

PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT NAMES

Edited by John McNeill, Scott A. Redhead & John H. Wiersema

Report of the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants: 60

R.K. Brummitt

The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AE, U.K. r.brummitt@rbgkew.org.uk

The previous report of this committee appeared in *Taxon* 56: 1289–1296 (2007). Those voting on proposals in this report were W. Applequist (St Louis), R.K. Brummitt (Kew, Secretary), G. Davidse (St Louis), R. de Mello-Silva (São Paulo), E.S. Fernando (Los Baños), I. Friis (Copenhagen, Chairman), K. Gandhi (Cambridge, Mass.), C.E. Jarvis (London), R. Kiesling (Mendoza), H.-W. Lack (Berlin), D.H. Nicolson (Washington D.C.), H. Ohashi (Sendai), G. Perry (Perth, W.A.), J. Prado (São Paulo), J.P. Roux (Cape Town), A. Sennikov (Helsinki), M. Thulin (Uppsala) and P. Vorster (Stellenbosch). A minimum of 11 votes is required for recommendation by this committee that a proposal for conservation or rejection of a name be accepted or rejected.

(1676). To conserve *Cassinia* R. Br. nom. cons. against *Ozothamnus* R. Br. (*Asteraceae*). Proposed by A.E. Orchard in *Taxon* 54: 199–201 (2005). Votes: 4–14 on the proposal to conserve against *Ozothamnus* (not recommended), but the alternative solution of changing the place of publication of conserved *Cassinia* from 1817 to “*Cassinia* R. Br. in Aiton, Hort. Kew., ed 2, 5: 184. Nov 1813”, its original place of publication, recommended by 14–4.

The name *Cassinia* R. Br. in Aiton, Hort. Kew, ed. 2, 5: 184 (1813) was originally published based on *C. aurea* R. Br., but circumscription changed in later years so that this species was no longer included in the genus. Currently, therefore, an artificial homonym, *Cassinia* R. Br., Obs. Comp.: 126 (1817) is conserved with one of the species included there, *C. aculeata* (Labill.) R. Br., as the conserved type—a procedure necessary prior to the *Tokyo Code* (Greuter & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 131. 1994). It now seems likely that the genera *Cassinia* and *Ozothamnus* will be combined, and since the latter has equal priority with the conserved *Cassinia* 1817, it is not clear which name should be adopted for the combined genus. The committee has voted to accept the proposal to change the date of conserved *Cassinia* back to 1813 with *C. aculeata* as the conserved type.

(1698). To conserve *Salix fragilis* L. with a conserved type. Proposed by K.I. Christenson & B. Jonsell in *Taxon* 54: 555–556. 2005. Votes: 4–14 (not recommended).

The name *S. fragilis* has been applied in Europe for over 250 years to a complex of widely naturalised plants which reproduce very easily by vegetative means when fragments of stem break off and root down to make new plants (hence the name *S. fragilis*) allowing large stands to develop. This complex includes an apparently rare glabrous species native

of northern Turkey and adjacent Caucasus, together with a hybrid of this with *S. alba* which may have been widely grown in Europe since medieval times. The hybrid is much more commonly and widely naturalised in Europe than the glabrous species is, and it is possible that only the hybrid occurs in the Uppsala region where it would have been known to Linnaeus. As noted in the committee by M. Thulin, as early as 1918 (if not earlier) Swedish botanists recognised that there was a good species and a hybrid in this complex, and, perhaps because there was a subconscious but unjustified assumption that the species name *S. fragilis* must be applied to the species rather than to the hybrid, some of the literature since then has applied the name to the glabrous species and looked for another name for the hybrid. On the other hand, the name *S. fragilis* has been very widely applied to the hybrid or uncritically to both the glabrous species and the hybrid. In a lengthy discussion of this in the committee, informative submissions have been received from R.D. Meikle, I. Belyaeva, the late A.K. Skvortsov and G.W. Argus, and the proposers were invited to comment on all points made. Irina Belyaeva, currently monographing the genus, has demonstrated convincingly that the great majority of plants throughout the distribution of the complex to which the name *S. fragilis* has been applied for 250 years are the hybrid, as found in major herbaria in Europe including Sweden. It is also probably the only taxon of this complex occurring in North America, Australia and South Africa where these plants are also widely naturalised. The proposers have indicated that the hybrid should be called *S. ×rubens* Schrank if their proposal is accepted. No acceptable lectotypification of *S. fragilis* has been made, the specimen in LINN chosen by Jordaán (in *Bothalia* 35: 17. 2005) being not available in 1753. It has been noted in the committee by M. Thulin that there is a specimen in the Celsius herbarium at Uppsala which would have been available to Linnaeus and could be chosen as the lectotype. This would retain the name *S. fragilis* in use for the widespread hybrid, but the glabrous species is then left without a name. The committee has encouraged I. Belyaeva to prepare a paper resolving these problems for publication in this journal shortly.

A supplementary problem concerns application of the name *S. decipiens* Hoffm., which the proposal noted has sometimes been used for the glabrous Turkish/Caucasian species. Hoffmann's original description of this did indicate a glabrous plant, but in the proposal a lectotype was chosen which would make the name a later synonym applicable to the hybrid. However, I. Belyaeva has noted to the committee

that *S. decipiens* should be treated as a superfluous replacement for *S. fragilis*. In their discussion in the proposal, the proposers noted that Hoffmann remarked that he had chosen a new name because *S. fragilis* had been used in various senses and should not be used. This indeed seems to suggest that *S. decipiens* is superfluous and illegitimate and therefore typified by the type of *S. fragilis*. A translation of Hoffmann's paragraph after his description reads "Under the name *Salix fragilis* occur different species, which are all in agreement with it, whose twigs break with the finger at the annual nodes, but they differ greatly in the flower period, leaves and others. I have said this species is very deceiving because it is easily mixed up with very similar species (*S. bigemmis*); the less curious and circumspect observers are deceived. The difference in its leaves will be more obvious in this description." Hoffmann did not account anywhere else for the name *S. fragilis*. Fourteen members of the committee considered that *S. decipiens* is superfluous and illegitimate, while four did not consider this to be the case.

(1714). To reject *Plantago psyllium* L. (*Plantaginaceae*). Proposed by W. Applequist in Taxon 55: 235–236. 2006. Votes: 16–1, 1 abstention (recommended).

Linnaeus apparently caused confusion by changing his concept of *P. psyllium* in different works, and the name has long been abandoned as a nomen confusum. The name has not been formally typified, but the proposal says that "there is general agreement that *P. psyllium* 1753 refers to the species currently known as *P. arenaria* Waldst. & Kit.". The name is only very rarely used at present, and the committee recommends acceptance of the proposal to formally reject it.

Assessment of this proposal has prompted consideration of an independent but related problem. The correct name of the species concerned has generally been thought to be *P. arenaria* Waldst. & Kit. (Descr. Icon. Rar. Pl. 1: 51. 1801). This is accepted, for example, in *Flora Europaea*, where "*P. indica* L. nom illegit." is given as a synonym. *Plantago indica* L. (Syst. Nat., ed. 10: 896. 1759) is not currently in use, but in the committee's discussion its illegitimacy has been questioned. In his group 'Caule ramoso' Linnaeus (Sp. Pl.: 115–116. 1753) had two species, 15 *P. psyllium* (leaves entire, spikes leafy) and 16 *P. cynops* (leaves toothed, spikes leafless). However, Linnaeus (l.c. 1759) included three species in this group, with *P. indica* added to the two names from 1753. Throughout his 1759 work Linnaeus tried to retain the numbering of the species in *Species Plantarum* of 1753, and where a new species was added he indicated this by a letter instead of a number, the letters starting at A and continuing as far as was needed within the genus. In *Plantago* in 1759, species 15 was named *P. indica* while *P. psyllium* was given letter B (*P. serraria* above was given A), and *P. cynops* was again 16. This seems to suggest that *P. indica* 1759 was a re-naming of *P. psyllium* 1753 and so an illegitimate superfluous name, while *P. psyllium* 1759 was an illegitimate later homonym applied to a new species.

However, it is not quite as simple as that. The phrase name of *P. indica* is very similar to that of *P. psyllium* 1753 but is not identical since the word 'herbaceo' has been added. While the

1753 phrase name was quoted from *Hortus Upsaliensis*, that in 1759 was attributed to 'An Kali' and 'Alp. aegypt'. And while the synonym *Psyllium majus erectus* of Bauhin was cited under *P. psyllium* in 1753, in 1759 it was transferred to *P. cynops*! Furthermore, while *P. psyllium* 1753 was said to be from S. Europe, the epithet and references for *P. indica* in 1759 suggest a much further eastern distribution. Linnaeus apparently did not merely re-name a species, he distributed different elements of *P. psyllium* 1753 among three species in 1759.

Moreover, recent editions of the *Code* are quite explicit in determining legitimacy and illegitimacy under such situations. In the absence of a holotype or any syntypes, or any previously designated type (and in 1759 *P. indica* had none of these) Art. 52.2 establishes that inclusion of the type of an earlier name requires "citation of the name itself or any name homotypic at that time ..." Linnaeus (l.c. 1759) did not cite any other name in association with *P. indica*. After discussion, in which several members thought that *P. indica* should be illegitimate, the committee concluded by a vote of 10–8 that, under the current *Code*, *P. indica* is a legitimate name.

