



# **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

# Notes on the taxonomic status and re-lectotypification of *Litsea iteodaphne* (Lauraceae)

Tapas Chakrabarty<sup>1</sup>, Anand Kumar<sup>2\*</sup> & Partha Pratim Ghoshal<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>4, Botanical Garden Lane, Howrah – 711 103, West Bengal, India
<sup>2</sup>Central National Herbarium, Botanical Survey of India, Botanic Garden, Howrah – 711 103, West Bengal, India

\*Email: anand\_kum234@rediffmail.com

# 

#### **ARTICLE HISTORY**

Received: 25 February 2024 Accepted: 30 June 2024

Available online Version 1.0 : 30 September 2024



#### **Additional information**

**Peer review**: Publisher thanks Sectional Editor and the other anonymous reviewers for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

**Reprints & permissions information** is available at https://horizonepublishing.com/ journals/index.php/PST/open\_access\_policy

**Publisher's Note**: Horizon e-Publishing Group remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Indexing: Plant Science Today, published by Horizon e-Publishing Group, is covered by Scopus, Web of Science, BIOSIS Previews, Clarivate Analytics, NAAS, UGC Care, etc See https://horizonepublishing.com/journals/ index.php/PST/indexing\_abstracting

**Copyright**: © The Author(s). This is an openaccess article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/ by/4.0/)

#### **CITE THIS ARTICLE**

Chakrabarty T, Kumar A, Ghoshal P P. Notes on the taxonomic status and relectotypification of *Litsea iteodaphne* (Lauraceae). Plant Science Today (Early Access). https:// doi.org/10.14719/pst.3437

### Abstract

*Litsea iteodaphne* (Nees) Hook.f., known endemic to Sri Lanka, is now synonymized with *L. saligna* (Nees) N.P. Balakr. of northeast India and Bangladesh, and thus revealing a curious disjunct distribution. The name *Tetranthera iteodaphne* Nees, the basionym of *L. iteodaphne* has been relectotypified.

# **Keywords**

Litsea; new synonym; typification; disjunct distribution

# Introduction

The genus Litsea Lam. comprises more than 300 species native to tropical Asia, the Pacific, Australia, and North and Central America (1). Kostermans (2) recorded 11 species in Sri Lanka, while Gangopadhyay et al. (3) listed 44 species in India. Ara et al. (4) enumerated 12 species in Bangladesh. While revising the genus Litsea in the Indo-Burmese region, it is found that Tetranthera iteodaphne Nees, the basionym of Litsea iteodaphne (Nees) Hook.f. was originally described from Sri Lanka based on a collection with female flowers and fruits by an unknown collector and locality during 1836. As per the circumscription established by Kostermans (2), this Ceylonese endemic species is characterized by its short stature (shrubs or trees, up to 3.5 m high), glabrescent branches (except very young shoots), linear-lanceolate leaves, gradually drawn out into long, sharp acumen, tapered at the base, with incised midrib on the upper surface and 15-30 pairs of lateral nerves, pedunculate axillary inflorescences (umbels) and ellipsoid fruits (c. 1 cm long) on about 0.5 cm long pedicels. Surprisingly, these characters fully match with the features of Litsea saligna (Nees) N.P. Balakr, a species of northeast India and Bangladesh origin. It was based on the description of Tetranthera saligna Nees, from Sylhet in Bangladesh, collected by F. de Silva with male flowers. On critical examination of the types of both the names and the available specimens of L. iteodaphne and L. saligna, we conclude here that the two species are conspecific (Table 1). Hence, the former species is synonymized with the latter species. In addition, this report also reveals a curious disjunct distribution between Sri Lanka and northeast India to Bangladesh, indicating a possible earlier wider distribution but now extinct in the intermediate areas.

Table 1. Comparison between Litsea iteodaphne and L. saligna.

