EDINBURGH JOURNAL OF BOTANY 75 (2): 205–214 (2018)

doi: 10.1017/S0960428618000057

NOMENCLATURE AND TYPIFICATION OF VARIOUS MYRTACEAE OCCURRING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

J. Parnell[1,2] & W. K. Soh[1,3]

The nomenclature of a number of taxa that occur in Southeast Asia in *Baeckea*, *Decaspermum*, *Leptospermum*, *Melaleuca*, *Psidium*, *Rhodamnia*, *Rhodomyrtus* and *Tristaniopsis* is discussed: eight lectotypes are designated, six taxa are shown to have been previously lectotypified under Article 9.9 with second-stage lectotypification being deemed unnecessary for two of them, and comments are made on two species that we cannot yet typify.

Keywords. *Baeckea*, *Decaspermum*, *Flora of Laos*, *Cambodia and Vietnam*, *Leptospermum*, *Melaleuca*, Myrtaceae, new subspecies, *Psidium*, *Rhodamnia*, *Rhodomyrtus*, *Tristaniopsis*, typification.

Introduction

Prior to the publication of our account of the Myrtaceae for the *Flora of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam*, we need to typify the names of a number of taxa, mostly species, across a range of genera, to clarify some long-standing nomenclatural questions and to comment on some existing typifications. Furthermore, the literature contains a significant number of names often used but which are illegitimate; we also briefly deal with these. All specimens and illustrations mentioned have been seen.

Designation of Lectotypes

Decaspermum montanum Ridl., J. Straits Branch Roy. Asiat. Soc. 61: 6 (1912). – Type: Kedah, Kedah Peak, vi 1893, *Ridley* 5357 (lecto SING, designated here [SING0222422]).

Ridley (1912, p. 7) listed the following specimens, all of which are therefore syntypes: Gunong Jerai (*Ridley* 5209, 5356 and 5357), Mount Ophir (*Ridley* 3310), *Hullett* 775 and *Derry* 608. We have been able to trace the following materials: Gunong Jerai (*Ridley* 5209 [SING0222424], 5356 [SING0222425] and 5357 [SING0222422]),

[1] Herbarium, Botany Department, School of Natural Sciences, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland. E-mail for correspondence: jparnell@tcd.ie
[2] Trinity Centre for Biodiversity Research, School of Natural Sciences, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland.
[3] School of Biology and Environmental Science, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland.

Mount Ophir (*Ridley* 3310 [K000800732]), *Hullett* 775 (SING0222423) and *Derry* 608 (SING0222420 and SING0222421). Of these, *Ridley* 5209 (SING0222424) has only a single unopened flower bud; *Derry* 608 (SING0222420) and *Ridley* 5356 (SING0222425) have very few flowers and both have lost a number of their leaves; and *Derry* 608 (SING0222421) has lost parts of the stem and petioles and has few flowers. Of the remaining materials, *Ridley* 5357 (SING0222422) is in better condition, with more flowers than either *Hullett* 775 (SING0222423) or *Ridley* 3310 (K000800732) and is designated as the lectotype above. Two synonyms of *Decaspermum montanum* are discussed below.

Decaspermum cambodianum Gagnep., Bull. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat. 26: 73 (1920). – Type: Cambodia, Thepong, *Herb. Pierre* 985 (lecto P, designated here [P00467145]; isolecto A [A00068988], K [K000261633], P [P00467147 and P00467146]).

