INTRODUCTION

The genus *Curcuma* L. (*Zingiberaceae*) is economically important, yet taxonomically rather difficult. It is naturally distributed throughout S and SE Asia, with a few species extending to China, Australia, and the South Pacific, while economically important species are cultivated elsewhere in the tropics and ornamental species can be found practically worldwide. The highest diversity is in India and Thailand, with at least 40 species in each, followed by Burma, Bangladesh, Indonesia and Vietnam. Since the most recent comprehensive taxonomic revision is over a century old (Schumann, 1904), there is little consensus upon the total number of species that should be recognized. Estimates vary from about 50 (Smith, 1981) to 80 (Larsen & al., 1998) or 100 species (Sirirugsa, 1996), while Škorníčková & al. (2004) suggest that detailed botanical exploration of India and SE Asia may well bring their number to 120 in the near future.

Several problems have hindered a satisfactory systematic treatment of the genus. The original descriptions of many *Curcuma* species are vague and inaccurate, and type specimens are often lacking or fragmentary, which leads to ambiguous assignment of names and usage. Almost all early accounts established synonymies based on descriptions and plates only, rarely citing herbarium material and it has to be plainly admitted that this approach does not give a reliable result. Furthermore, differing levels of variation between seed-setting species and those which reproduce vegetatively by well-branched rhizomes have triggered an enduring dispute concerning species concepts and the boundaries between taxa (Leong-...
Škorničková & al., unpub.). In addition, some species may hybridize in the wild resulting in progeny that naturalize (Škorničková & Sabu, 2005b; Leong-Skorničková & al., 2007). As a result, species have been described repeatedly under different names and names have been applied to different taxonomic entities.

The difficulties of making herbarium specimens which preserve the taxonomically important morphological features and the need to study gingers from living material have been pointed out several times (e.g., Burtt & Smith, 1976; Williams, 2004; Škorničková & Sabu, 2005b). In the genus Curcuma, in particular, the colour of the rhizomes, position of the inflorescence, the colour and shape of the bracts and flower parts are important characters for species determination (Škorničková & Sabu, 2005a), but they are rarely seen in herbarium specimens. Thus, living material including flowers and rhizomes is of crucial importance.

During the course of a revision of Indian Curcuma it has become clear that the names of most taxa have no types or these are lost or have deteriorated and that the typification and interpretation of all names in the genus is an exacting but essential task. Indeed, the typification of certain species names is so complicated that its explanation deserves more space than could reasonably be given to it in a revision. Two such examples are discussed here in detail. Our results are based on four years of intensive fieldwork throughout the Indian subcontinent, studies of living collections and of the relevant herbarium material in Indian and European herbaria, libraries and archives.

The name Curcuma zedoaria (Christm.) Roscoe is and always was used for more than one currently recognized taxon. The publication of the combination C. zedoaria (Roscoe, 1807) involved only five words, which do not adequately describe the plant, though Roscoe amplified this description in his later works (Roscoe, 1816, 1825) making it clear what he intended. Nevertheless, Roscoe soon realized (1816, 1825) that the taxon for which he intended to publish the combination C. zedoaria (Christm.) Roscoe was identical with that described by Roxburgh (1810) and depicted by him (1811) as Curcuma zerumbet.

Our revision of herbarium material, treatments and descriptions in various floras and accounts has revealed that the name C. zedoaria is applied to about ten taxa in India and other parts of Asia, which all produce the inflorescence laterally and have a more or less prominent red patch on the leaf, as depicted on the widely accessible colour drawing in Roscoe’s Monandrius Plants (Roscoe, 1825) (Leong-Škorničková, unpub.). In South India C. zedoaria was among several names long misapplied to plants recently determined as Curcuma zanthorrhiza Roxb. (Škorničková & Sabu, 2005b) and was also misapplied to Curcuma aeruginosa Roxb.

Burtt (1977) selected as the lectotype the reference to Rheede’s Kua from several original elements listed in the protologue of the basionym, Amomum zedoaria Christm. He did not, however, mention that (l) the original elements cited in the protologue of A. zedoaria are heterogeneous, nor did he notice (2) that Rheede’s Kua and the plant that Roscoe had in mind when publishing the combination C. zedoaria (Christm.) Roscoe are different taxa! Rheede’s Kua is a taxon in which the red patch on the leaves is not so prominent and its taxonomic identity has not been well understood.

In order to come to a resolution which will be nomenclaturally correct, as well as taxonomically acceptable, it is necessary: (a) to investigate the original elements of A. zedoaria, try to trace their taxonomic identities, assess whether any of the original elements match Roscoe’s interpretation of C. zedoaria and decide whether Burtt’s choice of lectotype is acceptable under current rules; (b) to attempt to trace the identity of Rheede’s Kua among some 20 Curcuma species growing near its type locality and to find out what names are in current use for this taxon; (c) to decide on the application of the name C. zedoaria; (d) to discuss the identity of the plant interpreted by Roscoe as C. zedoaria and described and depicted by Roxburgh as C. zerumbet, and check on the availability of names for this taxon.

### RESULTS

The taxonomic identities of the elements cited in the protologues of the names involved in the complex nomenclatural history of C. zedoaria and C. zerumbet are tabulated in Table 1.

