



Horticultural Reviews

VOLUME 42

WILEY Blackwell

HORTICULTURAL REVIEWS

Volume 42

Horticultural Reviews is sponsored by:

American Society for Horticultural Science

International Society for Horticultural Science

Editorial Board, Volume 42

Mary Hochenberry Meyer

Michael S. Reid

Dariusz Swietlik

HORTICULTURAL REVIEWS

Volume 42

edited by
Jules Janick
Purdue University

WILEY Blackwell

A John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Publication
Copyright © 2014 by Wiley-Blackwell. All rights reserved

Published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey
Published simultaneously in Canada

Wiley-Blackwell is an imprint of John Wiley & Sons, Inc., formed by the merger of Wiley's global Scientific, Technical, and Medical business with Blackwell Publishing.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without either the prior written permission of the Publisher, or authorization through payment of the appropriate per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400, fax (978) 750-4470, or on the web at www.copyright.com. Requests to the Publisher for permission should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, (201) 748-6011, fax (201) 748-6008, or online at <http://www.wiley.com/go/permission>.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives or written sales materials. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a professional where appropriate. Neither the publisher nor author shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

For general information on our other products and services or for technical support, please contact our Customer Care Department within the United States at (800) 762-2974, outside the United States at (317) 572-3993 or fax (317) 572-4002.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic formats. For more information about Wiley products, visit our web site at www.wiley.com.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

ISBN 978-1-118-91679-7

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Contributors	ix
Dedication: Pinhas Spiegel-Roy <i>Eliezer E. Goldschmidt</i>	xiii
1. Ornamental Palms: Biology and Horticulture <i>T.K. Broschat, D.R. Hodel, and M.L. Elliott</i>	1
I. Introduction	3
II. Palm Biology	14
III. Palm Production	26
IV. Landscape Management	49
V. Interiorscape Management	61
VI. Palm Problems	66
Literature Cited	95
2. Nitric Oxide Applications for Quality Enhancement of Horticulture Produce <i>Girigowda Manjunatha, Veeresh Lokesh, Bhagyalakshmi Neelwarne, Zora Singh, and Kapuganti J. Gupta</i>	121
I. Introduction	124
II. Nitric Oxide Chemistry and Biology	126
III. Nitric Oxide Effects on Postharvest Quality	131
IV. Nitric Oxide and Plant Hormones Cross Talk	135
V. Nitric Oxide in Disease Resistance	144
VI. Conclusions	146
Acknowledgments	147
Literature Cited	147

3. Molecular Regulation of Storage Root Formation and Development in Sweet Potato	157
<i>V. Ravi, S.K. Chakrabarti, T. Makesh Kumar, and R. Saravanan</i>	
I. Introduction	158
II. Root System	161
III. Endogenous Growth Regulators Affecting Storage Root Formation and Development	163
IV. Storage Root Development	168
V. Gene Expression During Storage Root Formation and Development	169
VI. Conclusions and Prospects	187
Literature Cited	191
4. Foliar Anthocyanins: A Horticultural Review	209
<i>Jennifer K. Boldt, Mary H. Meyer, and John E. Erwin</i>	
I. Introduction	210
II. Coloration in Horticultural Crops	211
III. Anthocyanins in Flowers and Fruits	214
IV. Foliar Anthocyanins	215
V. Anthocyanin Biosynthesis and Regulation	217
VI. Environmental Factors and Anthocyanin Accumulation	222
VII. Physiological Functions in Leaves	228
VIII. Anthocyanins Affect Leaf Photosynthetic Rate	236
IX. Future Research	237
Literature Cited	239
5. Variability in Size and Soluble Solids Concentration in Peaches and Nectarines	253
<i>John Lopresti, Ian Goodwin, Barry McGlasson, Paul Holford, and John Golding</i>	
I. Introduction	255
II. Environment and Tree Management Effects on Variation in Fruit Size and Soluble Solids	257
III. Fruit Sink Strength and Dry Matter Accumulation	271
IV. Flesh Anatomy, Fruit Size and Soluble Solids	284
V. Conclusions	294
Acknowledgments	299
Literature Cited	299

6. Physiological Disorders of Mango Fruit	313
<i>S. Shivashankar</i>	
I. Introduction	314
II. Physiological Disorders	316
III. Storage Disorders	335
IV. Future Research Needs	338
Acknowledgments	341
Literature Cited	341
7. Fusarium Wilt of Watermelon: 120 Years of Research	349
<i>Ray D. Martyn</i>	
I. Introduction	351
II. Physiological Specilaization in <i>F. oxysporum</i>	355
III. Effects of Inoculum and Root-Knot Nematodes on Wilt Resistance	370
IV. Infection, Colonization, and Survival	374
V. Management of Fusarium Wilt	389
VI. Concluding Remarks	418
Literature Cited	420
Subject Index	443
Cumulative Subject Index	445
Cumulative Contributor Index	479