Although this species has been quoted as being first published by Gagnepain in Lecomte, Fl. Indo-Chine 2: 846 (1921) (May 1921, according to Stafleu & Cowan, 1979), this publication is pre-dated by Gagnepain (1920). This is important, because the publications differ slightly in the information given. Gagnepain (1921, p. 847) listed only a single collection: Pierre from "prov. de Thepong (*Pierre*)", but with no collection number. Gagnepain (1920) gives this information and adds the collection number "985". The collection *Pierre* 985 bears the following information on the herbarium label, 'Herb. L. Pierre. No. 985 Nelitris Arbuscula 2–4 m. Hab. Crescit in prov thepong in Cambodia 5/1870 Coll. LP'. Numerous duplicates of *Pierre* 985 exist (A00068988, K000261633, P00467145, P00467146 and P00467147). It is almost certain that these are multiple preparations from a single gathering and represent duplicates of the type gathering (McNeill *et al.*, 2012: Article 8.3). To assume otherwise would be almost perverse, but to avoid all doubt, we believe that it is appropriate to lectotypify *Decaspermum cambodianum* from the available specimens. Of these, only P00467145 bears original drawings of this species and it is in the best physical condition; it is therefore selected as the lectotype above.

Eugenia ciliaris Ridl., Bull. Misc. Inform. Kew 1928: 74 (1928). – Type: Malaysia, Pulau Tioman, Mt Kajang, v 1927, *Nur* 18812 (lecto K, designated here [K000800733], isolecto K [K000800734]).

Ridley mentions only a collection of "Mahommed Nur 18912" from "Pulau Tioman, Gunong Kajang, 2,500 ft." Two sheets of *Nur* 18812 from that locality exist at K (K000800733 and K000800734), but both from the slightly higher elevation of 2700 ft and collected on 2 May 1927. We treat these differences in altitude and collection number as simple typographic errors (McNeill *et al.*, 2010: Article 60.1) by Ridley. K000800733 is the more complete specimen and is chosen as the lectotype above.

Melaleuca citrina (Curtis) Dum. Cours., Bot. Cult. 3: 282 (1802) ≡ *Metrosideros citrina* Curtis, Bot. Mag. 8: t. 260 (1794). – Type: Icon in Curtis, Bot. Mag. 8: t. 260 (lecto, designated here).

Dumont de Courset (1802) provides a description but does not cite any specimens nor refer to any plates. Brophy *et al.* (2013) follow Craven (2006) and treat this species as being first described by Curtis (1794) as *Meterosideros citrina*, but there is no direct indication in Dumont de Courset's (1802) description of the species that it is based on Curtis (1794), and he makes no mention of Curtis in the list of works consulted. In the 'Avertissment' to the second edition of his work (Dumont de Courset, 1811), however, Dumont de Courset indicates that he has consulted "le magasin de Curtis", and there is good evidence that it was his intent to base his name on that of Curtis; for example, the epithet chosen and the locality cited are the same. Furthermore, the full title of Dumont de Courset's work indicates that it follows the system of Jussieu (1789), who in his Appendix (p. 453) included *Metrosideros* under *Melaleuca*.

As no contrary evidence exists and as Dumont de Courset fulfilled the conditions for valid publication of *Melaleuca citrina* as the name of a new species, we believe that it should be treated under Article 41.4 of the International Code of Nomenclature (McNeill *et al.*, 2012) as based on *Metrosideros citrina* Curtis (1794).

For many years, this species was known as *Callistemon citrinus* (Curtis) Skeels. We follow Brophy *et al.* (2013) and Craven (2006), who treat *Callistemon* as a synonym of *Melaleuca*. When this combination was first published, Skeels (1913, p. 49) referred to the correct plate number but to Curtis's *Botanical Magazine* volume 7 rather than 8; this is a correctable error (McNeill *et al.*, 2012: Article 41.3).

Curtis (1794) states that his drawing was made from a "plant which blossomed toward the close of last summer at Lord Cremornes, the root of which had been sent from Botany-Bay". We cannot trace this specimen, and therefore the sole remaining material available for typification is the plate in Curtis (1794). As no one, including Skeels (1913), who cited only Curtis (1794), has named a type, the name requires lectotypification. We designate Curtis (1794, t. 260) as the lectotype.

Other synonyms of *Melaleuca citrina* that appear to require typification, being often cited in synonymy and considered as legitimate names but which are in fact superfluous and illegitimate and automatically typified by the type of the name that ought to have been adopted (Article 7.5), include the following.

