

Report of the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants: 69

Wendy L. Applequist

Missouri Botanical Garden, P.O. Box 299, St. Louis, Missouri 63166-0299, U.S.A.; wendy.applequist@mobot.org

DOI <https://doi.org/10.12705/662.17>

Summary The following ten generic names are recommended for conservation: *Brachypterum* against *Solori*, *Casearia* against *Laetia* and *Samyda*, *Cathaya* Chen & Kuang against *Cathaya* Karav., *Forsteronia* with a conserved type, *Iochroma* against *Acnistus* and *Pederlea*, *Miconia* against *Maieta* and *Tococa*, *Pinochia*, *Scytophyllum* Bernem. against *Scytophyllum* Eckl. & Zeyh., *Selenia* Nutt. against *Selenia* Hill, and *Stellaria* with a conserved type. The nothogeneric name \times *Brassolaeliocattleya* is recommended for conservation with that spelling and against \times *Brasso-catt-laelia* and \times *Laelia-brasso-cattleya*. The nothogeneric name \times *Laburnocytisus* is recommended for rejection. The generic name *Trisetum* is not recommended to be conserved against *Trisetaria*. The following 13 species names are recommended for conservation: *Acalypha brasiliensis* against *A. subsana*, *Acalypha communis* against *A. hirsuta*, *Andropogon caricosus* with a conserved type, *Astragalus membranaceus* Fisch. ex Bunge against *A. membranaceus* Moench, *Carex rostrata* against *C. inflata* and with a conserved type, *Chalcas paniculata* with a conserved type, *Drynaria fortunei* with a conserved type, *Hymenaea stigonocarpa* with a conserved type, *Malus domestica* against *M. pumila* and six other synonyms (contradicting a previously published recommendation), *Myriophyllum spicatum* with a conserved type, *Odontarrhena obovata* against *O. microphylla*, *Selinum microphyllum* with a conserved type, and *Sobralia infundibuligera* against *S. aurantiaca*. The following three species names are not recommended for conservation: *Dalbergia polyphylla* Benth. against *D. polyphylla* Poir., *Drosera \times belezeana* with a conserved type, and *Macroclinidium trilobum* with that spelling. The following eight species names are recommended for rejection: *Aloe obscura*, *Aloe picta*, *Aristolochia cordata*, *Cereus cubensis*, *Cereus subrepandus*, *Chenopodium caudatum*, *Corylus virginiana*, and *Crocus purpureus*. The species name *Aloe perfoliata* is not recommended for rejection. The varietal name *Aloe perfoliata* var. *saponaria* is recommended for rejection. It is recommended that the conserved author, place and date of publication of *Actinidiaceae*, *Lardizabalaceae*, *Melanthiaceae*, and *Primulaceae*, and the conserved place and date of *Eucommiaceae*, be changed. It is recommended that *Andinia* and *Andina* be treated as homonyms. It is not recommended that *Huperzia rubricaulis* and *H. rubricaulis*, *Pittosporum napaulense* and *P. napaliense*, or *Senecio petasioides* and *S. petasitoides*, be treated as homonyms. It is recommended that “*Euonymus bullatus* Wall. ex G. Lodd.” and “*Thea piquetiana* Laness.” be treated as not validly published. It is recommended that *Der sichere Führer in der Obstkunde*, Miller’s *Gardeners Dictionary* abridged edition 4 [species and infraspecific taxa], and Glaziou’s *Plantae Brasiliae centralis a Glaziou lectae* be added to the list of “Suppressed Works”. After two ballots, no vote of at least eleven either for or against has been obtained for proposals to reject *Alyssum hyperboreum* or *Pteris semipinnata* or to conserve *Rhaponticoides* against *Bielzia*, *Rhaponticum* with a conserved type, *Aloe parvibracteata* against *A. monteiroae*, *Dyschoriste humilis* with a conserved type, *Pteris semipinnata* with a conserved type, or *Salvia cruikshanksii* with that spelling, or for requests to determine whether the descriptive texts of “*Erica longipedunculata* G. Lodd.”, “*Goodyera tessellata* G. Lodd.”, “*Pittosporum angustifolium* G. Lodd.”, or “*Tillandsia amoena* G. Lodd.” were adequate for valid publication.