Contributors

- Jennifer K. Boldt**, Application Technology Research Unit, USDA-ARS, Toledo, OH 43606, USA
- T.K. Broschat**, Fort Lauderdale Research and Education Center, University of Florida, Davie, FL 33314, USA
- S.K. Chakrabarti**, Central Tuber Crops Research Institute, Sreekariyam, Thiruvananthapuram 695017, Kerala, India
- M.L. Elliott**, Fort Lauderdale Research and Education Center, University of Florida, Davie, FL 33314, USA
- John E. Erwin**, Department of Horticultural Science, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55108, USA
- John Golding**, NSW Department of Primary Industries, Gosford NSW 2250, Australia
- Ian Goodwin**, Department of Environment & Primary Industries, AgriBio Centre, Latrobe University, Bundoora, Victoria 3083, Australia
- Kapuganti J. Gupta**, Biochemistry & Systems Biology, Department of Plant Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 3RB, UK
- D.R. Hodel**, University of California, Cooperative Extension Alhambra, CA 91801, USA
- Paul Holford**, School of Science and Health, University of Western Sydney, Penrith NSW 2751, Australia
- Veeresh Lokesh**, Department of Plant Cell Biotechnology, CSIR-Central Food Technological Research Institute, Mysore 570020, Karnataka, India
- John Lopresti**, Department of Environment & Primary Industries, AgriBio Centre, Latrobe University, Bundoora, Victoria 3083, Australia
- T. Makesh Kumar**, Central Tuber Crops Research Institute, Sreekariyam, Thiruvananthapuram 695017, Kerala, India
- Girigowda Manjunatha**, Department of Plant Pathology, University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkot 587102, Karnataka, India
- Ray D. Martyn**, Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

- Barry McGlasson**, School of Science and Health, University of Western Sydney, Penrith NSW 2751, Australia
- Mary H. Meyer**, Department of Horticultural Science, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55108, USA
- Bhagyalakshmi Neelwarne**, Department of Plant Cell Biotechnology, CSIR-Central Food Technological Research Institute, Mysore 570020, Karnataka, India
- V. Ravi**, Central Tuber Crops Research Institute, Sreekariyam, Thiruvananthapuram 695017, Kerala, India
- R. Saravanan**, Central Tuber Crops Research Institute, Sreekariyam, Thiruvananthapuram 695017, Kerala, India
- S. Shivashankar**, Division of Plant Physiology and Biochemistry, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Bangalore 560089, Karnataka, India
- Zora Singh**, Department of Environment and Agriculture/Horticulture, School of Science, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Curtin University, Perth, Australia



Pinhas Spiegel-Roy

Dedication: Pinhas Spiegel-Roy

This volume is dedicated to Dr. Pinhas Spiegel-Roy, Professor of Horticulture, in appreciation of his outstanding achievements in the genetics of fruit trees and the breeding of prime quality fruit tree cultivars. His novel citrus, table grapes, and almond cultivars, in particular, play currently an immense role in the Israeli and international fruit tree industry.

Pinhas was born in Mukachevo, Czechoslovakia in 1922 and graduated from high school with distinction. At the age of 18, in the midst of World War II (1940), he managed to immigrate to Israel (then Palestine) with a group of youth. In 1942 he attempted to enroll for Chemistry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem but was not admitted, so he turned to Agriculture. His studies were interrupted by the 1948 Israeli War of Independence, in which he was injured. Soon afterward he joined the Department of Horticulture in the Israeli Government Experiment Station, now the Agricultural Research Organization (ARO) and completed his Ph.D. at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 1954. In 1959 he came to the United States for a series of scientific visits at the University of California, Davis, and other leading agricultural institutions. This visit focused his interest on the genetics of fruit trees and paved the way for his major breeding research. Dr. Spiegel-Roy held a series of administrative positions, serving as Deputy Head of the Volcani Center (1966–1969) and Director of the ARO Institute of Horticulture (1969–1975). In 1969 he established the Fruit Crop Breeding Department in the ARO and served as its Head until his retirement in 1989.

Dr. Spiegel-Roy engaged in a broad array of international activities. He organized and chaired the 18th International Horticultural Congress (Tel Aviv, 1970) and served as Honorary President of the International Society for Horticultural Science (1966–1970). Spiegel-Roy served as a Professor of Horticulture at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and lectured also at the Technion, Israel Institute of Technology. He published over 100 articles in scientific journals and numerous notes and book chapters in local Israeli publications (in Hebrew). His *Biology of Citrus* (with E.E. Goldschmidt, Cambridge University Press, 1996) became an acknowledged citrus textbook worldwide. Dr. Spiegel-Roy's

intellectual breadth and biotechnological breeding expertise made him a preferred invited speaker in international scientific conferences and symposia. When he attended a meeting, there was usually no need for an interpreter, since he mastered a large number of languages.