Metrosideros lanceolata Sm. (1797, p. 272), which is illegitimate (McNeill *et al.*, 2012: Article 52.2), as Smith cites *Meterosideros citrina* (Smith felt the epithet *citrina* was "too preposterous to be maintained").

Angophora lanceolata Cav. (1797, 4: 22, t. 339), which is illegitimate (McNeill *et al.*, 2012: Article 52.2), as the earlier *Metrosideros costata* Gaertn. (1788, p. 171, t. 34) is cited.

Metrosideros lanceolata Sm. in Pers. (1806, p. 26, no. 15), which is illegitimate (McNeill *et al.*, 2012: Article 52.2), as the earlier *Metrosideros citrina* Curtis and *Metrosideros lophantha* Vent. are cited.

Metrosideros lanceolata Pers. (1806, p. 25, no. 11), which is illegitimate (McNeill *et al.*, 2012: Article 52.2), being based on the illegitimate *Angophora lanceolata* Cav. (1797,

4: 22, t. 339) (an illegitimate name cannot act as a basionym; McNeill *et al.*, 2012: Article 6.10).

Callistemon lanceolatum Sweet (1826, part 1, p. 155), which is illegitimate (McNeill *et al.*, 2012: Article 52.2), as Sweet cites *Metrosideros citrina*. [This name is often written as *Callistemon lanceolatus* (Sm.) Sweet (e.g. in the International Plant Names Index, no date), but there is no relevant mention of Smith in Sweet (1826), and an illegitimate name cannot act as a basionym (McNeill *et al.*, 2012: Article 6.10).]

Callistemon lanceolatum DC. (1828, p. 223), which is a later isonym (McNeill *et al.*, 2012: Article 6, Note 2) of *C. lanceolatum* Sweet.

Psidium guajava L., Sp. Pl. 1: 470 (1753).

Psidium littorale Raddi, Alc. Sp. Pero 6, t. 1, Fig. 2 (1821). – Type: Raddi, Alc. Sp. Pero 6, t. 1, Fig. 2 (1821) (lecto, designated here).

Psidium littorale will be treated by us in the *Flora of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam* as a synonym of *P. guajava* and was first described in a preprint of the more commonly cited work by Raddi (1823): *Opuscoli Scientifici*, volume 4 (p. 254, t. 7, Fig. 2). Unfortunately, Raddi (1821) cited no specimens in the protologue and referred only to a single illustration of his own, indicating that he must have had a specimen or specimens available to him (J. McNeill, Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, personal communication). Later in the text, Raddi does refer to a sterile plant growing in the Botanical Gardens in Florence. M0146756 is labelled *Psidium littorale* and bears a label stating 'Herbarium Regium Monacense & Herb Zuccarini & Herbar. Univ. Ludo. Maximil.', with the written annotation by Otto Berg 'hort. berol. Otto'; it has tentatively been verified by Dickoré as type material on JSTOR, but we have traced no associated publication. Given that Berg's dates are 1815–1866, it is reasonable to conclude that it was impossible for Raddi to have seen this material in 1821, and we can find no indication that Raddi saw this material or used it in constructing the description. As we can trace no specimens that might have been seen by Raddi, it therefore appears that Raddi (1821) t. 1., Fig. 2, is the only remaining original material, and we designate it as the lectotype above.

Psidium cattleyanum Sabine, Trans. Hort. Soc. London 4: 317, t. 11 (1821). – Type: Sabine, Trans. Hort. Soc. London 4: 317, t. 11 (1821) (lecto, designated here).

Psidium cattleyanum Sabine will be treated by us in the *Flora of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam* as a synonym of *P. guajava*. Sabine (op. cit.) coined the name based on a drawing by Hooker and an account written by William Cattley and sent to him. Cattley certainly sent specimens of fruits to Sabine, but unfortunately the original herbarium of the Royal Horticultural Society was auctioned off in the mid-nineteenth century to alleviate the Society's debts, and no relevant herbarium material of Cattley's has been traced by us. Hooker's drawing is, however, excellent and is nominated as the lectotype above.