(1715). To reject *Plantago cynops* L. (*Plantaginaceae*). Proposed by W. Applequist in Taxon 55: 235–236. 2006. Votes: 17–0, 1 abstention.

This parallels the previous case. This name has not been typified, but we are told that *P. cynops* L. 1753 refers to the species currently known as *P. afra* L. Both this and the previous species apparently have economic importance. The committee again recommends acceptance of the proposal.

(1746). To conserve *Marattiaceae* Kaulf. against *Danaeaceae* C. Agardh (*Pteridophyta*). Proposed by A.G. Murdock, J.L. Reveal & A. Doweld in Taxon 55: 1040–1042. 2006. Votes: 18–0 (recommended).

The recent changes over starting points of family names have resulted in a potential competition between the names *Marattiaceae* and *Danaeaceae*, depending on whether one takes a broad or a narrow view of family limits. Whereas *Marattiaceae* has been very widely adopted when both *Marattia* and *Danaea* are included in the same family, while *Danaeaceae* has apparently never been used for a family including both genera, the latter family name has priority by two years. Many authors actually recognise separate families, but at least one recent important work has included both genera in the same family (and called it *Marattiaceae*). It would seem that conservation of the well known *Marattiaceae* would be much more acceptable than asking those with a broad concept to call the combined family *Danaeaceae*.

(1747). To conserve *Cynorkis fastigiata* Thouars against *Orchis obcordata* Willemet (*Orchidaceae*). Proposed by J. Hermans & P.J. Cribb in Taxon 55: 1042. 2006. Votes: 18–0 to retain *C. fastigiata* in use, but rejection of *O. obcordata* instead of conservation is recommended by a vote of 11–7.

Cynoris fastigiata is native to Madagascar, the Comoros, the Mascarenes and Seychelles, and is naturalised in more distant parts of the world and is often a weed in greenhouses. It is said to be by far the most widely known

of all Madagascan orchids. The name *C. obcordata* has not previously been typified and has been almost completely overlooked, but is in fact the earliest name. Rejection of *O. obcordata* is recommended, and will achieve the same result as the proposal.

(1748). To conserve *Orchis tipuloides* L. f. with a conserved type (*Orchidaceae*). Proposed by P.G. Efimov in Taxon 55: 1043–1044. 2006. Votes: 17–1 (recommended).

The species is said to be one of the commonest orchids of the Russian Far East, extending also to the Aleutian Islands, Japan and China. The name *P. tipuloides* has been universally applied to it since it was published in 1835. Names for five varieties under it were published in 1982. However, examination of the type in LINN shows that that is not the species to which the name has been applied but is *P. bifolia* (L.) Rich. The protologue said that the species was from Kamchatka, but *P. bifolia* does not occur there, raising doubts about the typification. The contradiction apparently is explained by Linnaeus fil. having been misinformed about the origin of the specimen he described, which has misled later generations of users of the name. Acceptance of the proposal is recommended.

(1749). To conserve *Krascheninnikovia* Gueldenst. against *Ceratoides* Gagnebin (*Chenopodiaceae*). Proposed by H. Heklau in Taxon 55: 1044–1045. 2006. Votes: 18–0 (recommended).

The validity of publication of *Ceratoides* has been in question for some time, and has been considered at length by the committee. Tournefort 1703 called a genus “*Ceratoides*”, gave a generic description, and recognised three species as detailed in the second paragraph of the proposal. The first of these was a perennial shrub which was described by Linnaeus 1753 as one of his four species of *Axyris*, *A. ceratoides* L., and is currently referred to *Krascheninnikovia* Gueldenst. 1772. The other two Tournefort species were annuals, now considered to be conspecific, and are currently referred to *Ceratocarpus* L. 1753. The protologue of *Ceratocarpus* L. 1753 included only one species, *C. arenarius*, which is the obligate type of the generic name and the currently correct name for the original annual species. In the protologue of *C. arenarius*, Linnaeus cited a reference to Buxbaum (1728), who apparently originally coined the name “*Ceratocarpus*” quoting Tournefort’s names for the two annual species. The proposal says that Linnaeus did not mention the two annual species, but he clearly included them in *Ceratocarpus* via the reference to Buxbaum. In fact Linnaeus correctly anticipated later work in dividing Tournefort’s “*Ceratoides*” between two genera. Two years after Linnaeus, Gagnebin published a rather odd paper which was mostly concerned with an illustration of an *Ophrys* by Tournefort but in which he made a diversion to comment on several assorted genera which he thought Tournefort had placed in the wrong class. One of these was “*Ceratoides*”. There was no description of this and little discussion, but, significantly, Gagnebin apparently accepted the name as applying to a good genus. The committee accepts that *Ceratoides* was validly published by indirect

reference back to the generic description of Tournefort, even though the reference may be very indirect. When Gagnebin accepted *Ceratoides* in 1755, he did not mention any species and so cannot be considered to have excluded any of the three Tournefort species. His circumscription of *Ceratoides* is unchanged from that of Tournefort, and it might appear that he included the type (only original species) of *Ceratocarpus* L. 1753, *C. arenarius*. But while Gagnebin can be considered to have included what might be regarded as the main historical element of *C. arenarius* (the two annual species of Tournefort to which the protologue’s Buxbaum reference leads), he did not include all the material included in the protologue of the specific name, for Linnaeus also cited his own *Hortus Upsaliensis* 1748. Here he included references to Gerber and Heintz and gave a rather wide geographical distribution. Although we often use a shorthand expression and say that the type of a generic name is a species, Art. 10.1 makes it clear that the type of a generic name is the **type** of a name of an included species. In the present case this could be Tournefort material but also could be the material referred to in *Hortus Upsaliensis*. So *Ceratoides* did not include “all elements eligible as types” of *Ceratocarpus* (Art. 52.2), and cannot be considered illegitimate. The first explicit lectotypification of *Ceratoides* was by J.J. Swart in ING Card No. 07154, 11 Nov. 1958, as now recorded in the ING database. There *Axyris ceratoides* L. was chosen as the type, i.e., the perennial species now referred to *Krascheninnikovia*. This is the same type element as quoted in the proposal but from an earlier date. Thanks are due to Gill Perry and Gea Zijlstra for checking information. The committee is happy to accept the proposal.

(1750). To reject *Euphorbia longifolia* Lam. (*Euphorbiaceae*). Proposed by C.M. Whitehouse in Taxon 55: 1046. 2006. Votes: 13–4 (recommended).

Euphorbia mellifera is a well known garden plant native of Madeira and the Canaries, almost exclusively known by that name for over 200 years. *Euphorbia longifolia* Lam. turns out to be the same species and has priority by a year. A later homonym, *E. longifolia* D. Don, was very widely used for a quite different species from the Himalayas until the substitute name *E. donii* was published in 1989. Although the name *E. longifolia* has been adopted in two recent publications, these are isolated usages which are in conflict with established usage of two centuries. In particular, the committee is influenced by the fact that *E. longifolia* has been consistently used for the Himalayan species for well over a century, and switching application of the name to a different species now would cause much confusion. In such circumstances, the case for rejecting a name seems strong. A first vote was 17–1 in favour of the proposal. After an appeal by J. Molero against this, the recommendation was considered again, and a second vote was taken, resulting in a 13–4 majority with one abstention.

(1751). To conserve *Thermopsis lanceolata* R. Br. with conserved type (*Leguminosae-Papilionoideae*). Proposed by X.Y. Zhu & J.H. Kirkbride in Taxon 55: 1047–1049. 2006. Votes: 17–0, 1 abstention.

This proposal and the following one concern two species of the genus *Thermopsis* both native of northern Asia but with non-overlapping distributions. The first occurs from eastern Europe across Siberia and China but not to Kamchatka, and has long been known as *T. lanceolata*. The second is native only of Kamchatka, and has been called *T. lupinoides* in early and recent times but *T. fabacea* for a period in the middle. The problem with the first name is that when *T. lanceolata* was first published, Brown described the Siberian species but included *Sophora lupinoides* (basonym of *T. lupinoides*) in the circumscription. This means that the name is illegitimate and typified by the type of *T. lupinoides* (i.e., the Kamchatka plant). Then Pallas in 1803 applied the epithet *lupinoides* to the Siberian plant (following Brown's synonymy) and adopted *fabacea* for the Kamchatka species, resulting in some confusion in later literature. However, the great majority of authors up to the present decade have used the illegitimate *T. lanceolata* for the Siberian species. The exception is the monographer Sa Ren who has dropped the illegitimate *T. lanceolata* but used *T. lupinoides* in its place for the Siberian plant. The proposal is to conserve *T. lanceolata* with a Siberian specimen as the type. The species is widespread and in cultivation as a colourful hardy perennial, and has medicinal uses in China. The committee recommends acceptance of the proposal.

(1753). To conserve *Ziziphus jujuba* Mill. against *Z. zizyphus* (L.) H. Karst. (*Rhamnaceae*). Proposed by J.H. Kirkbride, J.H. Wiersema & N.J. Turland in Taxon 55: 1049–1050. 2006. Votes: 15–3 (recommended).