Character	L. iteodaphne	L. saligna
Habit	Shrubs or trees, 1.5 –3.5 m high	Shrubs or trees 3 –3.5m high
Indumentum	Almost entirely glabrous (except very young shoots)	Almost entirely glabrous (except very young shoots)
Phyllotaxy	Alternate	Alternate
Leaf		
a. Shape and size	Linear to linear-lanceolate or sometimes oblong-lanceolate,	Linear, linear-lanceolate to lanceolate-oblong,
	(6–) 8–27 × 1–3 cm	7–25 × 0.6–3 cm
b. Base	Acute to subacute or cuneate at base, sometimes decurrent into petioles	Acute to cuneate or often cuneate-attenuate at base and decurrent into petioles
c. Apex	Apiculate to caudate-acuminate (acumen 1–3 cm long)	Apiculate to caudate-acuminate (acumen 1–3 cm long)
d. Texture	Coriaceous	Thinly coriaceous
e. Midrib	Incised above, raised beneath	Incised above, raised beneath
f. Lateral nerves (pairs)	(10-) 12-30	12–35
g. Minor venation	Inconspicuous	Inconspicuous
h. Undersurface	Mostly glaucous	Usually glaucous or glaucescent
Petioles (length)	5–10 (–15) mm, channelled above	4–10 mm, channelled above
Male umbels	Not seen	Axillary, 5–6-flowered, pedunculate (peduncle 5–15 mm long)
Female umbels	Axillary, 5-flowered, pedunculate (peduncle 3–7 mm long)	Axillary, 5-flowered, pedunculate (peduncle 5–15 mm long)
Fruits	Oblong-ellipsoid to obovoid-ellipsoid, 9–10 × 5–7 mm; cupule 2–3 mm high, 4–7 mm in diameter; fruiting pedicels 3–6 mm long	Oblong-ellipsoid, 8–10× 5–6 mm; cupule ca 2 mm high, ca 5 mm in diameter; fruiting pedicels 3–5 mm long

# **Materials and Methods**

The present investigation is a part of our ongoing studies on the family Lauraceae since the year 2000, and it is based on the study of herbarium specimens and literature (as cited). The following herbaria were consulted for the examination of specimens, including digital images: AS-SAM, BR, BSIS, CAL, E, G, GH, GZU, K, L, NY, and P (5). We also consulted ARUN and MH, but no relevant specimens were available for these herbaria.

#### Taxonomic Treatment

#### Litsea saligna

(Nees) N.P. Balakr., J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 63: 329. 1967. *–Tetranthera saligna* Nees in Wall., Pl. Asiat. Rar.2 : 67. 1831.–*Litsea angustifolia* Hook. f., Fl. Brit. India 5: 169. 1886, non Blume 1826, nom. Illeg. superfl.

#### Туре

(lectotype designated by Singh [6]): Bangladesh, Sylhet, s.d., *F. de Silva s.n.* in Wallich, Numer. List No. 2537 (GZU000254549, digital image!, Fig. 1; isolectotypes BM000951034, digital image!, CAL0000073546!, G00390143, K000357512, K001116380, fragm. NY00355962, digital images!).

= Tetranthera iteodaphne Nees, Syst. Laur. 542. 1836.– Litsea iteodaphne (Nees) Hook.f., Fl. Brit. India 5: 173. 1886. –Malapoenna iteodaphne (Nees) Kuntze, Revis. Gen. Pl. 2: 572. 1891. –Cylicodaphne thwaitesii Meisn. var. angustata Meisn. in DC., Prodr. 15(1): 208. 1864, nom. superfl., syn. nov.

#### Туре

(lectotype designated here): Sri Lanka, without precise

locality [Ceylani montosa], 1836, *no collector* 853 (GZU000254065, digital image!, Fig. 2).