Rhodamnia siamensis Craib, Bull. Misc. Inform. Kew 1926: 167 (1926). – Type: Thailand, Si Racha, Nawng Yai Bu, 15 m scrub jungle, *Kerr* 2147 (ABD, second stage lectotype designated here).

Rhodamnia siamensis is a taxonomic synonym of *Rhodamnia dumetorum* (DC.) Merr. & L.M.Perry in J. Arnold Arbor. 19: 195 (1938). Craib (1926) cites *Kerr* 2147 as the type but does not specify the herbarium where the holotype is located, so his nomination can be taken as a first-stage lectotypification. Duplicates of *Kerr* 2147 exist in ABD, BM (BM000944014) and K (K000800683). Of these, the material in ABD is by far the most complete, was obviously seen by Craib, who worked for many years in Aberdeen, and is nominated as the lectotype above (second stage). ABD does not, at present, use barcodes for its specimens.

Tristaniopsis burmanica (Griff.) Peter G.Wilson & J.T.Waterh. var. *rufescens* (Hance) J.Parn. & NicLugh., Kew Bull. 47: 705 (1992). – *Tristania rufescens* Hance, J. Bot. 14: 259 (1876). – Type: Vietnam, Phu Quoc Is., 1874, *Herb. Pierre* 1440, *Pierre* 19212 (lecto BM, designated here [BM000926077], isolectotype K [K000261634]).

Hance (1876, p. 259) cites a Pierre collection from "Phu kok, sinus Siamensis, a 1874". BM000926077 ex Herb. Hance from Herb. Pierre no. 1440 and bearing the Pierre number '19212' has all the above information, as does K000261634. The former is the larger and more complete specimen and so is designated as the lectotype above.

Application of Article 9.9 (McNeill *et al.*, 2012) to Various Taxa

Article 9.9 deals with the use of "a term as defined in the *Code* as denoting a type, in a sense other than that in which it is so defined". The article indicates that this is to be "treated as an error to be corrected (for example, the use of the term lectotype to denote what is in fact a neotype)". We deal with five examples where we apply this Article.

Baeckea frutescens L., Sp. Pl. 1: 358 (1753). – Type: China, Osbeck *s.n.* (lecto, Herb. Linn. LINN 505.1).

Bean (1997, p.248) states that P. Osbeck *s.n.* LINN 505.1 from China (Guangzhou [Canton], Guangdong Province) is the holotype. Based on Bean (op. cit.), Jarvis (2007), in accordance with Article 9.9 of McNeill *et al.* (2012), indicates that the above is in fact a lectotype. LINN 505.1 comprises at least five separate fragments, mounted on a single sheet, that were probably derived from a single specimen, and therefore second-stage lectotypification (McNeill *et al.* 2012: Article 9.17) does not apply.

Decaspermum parviflorum (Lam.) A.J.Scott, Kew Bull. 34: 66 (1979b). – *Eugenia parviflora* Lam., Encycl. 3: 200 (1789). – Java, Sonnerat *s.n.* [but probably Commerson; see Flora Malesiana 1(1): 113 (1950)] (lecto P [P-LA P00297798], designated by Scott, Kew Bull. 34: 66 [1979b]; iso P-JU 13911).

Scott's designation of a holotype is correctable under Article 9.9 (McNeill *et al.*, 2012) to lectotype.

Leptospermum javanicum Blume, Bijdr. 1100 (1826–1827). – Type: Indonesia, Mt Gede, specimen on the left-hand side, *unknown collector* (lecto L [L0009496], designated by Thompson, *Telopea* 3: 390 [1989]).

Blume (1825–1826, p. 1100) gives no collection details beyond stating "in cacumine montis Gede". Numerous collections by Blume of this taxon exist. These include L0009496 (comprising two specimens, this is labelled as the holotype but with no details appended on collection locality; based on the handwriting, the annotation is almost certainly by J. Thompson). Thompson's designation of a holotype is correctable under Article 9.9 (McNeill *et al.*, 2012) to lectotype.