In Taxon 49: 173–174. 1999 this committee declined a proposal to conserve the generic name with the spelling *Zizyphus*, which would have solved the problem of the specific name, but suggested that a proposal to conserve the specific name would be more acceptable. That is the proposal which has now come to the committee. Linnaeus published *Rhamnus zizyphus* for the species. When Miller put this in its own genus, he used a slightly different spelling of Linnaeus's epithet and called it *Ziziphus*, giving it a new specific epithet *jujuba* which has been very widely used since. Karsten in 1882 followed his usual practice of permitting tautonyms and published *Zizyphus zizyphus*. But his spelling of the generic name is an orthographic variant of Miller's version, and has to be corrected to *Ziziphus*. Since tautonyms must have the spelling of the epithet **identical** with that of the generic name (Art. 23.4), Karsten's corrected specific name is not a tautonym and is the correct name for the species. This was pointed out by Meikle in his *Flora of Cyprus* (1970) who adopted *Ziziphus zizyphus* (mistakenly proposing it as a new combination instead of attributing it to Karsten). Since then, some authors (a slight minority of seven among those cited in the proposal) have continued to use *Z. jujuba*, which is technically illegitimate, while others (nine cited) have taken up *Z. zizyphus*. But the weight of usage for two and a half centuries favours *Z. jujuba*. The species is well known in the Mediterranean area and is of some economic importance. Conservation as proposed is recommended.

(Post 1753). To place *Selbyana*, Suppl. 23. 2002 in the Opera Utique Oppressa in Appendix VI. Proposed by P. van Rijckevorsel in Taxon 55: 1053. 2006. Votes: 0–18 (not recommended).

Much has already been written about the discovery of a new species of *Phragmipedium* (*Orchidaceae*) in Peru in about 2002, of its spectacular reddish-purple flowers up to 20 cm across, of the race between different botanists to validly publish names for it, of the court case which ruled that criminal actions had taken place, and of the nomenclatural conclusions to be drawn. The name *P. kovachii* has thus been surrounded by controversy, including legal sanctions, while doubts have also been attached to the competing name *P. peruvianum*. The committee has attempted to base its recommendation on the nomenclatural facts of the matter as far as they can be ascertained.

A description to validate the name *P. peruvianum* was submitted to the journal *Orchids* by E.A. Christenson on 5 June 2002, the same day that a live specimen of the species was taken to the Marie Selby Botanical Garden in Florida by M. Kovach who had imported it from Peru. However, *P. peruvianum* was not published until 27 June. Meanwhile, a special supplement of the journal *Selbyana* was rushed out by the Marie Selby Botanical Garden and published on 10 June. This consisted of a single paper which included the protologue validating the name *P. kovachii* J.T. Atwood, Dalstrom & Ric. Fernández for the species, and this name gained nomenclatural priority by 17 days. But the live plant used to describe *P. kovachii* was illegally exported from Peru, which gave rise to the legal proceedings despite a pressed specimen of this plant having been returned to Peru shortly afterwards. It has been noted in the proposal that during the court case the representatives of the Marie Selby Botanical Garden pleaded guilty to the charges and promised to try to have the name *P. kovachii* revoked, but this has apparently not been followed up by them.

The proposal was strongly critical of the name *P. kovachii* and the way it was published, and has requested that the publication in which it appeared should be formally rejected in the opera utique oppressa in Appendix 6. Arguments against this proposal have been published by W.R. Anderson (in Taxon 56: 615–616. 2007), and further comments have been published by the editors of *Selbyana*, W.E. Higgins & D.H. Benzing (in Taxon 56: 968–969. 2007) and by the botanists of the USM herbarium in Peru, B. León, B. Millán, A. Cano & J. Albán (in Taxon 57: 664–665. 2008). While members of this committee may agree with much of the criticism of the actions of the Marie Selby Botanical Garden which prompted the present proposal, they have felt that it is inappropriate to reject utique the publication including the name *P. kovachii*. It is felt, as recommended by Anderson (l.c.), that the committee should confine itself to issues of plant nomenclature rather than indulge in questions of moral judgement or political or legal correctness. The courts in the United States have already given their judgements on the actions of the Marie Selby Botanical Garden and have imposed severe penalties on people involved in the acquisition of the plant described as *P. kovachii*. If

all names based on specimens illegally collected or named after persons who have acted unwisely—including certain politicians—were to be rejected, we might have some major nomenclatural instability.

The doubts over the name *P. peruvianum* Christenson centre on the existence of a type specimen. In June 2002 the name was published with a specimen from cultivation in Peru, Christenson 2056 at USM, cited as the type, but Higgins & Benzing (l.c.) have said that no specimen labelled as such exists, a fact confirmed by León, Millán, Cano & Albán (l.c.). In correspondence, however, Christenson has maintained that his holotype does exist. Three years after publication of the name, in July 2005, he visited Peru and annotated a specimen at USM, drawing a dotted line round an isolated flower and labelling this as “HOLOTYPE of *Phragmipedium peruvianum* Christenson”, and adding a label saying “No es tipo” by the leaves and second flower on the rest of the sheet. He did not indicate that the flower he circled was collected by a different collector or at a different time from the rest of the sheet. The date of collection on the label is December 2002, which was six months after the name *P. peruvianum* was published in June of that year, and the species name on the label is *P. kovachii*, not *P. peruvianum*. Christenson maintains that this flower is the holotype of the name but it is debatable whether a type can be designated retroactively, and since this has not been done in print this can have no standing (see Art. 7.10). The question arises as to whether a statement of a type which did not exist when the protologue was published can be accepted for valid publication of a name. A holotype was cited in the protologue, and rigorous application of a rule which states that a name is not validly published if the holotype did not exist in the herbarium cited at the time of publication of the name would be very difficult to achieve. This committee comes to no conclusion on the valid publication of *P. peruvianum*. The name *P. kovachii* should continue to be used.

In declining to recommend acceptance of this proposal to reject *Selbyana*, Suppl. 23, this committee does not in any way condone the actions of those concerned with its publication.

(1758). To reject *Arundo vallatoria* L. (*Poaceae*). Proposed by J.H. Kirkbride & J.H. Wiersema in Taxon 56: 258. 2007. Votes: 5–13 (not recommended, unnecessary).

A large and rather conspicuous reed widely known as *Phragmites karka* is widespread in Africa, temperate and tropical Asia, and Australia, and has local economic value as a medicinal plant and as a forage crop or source of fibre. In 1992 Veldkamp made the combination *P. vallatoria* based on an overlooked name which Linnaeus published in Stickman's thesis *Herbarium Amboinense* in 1754, saying this should replace *P. karka*. Since 1992 *P. vallatoria* has been taken up in a journal in 1995, in the *Flora of Taiwan* in 2000 and in the *Flora of Australia* in 2005. On the other hand, Floras of Brunei (1996), N.E. India (1996), Yemen (1997), Bhutan (2000)—see below—and very recently the *Flora of China* (2006) have not taken it up and have continued to use *P. karka*. Steve Cafferty of the Linnaean Names Project had commented in correspondence that Linnaeus was

merely citing “*A. vallatoria* Pluk., Mant. 28.” as a synonym of Rumphius's plant, and it was just a coincidence that the Plukenet name was composed of two words. Apart from the reprinting of the thesis (Amoenitates 4: 115. 1759), Linnaeus never used the name again. Consequently, in the *Flora of China* account in 2006, *P. karka* was retained, but with a slightly different argument. The authors quoted Art. 34 Ex. 2 of the *St Louis Code* as an example of names in the Stickman thesis being invalid. However, as noted by the authors of the present proposal, the Example is a case of names in the left-hand column (i.e., names previously used by Rumphius before 1753) being not accepted by Linnaeus, whereas *Arundo vallatoria* was in the right hand column. Here Linnaeus was trying to identify the Rumphius pre-1753 illustrations with anything else he could suggest. He sometimes gave his own binomials from *Species Plantarum*, sometimes gave no suggestion at all, sometimes gave generic names only, and occasionally gave polynomials. The committee has carefully considered the format of Stickman's thesis, and a majority have agreed that “*Arundo vallatoria*” was not validly published, as indicated in Jarvis's *Order Out of Chaos*: 320. 2007. Some have voted in favour of the proposal in order to achieve a final decision, but others have felt that this would create a bad precedent. The recommendation is that the name should not be taken up because it was not validly published.

(1759). To reject *Juncus setaceus* Rostk. (*Juncaceae*). Proposed by J. Kirschner in Taxon 56: 259. 2007. Votes: 18–0 (recommended).

A species occurring from New Jersey to Florida was known up to 1929 as *J. setaceus*. In that year Mackenzie questioned this application of the name and considered that it must apply instead to the widespread *J. effusus* L. He therefore described the E. American species as *J. coriaceous*, and it has been known by this name ever since. However, examination of the type in Berlin has shown that *J. setaceus* is referable not to *J. effusus* but to *J. balticus* Willd. 1809 and is thus the earliest name for that species. The name *J. balticus* has been universally applied to a species widespread on coasts and mountains of Europe, eastern and western N. America, and C. and S. America. The committee recommends acceptance of the proposal.

(1760). To reject *Cucubalus quadrifidus* L. (*Caryophyllaceae*). Proposed by B. Frajman in Taxon 56: 260–261. 2007. Votes: 18–0 (recommended).