**The original elements of the name Amomum zedoaria Christm.** — Burtt (1977) made clear that the binomial A. zedoaria Christm. was, contrary to his previous notes on nomenclature of C. zedoaria (Burtt, 1972: 226), validly published in Vollständiges Pflanzensystem by Christmann & Panzer (1777–1788). This work was chiefly based on Houttuyn’s Natuurlijke Historie (1773–1783, identical with Houttuyn’s Handleiding tot de Plant- en Kruidkunde, for details see Merrill, 1938) but with numerous newly published binomials. The arrangement of genera and species in Vollständiges Pflanzensystem followed that of the 12th edition of Linnaeus’s Systema naturae (1767). Many authors have confused Christmann & Panzer’s work with that of Houttuyn as both were illustrated by the same plates (Merrill, 1938). Burtt (1977) correctly linked the facts and concluded that the combination C. zedoaria should be attributed to Roscoe (1807), as he cites Willdenow (1797), who, in turn, refers to “Houttuyn Linn. Syst. 5. p. 12”, the German edition of this work, namely Christmann & Panzer’s Vollständiges Pflanzensystem vol. 5: 12 of 1779, where A. zedoaria was first published as a valid binomial.

The original elements of Amomum zedoaria Christm. (Christmann & Panzer, 1779) included:
(1) *Amomum scapo nudo spica laxa truncata*. Bergius Mat. Med. p. 4 (Bergius, 1778: 4);
(2) *Kua*, Rheede Hort. Mal. 11: 13 t. 7 (Rheede, 1692);
(3) *Tommon Itami*, Rhumphius, Herb. Amb. 5: 169 (Rumphius, 1747);
(5) *Zedoaria seu Indorum Tamogcansi*, Kamel, Herb. Philipp. 23 (Kamel [Camellus], 1704).

These elements include heterogeneous material (see Table 1). Bergius (1) cites the other four references (2–5) in his *Materia Medica*. In his short description he deals only with the characteristics of the rhizome, the part used in medicine. He refers to a plant from “India Orientalis” with an ash-grey rhizome when young and bluish-white “parenchyma” which is likely to be *C. aeruginosa* Roxb. This is a common species in the western part of S India, NE India, and W Bengal and is widespread and cultivated in many parts of Asia (e.g., Valeton, 1918; Holttum, 1950; Sabu, 2006). Rheede (2) refers to a plant from the Malabar region with horizontally running rhizomes, inwardly of white colour, and with leaves of which the inner part is of darker and the outer of paler colour. Here Rheede probably refers to the fact that the adaxial side of the leaf is dark green while abaxially the leaf is much paler, a character common to most *Curcuma* species. It is important to note that there is no explicit mention of any red patch around the midrib. Considering how long and detailed Rheede’s description is, such a conspicuous character is likely to be mentioned. Rhumphius’s description (3) of “*Tommon Itam*” (“*Tommo iran*”, “[Tommo] iram” in other local languages) clearly points to a taxon from Amboina (now Amboin, Moluccas) with a bluish-greenish rhizome and a red patch on the leaves. Three closely related taxa all with white, bluish-greenish or bluish-violet rhizomes can be considered, namely *Curcuma caesia* Roxb., *C. aeruginosa* and *C. phaeocaulis* Valeton. While Hasskari (1866) thought that “*Tommon Itam*” referred to *C. caesia*, Valeton (1917) was convinced that *C. aeruginosa* matched Rumphius’s description better. *Curcuma phaeocaulis*, described from Java, cannot be ruled out either, since Rumphius’s description is incomplete. In Indonesia and the Malay Peninsula the vernacular names *Temu hitam*, *Tomon itam*, *Temoe itam*, *Temu ireng*, *Temu erang* and a few other similar spelling forms of the same name are still applied to *C. aeruginosa* (Heyne 1927: 495; Burkhill, 1966: 715) but, according to Valeton (1918: 68), some of these names are also used for *C. phaeocaulis*. Petiver (4) briefly mentions that his plant is distinguished chiefly by its leaves having a brownish streak along the midrib and as a reference he cites Kamel [Camellus] (5). Kamel (5) describes a plant from Luzon with a red patch along the midrib and a rhizome, which is blue (when young) to whitish. This also points to a taxon close to *C. aeruginosa* (see Table 1).