Although the foundations of the Israeli fruit tree introduction and breeding research approaches already existed, Dr. Spiegel-Roy may be righteously regarded as the initiator of modern fruit tree breeding research in Israel. He foresaw the future needs of the Israeli fruit industry and combined biotechnological approaches with classical breeding methods in an attempt to obtain new, productive, high-quality cultivars. The genetics of fruit trees self-incompatibility, parthenocarpy, and seedlessness were subject to penetrating research. Dr. Spiegel-Roy's broad horizons were revealed in a 1975, now classical, study of the origins and domestication of Old World fruit trees. He also identified the chimeral nature of 'Shamouti', the original Israeli 'Jaffa' orange.

Dr. Spiegel-Roy's seminal contribution to the breeding of table grapes deserves special attention. The importance of seedless grapes became evident at the beginning of the 1980s. Market demands for seedlessness grew constantly, and grape breeders worldwide tried to develop technologies to achieve this goal. Until that time breeders of grapes were able to cross only two seeded parents or a seeded maternal parent and a seedless paternal pollen donor. Using either of these combinations resulted in up to 80% of seeded F_1 offspring among the progeny, thus rendering the development of truly seedless cultivar almost impossible. The hybridization of two seedless parents was impossible as an embryo rescue technology was not available to the grape breeders worldwide. His pioneering research (Spiegel-Roy, P., N. Sahar, J. Baron, and U. Lavi. 1985. *In vitro* culture and plant formation from grape cultivars with abortive ovules and seeds. *J. Am. Soc. Hortic. Sci.* 110:109–112) paved the way to the establishment of an *in vitro*, in-ovule embryo rescue procedure. This newly discovered technology enabled the use of both seedless maternal and paternal lines in a specific cross followed by embryo rescue. Even today, after several decades of scientific and practical scrutiny, this protocol is considered highly efficient, synchronous, and nonlaborious, enabling production of thousands of F_1 grape plantlets annually. Numerous patented international cultivars were developed using this technology, including 'Prime', 'Mystery', 'Rocky', 'Black Glory', and 'Big Pearl'. Dr. Spiegel-Roy's initial table grapes breeding program has been further developed and extended and is currently led by his former student Dr. Avichai Perl.

One of Dr. Spiegel-Roy's special talents was his ability to identify the needs and foresee the future prospects of every fruit crop. He understood

that increasing yield and fruit quality are crucial for the developing almond industry and devised useful approaches to achieve these goals. Breeding for efficient pollinators that will cover the entire flowering season of the main Israeli cultivar 'Um El Fahem' and will be genetically compatible with its self-incompatibility genes was one major project. Another line of research consisted of breeding for new, self-compatible cultivars with high yield and large tasty kernel that do not require pollinator cultivars. Both of these activities have resulted in the establishment of several new cultivars and pollinators that constitute today the modern almond orchard in Israel. The array of self-compatible cultivars bred by Dr. Spiegel-Roy is currently used as a source for breeding new self-compatible cultivars that will eliminate the need for pollinators in the almond orchard altogether, and perhaps reduce the dependence on bees. All in all, Dr. Spiegel-Roy registered several novel almond cultivars, including 'Gilad', 'Kochav', 'Kochva', 'Shefa', and 'Levad'; most of these cultivars are commercially grown in modern Israeli orchards. The almond breeding work is presently headed by Dr. Doron Holland.

Dr. Spiegel-Roy revolutionized the objectives of the Israeli citrus breeding research, identifying the production of seedless, easy-peeling mandarin cultivars as the major target for the future of the Israeli citrus industry. He developed a regenerative cell culture system, based on the natural regenerative potential of citrus nucellar cells. Further sophistication of the system enabled isolation, regeneration, and fusion of protoplasts, production of cybrids, plants from somatic fusion, and somaclonal variants. A peroxidase isozyme system was developed in order to distinguish between nucellar and zygotic seedlings of polyembryonic cultivars. A key role in this extensive research, as well as in the following breeding of new cultivars, was played by Dr. Spiegel-Roy's dedicated collaborator, Dr. Aliza Vardi, who also continued the project after his retirement. The breeding project is presently headed by Dr. Nir Carmi.

However, the real breakthrough in practical breeding of citrus cultivars did not emerge from the cell culture research, but rather from a combination of conventional breeding and irradiation-induced mutations. Although the initial idea of Dr. Spiegel-Roy was to irradiate cell cultures, irradiation of bud wood became the standard technique. Buds from old cultivars as well as newly released high-quality selections were irradiated with ^{60}Co , with the aim of inducing seedlessness. An efficient protocol for shortening of the juvenile period and rapid screening for parthenocarpic ability was developed. This focused effort resulted in a series of high-quality mandarin (*Citrus reticulata*) hybrid cultivar

releases (15 patented cultivars), several of which reached commercialization and export. Of particular significance is the highly praised 'Orri' mandarin cultivar. 'Orri' was developed from a selection of plants grown from irradiated bud wood of 'Orah', a 'Kinnow' × 'Temple' hybrid. 'Orri' is currently the major citrus export cultivar of Israel and is already grown in Spain and South Africa.

