

Correspondence



http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.115.2.5

The correct name of Aloe plicatilis in Kumara (Xanthorrhoeaceae: Asphodeloideae)

RONELL R. KLOPPER^{1,2}, GIDEON F. SMITH^{1,2,3} & ABRAHAM E. VAN WYK²

¹Biosystematics Research and Biodiversity Collections Division, South African National Biodiversity Institute, Private Bag X101, Pretoria 0001, South Africa. Email: r.klopper@sanbi.org.za; g.smith@sanbi.org.za
²H.G.W.J. Schweickerdt Herbarium, Department of Plant Science, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, 0002, South Africa.
³Centre for Functional Ecology, Departamento de Ciências da Vida, Universidade de Coimbra, 3001-455 Coimbra, Portugal

The genus *Kumara* Medikus (1786: 69) was recently reinstated in the Xanthorrhoeaceae: Asphodeloideae (alternatively Asphodelaceae: Alooideae) comprising only one species, namely the fan aloe, *Kumara disticha* Medikus (1786: 70) [with *Aloe plicatilis* (Linnaeus 1753: 321) Miller (1768: 7) given as a synonym] (Grace *et al.* 2013). However, if the fan aloe, currently known as *Aloe plicatilis*, is treated as a species of *Kumara*, the epithet *plicatilis* has priority and a new combination in *Kumara* is required. The new combination is made here.

Kumara disticha Medik., used as correct name for the fan aloe by Grace *et al.* (2013), is in reality a superfluous name. According to the synonymy provided by Medikus (1786: 70), it has to be considered as a new combination based on *Aloe disticha* Linnaeus (1753: 321) [i.e. the correct author citation is *Kumara disticha* (L.) Medik.]. It is thus a nomenclatural synonym of *Gasteria disticha* (L.) Haworth (1827: 352), even though the intention of Medikus (1786), as substantiated by the accompanying plate (Medikus 1786: t.4), was clearly to apply it to the fan aloe (Klopper *et al.* 2013).

The type of *Kumara* was designated by Rowley (1976: 55) as *K. disticha*, thus making the names *Kumara* (1786) and *Gasteria* Duval (1809: 6) synonyms for the same genus. Since *Kumara* has priority, the implication of this in terms of nomenclatural disruptions is severe. To retain use of the names *Kumara* and *Gasteria* in the sense that it was intended by Medikus (1786) and Duval (1809), and has been applied for the past two centuries, conservation of the name *Kumara* with a conserved type [namely *Aloe plicatilis* (L.) Burm.f.] is essential (see Klopper *et al.* 2013, for this conservation proposal).

The combination in *Aloe* of *A. plicatilis* has historically been attributed to Miller (1768: 7) [as *A. plicatilis* (L.) Mill.]. However, Miller's *The Gardener's Dictionary* was published on 16 April 1768 (Stafleu & Cowan 1981: 495), whereas the *Prodromus Florae Capensis* of Burman was published between 1 March and 6 April 1768 (Stafleu & Cowan 1976: 417). Therefore, the correct author citation is *A. plicatilis* (L.) Burm.f.

New combination in Kumara Medik.

Kumara plicatilis (L.) Klopper & Gideon F.Sm., comb. nov.

Basionym:—Aloe disticha var. plicatilis Linnaeus (1753: 321). Homotypic synonyms:—Aloe plicatilis (L.) Burman (1768: 10) ≡ Kumara disticha sensu Medikus (1786: 70, t.4), nom. superfl. Lectotype (designated by Wijnands 1983: 125):—Aloe africana arborescens montana non spinosa, folio longissimo plicatili, flore rubro (Commelijn 1701: 5, t.3).

For a complete list of synonyms see Grace et al. (2011: 123).