Linnaeus included two species under this name. Typification shows that it should be applied to a species of the Alps of Austria, Italy and Slovenia widely known as *Silene alpestris* or *Heliosperma alpestre*. However, since a publication of Jacquin in 1773 it has been generally applied to a different montane European species occurring in the Pyrenees, Apennines, Alps, Dinaric Alps and Carpathians correctly known as *S. pusilla* Waldst. & Kit. 1812 or *H. pusilla*. A superfluous replacement name for it, *S. quadridentata*, has sometimes also been used for *S. pusilla*. Realising the confusion, Mansfeld in 1939 said that *S. quadrifida* should be rejected as a nomen ambiguum, having been consistently applied to the

wrong species, and this was endorsed in *Flora Europaea* and other recent publications. Only the Med-Checklist and two other recent publications have used *S. quadrifida* in the sense of *S. alpestris*. It seems that a considerable majority of publications since Mansfeld in 1939 have informally rejected the name. The committee feels that stability will be best achieved by accepting the proposal.

(1761). To conserve *Hewittia* Wight & Arn. against *Shuterea* Choisy (Convolvulaceae). Proposed by G. Staples & H.J. Noltie in Taxon 56: 262. 2007. Votes: 18–0 (recommended).

Hewittia was proposed by Wight & Arnott in 1837 as a replacement for *Shuterea* Choisy which was regarded as homonymous with *Shutera* which Wight & Arnott had proposed themselves for a genus of Leguminosae. The legume name has been conserved over the convolvulaceous name, which is now shown to have been published in August 1834 three days before the homonym. But it has been overlooked that *Hewittia* was illegitimate when published because Choisy's *Shuterea* was not illegitimate. The convolvulaceous genus is small but common and well known in the Old World, and conservation seems very appropriate.

(1762). To conserve *Barbarea plantaginea* DC. against *Sisymbrium barbareae* L. (Brassicaceae). Proposed by N.J. Turland in Taxon 56: 263. 2007. Votes: 14–4 (recommended).

Barbarea plantaginea was proposed by Candolle as a nom. nov. for *Sisymbrium barbareae* apparently on the assumption that *Barbarea barbareae* would be a tautonym and so not permissible. In 1925 Sprague correctly published the name *Barbarea barbareae*, but nobody seems to have taken this up since. The species occurs widely in the Middle East, from Turkey, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Iran and Afghanistan, and all relevant literature uses the name *B. plantaginea*. No economic or ecological significance is claimed for the species. The widely used name *B. plantaginea* is illegitimate unless conserved. Acceptance of the proposal is recommended.

(1763). To reject *Erysimum orientale* Mill. (Brassicaceae). Proposed by N.J. Turland in Taxon 56: 264–265. 2007. Votes: 16–1, 1 abstention (recommended).

The potential type of this Miller name from 1768, now at BM, is incomplete and could be either *Barbarea plantaginea* (see previous proposal) or the even more widespread *B. vulgaris*. In either case, *B. orientale* would be the correct name which should be taken up, *B. vulgaris* dating only from W.T. Aiton 1812. The matter has been somewhat confused by the existence of a later *Erysimum orientale* published by Crantz 1769 based on *Brassica orientalis* L. 1753 (now *Conringia orientalis* (L.) Dumort.). Some recent authors, including Med-Checklist, have assumed that the Crantz name was based on Miller's *E. orientale* published the previous year, but the proposal convincingly argues that this is not the case and the two names are heterotypic. Acceptance of the proposal takes away the threat to names of both species of

Barbarea, and seems preferable to choosing an epitype and either upsetting one of the well known names or provoking another conservation proposal.

(1764). To conserve the family name *Dombeyaceae* Desf. Proposed by A. Doweld & J.L. Reveal in Taxon 56: 265–266. 2007. Votes: 13–5 (recommended).

Dombeya has very widely been placed in *Sterculiaceae*, but the proposal says the name *Dombeyaceae* is in current use, quoting works by one of the proposers, Doweld, in 2001 and 2007. In the recent shake-up of the *Malvales* sensu lato, there has been some acceptance of a separate family including *Dombeya*, but it would also include *Pentapetes* and there is a family name based on that, *Pentapetaceae* Bercht. & J. Presl 1820. *Dombeya* is a large well-known genus of over 100 species of usually large shrubs or small trees, while *Pentapetes* is a little-known genus of one small annual species. Many would therefore feel that the name *Dombeyaceae* would be preferable as being more readily comprehended. In Heywood & al., *Flowering Plant Families of the World*, 2007, where the *Malvales* sensu lato were written by M.R. Cheek who recognised some ten families, the name *Pentapetaceae* has been taken up rather than *Dombeyaceae*. In personal discussion with Cheek he has said that he would much prefer *Dombeyaceae* and regrets not having himself made the proposal we now have before us. The pragmatic approach for such cases seems to be to conserve now in order to ease the position for the future. Comparison may be made with the proposals 1746 on *Marattiaceae* above and 1765 on *Phyllanthaceae* below. Conservation of *Dombeyaceae* is recommended.

(1765). To conserve the family name *Phyllanthaceae* Martinov. Proposed by J.L. Reveal, P. Hoffmann, A. Doweld & K.J. Wurdack in Taxon 56: 266. 2007. Votes: 13–5 (recommended).

This case is similar to that of *Dombeyaceae* in the previous proposal. The smallish old subfam. *Oldfieldioideae* has become *Picrodendraceae* because the molecular evidence places *Picrodendron* in it, and this has become fairly well established in the last few years. At the same time, the larger subfam. *Phyllanthoideae* has become accepted by many as *Phyllanthaceae*. But now fashion is changing a little and there are suggestions that these two groups should be combined as one family. Because *Picrodendraceae* happens to be conserved while *Phyllanthaceae* is not, the former would have to be adopted for the combined family. *Picrodendron* itself is a unispecific genus with narrow geographical range, being confined to smaller islands of the West Indies, and is not morphologically 'typical' of either the old *Oldfieldioideae* or *Phyllanthoideae*, having been moved around quite a bit in the past (but is now clearly placed by the molecular evidence). Comparison may be made with *Pentapetes* in the previous proposal. Some of the resistance to merging the *Phyllanthaceae* and *Picrodendraceae* may arise from the need to call the combined family by the latter name. Looking to future stability, the committee recommends acceptance of the proposal.

(1766). To conserve *Agrimonia microcarpa* Wallr. with a conserved type (*Rosaceae*). Proposed by G.J. Kline & P.D. Sørensen in Taxon 56: 267–268. 2007. Votes: 17–1 (recommended).

The name *A. microcarpa* has been used for a species of the southern United States since Rydberg took it up in 1913. Prior to that it had been usually known as *A. pumila* Muhl. ex E.P. Bicknell. Wallroth cited three syntype collections, and in preparing their account for *Flora of North America* the authors of the proposal have consulted these in European herbaria. The one from Mexico is now identified as *A. pringlei* Rydb. The one from Pennsylvania is now identified as *A. pubescens* Wallr., while the one from southern Georgia is *A. microcarpa* as currently used. Unfortunately the one from Pennsylvania was chosen as lectotype by Skalicky in 1973, and *A. microcarpa* should displace *A. pubescens*. It is a pity if careful typification by modern authors only results in name changes, especially when this has resulted from uncritical lectotypification by somebody else. Conservation as proposed is recommended.

(1773). To conserve *Juncus micranthus* Schrad. ex E. Mey. against *Juncus micranthus* Desv. (*Juncaceae*). Proposed by J. Kirschner & L. Drábková in Taxon 56: 602–603. 2007. Votes: 18–0 (recommended).

The species concerned is widespread in South America from northern Brazil and Bolivia to northern Argentina. It was generally called *J. scirpoides* var. *meridionalis* from Buchenau's monograph of 1890 until 1953, or as *J. meridionalis* (Buchenau) Herter in 1956 but never since then, but has become widely known in the last decade or two as *J. micranthus* Schrad. ex E. Mey. It was included in the *Flora Neotropica* monograph of *Juncaceae* in 1996 and in the 2002 *Species Plantarum* global monograph of the *Juncaceae* as *J. micranthus*, and is now established in floristic works on Argentina, Paraguay and Brazil. The earlier *J. micranthus* was published in a local French Flora in 1818 has never been taken up since then, and is apparently referable either to *J. acutiflorus* Ehrh. ex Hoffm. or a hybrid of that with *J. articulatus*. Conservation is recommended.

(1774). To conserve *Chrysogonum peruvianum* L. with a conserved type (*Asteraceae*). Proposed by J.F. Pruski in Taxon 56: 603–605. 2007. Votes: 18–0 (recommended).

The name in question is the basionym of *Zinnia peruviana* which is the type of the well known name *Zinnia*. A recent argument that *Z. peruviana* was a new name and not based on *C. peruvianum* seems to be untenable. There were two elements in the protologue of *C. peruvianum*. The first is plate 50 of a publication by Feuillée, which is now identifiable as *Sphagneticola trilobata* (L.) Pruski 1996 and so is very undesirable as the type of *Zinnia*. Although Linnaeus's phrase name was taken from the context of this plate, in transferring the epithet *peruvianum* to *Zinnia* in 1759 Linnaeus clearly stated that he was excluding the Feuillée plate. The other element in the protologue is his citation “Peru. *D. Jussieu*”, apparently something collected in Peru by Joseph de Jussieu well before 1753. This appears to correspond

well with the specimen 9416 in the Jussieu herbarium in Paris, which is a *Zinnia* and would be a splendid type of that name. But the proposal suggests that Linnaeus never saw this specimen, and that at best the type could be a plant cultivated in Europe from seeds sent by J. de Jussieu. Acceptance of the proposal seems to resolve any practical issues.