Pinhas Spiegel-Roy is currently in his early nineties. He is remembered by all his colleagues and former students as a warm, kind, welcoming, bright, and highly inspiring person, very supportive and always ready to help. His broad vision and penetrating scientific research culminated in remarkable breeding achievements, which place him as a founder of the modern Israeli fruit industry and a leader of world horticulture.

ELIEZER E. GOLDSCHMIDT

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Israel

Ornamental Palms: Biology and Horticulture

T.K. Broschat and M.L. Elliott

Fort Lauderdale Research and Education Center
University of Florida,
Davie, FL 33314, USA

D.R. Hodel

University of California
Cooperative Extension Alhambra,
CA 91801, USA

ABSTRACT

Ornamental palms are important components of tropical, subtropical, and even warm temperate climate landscapes. In colder climates, they are important interiorscape plants and are often a focal point in malls, businesses, and other public areas. As arborescent monocots, palms have a unique morphology and this greatly influences their cultural requirements. Ornamental palms are overwhelmingly seed propagated, with seeds of most species germinating slowly and being intolerant of prolonged storage or cold temperatures. They generally do not have dormancy requirements, but do require high temperatures (30–35°C) for optimum germination. Palms are usually grown in containers prior to transplanting into a field nursery or landscape. Because of their adventitious root system, large field-grown specimen palms can easily be transplanted. In the landscape, palm health and quality are greatly affected by nutritional deficiencies, which can reduce their aesthetic value, growth rate, or even cause death. Palm life can also be shortened by a number of diseases or insect pests, some of which are lethal, have no controls, or have wide host ranges. With the increasing use of palms in the landscape, pathogens and insect pests have moved with the

palms, both between and within countries, with some having spread virtually worldwide.

KEYWORDS: Arecaceae; insect pests; nursery production; nutrient deficiencies; plant diseases; propagation; transplanting

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. PALM BIOLOGY
 - A. What Is Palm?
 - B. Taxonomy and Distribution
 - C. Growth and Development
 - D. General Architectural Model
 - E. Morphological and Anatomical Features
 - 1. Stems
 - 2. Leaves
 - 3. Inflorescences, Flowers, and Fruits
 - 4. Roots
- III. PALM PRODUCTION
 - A. Propagation
 - 1. Seed Propagation
 - 2. Vegetative Propagation
 - 3. Tissue Culture
 - B. Nursery Production
 - 1. Container Production
 - 2. Field Production of Palms
- IV. LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT
 - A. Transplanting
 - 1. Root Regeneration in Palms
 - 2. Palm Maturity Effects
 - 3. Auxin Effects on Rooting
 - 4. Seasonal Effects
 - 5. Root Ball Size
 - 6. Digging Palms
 - 7. Transport and Handling
 - 8. Planting
 - 9. Planting Hole Amendments
 - 10. Leaf Removal and Tying
 - 11. Transplanting Container-Grown Palms
 - B. Fertilization and Irrigation
 - C. Pruning
 - D. Growth Regulator Effects
- V. INTERIORSCAPE MANAGEMENT
 - A. Palm Selection for Interiorscape Use
 - B. Installation
 - C. Soil or Planting Substrate
 - D. Light
 - E. Relative Humidity

F. Temperature

G. Water

H. Fertilization

VI. PALM PROBLEMS

A. Physiological Disorders

1. Chemical Toxicities
2. Temperature-Related Disorders
3. Water-Related Problems
4. Salt Injury
5. Root Suffocation
6. Shallow Planting (Inverted Root Cone)
7. Lightning Injury
8. Powerline Decline
9. Sunburn
10. Wind Damage
11. Other "Disorders"

B. Nutritional Problems

1. Diagnosis of Nutrient Deficiencies
2. Nitrogen Deficiency
3. Phosphorus Deficiency
4. Potassium Deficiency
5. Magnesium Deficiency
6. Iron Deficiency
7. Manganese Deficiency
8. Boron Deficiency
9. Other Nutrient Deficiencies

C. Diseases

1. Virus and Viroid Diseases
2. Bacterial Diseases
3. Phytoplasma Diseases
4. Algal Diseases
5. Protozoan Diseases
6. Nematode Diseases
7. Oomycete Diseases
8. Fungal Diseases

D. Arthropod Pests

1. Defoliators
2. Sap Feeders
3. Borers

E. Weed Management

LITERATURE CITED

I. INTRODUCTION

Palms comprise a natural and distinctive, yet unusually diverse group of mostly tropical plants. The family includes ~2,500 species in 184 genera and is most diverse and rich in tropical Asia, the western Pacific, Central

and South America, Australia, and Madagascar (Dransfield et al. 2005, 2008; Govaerts 2013). Where palms occur naturally, they are typically among the most economically important plants, providing food, beverages, and cooking oil; fiber for clothing, rope, baskets, mats, hats, and other uses; material for furniture and construction; and medicine and narcotics (Balick 1988; Balick and Beck 1990). Several palms have been domesticated and are of international economic importance, including *Phoenix dactylifera* (date palm), *Bactris gasipaes* (peach palm), *Cocos nucifera* (coconut palm), and *Elaeis guineensis* (African oil palm). The latter two are considered two of the world's ten most important agronomic crops (Janick and Paull 2008).