The specimens on L0009496 are somewhat different in pubescence; the left-hand specimen lacks flowers and is pubescent on its uppermost branchlets and along the abaxial midrib of the leaves, whereas the right-hand one lacks these features and has pubescent hypanthia. Because of these differences, it is not absolutely certain that the specimens form part of the same collection, but we prefer to treat them as such in the absence of conclusive evidence to the contrary, thereby obviating the need for second-stage lectotypification (McNeill *et al.*, 2012: Article 9.17).

Rhodamnia cinerea Jack, Malayan Misc. 2: 48 (1822).

var. *cinerea*. – Type: Indonesia, Sumatra, *Jack s.n.* (lecto L [L0009540], designated by Scott, Kew Bull. 33: 437 [1979a]).

Scott's designation of a holotype is correctable under Article 9.9 (McNeill *et al.*, 2012) to lectotype.

var. *concolor* Blume, Mus. Bot. Lugd.-Bat. 1: 78 (1850). – Type: Indonesia, Sumatra, Singkara, *Korthals s.n.* (lecto L [L0009541], designated by Scott, Kew Bull. 33: 435 [1979a]).

Scott's designation of a holotype is correctable under Article 9.9 (McNeill *et al.*, 2012) to lectotype. 'Singkara' must be a misspelling of Sinkara in Sumatra and is not Singkara in the Philippines.

Blume (1850, p. 78) describes *Rhodamnia cinerea* and cites a number of previous publications by way of reference but does not cite any collections or specimens. Among the literature references, Blume (1850) states "Ejusd. Icon. Tab. 524. – Cum Var b(beta) in montanis Sumatrae.", by which he refers to Wight's Icones (1843) and may be indicating that this illustration refers to his var b(beta), which is var. *concolor*. Wight's tab. 524 and its accompanying description are of *Rhodamnia dumetorum* (as *Monoxora spectabilis*), but there is no indication in his description of the species that the leaves are concolorous. Indeed, the preceding generic description suggests that the leaves are always discolorous.

Later, Miquel (1860, p. 315) adds that this taxon (as *Rhodamnia concolor* Miq.) has been found near "Singkara", which, as indicated above, must be a misspelling. The

collector is indicated by Miquel (1860) as T. (= Teijsmann). A.J. Scott (in herb. U in 1977) indicates that U0005195 is the holotype of *Rhodamnia concolor* Miq. (the label on this specimen reads: '841 HB' [= 841 Herbarium Bogorense] '*Rhodamnia concolor* Mara' ?'paejan'?' [the latter is probably a vernacular name] 'Sinkara' [Sinkara is at decimal degree –0.683333S, 100.6E] 'WK' [= West Coast (Kust in Dutch)]. 'Sum.' [= Sumatra]). But in 1979, Scott cites *Korthals s.n.* (L0009541) as the holotype of *Rhodamnia cinerea* var. *concolor* Blume, and this attribution must be followed.

Rhodomyrtus tomentosa (Aiton) Hassk., Flora 25: 35 (1842). – *Myrtus tomentosa* Aiton, Hort. Kew, ed. 1, 2: 159 (1789). – Type: China, Wampo, xi 1772, *J. Robertson s.n.* (lecto BM [BM001025705], designated by Scott, Kew Bull. 33: 313 [1978]).

Scott's designation of a holotype is correctable under Article 9.9 (McNeill *et al.*, 2012) to lectotype.

In publishing the new combination in *Rhodomyrtus*, Hasskarl (1842, p. 35) wrote "146. *Rhodomyrtus tomentosa mihi* (Myrtus Bl. Bijdr. 1051. DC. Prdr. III. 240.)". His citation of Blume's Bijdrage 1051 is an error for 1081, where *Myrtus tomentosa* is ascribed to "Ait.", as it is also in de Candolle (1828, p. 240), who included the reference "hort. kew 2. p. 159."