(1775). To conserve *Solidago elongata* Nutt. against *S. elongata* Pépin (*Asteraceae*). Proposed by J.C. Semple in Taxon 56: 605–606. 2007. Votes: 17–1 (recommended).

The name *S. elongata*, or *S. canadensis* subsp./var. *elongata*, has been used for a species occurring from British Columbia to central California for more than 160 years. In the 2006 *Flora of North America* treatment it is accepted as *S. elongata*. The earlier homonym apparently applies to a plant from the S.E. United States, but has never been used since it was published. The next available name for the western species is *S. caurina* Piper 1901, but this has scarcely been taken up since it was published. Conservation is recommended.

(1776). To conserve *Melampodium ruderales* Sw. against *Eleutheranthera ovata* Poit. (*Asteraceae*). Proposed by W. Greuter in Taxon 56: 607–608. 2007. Votes: 17–0, 1 abstention (recommended).

The plant concerned is native of central and northern South America but is a widespread and problematic weed in many tropical countries. It is referred to a unispecific genus, and is universally known as *Eleutheranthera ruderalis*. Although *E. ovata*, the type of the generic name, has priority by four years, it has never been adopted. Conservation is recommended.

(1777). To conserve *Acacia macracantha* Humb. & Bonpl. ex Willd. against *Mimosa lutea* Mill. (*Leguminosae-Mimosoideae*). Proposed by D.S. Seigler & J.E. Ebinger in Taxon 56: 608–609. 2007. Votes: 16–2 (recommended).

The species concerned occurs from Florida and the Caribbean to Chile, and has been known for 200 years as *Acacia macracantha*. The earliest name is *Mimosa lutea*, but the epithet *lutea* is already taken up in *Acacia*. With the splitting up of *Acacia* into (at least) three genera, this species has to be transferred to *Vachellia*, and would have to be called *V. lutea*. The committee is sympathetic with the proposers' wish to maintain the same epithet whether the generic name is *Acacia* or *Vachellia*. In a book on the Mexican species published in 2007 by L. Rico, *Acacia* is not split up and *Vachellia* is not recognised, so the species concerned here is still called *A. macracantha*. It would seem unfortunate to have *A. macracantha* and *V. lutea* both correct and in use for the same species. Conservation is recommended.

(1778). To conserve *Acacia constricta* Benth. against *Mimosa arcuata* M. Martens & Galeotti (*Leguminosae-Mimosoideae*). Proposed by D.S. Seigler & J.E. Ebinger in Taxon 56: 609–610. 2007. Votes: 17–1 (recommended).

This case almost exactly parallels the previous one. The species is from the S.W. United States and much of Mexico,

and has been long known as *A. constricta*, the epithet *arcuata* being already occupied in *Acacia* but not in *Vachellia*. Without conservation, we would have *A. constricta* and *V. arcuata* both in use for the same species. Conservation is recommended.

(1779). To conserve *Acacia collinsii* Saff. against *A. glutea* Ram. Goyena (*Leguminosae-Mimosoideae*). Proposed by D.S. Seigler & J.E. Ebinger in Taxon 56: 609–610. 2007. Votes: 18–0 (recommended).

This case differs from the two above in that it does not involve different epithets being correct in different genera. It is a simple case of an earlier name having been discovered. The species is widespread in Central America and introduced in the United States. The name *Acacia collinsii* has been used for nearly 100 years and appears in standard Floras, but the more or less unknown name *A. glutea* has priority. Conservation is recommended.

(1780). To reject *Hibiscus brasiliensis* L. (*Malvaceae*). Proposed by P.A. Fryxell & F.A. Berazain in Taxon 56: 611–612. 2007. Votes: 13–5 (recommended).

This is a question of whether we should formally reject a name which has often been considered of doubtful application, or should enforce application in the only sense in which it has ever been used and which seems to be correct. The only original material available as type is a Plumier plate. The proposal states that although this is rather crude, it is clearly identifiable with *H. phoeniceus* Jacq. which occurs from the Caribbean to Peru. The problem arises from the Linnaean description being discordant with this species in important characters. In 1767 Linnaeus maintained his description but excluded the Plumier plate. In the lists of citations of different uses, the proposal gives 22 authors who have accepted *H. brasiliensis* for the species otherwise known as *H. phoeniceus* (up to 1982, with the latter name in synonymy in a majority of instances), and 17 authors (including two since 1982) who have not taken up *H. brasiliensis* but have used *H. phoeniceus* instead (among whom 2 have given *H. brasiliensis* as a synonym). The committee has considered the possibility of a formal lectotypification of *H. brasiliensis*, and if necessary designation of an epitype, which would definitively fix *H. brasiliensis* as the correct name rather than *H. phoeniceus*. However, a majority favours the proposal as the optimal way to avoid name changes, and conservation is recommended.

(1781). To reject *Androsace carnea* L. (*Primulaceae*). Proposed by C.J. Dixon & G.M. Schneeweiss in Taxon 56: 612–613. 2007. Votes: 15–2, 1 abstention (recommended).

The name has been variously applied to three different species by different authors. Although a lectotype was chosen in 1984, very few authors have ever used the name in this restricted sense, and Kress, the monographer who chose the lectotype, has since abandoned the name altogether. The distribution indicated in the protologue is Pyrenees (i.e., France and Spain) and Switzerland. According to the current taxonomy, the lectotype is referable to a Pyrenean species otherwise known as *A. laggeri* A. Huet. The other taxa to which the name has been applied are *A. adfinis* Biroli subsp.

puberula (Jord. & Fourr.) Kress from the S.W. Alps (not Pyrenees) and *A. halleri* from the Cantabrian Mts of N. Spain (again not Pyrenees) and Massif Central of France. Works cited in the proposal as having adopted *A. carnea* for *A. laggeri* (i.e., in accordance with the lectotype) are only the Med-Checklist 1989 and Kerguelen's checklist for France 1993. It has occasionally been used for *A. halleri* but many significant publications are cited in the proposal that have applied it to *A. adfinis* subsp. *puberula* (i.e., not in accordance with the lectotype). In *Flora Iberica* (1997) Kress dropped usage of *A. carnea* altogether and adopted *A. laggeri*. Although some may see it as a pity not to follow his 1984 lectotypification, the committee is persuaded that stability will be best served by accepting the proposal.

(1782). To conserve *Stylidium affine* Sond. against *S. drummondii* Graham (*Stylidiaceae*). Proposed by J.A. Wege in Taxon 56: 613–614. 2007. Votes: 17–1 (recommended).

The name *S. affine* has been used for a well known species of *Stylidium* for a century and a half. It has appeared in literature on the trigger mechanism of members of this genus, cytogenetics, population biology and seed germination as well as floristic literature. The name *S. drummondii* was based on a plant sent to Britain in 1840 and has never been used in Australia. The committee sees no point in resurrecting such long-lost names, and conservation is recommended.

(1785). To conserve *Zinnia elegans* Jacq. against *Z. violacea* Cav. (*Asteraceae*). Proposed by J.H. Kirkbride & J.H. Wiersema in Taxon 56: 958–959. 2007. Votes: 13–5 (recommended).

The common garden plant grown in many countries of the world (and often naturalised in warm areas) as zinnia was sent from Mexico to Europe by Sessé & Moçino in 1791 under the name *Zinnia elegans*. This name was first validly published by Jacquin in 1792 and has been very widely adopted ever since. However, careful work by McVaugh in his *Flora Novo-Galiciana* 1984 showed that Cavanilles described the species as *Z. violacea* a year before Jacquin's publication, and so he adopted that name. This has been followed in a Missouri publication of 1993, Badillo's enumeration of the Compositae of Venezuela in 1995, the *Flora of China* 1999, the *Flora of Tropical East Africa* 2005 and *Flora of North America* 2006. Against that, Floras of the Lesser Antilles 1989 and British Isles 1991, the catalogue for Peru 1993, *Flora of India* 1995, the *European Garden Flora* 2000 and *Flora of Bhutan* 2001 have all maintained *Z. elegans*. It is a situation in which the committee cannot please everyone. The vote favours conservation as proposed, maintaining the long-standing usage of *Z. elegans*. The case seems to emphasise that when threats first appear to very well known names, conservation proposals should be published quickly so that decisions can be taken before the literature becomes confused.

(1786). To conserve *Erica manipuliflora* Salisb. against *E. forskalii* Vitman (*Ericaceae*). Proposed by E.C. Nelson & E.M.T. Wulff in Taxon 56: 959–961. 2007. Votes: 15–0, 3 abstentions (recommended).

The species concerned, which occurs in the eastern Mediterranean and is widely cultivated, has had a rather unfortunate nomenclatural history. Up to 1965 it was consistently named as *E. verticillata* Forssk., but Dulfer's monograph pointed out that this is a later homonym of *E. verticillata* P.J. Bergius, the accepted name of a South African species. He adopted in its place the name *E. manipuliflora* Salisb., which has now been taken up in all floristic and horticultural literature. However, in a rather little-known work of 1789, Vitman realised that Forsskål's *E. verticillata* was a later homonym, and so published a replacement name *E. forskalii*. But this has been completely overlooked, and *E. manipuliflora* has been widely used. Conservation is recommended.