Palms are also important as ornamentals and are widely used in the landscape in tropical, subtropical, and Mediterranean climates around the world (Table 1.1, Plate 1.1). They are often the featured plants in botanical glasshouses in temperate climates. Indeed, they are the quintessential plant of the tropics and few, if any other, plants can capture that tropical motif as do the palms (Ledin 1961). *C. nucifera* in Hawaii and south Florida and *Phoenix canariensis* (Canary Island date palm) and *Washingtonia robusta* (Mexican fan palm) in California are the iconic or signature trees of these respective regions, filling the skyline and providing the tropical ambience upon which these tourism-reliant regions depend to draw visitors to support their economies.

In warmer parts of the United States, especially Hawaii, Florida, and California but also in Arizona, Texas, and the Gulf Coast, palms are a significant and increasing component of ornamental wholesale production nurseries. Palms of all sizes are grown for landscape use in these areas but also for indoor use everywhere. The monetary value of palm extends from the seed to transplantation of mature palms into residential and commercial landscapes. For the Florida nursery industry alone, the monetary value of palms has almost doubled every 5 years for the past 10 years. The estimated total sales value for palm trees by Florida producers in 2010 was \$404 million, representing 9.5% of nursery growers' sales (Hodges et al. 2011). While this represents only a 2.5% increase in percentage of nursery sales from 2005, it is a near double of the monetary value (\$220 million) from 2005 (Hodges and Haydu 2006). The 2005 monetary value was a near double of the 2000 palm sales, which were \$123 million (Hodges and Haydu 2002). In 2010, the percentage of sales (9.5%) of palms was equal to the combination of deciduous shade trees, flowering and fruiting trees, and evergreen trees (9.8%).

Table 1.1. Common ornamental palms, along with their botanical and common names and information about their habit, size, uses, and environmental adaptations.

Botanical name (synonyms)	Common name	Habit/trunk diameter (cm)	Size {h × w} (m) ^z	Leaf type and length (m) ^y	Inflorescence length (m)	Fruit			Exposure ^w / climate zone {USDA} ^x
						Length (cm)	Color	Uses ^x	
<i>Acoelorrhaphe wrightii</i> (<i>Paurotis wrightii</i>)	Everglades palm	Clustered/10	7 × 6	Palmate, 1	1	0.3	Orange- brown	BG, H, S	Sun/9–11
<i>Acrocomia aculeata</i> (<i>A. media</i> , <i>A. mexicana</i> , <i>A. totai</i>)	Gru-gru palm, macaw palm	Solitary/30	12 × 4	Pinnate, 2	1.5	2	Brown	S	Sun/10–11
<i>Adonidia merrillii</i> (<i>Veitchia merrillii</i>)	Christmas palm, Manila Palm	Solitary/15	4 × 2	Pinnate, 1	0.5	2.5	Red	BG, B, S, C	Sun/10-11
<i>Archontophoenix alexandrae</i>	Alexandra palm	Solitary/20	14 × 4	Pinnate, 2	0.75	1	Red	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>A. cunninghamiana</i>	King palm	Solitary/20	14 × 4	Pinnate, 2	0.75	1	Red	BG, B S	Sun/10-11
<i>Areca catechu</i>	Betel nut palm	Solitary/12	10 × 2.5	Pinnate, 1.3	0.60	5	Yellow- orange	BG, B, S, C	Part sun to sun/11
<i>A. triandra aliciae</i>	NCN ^o	Clustered/8	8 × 3	Pinnate, 1.5	0.30	2	Red	BG, B, S, C, I	Shade to part sun/11
<i>Arenga engleri</i>	Formosa palm	Clustered/15	2.5 × 5	Pinnate, 2	0.75	2	Purple- red	BG, B, H, S, C	Part sun/9-11
<i>A. pinnata</i>	Sugar palm	Solitary/45	15 × 6	Pinnate, 3	2.25	6	Yellow	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Astrocaryum mexicanum</i>	NCN	Solitary/10	5 × 3	Pinnate, 1.5	0.75	5	Brown	BG, B, S	Part sun to sun/9-11

(continued)

Table 1.1. (Continued)