Comments on Other Names Yet to be Typified

Decaspermum paniculatum (Lindl.) Kurz in J. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, Pt 2, Nat. Hist. 46: 61 (1877). – *Nelitris paniculata* Lindl., Coll. Bot. Pt. 4: pl. 16 (1821).

Scott (1979b) indicates that the "Type" is from the Moluccas and was collected by Roxburgh with the holotype remaining unlocated in Herb. Lambert. The disposal of Lambert's herbarium is complex. Miller (1970) indicates that the final resting place of some of the material remains obscure, with the rest scattered throughout at least eighteen European institutions. The first author had hoped that relevant material would have been found owing to the recent availability of imaged material from many of the main institutions. Unfortunately, this is not yet the case; however, the search has been narrowed, as the material does not appear to be in AAH, B, BM, BR, FI, G, K, L, OXF or P.

Melaleuca cajaputi R.Powell, Pharmacop. Roy. Coll. Physicians: 21 (1809).

Powell (1809, pp. 21–22) stated, "This oil was supposed to be the produce of *Melaleuca Leucodendron* (Med. Bot. t. 229), but it appears from specimens of the tree yielding the true Cajuputi, sent home by Mr. Christopher Smith, that the species is different, and referable to tab. 17, of Rumphius's Herbarium Amboinense (vol. ii), and not to that author's 'Arbor alba,' tab. 16. After a careful examination of specimens in Sir Joseph Banks's, and other collections by Dr. Maton, and of those in the Linnean Herbarium by Dr. Smith, we are authorised to consider the tree which yields the above oil as a new species, and, from the name of its medicinal product, these gentlemen have

agreed to give it the appellation of *(Melaleuca) Cajuputi*." Powell (op. cit.) gave no description or diagnosis, referring only to Rumphius's tab. 17, which consists of two very different figures. They were both considered by Rumphius to illustrate a single species, and tab. 17 was directly associated (in the "Explicatio", p. 77) with adequate descriptive material to satisfy the requirement of Article 38.1(a) for a "previously and effectively published description or diagnosis". Blake (1968), in adopting Powell's name, indicated that Roxburgh (1832) only considered plate 1 to be relevant in the case of *Melaleuca cajaputi* (Blake's reference, on p. 26 of his paper, to "p. 347" in Roxburgh is an error for p. 397). As Roxburgh did not use the word "type" (Article 7.10), this cannot be taken as typification, but it appears to have been the general application ever since. Therefore Craven, the world expert on the group, was justified in his use of the name *Melaleuca cajaputi* (Craven, 2006), recently repeated in the latest monograph of *Melaleuca* (Brophy *et al.*, 2013). This is fortunate, as the name *Melaleuca cajaputi* is used widely in Asia because the essential oil extracted from plants with this name forms the basis of a large industry.

Melaleuca minor Sm. in Rees (1812), sometimes treated as a synonym of *M. cajaputi*, notably by Blake (1968), has an extensive description in which Smith mentions receiving material from Mr Christopher Smith and in which is cited "Rumph. Amboin. V.2.76. t.17.", with the appended comment that "Rumphius's plates are by no means calculated to give a just idea of the foliage of either, especially of the present, but his descriptions are excellent." So, as Smith (1812) pointed out, there is a link between Rumphius's plate and his text. Material in the Smith herbarium in LINN (LINN-HS 1243.3) may be that received from Christopher Smith.

Craven (personal communication) worked for many years on *Melaleuca* and, at the time of his early and untimely death, was reluctant to lectotypify *M. cajuputi*. We are similarly hesitant to undertake a task that Craven indicated was difficult, and so believe that lectotypification is best carried out by a specialist working exclusively on *Melaleuca*. As McNeill (personal communication) points out, only material available to Rumphius is eligible to be selected as type of *Melaleuca cajuputi* (Article 7.7), and this must mean that Rumphius's plate 17 is the obligate lectotype, although presumably a selection of Fig. 1 or Fig. 2 should be made.