Burtt (1977) pointed out that “Christmann cites a number of authors under *Amomum zedoaria*: Bergius, Rheede, Rumphius, Petiver and others. It is the description by Rheede under the name Kua which gives the most detailed and reliable account of this plant: this was cited by Bergius at the head of his references and formed the basis of Lamark’s *Anomum latifolium* and it is Rheede’s illustration of it that was re-drawn for Plencz’s plate. There is every reason for taking this reference as the ‘lectotype’ of the name *Amomum zedoaria* Christm., and this I accordingly propose.” Even though this choice conserved a somewhat different sense of this name than was usually applied, i.e., for several species with a prominent red patch along the midrib resembling the plant depicted by Roscoe (1825: Tab. 109) as *C. zedoaria* (e.g., Baker, 1890; Ridley 1899, 1907, 1909, 1924; Holttum 1950), Burtt’s decision is to be preferred, since the remaining elements clearly point towards taxa with bluish rhizomes, such as *C. aeruginosa*, *C. caesia* and *C. phaeocaulis*, which are all names with rather unambiguous application. Changing the typification to one of these other elements would necessitate a much larger alteration in nomenclature. It must also be said that none of the elements involved in the protologue fits Roscoe’s (1825: Tab. 109) plant. The Kua of Rheede is the only element with a somewhat obscure identity but, from Rheede’s description, it is obvious that there is no conspicuous red patch around the midrib. Moreover, no *Curcuma* species reported from South India would fit Roscoe’s description of 1825 (Tab. 109), which amplified his earlier publication of the combination *C. zedoaria* (Roscoe, 1807). It has to be concluded, therefore, that Roscoe himself attached the name *C. zedoaria* to a taxon that is not involved in Christmann’s protologue.

**Tracing the identity of Malabar Kua.** — Interpretations of the plants in the *Hortus Malabaricus* have been attempted by many botanists but the lack of herbarium specimens often makes correct identification difficult, especially because the descriptions are not as scientifically accurate as would be required today (Manilal, 1984). Manilal (1997) mentioned that Rheede sent many of the dried plant specimens he described to Europe. Unfortunately, in spite of the efforts of Manilal (1997), Johnston (1970) and others, it is still not known where they are.

When tracing the identity of Rheede’s Kua, the original description and plate, the way in which the *Hortus Malabaricus* was produced and all possible taxa available in the area have to be taken into account.

Hendrik (Henrik, Heinrich) Adriaan Van Rheede tot Drakenstein (Drakenstein), the Dutch Governor of Cochín, spent many years of his life in the Malabar region. The twelve volume *Hortus Malabaricus* was published from 1678–1693, arising from his desire to document the rich plant diversity of Malabar as accurately as possible.

Rheede employed over 200 local collectors in different
Table 1. Taxonomic interpretations and inclusion of various elements involved in the complex nomenclatural history of *Curcuma zedoaria* (Christm.) Roscoe and *C. zerumbet* Roxb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Kua, Rheede, Hort. Malabar. (1692)</td>
<td>C. zedoaria (= C. rakatakanta, C. malabarica)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecto (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Zedoaria seu Indorum Tamogcansi, Camellus, Luz. (1704)</td>
<td>cf. C. aeruginosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Zedoaria officinarum, Petiver, Gazoph. (1704-1706)</td>
<td>cf. C. aeruginosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Zinziber sylvestre majus, fructu in pediculo singiari, Sloane, Voy. Jamaica 1: 165 (1707)</td>
<td>Zingiber sp.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Tommon Itam, Rhumphius, Herb. Amb. (1747)</td>
<td>cf. C. aeruginosa, C. caesia &amp; C. phaeocaulis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zerumberd, Rhumphius, Herb. Amb. (1747)</strong></td>
<td>cf. <em>C. euchroma</em>, <em>C. colorata</em> &amp; <em>C. purpurascens</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amomum scapo nudo spica laxa truncata, Bergius, Mat. Med. (1778)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. aeruginosa aff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amomum zedoaria Christm., Christmann &amp; Panzer Völst. Pflanzenyst. 5: 12 (1779)</strong></td>
<td><em>C. zedoaria</em> (= <em>C. rakatakanta</em>, <em>C. malabarica</em>) sensu lectotype</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amomum zerumbeth J. König in Retz., Observ. Bot. (1783), non L., Sp. Pl. (1753)</strong></td>
<td>cf. <em>C. euchroma</em>, <em>C. colorata</em> &amp; <em>C. purpurascens</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* (3) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amomum latifolium Lamarck, Encycl. 1: 134 (1783)</strong></td>
<td>C. zedoaria (= <em>C. rakatakanta</em>, <em>C. malabarica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* (4) * (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amomum zedoaria, sensu Wildenow, Sp. Pl., ed. 5., 1: 7 (1797)</strong></td>
<td><em>Curcuma</em> sp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curcuma zerumbet Roxb. in Asiat. Res. II: 333 (1810) nom. illeg.</strong></td>
<td><em>C. picta</em> sp. nov. (named here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* * * (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curcuma zedoaria Roxb., illustration &amp; description in Curtis’s Bot. Mag. No. 1546 (1813)</strong></td>
<td><em>C. aff. aromatica</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. zedoaria Roscoe in Trans. Linn. Soc. London I: 275 (Roscoe, 1815)</strong></td>
<td><em>C. picta</em> sp. nov. (named here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. zerumbet Roxb., as accepted by R. &amp; S. in Syst. Veg., ed. 15 (Roemer &amp; Schultes, 1817)</strong></td>
<td><em>C. picta</em> sp. nov. (named here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Element cited; (1) designated by Burtt (1977); (2) cited as “Curcuma zedoaria Roscoe in Trans. Linn. Soc. London XI. (Roscoe, 1816); (3) cited as “Curcuma zerumbet Roxb. in Syst. Veg., ed. 15 (Roemer & Schultes, 1817); (4) implicite includes both elements of Erndlia subpersonata Giseke; (5) cites also Roxb. 1811 & 1820).
seasons to bring him whole plants or their twigs bearing flowers, fruits and seeds. Related information on these plants was given by local physicians in Malayalam and Konkani, and was translated first into Portuguese and from that into Latin, in which the descriptions finally appeared printed. Each description was accompanied by a plate with the name inscribed in Malayalam, Roman and Arabic scripts, while the Konkani name was inscribed in Devanagari (Nagari) script. Four soldiers from the Dutch Army were asked to execute the illustrations, to which the descriptions were added in Rheede’s presence (Manilal, 1984; Mohan Ram, 2005). It is necessary to keep in mind that mixed collections could occur, especially when plants were collected at different seasons and that mistakes could be made through the process of double translation.