Botanical name (synonyms)	Common name	Habit/trunk diameter (cm)	Size (h × w) (m) ^z	Leaf type and length (m) ^y	Inflorescence length (m)	Fruit			Exposure ^w / climate zone (USDA) ^v
						Length (cm)	Color	Uses ^x	
<i>Bismarckia nobilis</i>	Bismarck palm	Solitary/40	10 × 5	Palmate, 2.5	2.25	5	Brown	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Brahea armata</i>	Mexican blue palm	Solitary/30	8 × 3	Palmate, 1.5	5	2.5	Black	BG, B, S	Sun/9-11
<i>B. edulis</i>	Guadalupe palm	Solitary/=30	8 × 3	Palmate, 1.5	2	2.5	Black	BG, B, S	Sun/9-11
<i>Butia odorata</i> (<i>B. capitata</i>)	Pindo palm, jelly palm	Solitary/40	5 × 3	Pinnate, 1.5	1	2.5	Yellow- orange	BG, B, S, C	Sun/8-11
<i>Carpentaria acuminata</i>	NCN	Solitary/20	15 × 3	Pinnate, 1.5	1	1.5	Red	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Caryota maxima</i>	Fishtail palm	Solitary/30	15 × 4	Pinnate, 2	3	2.5	Reddish	BG, B, S	Part sun to sun/9-11
<i>C. mitis</i>	Clustered fishtail palm	Clustered/12	10 × 4	Pinnate, 2	1.5	1.2	Black	BG, B, H, S, C, I	Shade to sun/ 10-11
<i>Chamaedorea benziei</i>	NCN	Solitary/4	3 × 1.5	Pinnate, 0.7	1	1	Black	BG, B, H, S, C, I	Shade/10-11
<i>C. catactarum</i>	Cat palm	Clustered/3	1 × 3	Pinnate, 1	0.75	1	Black	FG, B, H, C, I	Shade/10-11
<i>C. elegans</i>	Parlor palm	Solitary/1.5	2 × 0.8	Pinnate, 0.4	1	0.7	Black	FG, B, C, I	Shade/10-11

<i>C. hooperiana</i>	Maya palm	Clustered/3	3×3	Pinnate, 1.5	0.75	1	Black	BG, B, S, C, I	Shade/10-11
<i>C. metallica</i>	NCN	Solitary/1.5	1×0.4	Bifid to pinnate, 0.2	0.25	1.2	Black	FG, B, H, C, I	Shade/10-11
<i>C. microspadix</i>	Bamboo palm	Clustered/1	3×2	Pinnate, 0.3	0.25	1.2	Red-orange	FG, B, C, I	Shade to part sun/9-11
<i>C. plumosa</i>	NCN	Solitary/3	3×1.5	Pinnate, 1	0.75	1	Black	BG, B, S, C	Part sun to sun/10-11
<i>C. radicalis</i>	NCN	Solitary/2.5	1×1	Pinnate, 0.6	1.25	1.2	Red	FG, M, B, C, I	Shade to part sun/9-11
<i>C. seifrizii</i> (<i>C. erumpens</i>)	Bamboo palm	Clustered/1.5	2.5×1	Pinnate, 0.3	0.20	0.8	Black	BG, B, H, S, C, I	Part sun to sun/10-11
<i>Chambeyronia macrocarpa</i>	NCN	Solitary/12	8×3	Pinnate, 1.5	1	4.5	Red	BG, B, S	Part sun to sun/10-11
<i>Coccothrinax argentata</i>	Thatch palm	Solitary/10	8×2	Palmate, 1	0.5	1.2	Black	BG, B, S, C	Part sun to sun/10-11
<i>C. crinita</i>	Old-man palm	Solitary/12	5×2	Palmate, 1	1.5	2.5	Pinkish	BG, B, S, C	Sun/10-11
<i>Cocos nucifera</i>	Coconut palm	Solitary/45	20×6	Pinnate, 3	1.25	30	Greenish yellow	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Cyrtostachys renda</i>	Sealing wax palm	Clustered/8	8××3	Pinnate, 1	0.9	1	Black	BG, B, H, S, C	Part sun to sun/11
<i>Dictyosperma album</i>	Princess palm	Solitary/15	14×3	Pinnate, 1.5	0.6	1.2	Black	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Dypsis cabadae</i>	Cabada palm	Clustered/10	8×5	Pinnate, 1.5	1.25	1.2	Red	BG, B, S	Part sun to sun/10-11
<i>D. decaryi</i>	Triangle palm	Solitary/30	4×3	Pinnate, 1.5	1.25	2.5	Greenish yellow	BG, S, C, I	Sun/10-11
<i>D. leptocheilos</i>	Teddy bear palm	Solitary/20	10×4	Pinnate, 2	1.5	1.2	Brown	BG, B, S	Part sun to sun; 10-11

(continued)

Table 1.1. (Continued)

