

## Article



http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.94.2.2

## A note on the typification of *Hechtia galeottii* (Hechtioideae, Bromeliaceae)

ADOLFO ESPEJO-SERNA<sup>1</sup>, ANA ROSA LÓPEZ-FERRARI<sup>1</sup>, NANCY MARTÍNEZ-CORREA<sup>2</sup> & WALTER TILL<sup>3</sup>

## **Abstract**

We explain why the lectotypification of *Hechtia galeottii* proposed by Smith & Downs is inaccurate and in serious conflict with the protologue and should be discarded. Accordingly, we propose a new lectotype and include a more detailed description of the species.

## Resumen

Se explica porque la lectotipificación de *Hechtia glaeotti* propuesta por Smith & Downs es inadecuada y está en serio conflicto con el protólogo, por lo cual debe ser deshechada. Se propone, por lo tanto, un nuevo lectotipo y se incluye una descripción detallada de la especie.

When Mez (1919: 71) described *Hechtia galeottii*, he cited two collections: *Galeotti 5440* from Oaxaca, and *Pringle 6703* from Tomelin Canyon [Cañón de Tomellín] (see Appendix 1) in the protologue. These two gatherings are therefore the syntypes and are deposited in the Berlin herbarium (B) where there are three specimens, one of Galeotti's number and two of Pringle's number.

Smith & Downs (1974: 587) selected as lectotype (as holotype, see McNeill et al., 2012, Art 9.9) of *Hechtia galeottii* the Galeotti's specimen deposited at B [B 10 0144795] (Fig. 1, [Röpert, 2000–]).

It should be noted that the Galeotti specimen (Fig. 1) is very incomplete as it comprises only three fragmentary spikes from a staminate inflorescence, one 3 cm long and the other two 7.5 and 12 cm long respectively, and has neither leaves nor pistillate flowers or inflorescence parts. Obviously, the description provided by Mez in the protologue (see Appendix 1) can not be based alone on this incomplete gathering. Moreover, the only known duplicate of this collection in Geneva (G–DEL) is equally incomplete (Fig. 2). It is important to mention that Carl Mez's herbarium was added to the Berlin herbarium during the year 1933 (Hiepko, 1987: 245), and that the Königsberg University herbarium, which contained much of Mez's material, was destroyed during an air-attack in September 1944, shortly after Mez's death. Therefore, many of the Mez types may be found at B, M, and G (Stafleu & Cowan, 1981).

On the other hand, the Pringle specimens are more complete and comprises each a portion of a leaf, a staminate twice divided spike, a simple pistillate spike, as well as a fruiting simple spike (Fig. 3, [Röpert, 2000–]). Moreover, of this gathering there are at least 15 duplicates in several herbaria. A careful comparison (Table 1) of the syntypes with the original description (Appendix 1) allows us to conclude that for making the description Mez used mainly the Pringle specimens.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Herbario Metropolitano UAMIZ, Departamento de Biología, División de Ciencias Biológicas y de la Salud, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Iztapalapa. Apdo. Postal 55-535, 09340 MÉXICO, D.F., aes@xanum.uam.mx

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Doctorado en Ciencias Biológicas y de la Salud, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidades Iztapalapa, Xochimilco y Cuajimalpa

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Botanical Institute of the University of Vienna, Rennweg 14, A-1030, Wien, Austria