(1787). To conserve *Acacia cyclops* A. Cunn. ex G. Don against *A. eglandulosa* DC. (*Leguminosae* – *Mimosoideae*). Proposed by B.R. Maslin & Paul G. Wilson in *Taxon* 56: 961–962. 2007. Votes: 18–0 (recommended).

This case has close similarities to that of *Stylidium affine* in Prop. 1782 above. In both, the plants are from Western Australia (the *Acacia* extending to S. Australia) and have been known in floristic and much other literature for over 150 years, but an earlier name, never taken up in Australia, has turned up in European literature. Although Pedley took up *Racosperma eglandulosum* in 2003, in the same publication he noted that because of the economic and other importance of this species it might be better to conserve *A. cyclops*. The committee concurs with this.

Requests for recommendations on cases of near homonymy

- (1) *Cineraria tussilaginea* and *C. tussilaginis* (*Asteraceae*)
- (a) *Cineraria tussilaginea* Thunb., Fl. Cap., ed. 2: 671. 1823.
- (b) *Cineraria tussilaginis* L'Hér., Sert. Angl.: 26. 1789 (= *Pericallis tussilaginis* (L'Hér.) D. Don).

Thunberg described *Cineraria tussilaginea* in the second edition of his *Flora Capensis* (1823), citing “*CINERARIA tussilagines?* Herit. Sert. Angl. p. 26.” as a possible synonym, the question mark indicating his lack of certainty. Harvey (in Fl. Cap. 3: 310. 1865) matched a specimen in Thunberg's herbarium (Thunb. 19937 [UPS-THUNB]) labelled *C. tussilaginis* [sic] by Thunberg with his description of *C. tussilaginea* (1823), and referred the name, excluding the L'Héritier synonym, to *Cineraria erodioides* DC. (Prodr. 6: 307. 1838). Harvey did not restore the name *C. tussilaginea* “lest it may perpetuate confusion with the *C. tussilaginis* L'Her.”, now *Pericallis tussilaginis*, adopting instead the later *C. erodioides* which has been applied to this species ever since. Although Harvey dismissed the name *C. tussilaginea*, it has never been formally rejected and has priority over the widely used *C. erodioides* DC. We considered a proposal to reject *C. tussilaginea* under Art. 56, but a simpler solution would be to accept the view of Harvey in 1865 that the two names are sufficiently alike to be confused and

to treat them as homonyms accordingly. We are therefore submitting this request (under Article 53.5 of the *ICBN*) to the General Committee for such a decision on the names *Cineraria tussilaginea* Thunb. and *Cineraria tussilaginis* L'Hér. (now *Pericallis tussilaginis* (L'Hér.) D. Don), both of the *Asteraceae*, *Senecioneae*.

Glynis Cron¹, Kevin Balkwill¹ & Eric Knox²

¹*School of Animal, Plant & Environmental Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa*

²*Department of Biology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, U.S.A.*

Committee recommendation. — One member, M. Thulin, has noted that in Thunberg's 1823 publication “*Cineraria tussilagines?* Herit.” is corrected under “Errata” on p. 671 to “*tussilaginea*”. This makes it quite obvious that Thunberg simply reused L'Héritier's name, although he spelt it wrongly. The question mark apparently indicates that he was not sure that he reused it correctly. *Cineraria tussilaginea* Thunb. is a mere orthographic variant, and the committee concludes that the question of homonymy does not arise.

(2) *Disterigma staphelioides* and *D. styphelioides* (*Eriaceae*)

Disterigma is a neotropical genus of 35–40 species and the berries of some species are eaten locally by farmers. However, for the two species that here concern me, I have no reports of them being edible or having vernacular names. These two species have similar names, differing only for one vowel, and are very often pronounced the same way by scientists, being indistinguishable (I have asked many people around me if they hear the difference between them). Both names are legitimate and in current use.

- (a) *Disterigma staphelioides* (Planch. ex Wedd.) Nied., Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 11: 210. 1889. *Vaccinium staphelioides* Planch. ex Wedd., Chlor. And. 2: 180. 1857. Type: Colombia. Cauca: Popayán, Páramo de Guanacas, s.d. (fl), Hartweg 1214, (holotype, P; isotype, B?, BM, C, K, fragment L ex K, NY, fragment NY ex K).

Disterigma staphelioides is widespread in the northern Andes from Monte Roraima in the border of Guyana, Brazil and Venezuela, going through the three Colombian cordilleras as south as Nariño. In the original description Planchon did not specify what Latin root he was using, and nothing in the name seems to be related with the species morphology. These are the closest Latin roots I have found but I can't relate any of them to the plant morphology or the places where they grow: (a) *Staphylea*, a genus in *Staphyleaceae*; (b) *Staphyla*, the name of a woman; (c) *Staphis*, a plant; and (d) *Staphylus*, a son of Silenus who taught the art of mixing wine and water.

- (b) *Disterigma styphelioides* potentially to be published in future based on *Killipiella styphelioides* A.C. Sm., J. Wash. Acad. Sci. 33: 243. 1943. Type: Colombia. Chocó: Corcovado region, upper Río San Juan, ridge along Yeracüi Valley, 200–275 m, 24–25 Apr 1939 (fl), Killip 35222 (holotype, US).

This species is endemic to the department of Chocó (Colombia). It is very rare and it is only known from three collections, the most recent one from 1984. It was named after the genus *Styphelia* (*Epacridaceae*, *Ericaceae*) that vegetatively resembles it. The genus *Killipiella* was synonymised under *Disterigma* some years ago, but the new combinations have not yet been made. Already I have found confusion in herbaria between *staphelioides* and *styphelioides*.

Paola Pedraza (NY).

Committee recommendation. — The second of these names has not yet been published, and the author of the request (who is monographing the genus as her PhD project) asks for our recommendation on whether she should publish it or publish a nom. nov. instead. The only criterion stipulated in Art. 53.3 is whether the names are so similar that they are likely to be confused. It does not mention meaning of names or etymological derivation, nor geographical distribution. It does not actually even mention whether both names are in current use or not. A majority of members think that the two names would be confusable, and favour that recommendation by a vote of 12–6.

(3) *Solanum cheesmaniae* and *S. cheesemanii* (*Solanaceae*)

- (a) *Solanum cheesmaniae*** (L. Riley) Fosberg in *Phytologia* 62: 181. 1987. *Lycopersicon cheesmaniae* (as ‘*cheesmanii*’) L. Riley in *Bull. Misc. Inf. Kew* 1925: 227. 1925. Names after a plant collector Lucy Cheesman.

This is a plant of some economic importance from the Galapagos Islands.

- (b) *Solanum cheesemanii*** Geras. in *Novosti Sist. Vyssh. Rast.* 7: 271. 1971.

This is a name which has scarcely ever been taken up since it was published in 1971, being regarded by most authors as merely a white-flowered variant of the normally purple-flowered *S. aviculare*. It was named after Thomas Frederick Cheesman, author of many works on the flora of New Zealand.

Derived from a conservation proposal by S. Knapp & S.C. Darwin in Taxon 55: 806–807. 2006.

Committee recommendation. — In Proposal 1736 by S. Knapp & S.C. Darwin in *Taxon* 55: 806–807. 2006 to conserve the later name, *S. cheesmaniae*, over the other, the proposers made an assumption that the two names were to be treated as homonyms. Example 30 under Art. 60.11 of the Code states that *Astragalus matthewsii* and *A. matthewsiae* are not homonyms, which is undeniable since they are not spelled identically, but it does not say that they cannot be **treated** as homonyms if they are considered confusable, as noted to the committee by J. McNeill. In fact, in the case below in this report, the committee recommends that *A. matthewsii* and *A. matthewsiae* should be treated as homonyms. The question before the committee therefore is whether these *Solanum* names are confusable or not. Perhaps surprisingly, 7 members consider that these names should be treated as homonyms, while 11 consider that they should

not. The conservation proposal is therefore unnecessary and has been withdrawn.

(4) *Astragalus matthewsii* and *A. matthewsiae* (*Leguminosae*)

- (a) *Astragalus matthewsii*** S. Watson in *Proc. Amer. Acad.* 18: 192. 1883. *A. mollissimus* var. *matthewsii* (S. Watson) Barneby in *Mem. New York Bot. Gard.* 13(1). 1964. Native of New Mexico in the U.S.A., named after Dr. W. Matthews.

- (b) *A. matthewsiae*** Podlech & Kirchhoff in *Mitt. Bot. Staatssamml. München* 11: 432. 1974. *A. victoriae* Podlech & Kirchhoff in *Mitt. Bot. Staatssamml. München* 12: 375. 1976. Native of Turkey, named after Victoria A. Matthews, joint author of *Astragalus* for *Flora of Turkey*.