Botanical name (synonyms)	Common name	Habit/trunk diameter (cm)	Size (h × w) (m) ^z	Leaf type and length (m) ^y	Inflorescence length (m)	Fruit		Uses ^x	Exposure ^w / climate zone (USDA) ^v
						Length (cm)	Color		
<i>D. lutescens</i> (<i>Chrysalidocarpus</i> <i>lutescens</i>)	Areca palm	Clustered/10	10 × 5	Pinnate, 1.5	1.25	2.5	Yellow to black	BG, B, H, S, C, I	Part sun to sun/10-11
<i>Euterpe oleracea</i>	Assai palm	Clustered/20	15 × 5	Pinnate, 2	1	2	Black	BG, B, H, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Heterospathe elata</i>	Sagisi palm	Solitary/20	15 × 4	Pinnate, 2	1.25	1	White	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Howea forsteriana</i>	Kentia palm, sentry palm	Solitary/20	15 × 4	Pinnate, 2	0.6	4	Red	BG, B, S, C, I	Shade to sun/ 10-11
<i>Hyophorbe</i> <i>lagenicaulis</i> (<i>Mascarena</i> <i>lagenicaulis</i>)	Bottle palm	Solitary/60	6 × 3	Pinnate, 1.5	0.9	2.5	Black	FG, B, S, C	Sun/10-11
<i>H. verschaffeltii</i> (<i>Mascarena</i> <i>verschaffeltii</i>)	Spindle palm	Solitary/30	8 × 4	Pinnate, 2	0.7	2	Black	FG, B, S, C	Sun/10-11
<i>Jubaea chilensis</i> (<i>J. spectabilis</i>)	Chilean wine palm	Solitary/200	25 × 8	Pinnate, 4	1.25	4	Yellow- orange	BG, B, S	Sun/9-10
<i>Latania loddigesii</i>	Blue latan palm	Solitary/25	7 × 4	Palmate, 2	2	8	Greenish brown	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Licuala grandis</i>	NCN	Solitary/8	3 × 3	Palmate, 1.5	2	1.2	Red	FG, B, M, S, C, I	Shade to part sun/10-11
<i>L. spinosa</i>	NCN	Clustered/5	6 × 3	Palmate, 1	2.5	1.2	Red	BG, FG, H, S, Cs, I	Part sun to sun/10-11

<i>Livistona australis</i>	Australian fan palm	Solitary/30	20×5	Palmate, 2/5	1.25	2	Black	BG, B, S	Sun/9-11
<i>L. chinensis</i>	Chinese fan palm	Solitary/30	20×6	Palmate, 2.5	2	2.5	Bluish-green	BG, B, S, I	Sun/9-11
<i>L. decora</i> (<i>L. decipiens</i>)	Ribbon fan palm	Solitary/25	15×6	Palmate, 2.5	3	1.5	Black	BG, B, S	Sun/9-11
<i>Phoenix canariensis</i>	Canary Island date palm	Solitary/100	20×8	Pinnate, 4	2	1.2	Golden orange	BG, B, S	Sun/8-11
<i>P. dactylifera</i>	Date palm	Clustered or solitary/45	20×8	Pinnate, 3.5	2.5	2.5	Dark brown to black	BG, B, H, S	Sun/8-11
<i>P. reclinata</i>	Senegal date palm	Clustered/20	15××15	Pinnate, 3	1	2	Black	BG, B, H, S	Sun/9-11
<i>P. roebelenii</i>	Pygmy date palm	Solitary/10	4×2.5	Pinnate, 1.2	0.6	1	Black	FG, B, M, S, C, I	Part sun to sun/9-11
<i>P. sylvestris</i>	Wild date palm	Solitary/45	15×6	Pinnate, 3	1	2.5	Purplish	BG, B, S	Sun/8-11
<i>Ptychosperma elegans</i>	Solitaire palm	Solitary/10	10×3	Pinnate, 1.5	0.75	1.2	Red	BG, B, S, C, I	Part sun to sun/10-11
<i>P. macarthurii</i>	Macarthur palm	Clustered/6	10×5	Pinnate, 1.5	0.75	1.2	Red	BG, B, H, S, C	Part sun to sun/10-11
<i>Ravenea rivularis</i>	Majesty palm	Solitary/45	15×3	Pinnate, 1.5	1	1.2	Red	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Rhapis excelsa</i>	Lady palm	Clustered/3	4×4	Palmate, 0.7	0.3	0.8	White	BG, B, H, S, C, I	Shade to part sun/9-11
<i>R. humilis</i>	Slender lady palm	Clustered/3	5×5	Palmate, 0.7	0.3	0.8	White	BG, B, H, S, C, I	Shade to part sun/9-11
<i>Roystonea regia</i>	Royal palm	Solitary/50	25×8	Pinnate, 4-5	0.3	0.6	Reddish purple	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Sabal Mexicana</i>	Texas palmetto	Solitary/30	20×5	Palmate, 2.5	2	1.2	Black	BG, B, S	Sun/8-11

(continued)

Table 1.1. (Continued)