The useful characters obvious from Rheede’s description and plate (1692: 13, t. 7) are:

1. Rhizome horizontally running, inwardly white, run through with many whitish threads, aromatic, the scent strong and pleasant as if many aromas were mixed together; stems a foot and a half high [c. 45 cm] (description);

2. Coma not conspicuously spreading, flowers as long as the bracts (drawing);

3. Leaves glabrous, shining, clear [aqueous], the colour on the inner part dark, on the outer paler (description);

4. Flowers yellow and white, 6 petalled, the upper one pellucid, shaped like a helmet, erect (description).

During extensive fieldwork conducted 2001–2005 the first author collected about 20 species of Curcuma in the Malabar region. All the seed-setting species of the area can be ruled out as none of them reach the size mentioned by Rheede, most of them possess simple, ovoid rhizome branches, and both positions of inflorescence, flowering laterally at first followed by a central inflorescence later in the season, or have a central inflorescence only. Most of them also lack a brightly coloured coma. For the remaining sterile, vegetatively reproducing taxa, characters such as the shape and colour of the rhizome, presence, shape and intensity of the red patch on the leaf, and position and structure of the inflorescence can be used as they do not vary greatly either within or among populations.

There are only six taxa, which flower laterally at the beginning of the monsoon season and thus have to be considered, namely C. aeruginosa, C. aff. aromatica Salisb. (C. aromatica auct. non Salisb. : Mangaly & Sabu, 1993), C. haritha Mangaly & M. Sabu, C. aff. mangga Valeton & Zip. (C. amada auct. non Roxb. : Mangaly & Sabu, 1993) C. raktakanta Mangaly & M. Sabu (= C. malabarica) and C. zanthorrhiza Roxb.

*Curcuma aeruginosa* does not match characters (1), (3) and (4) as it has a deep red patch on the upper half of the lamina, rhizome inwardly aeruginous, and corolla lobes of deep pink colour. *Curcuma zanthorrhiza* also contradicts (1), (3), and (4) by having a deep orange rhizome, red patch on the lamina and pink corolla lobes. C. aff. *aromatica* has a rhizome which is creamy-white, but it does not run horizontally and its branches are quite short; the flowers are longer than the bracts (exserted) and the leaves are bright light green and densely velvety pubescent below. *Curcuma haritha* has a conspicuously spreading coma (2) and its leaves are bright light green and densely velvety pubescent below (3). *Curcuma aff. mangga* has a light yellow rhizome with a peculiar smell and taste of unripe mango.

The best fit to Rheede’s description and plate is *C. raktakanta*, a common species growing abundantly in sandy coastal areas of Malabar, especially around Cochin. According to Manilal (1997), the original Rheedean specimens were collected there. *Curcuma raktakanta* has rhizomes with long, horizontally running branches of creamy to white colour internally (the younger the whiter) and a pleasant aroma with traces of camphor and menthol. The leaves are glossy, deep green in colour and without a prominent red patch on the upper surface. A slight brownish shade may be seen upon close inspection about 1–3 mm on either side of the midrib in the middle part of lamina but this is conspicuous only on the first two leaves when they are young and soon vanishes completely. The flowers are as long as the bracts and the coma does not spread conspicuously. Burtt (1977) provided a useful English translation of Rheede’s original Latin description with occasional explanations of some terms placed in square brackets. In his description of the rhizome Rheede mentions that there are many whitish threads, which are interpreted by Burtt as “vascular bundles”. We should like point out that Rheede was probably referring to the rubbery threads made of a “latex like” compound which are visible when the running branch of the rhizome is broken and pulled apart, a character peculiar to this species. Nicolson & al. (1988) state that the name Kua is still used for this plant which occurs in the hills adjoining the coastal plains of Kerala and is not cultivated, although the roots are used for medicinal purposes after drying and grinding (also Manilal, 2003). When we collected this species near Cochin (Ernakulam), the local people referred to it unambiguously as Kua or Kuva and mentioned the use of this plant for extraction of starch. It should be noted, however, that the local name Kua is applied all over Kerala for several abundant *Curcuma* species which can be profitably used for extraction of “Kua Podi”, a starch known also as East Indian Arrowroot (Sabu & Škorničková, 2003).