Submitted by R.K. Brummitt

Committee recommendation. — This *Astragalus* case is quoted in Ex. 30 under Art. 60.11 as an example of correction of the gender of the termination of the epithet, the second name having been mistakenly published as *matthewsii* when named after a lady. Example 30 indicates that correction to *matthewsiae* is required, and (a little confusingly, perhaps, in the absence of any cautionary note) states that “it is not therefore a later homonym of *A. matthewsii* S. Watson”. But this does not rule out the possibility of the names being **treated as** homonyms if they are considered confusable. It should therefore not be taken as an indication that all pairs of epithets differing only in the gender of their termination must necessarily be treated as not being homonyms. The authors of the original name of the Turkish species replaced that name two years later by *A. victoriae*, and it appears that this is the name in current use. The ILDIS database gives no guidance, but the major work by Podlech, *Thesaurus Astragalarum* (1996) lists *A. matthewsiae* as illegitimate because of *A. matthewsii* and accepts *A. victoriae*. In this case, stability will therefore apparently be promoted if the committee opts for the view that the two names should be treated as homonyms. By a vote of 11–7 the committee recommends that *Astragalus matthewsii* and *A. matthewsiae* are sufficiently alike to be confused.

(5) *Hulsea* and *Hullsia* (both *Asteraceae*)

- (a) *Hulsea*** Torrey & A. Gray, *Pac. Railr. Rep.* 6(3): 77. 1858 (*Asteraceae*).

Hulsea is the type of the relatively new subtribe *Hulseinae* B.G. Baldwin (2002) of the re-recognized tribe *Millerieae* Lindl.—part of the *Heliantheae* s.l.; the second genus in the subtribe is *Eatonella* A. Gray. The genus was revised by Wilken (in *Brittonia* 27: 228–244. 1975) and consists of 7 species, a number still recognized by Panero in the *Heliantheae* s.l. account in Kubitzki’s *FGVP Compositae* volume. Wilken also provided the genus account in the recently published *Flora of North America* (21: 396–400. 2006), where the common name of the genus was also referred to as Alpinegold. Three species were also treated in Cronquist’s *Intermountain Flora* (5: 86–88. 1994), with no apparent dif-

ference of species concepts. The genus was named in honour of Dr Gilbert White Hulse (1807–1883), a physician (U.S. army surgeon) and plant collector. It is distributed in western U.S.A., northwestern Mexico (Baja California). There appear to be no cultivated species of the genus, and no obvious economic value is mentioned anywhere. Only one or two taxa appear to be of some conservation concern although that is not quantified/specified in the FNA account.

(b) **Hullsia** P.S. Short in *Muelleria* 20: 58. 2004 (*Asteraceae*).

This is a relatively recent segregate from *Brachycome* Less., with the sole species *H. argillicola* P.S. Short from northern Australia. *Hullsia* was unplaced in the last major account for the tribe/family, the Kubitzki FGVP *Compositae* volume by Nesom & Robinson [2006: 342](2007), where not even a description of the genus was provided. There appear to be no other accounts than the protologue. The generic-specific description was based on *Hullsia argillicola*. Short provided the following explanation of the etymology: ‘The generic name commemorates an early “Top End” collector with the surname of Hulls, a person who in Bentham’s *Flora Australiensis* is accredited with having gathered no fewer than 27 collections from Escape Cliff and 11 from Adam Bay. As far as could be ascertained by Short the collector was “Charles Hulls (his surname in *Flora Australiensis* sometimes spelt as “Hulse” or “Hullse” who was a member of John McKinlay’s party which in 1866 unsuccessfully attempted a journey from Escape Cliff to the Liverpool River ...’ The genus/species is restricted to northern Australia, with the majority of collections made in the Northern Territory. Ecologically Short recorded the species as DD, Data Deficient. The species appears to have no economic importance at all. Apparently early collections of the taxon were referred to *Brachycome*, and in particular *B. basaltica*, a taxon bearing a superficial resemblance.

D.J.N. Hind, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, U.K.

Committee recommendation — In favour of their being treated as homonyms are the probably almost identical pronunciation, their being in the same family, the fact that the Australian explorer Hulls was sometimes spelled Hulse, and the little use of the name since it was published. Against that view are their non-overlapping distributions and the rather obviously different spellings. The committee votes by 2–16 that the names should not be treated as homonyms.

(6) **Pleioogyne (Asteraceae) and Pleogyne (Menispermaceae)**

(a) **Pleioogyne** K. Koch in *Bot. Zeit.* 1: 40. 1843 (*Asteraceae*).

Koch (l.c.) proposed the new genus *Pleioogyne* and, in the first taxon of unspecified infrageneric rank, ‘*I. Strongylosperma* Less.’, included the type of Lessing’s *Strongylosperma*, *S. australe*, thereby making *Pleioogyne* superfluous and illegitimate. Six species were placed in this ‘new’ genus, all of which are now considered still to belong in *Cotula* L. Koch’s name has remained in synonymy, although in a number of works the generic name has been recorded as be-

longing to the *Menispermaceae*, e.g., Chapman (*Austral. Pl. Name Ind.* K–P, 1991), where in compounded errors *Strongylosperma* Less. was also ascribed to the *Menispermaceae*, as was ‘*Anacyclis australis* Spreng.’ (= *Cotula australis* (Sieber ex Spreng.) Hook. f. [*Compositae*]; Quattrocchi (*CRC World Dict. Pl. Names* 3 (M–Q). 2000).

Etymology (ex Quattrocchi, l.c.): Greek *pleios* ‘many, more than one’ and *gyne* ‘a woman, female [female organs]’.

(b) **Pleogyne** Miers in *Ann. Nat. Hist.*, ser. 2, 7: 37 (in key). 1851 (*Menispermaceae*).

The key by Miers (Miers, l.c.) provided the validating diagnostic characters, and first mention of the generic name *Pleogyne*; no species were recorded for the genus at this point. One species were recorded by Bentham (*Fl. Austral.* 1. 1863), and the second added ‘unintentionally’ by Miers (in *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.*, ser. 3, 19: 319–330. 1867) is now reduced to synonymy of the type. Forman (in *Kew Bull.* 30: 77–100. 1975) in a regional revision recognized one species, *Pleogyne australis* Benth., noted by Chapman (l.c.) as the ‘lectotype’.

Etymology (ex Quattrocchi, l.c.): Greek *pleon*, ‘many, more’ and *gyne* ‘a woman, female, female organs’.

D.J.N. Hind¹ & A.R. Bean²

¹Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, U.K.

²Queensland Herbarium, Brisbane Botanic Gardens, Toowoong, Queensland, Australia

Committee recommendation. — *Pleioogyne* in *Asteraceae* is illegitimate and can never be used. *Pleogyne* in *Menispermaceae* is later but is in current use for a monotypic genus from Australia. The etymological derivation is the same for both names. A decision was asked for on whether *Pleogyne* can be used in the account of *Menispermaceae* for *Flora of Australia*. One name is in current use and one is not and, moreover, is illegitimate and so can never be used. The committee considered whether this is an over-riding factor, or whether the marked similarity in pronunciation and spelling and the same derivation more important. The new second sentence in Art. 53.3 of the *Vienna Code* says that “if established practice has been to treat two similar names as homonyms, this practice is to be continued if it is in the interests of nomenclatural stability”. But in this case the established practice is *not* to treat two similar names as homonyms, which is the converse of this sentence in the *Code*. The implication, however, might be that established practice should be respected. In the vote, 6 members voted that the names should be treated as homonyms, while 12 voted that they should not.

(7) **Habenaria elliotii and H. elliotii (Orchidaceae)**

(a) **Habenaria elliotii** L.C. Beck, *Bot. North. Middle States*: 348. 1833, was published for a North American taxon, named after Stephen Elliott.

(b) **Habenaria elliotii** Rolfe, *J. Linn. Soc., Bot.* 29: 57. 1891, is from Madagascar, named after G.F. Scott-Elliot.

Hermans (*Orchids Madagascar*, ed. 2, 195. 2007) treats the names as homonyms and has published *Habenaria clareae* Hermans to replace *H. elliotii* Rolfe. *Habenaria*

elliottii Rolfe is an accepted name in the World Checklist whereas *H. elliottii* L.C. Beck is a synonym of *Platanthera integra* (Nutt.) L.C. Beck.

Flora of North America also accepts *P. integra* and doesn't even mention *H. elliottii*. In the second edition of his own work, Beck placed *H. elliottii* in the synonymy of *P. integra*. I'm inclined to say that the two names aren't homonyms, and Hermans has published a nom. superfl.

Katherine Challis, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, U.K.

Committee recommendation. — The names differ only in one having a single 't' and the other having a double 't'. Pronunciation in English would be identical. The later name, *H. elliottii*, has been used recently, whereas the earlier name seems to be now consigned to synonymy. But a nomen novum has been proposed by an author who considers the names should be treated as homonyms. This again tests whether the committee thinks the similarity of the names is the over-riding issue, or whether current usage is of greater importance. The votes are 10 in favour of treating them as homonyms and 7 not in favour of that.

(8) *Salix skvortzovii* and *S. skvortsovii* (Salicaceae)

(a) *Salix skvortzovii* Y.L. Chang & Y.L. Chou in Y.L. Chou & al., Woody Pl. Xiao Hingan Mts.: 86. 1955. Named after B.V. Skvortsov.

(b) *Salix skvortsovii* Sennikov in Komarovia 4: 400. 2006. Named after A.K. Skvortsov.