Shrubs (often bushy) or trees, 1.5-3.5 m high, almost entirely glabrous; branchlets flattened and striated towards tips, terete towards the base, 1-5 mm thick. Leaves alternate, linear, linear-lanceolate to oblonglanceolate, (6-) 8 -27× 0.7-3 cm, acute at apex, cuneateattenuate at the base, sometimes decurrent into petioles, apiculate to caudate-acuminate (acumen 1-3 cm long) at apex, thinly coriaceous, usually glaucous or glaucescent on lower surface; midrib incised on the upper surface, raised on lower surface; lateral nerves slender, ascending, (10-) 12-35 pairs, obscure on the upper surface, faint to prominent on lower surface; tertiary nerves and nerves not conspicuous; petioles 4-10 (-15) mm long, channeled above. Umbels axillary, solitary or 2-5-together, the males 5–6-flowered, the females 5-flowered, pedunculate (male peduncles 5-15 mm long, female peduncles 3-15 mm long); involucral bracts suborbicular, 2-3.5 mm across. Male flowers: pedicels 1-2 mm long; calyx tube inconspicuous; tepals 6, ovate-oblong, c. 1.5 × 0.7 mm; stamens 6 or 9, in 2 or 3 series, 1.5-2 mm long; anthers oblong, 4locular, c. 1 mm long; filaments pilose. Female flowers: pedicels 0.5-1 mm long; calyx tube funnel-shaped, c. 0.5 mm long; tepals 6, narrowly ovate, c. 1.2 × 0.4 mm; staminodes small; ovary ovoid-oblong, c. 1.5 mm long; style broadened towards stigma, c. 1.5 mm long; stigma peltate. Fruits oblong-ellipsoid to obovoid-ellipsoid, 8 -10 × 5-8 mm; cupule  $2-3 \times 4-7$  mm high; fruiting pedicels 3-6 mm long, stout.

# Flowering & fruiting

January–September (Sri Lanka: January–August; Northeast India and Bangladesh: January–September).



Fig. 1. Lectotype of Tetranthera saligna Nees. Available at: https://gzu.jacq.org/GZU000254549.



4

Fig. 2. Lectotype of Tetrantera iteodaphne Nees. Available at: https://gzu.jacq.org/GZU000254065.

# Habitat

It is frequent in evergreen forests between 200–2000 m asl in Sri Lanka; rare in northeast India on rocky watercourses or riverbanks, up to 900 m asl; common on the Chittagong hill tracts in Bangladesh up to 1000 m asl.

#### Distribution

Sri Lanka, northeast India, and Bangladesh.

#### Specimens examined

BANGLADESH. Rangamati Dist.: Burkul, 3 April 1876, J.L. Lister s.n. (CAL herb. acc. no. 387443). Sitapahar, 1876, J.L. Lister s.n. (CAL herb. acc. nos. 387444, 387446, 387448). Mogaserah Hills, 35 miles from Chittagong, September 1885, Badul Khan (King's collector) 147 (CAL). Kodala hills, 30 miles from Chittagong, April 1887, Badul Khan (King's collector) 422 (CAL); ibid., March 1886, Badul Khan (King's collector) 480 (CAL - 5 sheets). Kasalong, 1876, J.L. Lister 15 (CAL - 4 sheets). Ruikheong, 2 March 1879, J.S. Gamble 6778 C (CAL). Sylhet Dist.: Chattuck, 12 January 1886, C.B. Clarke 42696 (CAL). INDIA. Assam. Cachar dist., Barak reserve, opposite Alni, 19 Nov. 1914, U.N. Kanjilal 4731 (ASSAM, CAL). Manipur, Moupong, On the Manipur to Cachar road, 27 May 1882, G. Watt 7199 (BSIS, CAL - 2 sheets, E01092358). Mizoram, Lushai hills, Jeyked, Changsel, 20 Mar. 1890, J.C. Prazer s.n. (CAL herb. acc. nos. 387474, 387477, 387478). SRI LANKA. Without locality, s.d., Wight s.n. (E01092697). Without locality, March 1846, Thwaites s.n. in CP 360 (K000793235). Without locality, s.d., Thwaites s.n. in CP 360 (P01990578, P01990579, P0199580, P0199581, P02003111, P02003113). Without locality, s.d., no collector s.n. in CP 360 (BR0000005115136, CAL herb. acc. no. 387765). Without locality, s.d., Thwaites s.n. (CAL herb. acc. nos. 387703, 387704). Without locality and date, no collector in CP 10 (GH00041771). Galle Dist.: Masbeliya valley, 28 May 1969, Kostermans 23656 S (P01990583). Enselwatte estate, above Deniaya, June 1969, Kostermans 23694 (P01990584). Kandy Dist.: 75 mile NW of double cutting junction, Maskeliya, 19 April 1972, M. Jayasuriya, M.D. Dassanayake & S. Balasubramanium MJ 743 (L.1789584, L.1789588, P01990565). Dolosbage, Horogolle, 7 April 1976, L.H.Cramer 4634 (CAL). The upper part of Moray estate, 18 August 1974, Kostermans 25412 (L.1789586, L.1789587, P01990576). Road Laxapana -Maskeliya near Double cutting, 12 May 1971, Kostermans 24089 (P01990577). Nuwara Eliya dist.: Peak wilderness, 23 June 1976, S. Waas 1697 (L.1789574). Rathnapura Dist.: Sinharaja forest, Weddagale entrance, 3 February 1979, Kostermans 27303 (L.1789590).