Two characters in Rheede’s description require further comment. Firstly, the dimensions of the leaf are given as “up to a cubit long [c. 46 cm] and two spans [c. 38 cm] wide in the middle”. This must be a typographic error as it would imply that the leaves were close to round. Secondly,
“the seed capsules are small and round, depressed, and contain grey seeds like those of Tsjana Kua [Costus speciosus], but they are rarely found”. The capsules of all seed-setting Curcuma species in India are round or round-ovate and contain ovate, light brown to brown, shiny seeds with a conspicuous, white, laciniate aril. They are often found in species with ovoid simple rhizomes (all 2n = 42) and, although they are found occasionally in species with branched rhizomes (2n = 63, 105), they are not then well developed. It is clear that the seeds mentioned in Rheede’s description must have been collected at a different time and either belonged to a seed-setting species or a plant of another (Zingiberaceae?) genus.

The application of the name Curcuma zedoaria (Christm.) Roscoe. — The reference of Rheede’s Kua (1692) chosen by Burtt (1977) as lectotype is not in conflict with the protologue. It has to be noted, however, that reference of Kua as chosen by Burtt includes description and plate. In 1977 both of these elements were eligible to be chosen as the lectotype, but Burtt did not make any specific choice. Burtt’s choice of lectotype has to be narrowed down to a single element and because the description is not eligible under current (and retrospective) rules (Art. 9.2) the type of Kua remains as the only element to serve as the lectotype. Thus there are no grounds for superseding his decision (Art. 9.17, McNeill & al., 2006) and the name C. zedoaria has to be applied to the plant called Kua by Rheede. Moreover, the obvious ambiguity in the application and interpretation of the name C. zedoaria does not encourage us to propose conservation of the name with a different type (Art. 14.9 of the Vienna Code, McNeill & al., 2006).

We also do not favour rejection of C. zedoaria under Art. 56 of the Vienna Code (McNeill & al., 2006). Curcuma zedoaria is far from being the only name in the genus to have been applied to more than one taxon, sometimes more often to a taxon, which does not include the type of the name. A proposal for rejection may open Pandora’s Box and lead to further rejection proposals in Curcuma. Moreover, the names, which might be used if C. zedoaria was rejected, namely C. raktakanta Mangaly & M. Sabu and C. malabarica Velay & al., have not been used by anyone but their authors. Rejection of C. zedoaria would not, therefore, result in greater stability of Curcuma nomenclature.

To support Burtt’s lectotypification and clarify the name, which is based on the Rheedean 1692 drawing, an epitype collected in the Malabar area is designated here. A colour plate based on the epitype collection is also provided (Fig. 1).


Link (1821: 3), under Curcuma speciosa, referred to “C. zedoaria Rosc. Linn. Transact. XI. 275” (Roscoe, 1816) and to “C. zerumbet Roxb. R. S. i. 573” (Roemer & Schultes, 1817), which eventually refers to A. zerumbet J. König (in Retzius, 1783) and to the illustration of Zerumberd in Rumphius (1747: t. 68). Link thus placed in synonymy two species names older than his C. speciosa, which makes it a nomen illegitimum. According to Art. 7.5 of the Vienna Code (McNeill & al., 2006) it has to be typified by the type of C. zedoaria, which is the name that ought to have been adopted under the rules, because the name C. zerumbet Roxb. is both later and illegitimate (see below).

Mangaly & Sabu (1993) treated Curcuma malabarica as a synonym of C. caesia Roxb., while the name C. zedoaria was erroneously applied to C. zanthorrhiza (ibid.). Later, Sabu (2006) realized that C. caesia, which had earlier been reported to be a new record for S India (Sabu & Mangaly, 1990), was, in fact, a different blue-rhizomed species, C. aeruginosa so he placed C. malabarica in synonymy with C. aeruginosa. Detailed study of the holotypes, their duplicates and living flowering material collected from the type localities of C. malabarica and C. raktakanta has proven, however, that both C. raktakanta and C. malabarica are conspecific with C. zedoaria (Christm.) Roscoe in the sense of the above lecto- and epitypification so they are treated here as heterotopic synonyms. The protologue of C. raktakanta describes the lamina as puberulent below and glabrous above but our study of the holotype, both isotypes and of all other material we have seen in herbaria and in cultivation shows that the leaves are glabrous on both sides.

In 1810 Roxburgh, probably unaware of the existence of Roscoe’s 1807 paper published the combination C. zedoaria (Christm.) Roxb. He cited “Amomum zedoaria Linn. Sp. Pl., Willd. 1.” as the only element, which is the same element cited by Roscoe for the same combination published three years earlier. Roxburgh’s C.
*Curcuma zedoaria* should, therefore, be considered an isonym, having no nomenclatural relevance. It is interesting to note that Roxburgh understood *C. zedoaria* differently from *C. zedoaria* sensu Roscoe or from *C. zerumbet* Roxb. (see below). The name “*C. zedoaria* Roxb.” was always treated as a synonym of *C. aromatica* Salisb. as proposed by Roscoe (1816) but this judgement was based solely on the fact that both names refer to taxa with green leaves, which are sericeous underneath. Shedding light on the identity of the plant treated by Roxburgh (1810) as *C. zedoaria*, however, calls for further investigation as the history of the name *C. aromatica* is obscure and the interpretation of this historical name involves a complex of several superficially similar species.