Acknowledgements

We thank Professor Dr Peter van Welzen for assistance in interpreting the label of U0005195 and the abbreviations in Miquel (1860), Dr Eve Lucas for providing information on the current state of imaging and barcoding of Kew's Myrtaceae, Dr David Simpson for comments on an early draft of this manuscript and especially Dr J. McNeill for very full and helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

References

Aiton, W. (1789). *Hortus Kewensis or a Catalogue of the Plants Cultivated in the Royal Botanic Garden at Kew*, vol. 2, London: George Nicol.

Bean, A. R. (1997). A revision of *Baeckea* (Myrtaceae) in eastern Australia, Malesia and south-east Asia. *Telopea* 7(3): 245–268.
Blake, S. T. (1968). A revision of *Melaleuca leucadendron* and its allies (Myrtaceae). *Contr. Queensland Herb.* 1: 1–114.
Blume, C. L. (1825–1826). *Bijdragen tot de Flora van Nederlandisch Indië*. Batavia: Ter Lands Drukkerij.
Blume, C. L. (1850). *Museum Botanicum Lugduno-Batavum*, vol. 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
Brophy, J. J., Craven, L. & Doran, J. C. (2013). *Melaleucas. Their Botany, Essential Oils and Uses.* Canberra: Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research and Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation.
Candolle, A. P. de (1828). *Prodromus Systematis Naturalis Regni Vegetabilis*, vol. 3. Paris: Treuttel & Würtz.
Cavanilles, A. J. (1797). *Icones et Descriptiones Planterum*, vol. IV. Madrid: Ex Regis Typographia.
Craib, W. B. (1926). Contributions to the Flora of Siam. Additamentum XVIII. *Bull. Misc. Inform. Kew* 1926: 154–174.
Craven, L. (2006). New combinations in *Melaleuca* for Australian species of *Callistemon* (Myrtaceae). *Novon* 16(4): 468–475.
Curtis, W. (1794). *Metrosideros citrina. Bot. Mag*. 8: t. 260.
Dumont de Courset, G. L. M. (1802). *Le Botaniste Cultivateur*. Paris: H. L. Perronneau.
Dumont de Courset, G. L. M. (1811). *Le Botaniste Cultivateur*, 2nd edition. Paris: J. J. Fuchs.
Gaertner, J. (1788). *De Fructibus et Seminibus Plantarum*. Stuttgart: Sumtibus Auctoris.
Gagnepain, F. (1920). Barringtonia et Decaspermum nouveaux. *Bull. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat.* 26: 73–74.
Gagnepain, F. (1921). Myrtacées. In: Lecomte, H. *Flore Générale de l'Indo-Chine*, vol. 2, pp. 788–864. Paris: Masson.
Hance, H. F. (1876). Corolla Pierreana; sive stirpum Cambodianarum a cl. L. Pierre, horti bot. Siagonensis praeposito, lectarum ecologae. *J. Bot.* 5: 257–262.
Hasskarl, J. K. (1842). Plantarum genera et species novae aut reformatae javenses. In: *Flora* 25 (Band 2, Beiblatt 1).
Hooker, J. D. (1879). *Flora of British India*, vol. 2. London: L. Reeve.
International Plant Names Index (no date). Online. Available: http://www.ipni.org (accessed 9 January 2017).
Jack, W. (1822). *Malayan Miscellanies* 2(7): 48–49.
Jarvis, C. (2007). *Order Out of Chaos. Linnean Plant Names and their Types*. London: Linnean Society of London and Natural History Museum.
Jussieu, A.-L. (1789). *Genera Plantarum*. Paris: Herissant.
Kurz, S. (1877). Contributions towards a knowledge of the Burmese flora. *J. Asiat. Soc. Bengal* 46: 49–258.
Linnaeus, C. (1753). *Species Plantarum*. Stockholm: Laurentii Salvii.
McNeill, J., Barrie, F. R., Buck, W. R., Demoulin, V., Greuter, W., Hawksworth, D. L., Herendeen, P. S., Knapp, S., Marhold, K., Prado, J., Prud'homme van Reine, W. F., Smith, G. F., Wiersema, J. H. & Turland, N. J. (eds and comps) (2012). *International Code of Nomenclature for Algae, Fungi and Plants (Melbourne Code), Adopted by the Eighteenth International Botanical Congress Melbourne, Australia, July 2011. Regnum Vegetabile 154*. Oberreifenberg: Koeltz Botanical Books.
Merrill, E. D. & Perry, L. M. (1938). The Myrtaceae of China. *J. Arnold Arbor.* 19: 191–247.