#### Notes

The lectotype of *Tetranthera iteodaphne* designated by Kostermans (2, p. 199) based on a collection by Thwaites (in CP 360 –K000793235, digital image!) is not the original material of the name because it was collected in March

1846. The protologue cited the locality as: "In Ceylani insulae montosis." We located a specimen collected from Sri Lanka by an unknown collector in 1836 bearing the locality: 'Ceylani montosa' at Nees's own herbarium (GZU000254065). Hence, this specimen is designated here as the new lectotype of the name following Art. 9.11 of Shenzhen Code (7).

#### Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to the Director of Botanical Survey of India, Kolkata, and the Head of Office, Central National Herbarium, Howrah (CAL), for the facilities.

# **Authors' contributions**

All authors have equally contributed to the planning of the research and preparation of the manuscript.

# **Compliance with ethical standards**

**Conflict of interest**: The authors declared that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical issues: None.

#### References

- 1. de Kok RPJ. A revision of *Litsea* (Lauraceae) in Peninsular Malaysia and Singapore. Gard Bull Singapore. 2021;73(1):81-178. https://doi.org/10.26492/gbs73(1).2021-07
- Kostermans AJGH. Lauraceae. In: Dassanayake MD, Fosberg FR, Clayton WD, editors. Revised handbook of the flora of Ceylon. New Delhi: Amerind Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd. 1995;Vol. 9:p. 103-72.
- Gangopadhyay M, Chakrabarty T, Bhuiya T, Singh P. Lauraceae. In: Mao AA, Dash SS, editors. Flowering plants of India, an annotated checklist (Dicotyledons). Kolkata: Botanical Survey of India. Vol. 2:p. 427-49.
- Ara H, Mia MM, Khan B. An annotated checklist of Lauraceae in Bangladesh. Bangladesh J Plant Taxon. 2007;14(2):147-62. https://doi.org/10.3329/bjpt.v14i2.533
- Thiers B. (Continuously updated) Index herbariorum: A global directory of public herbaria and associated staff. New York Botanical Garden's Virtual Herbarium. Available from: http:// sweetgum.nybg.org/science/ih/ (accessed 17 December 2023).
- Singh RK. Nomenclatural notes and lectotypifications in *Litsea* (Lauraceae). Kew Bull. 2017;72(2)-20:1-9. https:// doi.org/10.1007/S12225-017-9693-6
- Turland NJ, Wiersema JH, Barrie FR, Greuter W, Hawksworth DL, Herendeen PS (eds.). 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. Koeltz Botanical Books, Glashütten; 2018. https://doi.org/10.12705/Code.2018