The identity of *Curcuma zedoaria* sensu Roscoe non (Christm.) Roscoe and the search for its correct name. — The plant described and depicted by Roscoe (1825: pl. 109) as *C. zedoaria*.
does not agree with Christmann’s *A. zedoaria* but agrees well with the short original description of *C. zerumbet* Roxb. (1810) and his amplified description with colour plate (Roxburgh, 1811).

Both morphological descriptions, that of *C. zedoaria* by Roscoe in 1825 and *C. zerumbet* by Roxburgh in 1811 represent a *Curcuma* species with a well developed, branched rhizome, which is pale straw-coloured internally (Roxburgh, 1811) or light yellow (Roscoe, 1825). The lamina is green with a prominent red patch running the length of the midrib and glabrous on both sides; the flowers have white corolla lobes. The colour drawings (Roxburgh 1811: t. 201; Roscoe, 1825: t. 109) are remarkably similar to each other. This similarity had already been noticed by Roscoe (1816: 276) who further commented in the description accompanying his plate t. 106, 1825: “at the same time he [Roxburgh] has described the true Zedoary, (the plant figured here,) under the name of *C. zerumbet*, by which name it is also figured and described in the Plants of the Coast of Coromandel, fig. 201”. From the general chapter on *Curcuma* in Roscoe’s *Monandrian Plants* it is clear that Roscoe obtained from Dr. W. Carey specimens of several native *Curcuma* species preserved in spirit and accompanied by accurate colour drawings of the floral bracts, *C. zerumbet* among them. It is also known that Carey obtained many seeds and plants for his garden at Serampore (near Calcutta) from W. Roxburgh, of whom he was a great friend (Stansfield, 1955).

Roscoe did not explicitly mention the source of his *C. zedoaria* plant in any of his works (1807, 1816, 1825). He says (Roscoe, 1825) that he is “acquainted with upwards of 20 species of *Curcuma*, nearly all of which are now growing in the Botanic Garden at Liverpool, and about half of which have been figured in the present work [*Monandrian Plants*]”. It is known that plants were obtained for Liverpool Botanic Garden through several botanists and explorers from different parts of the world, especially from India and the East Indies (Stansfield, 1955; Cullen, 1973). These were sent several times by N. Wallich and W. Carey, both of whom Roscoe acknowledged in the introduction and general chapter on *Curcuma* in *Monandrian Plants*. Close friendship and cooperation are also obvious from the numerous letters of W. Roscoe to N. Wallich and W. Carey (deposited at Liverpool Records Office) but a few Indian plants were also obtained from London nurseries, J.S. Smith and J.D. Hooker. Roxburgh said that *C. zerumbet* is a native of various parts of India, particularly of Bengal where he observed it to blossom in April (Roxburgh, 1811). In his later work (1820) he said that the description of *C. zerumbet* was based on a plant from Chittagong sent by F. Buchanan in 1798 to Calcutta Botanical Garden.

It may be that Roscoe’s and Roxburgh’s plants were actually part of the same living material, since many plants sent by Carey or Wallich were of Roxburgh’s origin. Even if not, Roscoe could at least compare his living plant of *C. zedoaria* with spirit material of *C. zerumbet*. Under the circumstances mentioned above, Roscoe’s statement that *C. zerumbet* as described by Roxburgh is identical with the plant he called *C. zedoaria* seems to be well founded and these two are treated here as the same taxon.

Had Roxburgh not referred to other names and their descriptions in his protologue of *C. zerumbet*, this name would be the first available validly published name suitable for this taxon. Unfortunately, this did not happen and, as already pointed out by Burtt & Smith (1972), *C. zerumbet* has to be considered an illegitimate name.

**The illegitimacy of Curcuma zerumbet Roxb. —** Roxburgh (1810: 333), in the protologue of *C. zerumbet* Roxb., referred to heterogeneous elements, which can be listed as follows:

1. *Kua*, Rheede Mal. 11: t. 7. (Rheede, 1692);
2. *Zerumbed*, Rumph. Amb: t. 68 (Rumphius, 1747);
3. *Amomum zerumbeth*, Retz. Obs. 3. 55. [= *Amomum zerumbeth* J. König in Retz., Observ. Bot. 3: 55. 1783, nom illeg. (non *A. zerumbet* L. – for details see Burtt & Smith, 1972: 190, 192, 203) referring to Rumphius, Herb. Amboinense 5. p. 68–72 [a typographic error for 168–172], t. 68 as to the only element eligible as a type in the protologue);
4. *C. zerumbet* Roxb. (1810) as described in protologue: “Bulbs small, and with the palmate tubers pale straw colour. Leaves green-petioled, broad lanceolate with a purple cloud down the middle. Flowers shorter than their bracts. Flowering time the hot season before the leaves appear. The pale colour of the roots, crimson coma and ferrugineous mark down the centre of the leaves, which is a constant mark in this elegant species, readily point it out from every other, which I have yet seen”;
5. *Ind. Pl. 3* No. 201. (= *C. zerumbet* colour plate with description in Pl. Coromandel 3, No. 201), which was printed and distributed in 1811, a few months later than the protologue, but apparently these two works were in press simultaneously and thus Roxburgh cites it here.

