsien [Xian], 26 July 1938, *T. T. Yu 19429* (Holotype: PE [01199677]; Isotype: A [00261132], image seen).

Trichosanthes subrosea (Yueh and Cheng, 1980) was validly published with the type designated as *T. T. Yu 19429* (PE). The locality of collection was cited as “Zhenkang Xian.” However, the collection locality on the label of the holotype specimens is Kiukiang [Nu Jiang] Valley, (Taron), which is in Gongshan Hsien [Xian], not Zhenkang Hsien [Xian]. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and it is to be corrected.

LITERATURE CITED

- CHANG, Y. T. 1982. *Materiae ad floram Euphorbiacearum Sinensium I*. Acta Phytotaxonomica Sinica 22(2): 224–225.
- CHEN, S. C., AND Z. H. TSI. 2000. *Pleione microphylla*, A new orchid from southern Guangdong, China. Acta Phytotaxonomica Sinica 38(2): 182–184.
- CHING, R. C. 1938. A revision of the Chinese and Sikkim-Himalayan *Dryopteris* with reference to some species in the neighbouring regions. Bulletin of the Fan Memorial Institute of Biology, Botany Series 8(5): 275–334.
- HWANG, S. M. 1980. A preliminary study on the family Styracaceae from China. Acta Phytotaxonomica Sinica 18(2): 154–167.
- LIANG, S. Y. 1999. New material of *Carex* sect. *Praelongae* from China. Acta Phytotaxonomica Sinica 37(2): 189–193.
- LIN Y, Y. L HAN, AND Q. SUN. 2021. Correction of date errors in the protologues of eighteen taxon names from China. Harvard Papers in Botany 26, No. 1: 115–118.
- REHDER, A., AND E. H. WILSON, 1915. Celastraceae. Pages 346–359 in C. S. SARGENT, ED., *Plantae Wilsonianae*, Vol. 2. Cambridge, the University Press.
- TURLAND, N. J., J. H. WIERSEMA, F. R. BARRIE, ET AL. 2018. International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (Shenzhen Code) adopted by the Nineteenth International Botanical Congress Shenzhen, China, July 2017. Regnum Vegetabile 159. Glashutten: Koeltz Scientific Books.
- YU, T. T., AND L. T. LU. 1982. Taxa nova Rosacearum Sinicarum (IV) (Cont.). Acta Phytotaxonomica Sinica 20(4): 453–464.
- YU, T. T., AND K. C. KUAN. 1963. Taxa nova Rosacearum Sinicarum (I). Acta Phytotaxonomica Sinica 8(3): 202–234.
- YUEH, C. H., AND C. Y. CHENG. 1980. The Chinese medicinal species of the genus *Trichosanthes* L. Acta Phytotaxonomica Sinica 18(3): 333–352.