(1729) Proposal to conserve the name *Arctopus echinatus* with a conserved type (*Apiaceae*)

Ben-Erik van Wyk[1], Anthony R. Magee[1], Charles E. Jarvis[2] & Patricia M. Tilney[1]

[1]*Department of Botany and Plant Biotechnology, University of Johannesburg, P.O. Box 524, Auckland Park 2006, Johannesburg, South Africa. bevw@na.rau.ac.za (author for correspondence)*
[2]*Department of Botany, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*

(1729) ***Arctopus echinatus*** L., Sp. Pl.: 1058. 1 Mai 1753 [Dicot.: Umbell.], *nom. cons. prop.*
Typus: South Africa, Western Cape Province, Cape Town, Signal Hill, near Kramat, *Manning & Reeves* 2845 (NBG), *typ. cons. prop.*

Arctopus L. (Hort. Cliff.: 495. 1737; Sp. Pl.: 1058. 1753) was originally described as monospecific, based on *A. echinatus* L. (Sp. Pl.: 1058. 1753). Since its original description, *A. echinatus* has been applied to the most common and widely distributed species of the genus. Its leaves usually have one to three spines (sometimes four) in each leaf sinus and small, ovate pseudanthium bracteoles with one or two inflexed marginal spines in female plants. The plant is important medicinally, well known as "platdoring" or "sieketroost".

Sonder (in Harvey & Sonder, Fl. Cap. 2: 564–565. 1862) described a further two species: *Arctopus dregei* Sond., usually lacking leaf spines and with small, involute pseudanthium bracteoles in the female; and *A. monacanthus* Carmich. ex Sond., which has up to six stellate leaf spines and large, foliose orbicular female pseudanthium bracteoles with the margin almost always entire.

The only original elements eligible for lectotypification of *Arctopus echinatus* are two figures: Plukenet, Phytographia t. 271, fig. 5. 1694 ("mant. 185. t. 271. f. 5") and Burman, Rar. Afric. Pl.: t. 1. 1738 ("afr. 1. p. 1. t. 1"). The latter image is reproduced in the Linnaean Plant Names Database of the British Museum of Natural History and in Jarvis, Symb. Bot. Upsal. 33(3): 30, fig. 5. 2005. The Plukenet figure is diagnostic of the genus but too highly stylized to be referable to any of the three species currently recognized. Burtt (in Jarvis & al. (ed.), Regnum Veg. 127: 20. 1993) reasonably designated the Burman plate "*Arctopus* foliis superne spinis stelliformibus echinatis, laciniatis, & in cilia diductis; floribus umbellatis" as lectotype of *A. echinatus*. Unfortunately the five to six spines of the male plant and the large, foliose orbicular bracteoles of the female pseudanthium illustrated in the Burman plate are identifiable not as *A. echinatus* of usage, but as Sonder's *A. monacanthus*.

The widespread usage of *A. echinatus* for the well-known "platdoring" has persisted from the time of Thunberg (1800, 1823, see below) until the present, including recent molecular systematic studies (Plunkett, 2004, see below). Wolff (1913, see below), for example, provided a beautiful plate of "platdoring" under the name *A. echinatus*. All other authors have used the name in this sense: Thunberg (Fl. Cap.: 254–256. 1823; with several references in the diary of his travels in southern Africa – see Forbes, 1986; Anon. (in Bot. Reg. 9: 705–706. 1823); Candolle (Prodr. 4: 236. 1830); Ecklon & Zeyher (Enum. Pl. Afric. Austral. 3: 354. 1837); Pappe (Fl. Cap. Med. Prodr. 2: 19. 1857); Sonder (l.c.); Drude (in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 3(8): 145. 1898); Wolff (in Engler, Pflanzenr. I*V.* 228 (Heft 61): 274–277. 1913); Meyer & Rindl (in S. African J. Sci. 29: 272–277. 1932); Watt & Breyer-Brandwijk (Med. & Poison. Pl. South. & East. Afr. 2: 1034. 1962); Froebe (in Beitr. Biol. Pflanzen. 40: 381–383. 1964); Smith (Common Names S. Afr. Pl.: 372–373, 416. 1966); Watt (in Lloydia 30: 4,5, 44, 123–124. 1967); Theodore (in S. African Med. J. 46: 1013–1016. 1972); Hiroe (Umbell. World: 654–655. 1979); Magin (in Pl. Syst. Evol. 133: 239–259. 1980); Bond & Goldblatt (in J. S. African Bot. 13: 140. 1984); Forbes (Thunb. Travels at the Cape of Good Hope: 1772–1775. 1986); Burtt (in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 48: 185. 1991); Pimenov & Leonov (Gen. Umbell.: 23. 1993); Van Wyk & al. (Med. Pl. S. Afr.: 42. 1997); Goldblatt & Manning (in Strelitzia 9: 275. 2000); Van Wyk & Gericke (Peoples Pl.: 140–141. 2000); Plunkett (in Edinburgh J. Bot. 58: 183–200. 2001); Liu (in Taxon 52: 261–270. 2003); Plunkett & al. (in S. African J. Bot. 70: 371–381. 2004).

The consequences of Burtt's formal typification leave two options. The first is to accept the typification, in which case *A. monacanthus* falls into the synonymy of *A. echinatus* and the latter is newly applied to the species (with up to six stellate spines and foliose bracteoles) formerly known as *A. monacanthus*. This would be most unfortunate, switching the application of *A. echinatus* from one well-known species to a different, little-known one, thereby causing confusion and also making it necessary to provide a new name for the species previously known as *A. echinatus*. The second option, which we favour, is to propose *A. echinatus* for conservation with a conserved type. If approved, this will allow the name to continue to be used in its traditional sense, as commonly cited and illustrated in books and other publications as noted above.

"In order to avoid disadvantageous name changes entailed by the strict application of the rules" (Art. 14.1; Greuter & al. in Regnum Veg. 138. 2000), we therefore propose the conservation of *A. echinatus* with a conserved type.