

(2338) Proposal to conserve the name *Gynochthodes* against *Stigmanthus* (*Rubiaceae*)

Sylvain G. Razafimandimbison,¹ Rafaël Govaerts² & Birgitta Bremer¹

¹ *The Bergius Foundation at The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences and Department of Ecology, Environment and Plant Sciences, Stockholm University, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden*

² *The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AE, U.K.*

Author for correspondence: Sylvain G. Razafimandimbison, sylvain@bergianska.se

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/636.29>

(2338) *Gynochthodes* Blume, Bijdr.: 993. Oct 1826–Nov 1827 ('*Gynochthodes*') [*Rub.*], nom. cons. prop.

Type: *G. coriacea* Blume.

(=) *Stigmanthus* Lour., Fl. Cochinch.: 96, 146. Sep 1790, nom. rej. prop.

Type: *S. cymosus* Lour.

Gynochthodes Blume is a Paleotropical and the most species-rich genus of the tribe *Morindeae* (Razafimandimbison & al. in Molec. Phylogen. Evol. 52: 879–886. 2009) in the subfamily *Rubioideae* of the coffee family (*Rubiaceae*). The genus currently contains at least 93 species mostly of lianas, which are distributed in tropical Asia, the Pacific, tropical Australia, and Madagascar (Razafimandimbison & Bremer in Adansonia 33: 283–309. 2011). *Gynochthodes* is sister to the genus *Coelospermum* Blume (l.c.: 994. 1826–1827), and is distinguished by its mostly head-like inflorescences, small flowers with partly exserted anthers, and mostly multiple fruits (as opposed to mostly paniculate inflorescences, small flowers with anthers well-exserted beyond the corolla lobes, and mostly simple drupes as in the latter genus). The generic name *Tetralopha* Hook. f. (in Hooker's Icon. Pl. 11: t. 1072. 1870) is a long-established synonym of *Gynochthodes* and further synonymy has recently been proposed involving *Guttenbergia* Zoll. & Moritz (in Natuur- Geneesk. Arch. Ned.-Indië 2: 2. 1845) (Razafimandimbison & Bremer, l.c.), *Imantina* Hook. f. (in Bentham & Hooker, Gen. Pl. 2: 120. 1873), *Pogonanthus* Montrouz. (in Mém. Acad. Imp. Sci. Lyon, Sect. Sci. 10: 225. 1860), and *Sphaerophora* Blume (Mus. Bot. 1: 179, fig. 36. 1850) non (Hassal) Lindl. 1846 (Razafimandimbison & al., l.c.: 885. 2009).

None of these names predates *Gynochthodes* but *Stigmanthus* Lour. (l.c.), applying to a monotypic genus comprising *Stigmanthus cymosus* Lour., is an earlier name. [Schultes (in Roemer & Schultes,

Syst. Veg. 5: 225, 628. 1819) used the name as *Stigmatanthus cymosus*, but this orthographic variant was never used in the *Rubiaceae* literature.] The type specimen of *Stigmanthus cymosus* at the BM herbarium is conspecific with *Morinda umbellata* L. (not *M. umbellata* Lour.) (Moore in J. Bot. 63: 252. 1925). As a result, *S. cymosus* has always been synonymized under Linnaeus's *M. umbellata* (e.g., Merrill in Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc. 24: 374. 1935). Recently, the lianescent species of *Morinda* L., including *M. umbellata*, were shown to be more closely related to *Gynochthodes* than to *Morinda* (Razafimandimbison & al., l.c. 2009). Accordingly, all lianescent species of the genus *Morinda* (with the exceptions of the African *Morinda morindoides* (Baker) Milne-Redh. and *M. longiflora* G. Don, both with large and hermaphroditic flowers) were formally transferred to *Gynochthodes* (Razafimandimbison & Bremer, l.c.). However, it was only recently noticed that *Stigmanthus* predates and has priority over *Gynochthodes* according to the Art. 11.3 of the *International Code of Nomenclature* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012). Therefore, the current proposal is necessary to maintain established usage of *Gynochthodes*. If the proposal is declined, all 93 species of *Gynochthodes* as currently delimited (Razafimandimbison & al., l.c. 2009) would have to be formally transferred to *Stigmanthus*, requiring that number of new combinations. This would cause tremendous nomenclatural instability because the generic name *Gynochthodes* is well established in the *Rubiaceae* literature, and has for long been widely accepted (e.g., Candolle, Prodr. 4: 467. 1830; Richard in Mém. Soc. Hist. Nat. Paris 5: 208. 1830; Pitard in Lecomte, Fl. Indo-Chine 3: 432. 1924; Johansson in Austral. Syst. Bot. 1: 369–372. 1988; Johansson in Opera Bot. 122: 5–67. 1994; Halford in Austrobaileya 6: 891–894. 2004; Razafimandimbison & al. in Molec. Phylogen. Evol. 48: 207–223. 2008; Rusham & al. in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 157: 115–124. 2008; Razafimandimbison & al., l.c. 2009; Razafimandimbison &

Bremer, I.c.; Razafimandimbison & al. in PLoS ONE 7(7): e40851. 2012 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0040851>]; Oguri & al. in Molec. Phylogen. Evol. 68: 699–708. 2013). As a consequence, the name *Gynochthodes* would be lost in favour of the almost unknown *Stigmanthus* for which only Loureiro's original binomial has ever been published. We therefore propose conservation of *Gynochthodes* against *Stigmanthus*.

Acceptance of this proposal will also have the benefit of establishing unequivocally (under Art. 14.8) the correctness of the long accepted spelling of the generic name. Blume (I.c. 1826) originally spelled the name "*Gynochtodes*" but in a later publication (Blume, Fl. Java: v–viii. 1828) corrected this and other spellings noting that the

earlier spellings were errors occasioned by his illness and the fact that he did not have access to the literature at the time (cf. Brummitt in Taxon 39: 305. 1990). Blume's correction has been generally accepted but there have been exceptions (e.g., Smith, Fl. Vitiensis Nova 4: 341. 1988; NCU-3 – Greuter & al. in Regnum Veg. 129. 1993; and the online version of Index Nominum Genericorum – <http://botany.si.edu/ing/>, accessed 4 Nov 2014). As we believe that Blume's later correction is in accord with Art. 60.1 ("correction of typographical and orthographical errors") so that *Gynochthodes* is currently the correct spelling under the *Code*, we do not think it appropriate to propose this as an "orth. cons." Art. 14.8 will, however, ensure universal acceptance of *Gynochthodes*.