MILLER, H. S. (1970). The herbarium of Aylmer Bourke Lambert. *Taxon* 19: 489–553.
MIQUEL, F. A. W. (1860). *Flora van Nederlandsch Indië*. Amsterdam: C. G. van der Poste.
PARNELL, J. & NIC LUGHADHA, E. (1992). Notes on Thai Myrtaceae. *Kew Bull*. 47(4): 703–706.
PERSOON, C. H. (1806). *Synopsis Plantarum, Seu Enchiridium Botanicum Complectens Enumerationem Systematicum Specierum Hucusque Cognitorum*... Paris: C. F. Cramerum.
POWELL, R. (1809). *Pharmacopaeia of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, pp. 21–22. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees and Long.
RADDI, G. (1821). *Di Alcune Specie di Pero Indiano Memoria di Giuseppi Raddi*. Bologna: Annesio Nobili.
RADDI, G. (1823). *Opuscoli Scientifici*, vol. 4. Bologna: Annesio Nobili.
REES, M. (1812). *The Cyclopedia or Universal Dictionary of Arts, Sciences and Literature* [also known as *Rees's Cyclopedia*], vol. 23. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orm and Brown.
RIDLEY, H. N. (1912). New and rare Malayan Plants. *J. Straits Branch Roy. Asiat. Soc.* 61: 1–43.
RIDLEY, H. N. (1928). XIII. – Decades Kewensis Plantarum Novarum in Herbario Horti Regii Conservatarum. Decas CXIX. 1183. *Bull. Misc. Inform. Kew* 74.
ROXBURGH, W. (1832). *Flora Indica; or, Descriptions of Indian Plants*, vol. III. Calcutta: W. Thacker & Co.
RUMPHIUS, G. E. (1741). *Herbarium Amboinense*, vol. 2. Amsterdam: Changuion, Catuffe & Uytwerf.
SABINE, J. (1821). Account of a new Psidium. *Trans. Hort. Soc. London* 4: 315–317.
SCOTT, A. J. (1978). A revision of *Rhodomyrtus* (Myrtaceae). *Kew Bull*. 33(2): 311–329.
SCOTT, A. J. (1979a). A revision of *Rhodamnia* (Myrtaceae). *Kew Bull*. 33(3): 429–459.
SCOTT, A. J. (1979b). The Austral-Pacific species of *Decaspermum* (Myrtaceae). *Kew Bull*. 34(1): 59–67.
SKEELS, H. C. (1913). Seeds and plants imported during the period from January 1 to March 31, 1912. Inventory no. 30, nos 32369 to 33278. *Bull. Bur. Pl. Industr. U.S.D.A.* 282: 49.
SMITH, J. E. (1797). Botanical characters of some plants of the natural order of Myrti. *Trans. Linn. Soc.* 3: 255–288.
STAFLEU, F. A. & COWAN, R. S. (1979). *Taxonomic Literature, Volume II, H–Le*. Utrecht: Bohn, Scheltema & Holkema.
SWEET, R. (1826). *Sweet's Hortus Britannicus Arranged in Natural Orders: With the Addition of*... London: James Ridgeway.
WIGHT, R. (1843). *Icones Plantarum Indiae Orientalis* [*Figures of Indian Plants*], vol. 2. Madras: J. B. Pharoah.

Received 18 May 2017; accepted for publication 9 February 2018;
first published online 27 March 2018