Working on the checklist of *Salicaceae* s.str. I have found it necessary to clarify the situation regarding four names: *Salix* ×*pentandroides* Rouy, *S. pentandroides* A.K. Skvortsov, *S. skvortzovii* Y.L. Chang & Y.L. Chou and *S. skvortsovii* Sennikov. The name *Salix* ×*pentandroides* Rouy, was validly published by Rouy in 1904 (in Rev. Bot. Syst. Géogr. Bot. 2: 168) for the triple hybrid *S. fragilis* × *alba* × *pentandra* without any description but with indirect reference to C. Beckmann who gave a formal description of the hybrid in his *Florula Bassumensis* (1889). Therefore, the name *S. pentandroides* A.K. Skvortsov published in 1961 is a later homonym as mentioned in "A nomenclatural note on *S. pentandroides* A. Skvortsov" by Alexander N. Sennikov (in Komarovia 4: 140. 2006). Sennikov presented arguments that this name was not validly published and made a formal description of a new species—*S. skvortsovii* renamed by him after A.K. Skvortsov. However, there is another species in *Salix* with a very similar name, *S. skvortzovii* described by Y.L. Chang & Y.L. Chou in 1955. The description of this willow, in English, is on the website http://www.efloras.org/object_page.aspx?object_id=2115&flora_id=2. It is interesting, that this species was named after another person, B.V. Skvortsov, but with a different transliteration of only one Russian letter.

Following the articles 53.3 and 53.5 of the ICBN, the name *S. skvortsovii* Sennikov may have to be treated as an illegitimate later homonym of *S. skvortzovii* Y.L. Chang & Y.L. Chou, because both these names are "based on different types and are so similar that they are likely to be confused". Also the name *S. skvortzovii* Y.L. Chang & Y.L. Chou was

still used in the recently published *Flora of China* (1999) even though it is, in my opinion, a synonym of *S. kangensis* Nakai. Does the committee think the later name should be treated as a homonym?

Irina Belyaeva, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, U.K.

Committee recommendation. — These two *Salix* names are named after different people called Skvortsov/Skvortzov with transliterations from the Russian differing only in one letter. Again the case could be influenced by the earlier name being suggested as only a synonym, but that is at present only one person's opinion. The votes are 16 in favour of treating them as homonyms and 1 not in favour of that.

Requests for recommendations on whether a descriptive statement represents a "description or diagnosis":

(1) *Brugmansia aurea* Harrison, Floricultural Cabinet and Florist's Magazine 5: 144. 1837

I am writing a horticultural and botanical monograph of *Brugmansia*, and, digging around in mid-19th Century horticultural literature, I have come across a possibly validly published occurrence of a name which threatens one in widespread current use. I want if possible to make the earlier one "go away". The current name which I want to protect is *Brugmansia aurea* Lagerh. (Gartenflora 42: 33. 1893) which seems perfectly OK apart from this threatening earlier occurrence of the binomial. *Brugmansia aurea* in Lagerheim's sense is in widespread use in horticultural, ethnobotanical and phytochemical literature and has been at least since the 1950s. The newly found earlier instance was published by Harrison in 1837 (see above) and appears thus in a series of little articles collected together under a heading "Miscellaneous Intelligence" [my comments in square brackets]:

"BRUGMANSIA AUREA, etc. — On visiting the gardens of Mr. Barratt of Wakefield, we were very much pleased to find plants about two feet high in bloom of the true yellow flower seed Pomagamansia [sic — no such genus in ING or IPNI] (see Advertisement in this month's Cabinet) [RBG Sydney copy not bound with advertisements included, so I haven't seen if there is anything illuminating there]. The flower is about the size of the *B. sanguinea*, but of fine rich golden yellow colour. There is an inferior kind in the country, the flowers of which are of a dull buff colour, and which has been sold out for the true *B. aurea*; this has led to the denial (by many persons) of their [sic] being a real golden yellow kind. The true one is a very desirable plant for any cultivation. ... [then goes on about another plant altogether]."

It seems probable to me that this refers to yellow-flowered forms of *Brugmansia sanguinea*. *Brugmansia sanguinea* was introduced to U.K. from Ecuador as seed in 1832 and raised to flower the following year in both the normal red-and-yellow and the yellow-only variant which latter became known somewhat later as *Brugmansia lutea* and/or *Brugmania sanguinea* var. *flava*. It does occur in various shades of yellow from dull to intense. *B. aurea* in this sense seems never to have been taken up for this plant.

There is no evidence, that I am aware of, of *B. aurea* in its current sense being cultivated in U.K. until the 20th Century. Does the committee consider the 1837 instance is validly published, and if so, do they think it can be rejected in favour of *B. aurea* Lagerh.?

Alistair Hay, Royal Botanic Garden, Sydney, Australia

Committee recommendation. — The 1837 context is entirely non-scientific and non-taxonomic, and many would say that the name should not be treated as validly published. On the other hand, some might make a case for saying that

there is a diagnosis from *B. sanguinea*. The only characters given are the plant being two feet high and having yellow flowers, but was any intention by the author to describe a new species? However, intent is not a component of Art. 32.1, and the committee is only required to recommend ‘whether a descriptive statement satisfies the requirement of Art. 32.1(d) for a “description or diagnosis”’. In the vote, 14 members considered that there was a description or diagnosis, and that the name should, therefore, be treated as validly published, while 3 did not.

(1861) Proposal to conserve the name *Aspicilia farinosa* (Ascomycota: Pertusariales: Megasporaceae) with a conserved type

Anders Nordin¹ & Claude Roux²

¹ Museum of Evolution, Uppsala University, Norbyvägen 16, 752 36 Uppsala, Sweden. anders.nordin@evolvemuseum.uu.se (author for correspondence)

² Chemin des Vignes vieilles, 84120 Mirabeau, France

(1861) *Aspicilia farinosa* (Flörke) Hue, Nouv. Arch. Mus. Hist. Nat. sér. 5, 2: 61. 1910 (*Urceolaria calcarea* var. *farinosa* Flörke in Mag. Neuesten Entdeck. Gesammten Naturk. Ges. Naturf. Freunde, Berlin 1810: 125. 1810 (‘λ’), nom. cons. prop. Typus: [France, Île-de-France], ‘Ad saxa calcarea prope Moret’, Nylander, [Herb. Lich. Paris. No. 127, sub *Lecanora cinerea* var. *calcarea* (*farinosa* Ach.)] (UPS), typ. cons. prop.

Aspicilia farinosa (Flörke) Hue is a name that for a long time has been applied to a widely distributed and well delimited crustose lichen species in southern Europe and northern Africa, distinguished from *A. calcarea* (L.) Mudd. mainly by its 8-spored asci and the distinctly smaller spores. It is included in influential lichen floras and checklists covering these areas, such as Ozenda & Clauzade (Les Lichens, 1970), Clauzade & Roux (in Bull. Soc. Bot. Centre-Ouest Numero Special 7: 1–893. 1985), Nimis (Lichens Italy, 1993), Hafellner & Türk (in Stapfia 76: 1–167. 2001), Llimona & Hladun (in Bocconea 14: 1–581. 2001), Clerc (in Cryptog. Helv. 19: 1–320. 2004), and Nimis (Checkl. Ital. Lich. 3.0. <http://dbiodbs.univ.trieste.it/global/italic1>; consulted 6 June 2008), although with incorrect author citations, with the combination into *Aspicilia* attributed to Arnold. Arnold (in Flora 67: 409. 1884), however, used the epithet at subspecific level in a numbered list of species (‘210. *Aspicilia calcarea* ... **A. farinosa* Fl.’ followed by ‘211. *A. ceracea*’). This way of indicating a subspecific level was widely used in the 19th century, and it was consistently used by Arnold in *Die Lichenen des fränkischen Jura*, of which the cited *Flora* paper was a part.

The first valid transfer to specific rank was made by Hue (l.c.). Like Arnold (l.c.), Hue was aware of the fact that

two different taxa were involved in the application of the epithet *farinosa*, one identical or closely related to *A. calcarea*, with a reduced number of large spores in the asci (usually four), and one having 8-spored asci and distinctly smaller spores. Among others, Massalongo (Sched. Crit.: 148. 1855) as *Pachyospora farinosa*, and Hepp (Flechten Europas No. 628), as *Lecanora calcarea* β *farinosa*, referred to the former, while the latter was referred to by Nylander (in Bull. Soc. Linn. Normandie, ser. 2, 6: 307 (note). 1872) and Flagey (Lichenes Algeriensis Exsiccati No. 244) as *Lecanora farinosa*. The identity and whereabouts of Flörke’s original material remain unknown, Hue chose to base his species concept on the small-spored taxon. This has been widely adopted since (see above).

Recently a new *Aspicilia* species, *A. substerilis* Sipman (in Biblioth. Lichenol. 96: 267. 2007) was described. In connection with this Sipman (l.c.) reported that original material of *Urceolaria calcarea* var. *farinosa* Flörke had been found in B, and that this material neither agreed with *A. substerilis* Sipman, nor with *A. farinosa* sensu Hue. Flörke’s material, however, is not in very good condition, and it is not possible to judge whether it belongs to *A. calcarea* or represents a distinct species. If this material were to be designated lectotype of *Urceolaria calcarea* var. *farinosa* Flörke, the current application of *A. farinosa* could no longer be maintained and the application of the name would be obscure. Consequently, we propose the name *A. farinosa* for conservation with a conserved type, cited above. The conserved type proposed represents the same material as was discussed both by Hue (l.c.), Arnold (l.c.) and Nylander (l.c.).