The elements that Roxburgh (1810) cited preclude the application of *Curcuma zerumbet* for the taxon he described (4) and depicted (5). *Amomum zerumbeth* J. König (Retzius, 1783) is an illegitimate name being a later homonym of *Amomum zerumbet* L. (Linnaeus, 1753: 1), the basionym of *Zingiber zerumbet* (L.) Sm. which would seem to make Roxburgh’s *C. zerumbet* eligible as a new name for it (Art. 58.1). However *C. zerumbet* Roxb. is illegitimate on other grounds. In 1792, Giseke established the genus *Erndlia* based solely on König’s *Amomum*
zerumbeth (Giseke, 1792: 209, 229) and with the only species, *E. subpersonata* Giseke, published (p. 252) as a explicit replacement name for it, Giseke citing “Amomum Zerumbeth” Rumph. amb. 5. p. 68–72 t. 68. Koen. p. 55.” By citing “Amomum Zerumbeth, Retz. obs. 3. 55” (i.e., *A. zerumbeth* J. König 1783), Roxburgh (1810) included the type of *Erndlia subpersonata* Giseke, a name that is necessarily homotypic with it (Art. 52.2e, McNeill & al., 2006). Roxburgh should, therefore, have taken up Giseke’s epithet “subpersonata”, which was by 1810 a valid and legitimate name, homotypic with *A. zerumbeth* J. König (Art. 52.1, 52.2, McNeill & al., 2006). The name *C. zerumbet* Roxb. is thus a nomen illegitimum, attached to Giseke’s name *E. subpersonata*, and automatically typified by an element from the protologue of *A. zerumbeth* (Art. 7.5, McNeill & al., 2006).

Burtt & Smith (1972) have already mentioned that Roxburgh worked mainly with plants that he knew alive and that the citation of *C. zerumbet* Roxb. as a nomenclatural synonym did not necessarily mean that the epithet “subpersonata” would be correct for plants described and illustrated by Roxburgh as *C. zerumbeth* Roxb. They concluded that the epithet should not be adopted until the identity of the plant had been critically determined.

A close look at the taxonomic identity of the elements included by Roxburgh in his description of *C. zerumbet* reveals that it includes three heterogeneous entities (see Table 1).

The description and plate of Rheede’s Kua (1) are the lectotype of *C. zedoaria* (Christm.) Roscoe (Burtt, 1977) and represents a laterally flowering species with no conspicuous red patch on the lamina, which is distributed in S and NE India, as elaborated above.

*Amomum zerumbeth* J. König (3) is based on Zerumbed (2) and thus both represent the same taxon. König (in Retzius, 1783) cited under *A. zerumbeth*: “Rumph. Herb. Amb. V. p. 68-72. tab. 68”. This appears to be a typographic error, which occurred in Retzius (1783) and was repeated by later authors. Pages 68–72 of vol. 5 in Herbarium Amboinense refer to “Funnis Muraenarum latifolium, Funis convolutus, Clompanus funicularis and Quis qualis” followed by t. 35, 36 and 37. The account of Zerumbed is on pages 168–172 followed by t. 68. It is appropriate to note here that Rumphius (1747) treated the name Zerumbed/Tommon as a group name for several species and on pages 168–172 he described six of them (Tommon Besaar, Tommon Iam, Tommon Poeti, Tommon Giring, Tommon Dingin, Tommon Manga). Plate t. 68. is the only element eligible as a type, but it is not cited anywhere in Rumphius’s text and is not unambiguously linked to any of these six taxa. In the legend to plate t. 68 only the name Zerumbed appears. König (in Retzius, 1783) also failed to specify to which of the six Rumphian taxa described in Chapter “Zerumbed” his name *A. zerumbeth* refers. Based on the descriptions, however, the first species Tommon Besaar, which is according to Rumphius also called simply Tommon, is the best match to Rumphius’s plate and both agree well with König’s description. *Amomum zerumbeth* J. König is a species with a branched, yellow rhizome, a red patch on the lamina and central inflorescence.

The plant Roxburgh had in mind when describing *C. zerumbet* Roxb. from living material, i.e., elements (4) and (5), is again, a species with a lateral inflorescence, but it differs from Rheede’s Kua by the very prominent red patch on the lamina. All the names mentioned above are vegetatively reproducing taxa with well-developed, branched rhizomes, in which the position of the inflorescence (lateral or central) is a stable character. Both positions never occur in the same taxon, unlike the case in many of the seed-setting species, of which many produce a lateral inflorescence at the beginning of the vegetative season and another inflorescence in the centre of the leaves later in the season. Thus, elements (1), (2) and (3) are in conflict with the description of *C. zerumbet* as put forward by Roxburgh.

To complete the picture, it is necessary to mention one more name, which is intertwined with *C. zerumbet*. Salisbury (1812) published the name *Curcuma officinalis* and included in its synonymy (1) “Curcuma zerumbet” Roxb. in As. Res. v. 11, p. 16”, (2) “Amomum zerumbet Retz. Obs. fasc. 3. p. 35 [typographic error for p. 55; König’s Descriptiones Monandrorum starts on p. 49]” and (3) “Zerumbed Rumph. Herb. Amb. v. 5. t. 68”. Similarly to Roxburgh (1810), Salisbury (1812), by including *A. zerumbeth* J. König cited a name homotypic with *Erndlia subpersonata* Giseke and consequently *Curcuma officinalis* is illegitimate (Art. 52.2e, McNeill & al., 2006) and typified by the type of *E. subpersonata*, i.e., Rumphius’s illustration (Rumphius, 1747: t. 68).