Botanical name (synonyms)	Common name	Habit/trunk diameter (cm)	Size (h × w) (m) ^z	Leaf type and length (m) ^y	Inflorescence length (m)	Fruit		Uses ^x	Exposure ^w / climate zone (USDA) ^y
						Length (cm)	Color		
<i>Sabal minor</i>	Dwarf palmetto	Solitary/15	2.5 × 3	Palmate, 2	3	0.8	Black	FG, M, C	Shade to sun/ 7-11
<i>S. palmetto</i>	Palmetto palm, cabbage palm	Solitary/40	20 × 4	Palmate, 2- 2.5	2.5	1.2	Black	BG, B, S	Sun/8-11
<i>Saribus rotundifolius</i> (<i>L. rotundifolia</i>)	Footstool palm	Solitary/25	20 × 5	Palmate, 2	2.5	2.5	Orange- red	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Syagrus romanzoffiana</i>	Queen palm	Solitary/25	20 × 6	Pinnate, 3- 3.5	2.5	2.5	Yellow to orange	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Thrinax radiata</i>	Thatch palm	Solitary/12	12 × 4	Palmate, 2	1	0.6	White	BG, FG, B, S, C	Sun/10-11
<i>Trachycarpus fortunei</i>	Windmill palm, Chinese windmill palm	Solitary/12	7 × 3	Palmate, 1	0.5	1.2	Bluish	BG, FG, B, S, C	Sun/8-11
<i>T. wagnerianus</i>	Windmill palm	Solitary/12	7 × 2	Palmate, 1	0.5	1.2	bluish	FG, B, S, C	Sun/8-11
<i>Veitchia arecina</i> (<i>V.</i> <i>montgomeryana</i>)	Montgomery palm, NCN	Solitary/20	20 × 5	Pinnate, 2.5	1.25	4	Red	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>V. joannis</i>	NCN	Solitary/40	30 × 6	Pinnate, 3	1	5	Red	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11
<i>Veitchia winii</i>	NCN	Solitary/30	25 × 5	Pinnate, 2.5	1.25	1	Red	BG, B, S	Sun/10-11

<i>Washingtonia filifera</i>	California fan palm	Solitary/100	20 × 6	Palmate, 2.5	5	0.6	Black	BG, B, S	Sun/8-11
<i>W. robusta</i>	Mexican fan palm	Solitary/50	30 × 5	Palmate, 2.5	4	0.6	Black	BG, B, S	Sun/8-11
<i>Wodyetia bifurcata</i>	Foxtail palm	Solitary/25	10 × 5	Pinnate, 2.5	3	5	Red	BG, B, S, C	Sun/10-11

The categories covering habit, size, uses, and environmental adaptation are annotated and described or defined at the end of the table. Information is derived mostly from Meerow (2006), Riffle et al. (2012), and Hodel (2012).

*Height and width are averages for typical landscape specimens; width is through canopy of solitary species or through canopies of clustered species at maturity.

[†]Length includes leaf blade and petiole but not leaf base.

[‡]BG: Background: taller and/or wider plants that can interrupt a line of sight or in front of which smaller plants can be positioned; FG: foreground: smaller or slow-growing plants that do not block a line of sight and that can be positioned in front of larger plants; B: border—short or tall plants for an elongated or narrow area or for an area along a building or other structure or lining a street; H: hedge screen—typically densely clustered plants that can be managed as a hedge or to block a view; M: mass—mostly very small, dwarf, and/or trunkless plants that can be planted canopy to canopy to create a uniform block or groundcover effect; S: specimen—a plant that can stand alone on its own merits; C: container—typically a small or slow-growing plant that can remain in a container for several years, attaining or nearly attaining maturity, note that nearly all palms make suitable container subjects when young and that recommendations are made in this table for palms that are especially distinctive or exhibit adult characters when still relatively small plants; I: indoors—a plant tolerant of conditions typically encountered inside homes, offices, and other buildings where light and humidity are usually low.

[§]Shade: no direct sun; part sun: filtered sun or morning full sun and afternoon shade; sun: full sun all day.

[¶]USDA climate zone recommendations are based mostly on Meerow (2006) and Riffle et al. (2012).

^{||}No common name.



Plate 1.1. Ornamental palms. (a) *Acoelorrhaphe wrightii* (paurotis palm) (b) *Adonidia merrillii* (Christmas palm); (c) *Bismarckia nobilis* (Bismarck palm); (d) *Chamaedorea cataractarum* (cat palm); (e) *Cocos nucifera* (coconut palm); (f) *Dypsis lutescens* (areca palm); (g) *Livistona chinensis* (Chinese fan palm); (h) *Phoenix canariensis* (Canary Island date palm); (i) *P. dactylifera* (date palm); (j) *P. roebelenii* (pygmy date palm); (k) *P. sylvestris* (wild date palm); (l) *Ptychosperma elegans* (solitaire palm); (m) *Roystonea regia* (royal palm); (n) *Sabal palmetto* (cabbage palm); (o) *Syagrus romanzoffiana* (queen palm); (p) *Veitchia* sp. (Montgomery palm); (q) *Washingtonia robusta* (Mexican fan palm); (r) *Wodyetia bifurcata* (foxtail palm)