Typification of *Geranium lobatum*, basionym of *Pelargonium lobatum*
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*Geranium lobatum* Burm. f., the basionym of *Pelargonium lobatum* (Burm. f.) L’Hérit., is lectotypified by an Oldenland specimen in G, selected from amongst four elements comprising the protologue to the name.

1. Citation from Van Royen’s *Flora leydenensis prodromus*... (Fl. leyd. prodr.) p. 350 (1740): ‘GERANIUM calycibus monophyllis, tubis longissimus, subsessilibus, radix subrotunda, foliis lobatis, crenatis, hirsutis.’

2. 3. Citation from Commelin’s *Horti medici amstelodamensis*. ... (Hort. med. amstelod.) 2: 123, t. 62 (1701); and Ray’s *Historia plantarum*. ... (Hist. pl.) 3: 514 (1704): ‘Geranium africanum noctu olens, tuberosum, vitis folis hirsutus.’

4. Citation of a specimen in Oldenland’s herbarium: ‘Geranium monomotapense floribus atro purpureis, foliis vitis viniferae. Herb. OLDENL.’

The protologue to the name *Geranium lobatum* Burm. f., *Geran.* p. 44 (1759) consists of four elements:

The first question regards the element on which Burman based the name. According to the protologue, three previous descriptions were seen (Van Royen; Commelin; Ray), one illustration (Commelin, t. 62) and one specimen (Oldenland). Given a choice, the type should be a specimen (Art. 9.1 of the I.C.B.N.), or if no suitable specimen is available, the name may be typified by a figure or description (Art. 9.3). As far as specimens are concerned, I have been able to trace a specimen in Burman’s collection in G which is further discussed below, plus two sheets in the Van Royen herbarium in L which may have been used by Van Royen in the compilation of his *Fl. leyd. prodr*. One of these sheets, sub L 903285-66, has the name ‘Ger. lobatum’ attached in a handwriting which looks very much like that of Burman as reproduced in H.M. Burdet’s *Auxilium ad botanicorum graphicem* (Geneve, 1979). There is, however, no indication in the protologue that Burman used these Van Royen specimens when drawing up his description of *G. lobatum*, nor that they were collected by Oldenland.

The specimen in G (Figure 1) is altogether a more probable candidate for typification purposes. It is inscribed ‘G. lobatum’ in what appears to be Burman’s handwriting, and with a partial quotation from Van Royen’s *Fl. leyd. prodr*. p. 350 (‘Geranium calycibus monophyllis radice subrotunda foliis lobatis crenatis, hirsutis’) which is definitely in Burman’s handwriting. The phrase ‘Geranium monomotapense floribus atro purpureis, foliis Vitis viniferae’, identical to that cited by Burman with the Oldenland specimen, is inscribed in another hand. The sheet is stamped with the words ‘HERBIER DELESSERT COLLECTION BURMANN’. It is clear that Burman did have this specimen at hand at one time or another.
The second question in this matter is whether this specimen in G is in fact the Oldenland specimen referred to by Burman. Firstly, the sheet is inscribed with the exact phrase used by Burman in connection with the Oldenland specimen. Secondly, according to Gunn & Codd, *Botanical exploration of southern Africa* p. 266 (Cape Town, 1981), from Oldenland’s herbarium and originally bound as a book, came into the possession of Burman’s father who eventually passed it on to his son. After Burman jun.’s death his herbarium was acquired by the French banker, Delessert, and later incorpo-
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*Figure 1 Pelargonium lobatum: Lectotype specimen of Geranium lobatum Burm. f. [Oldenland s.n. sub Herb. Burman (G)]. Scale in cm.*
rated in G. These specimens were firmly glued onto thick sheets (according to a letter from Burman jun. to Linnaeus). The specimen in question is indeed gummed securely onto the sheet, although not a particularly thick sheet. Furthermore the left-hand edge of the sheet is slightly folded and shows unmistakable signs of having been sewn into a book. The circumstantial indications therefore are strong that this sheet is indeed the Oldenland specimen referred to by Burman.

Wijnands, in *The botany of the Commelins* p. 107 (Amsterdam, 1983), mentioned an Oldenland specimen of this species in the Sloane herbarium in BM, suggesting that it is the type. This specimen cannot be considered for typification purposes because Sloane’s portion of the Oldenland herbarium never belonged to the Burmans (Stafleu, *Taxonomic literature* ed. 2, 3: 817 (1981)). It cannot even be considered to be an isotype because there is no evidence that it is a duplicate of Burman’s specimen.

The last question is whether this specimen should be referred to as the holotype, or chosen as a lectotype. In my opinion it should be called a lectotype for the following reasons:

1. Although it is the only specimen in question, it is not the sole element comprising the protologue, but one of four.
2. Burman neither designated this specimen as holotype nor is there any evidence that he used it exclusively to compile his description of *Geranium lobatum*.
3. Although there is strong circumstantial evidence, there is no absolute proof that this is in fact the specimen referred to by Burman.

The type of *Geranium lobatum* Burm. f. therefore is:

CAPE. — ‘Cap. BON. SPEI’, Oldenland s.n. sub Herb. Burman, lecto., here chosen (G!).