Nomenclatural clarification of the name *Phaius grandiflorus* (Orchidaceae)
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The name *Calanthe grandiflora* was published by Nadeaud (1873) for a plant first discovered in the Papenoo Valley, Tahiti, French Polynesia. The species is now also known from Raiatea, Tahaa, Huahine and Moorea where I saw it for myself. The name was transferred to the genus *Phaius* Lour. by Schlechter (1926) who published the nomen novum *Phaius tahitensis*. Unfortunately he did not give any indication why he thought it necessary to create a nomen novum rather than a new combination. I can only speculate that he saw the entry under the genus *Phaius* in Index Kewensis which reads "*Phaius grandiflorus* Rchb. f. in Walp. Ann. vi. 459". More recently Marońska & Szlachetko (2010) cited this as "*Phaius grandiflorus* (Nadeaud) Rchb.f., Walp. Ann. 6: 459. 1861, nom. illeg. non *Phaius grandifolius* Lour., Bot. Reg. 25, Misc.: 40. 1839". This immediately aroused my suspicion as the epithets "grandiflorus" and "grandifolius" are not normally considered homonyms. When checking the Reichenbach reference, it turns out that this is definitely not a new combination of the Nadeaud name. Reichenbach writes "*Phaius grandiflorus* Lour. B. Reg. XXV. 1839. Misc. 40." When I tried to check the reference he cites (Cunningham, 1839), I noticed two typing errors. First, the name and quoted text is found on page 34 and not page 40. More importantly, Cunningham gives the name as "*P. grandifolius* Lour.", referring to a name published earlier by Loureiro. The Cunningham reference can therefore at most be interpreted as a misapplied name. From all this, I must conclude that the name *Phaius grandiflorus* Rchb.f. is invalid firstly as the name is not accepted by the authors (Art. 34.1), not by Reichenbach who merely quotes the text under *Phaius australis* and not by Cunningham who's text is quoted as he equates it with *Phaius tankervilleae* (Banks) Blume; secondly, "grandiflorus" is merely a typing error for "grandifolius" (Art. 61.1).

The inevitable conclusion must be that the name *Phaius tahitensis* is an illegitimate superfluous name as the epithet "grandiflorus" should have been used as it was available at the time. To correct this I validate here the combination.

**Phaius grandiflorus** (Nadeaud) Govaerts, *comb. nov.*  

non *Phaius grandiflorus* Reichenbach (1862: 459), nom. inval.
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