Proposal to conserve *Clausena pentaphylla* DC. (*Rutaceae*) with a conserved type
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**Prop.**

Type: India, Uttar Pradesh, Kanpur (as Cawnpore), *Roxburgh 2484* (BM), typ. cons. prop.

Since Oliver's work on "the Natural Order Aurantiaceae" (in J. Proc. Linn. Soc., Bot. 5, Suppl. 2: 30. 1861), *Clausena pentaphylla* DC. (Prodr. 1: 538. 1824) has been universally but erroneously considered as a new combination based on *Amyris pentaphylla* Roxb. ([Hort. Bengal.: 28. 1814, nom. nud.], Fl. Ind., ed. 1832, 2: 247. 1832) from N.W. India, and cited as *C. pentaphylla* "(Roxb.)" DC. This is patently wrong, if only because *Roxburgh’s name was not validly published before 1832, long after the Candollean name. *A. pentaphylla* Roxb. was lectotypified by Tanaka (in J. Bot. 68: 228. 1930) by the Roxburgh specimen here proposed as the conserved type of *C. pentaphylla* DC.

The protologue of *Clausena pentaphylla* did not mention *Amyris pentaphylla* but cited "*Limonia pentaphylla* herb. Lamb. non Roxb." [See Brizicky (in J. Arnold Arbor. 18: 91. 1962) for a discussion of *Limonia pentaphylla* sensu Roxb. (Pl. Comorandel 1: 60, t. 84. 1798 & Fl. Ind. ed. 1832, 2: 382. 1832) non Retz. (Observ. Bot. 5: 24. 1788.)] The undoubted holotype of *C. pentaphylla* is thus a Roxburghian specimen from India (G-DC) received by Candolle in 1816 from Lambert and labelled in Candolle's hand as "Inde. Roxburgh. misit.Lambert. 1816". The oldest label, in Roxburgh’s hand, reads "*Limonia pentagyna* R." This specimen belongs to *Protium serratum* (Wall. ex Colebr.). Engl. (*Burseraceae*), and is likely a duplicate of the specimen (BM) cited by Swart (in Rec. Trav. Bot. Néerl. 39: 257. 1942) as "W. Roxburgh, India, *Limonia pentagyna* Roxb. Chitreka", probably "collected from the tree in the Bot. Gard. at Calcutta mentioned by Roxburgh". Roxburgh (Hort. Bengal.: 32. 1814; Fl. Ind. ed. 1832, 2: 382. 1832) cited "chitreka" as the Telinga (language of Andhra Pradesh) name for "*Limonia pentagyna*", and it still is the vernacular name of *Protium serratum* according to Gamble (Fl. Madras 1: 171. 1915) and Swart (l.c.: 256). It is evident that Candolle (1) misread Roxburgh's label name, "*Limonia pentagyna*", as "*Limonia pentaphylla*" and (2) misidentified, like Roxburgh, the burseraceous material as rutaceous.


---
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C. pentaphylla DC., to replace Protium serratum. All this was done reluctantly, since both names, *P. serratum* and *C. pentaphylla*, are in general use in pertinent floras and taxonomic works, e.g.:


The present proposal aims both at restoring the name *Clausena pentaphylla* to its historic sense and avoid a new combination for what is known as *Protium serratum*, thus ensuring stability for both. The only change is in the author citation of the former, Roxburgh being dropped as a parenthetic author. Indeed, the synonymous *Amyris pentaphylla* will change its author citation from “Roxb.” to “(DC.) Roxb.”, since the proposed conserved type of *C. pentaphylla* is the same as the lectotype of *A. pentaphylla*. There are two further combinations directly based on *A. pentaphylla*: *Polyceyma pentaphyllum* (Roxb.) Voigt (Hort. Suburb. Calcutt.: 141. 1845) and *Gallesioa pentaphylla* (Roxb.) M. Roem. (Fam. Nat. Syn. Monogr. 1: 45. 1846): the parenthetic author citation in both will also change from “(Roxb.)” to “(DC.)” if this proposal is approved.

One might consider, as an alternative, conservation of *Clausena pentaphylla* (Roxb.) Oliv. against *C. pentaphylla* DC. The result would be the same with respect to maintenance of the names, but the proposed action appears to be preferable for two reasons: (1) *C. pentaphylla* has always been attributed to Candolle, even by Olivier himself, and changing from *C. pentaphylla* (Roxb.) DC. to *C. pentaphylla* DC. is less disturbing than changing to *C. pentaphylla* (Roxb.) Oliv.; and (2) it would stabilize this name from the earliest possible date, 1824 (vs. 1861 under the second option).
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