As elaborated above, *C. zerumbet* Roxb. and *A. zerumbet* (with its homotypic synonym *E. subpersonata*) are two different taxa in terms of their descriptions. The epithet *subpersonata* should be adopted for the *Curcuma* species with the yellow rhizome, a central inflorescence and leaves with a red patch on the upper surface of lamina, which now includes *A. zerumbeth* J. König, nom. illeg., *E. subpersonata* Giseke, *C. zerumbeth* Roxb., nom. illeg., *C. officinalis* Salisbury, nom. illeg. There are several taxa, e.g., *C. euchroma*, *C. colorata*, *C. purpurascens* and some yet undescribed, occurring in Indonesia, which agree with König’s description and plate t. 68 well. The identity and synonymy of König’s plant and the nomenclatural treatment of this complex of taxa are beyond the scope of this paper and will be addressed in the future.

A new name for the red patch-leaved *Curcuma*. — Finally we are left to name the plant with the lateral
inflorescence, a prominent red patch on the leaves and whitish rhizomes, which fits the description and drawing of *C. zedoaria* sensu Roscoe in *Monandrian Plants of the order Scitamineae* (Roscoe, 1825; courtesy of RBG Edinburgh); B, Roxburgh’s illustration of *Curcuma zerumbet* from the *Plants of the Coast Coromandel* (Roxburgh, 1811; courtesy of RBG Kew); C, inflorescence of *Curcuma picta*; D, habit of *C. picta*; E, Roxburgh’s specimen (BM; courtesy of the Trustees of the NHM, London) with holotype (left) and paratype (right). C–D based on Škorničková 77028.

**Curcuma picta** Roxb. ex Škorničk., sp. nov.


Curcuma aeruginosa Roxb. similis, rhizomate dilute stramineo, corollae lobis lutescentier albis, macula conspicuissima profunde rubra folii costa tota longitudine currenti infra penetranti (contra C. aeruginosae macula penniformi praecipue conspicua in laminae dimidio distali differt).

Type. – India orientalis, Roxburgh s.n. (holotype: BM [barcode BM000784099]; paratype: BM [barcode BM000784100]).

There is one herbarium sheet at BM, which bears the inscription “Ind. Orient. Dr. Roxburgh” on the reverse and seems to be directly related to Roxburgh’s illustration of C. zerumbet in the Plants of the Coast of Coromandel (Roxburgh 1811: Table 201). There are fragments of two plants on the sheet (two inflorescences and two leaves), which are likely to belong to two separate gatherings. There are two original labels on the sheet, apparently written in Roxburgh’s hand. The original inscription on the label below the plant to the left (BM000784099) reads, “Curcuma picta”. The epithet picta was later crossed out and changed by Roxburgh to “zerumbet”. The inscription on the label of the plant to the right (BM000784100) reads, “Curcuma zerumbet”. Accepting that the plants on the sheet are likely to belong to two separate gatherings we designate the left one as the holotype and the other as the paratype.

Etymology. – Picta means painted and refers to the conspicuous deep red patch running along the midrib of the lamina, which looks as if painted with a brush. The name C. picta was chosen as it seems to have been the original intention of W. Roxburgh to use it.

Distribution. – Widespread in Asia. We have found it in India (West Bengal, Meghalaya) and a good photograph has been published from Thailand (Apavatjrut & al., 1999: fig. 1). Herbarium materials show that it is found in Sri Lanka, India, Bangladesh, Thailand and Peninsular Malaysia and is introduced into gardens elsewhere in the tropics, e.g., the West Indies.

Full descriptions and a revision of the herbarium materials of C. zedoaria (Christm.) Roscoe and C. picta will be elaborated in our forthcoming revision of Indian Curcuma (Leong-Škorničková & al., in prep.).

CONCLUSIONS

Had Roscoe correctly interpreted the basionym of C. zedoaria and had Roxburgh recognized that A. zerumbet of König represented a different taxon than his C. zerumbet or had both simply described their plants without attempting to place other people’s names in synonymy under them, we should not have to face the existing level of confusion about these two names. Placing the same elements by the same authors in synonymy under different species set up a reticulate trap, which resulted not only in confusion and very loose application of many Curcuma names for many years, but has also resulted ultimately in name changes, now that the rules of nomenclature have been applied retrospectively. Yet, without types for these names, and without clarification of their identities to settle the nomenclature of these historical taxa, it would be impossible to proceed with further work. For nomenclatural reasons, the plant depicted by Roscoe (1825) as C. zedoaria and by Roxburgh (1811) as C. zerumbet has to be described as new here and is now called C. picta, while the name C. zedoaria has to be attached to its type—Rheede’s Kua. The first validly published homotypic name for König’s illegitimate A. zerumbet is E. subpersonata (1792) and this epithet has to be retained when transferring the name to Curcuma, where this taxon undoubtedly belongs.
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