The previous report of this committee appeared in *Taxon* 65: 1153–1165. 2016. This report is being published to cover the last committee ballot whose included proposals can be dealt with by the General Committee before the XIX International Botanical Congress in Shenzhen in July 2017. Members eligible to vote on that ballot were W.L. Applequist (St. Louis, U.S.A., Secretary), P. Daniel (Nagercoil, India), R. de Mello-Silva (São Paulo, Brazil), R. Fortunato (Buenos Aires, Argentina), K. Gandhi (Cambridge, U.S.A.), R. Govaerts (Kew, U.K.), N. Kilian (Berlin, Germany), R.R. Klopper (Pretoria, South Africa), V. Malécot (Angers, France), J. Murata (Tokyo, Japan), J. Prado (São Paulo, Brazil), J.P. Roux (Cape Town, South Africa), P.A. Schäfer (Montpellier, France), A. Sennikov (Helsinki, Finland, Chairman), R. Sorong (Washington, U.S.A.), M. Thulin (Uppsala, Sweden), P. Vorster (Stellenbosch, South Africa), and P.G. Wilson (Sydney, Australia). As the Committee had 18 members at the time of the reported ballot, though one member abstained from voting on most proposals, a minimum of 11 votes is required for recommendation that a proposal be accepted or rejected. Vote counts for proposals are given, in order, as votes for the proposal–votes against the proposal–abstentions.

Proposals to conserve or reject names

(1722) To conserve *Carex rostrata* Stokes (*Cyperaceae*) against *C. inflata* Huds. and with a conserved type. Proposed by A. Molina,

C. Acedo & F. Llamas in *Taxon* 55: 532–533. 2006. Votes: 16–1–1 (recommended).

Carex rostrata has been in common use for over 200 years for a sedge that is widely distributed in boreal regions of Eurasia and North America. The name appears in a great deal of literature. The older taxonomic synonym *C. inflata* has been much less often used, and is problematic because Hudson changed its application in a later edition of *Flora anglica*. Molina & al. therefore proposed to conserve the well-known younger name. The Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants (NCVP) at the time strongly favored that action, voting 16–0–2 to support conservation (Brummitt in *Taxon* 56: 1292. 2007).

Carex rostrata had not been typified, and no original herbarium material could be found. Under the *Code*, one of the illustrations cited by Stokes would have to be selected as lectotype. None of these were very good, and at best, would require an epitype to stabilize the meaning of the name. They proposed instead to conserve as type a specimen that was not original material, which had been collected in 1844 from one of the locations (Islay) mentioned in the protologue. Most members of this Committee at the time thought that the proposers should have lectotypified the name and designated an epitype. We voted 11–7 to insist that the proposers adopt that approach. Molina then provided a lectotype designation (published in Brummitt, l.c., of an illustration Brummitt described as “poor”), combined with a designation of the Islay specimen as an epitype.

The General Committee reviewed this proposal just before the Melbourne Congress. That Committee did not think we should have pressured Molina & al. to choose the option of designating a lectotype and epitype, because if the inadequate lectotype were ever proven to represent a different taxon, another conservation proposal would be necessary (Barrie in Taxon 60: 1212. 2011). They voted to return the proposal to us for further discussion. Therefore, we now vote to recommend the proposal as originally published.

(1841) To conserve *Rhaponticum* Ludwig (*Asteraceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by W. Greuter in Taxon 57: 1001 [and cf. 1015]. 2008. Votes: 9–8–1 (neither recommended nor rejected).

This proposal deals with a group of over two dozen Eurasian species that were previously known as *Rhaponticum*. The earliest publication of that name, *Rhaponticum* Ludwig, is typified by *C. jacea* L., so it is a younger nomenclatural synonym of *Jacea* Mill. (= *Centaurea* L.). However, the name was not usually applied to that group, but to a group including *C. rhaponticum* L. An attempt was made to conserve the name *Rhapontica* Hill (dated 1762, typified by *C. rhaponticum*) against the near-homonym *Rhaponticum* Ludwig (Dittrich in Taxon 22: 314–315. 1973). That proposal failed, at least partly because some members of the then Committee for Spermatophyta did not believe that the two names should be treated as homonyms. If everyone agreed that *Rhapontica* could be used, the species now incorrectly called *Rhaponticum* could simply be transferred to *Rhapontica*, with the orthography of the epithets corrected. However, nobody chose to do that. Instead, some people started using *Leuzea* DC., or both *Leuzea* and *Stemmacantha* Cass., for these species. Greuter now wishes to retypify *Rhaponticum* so that the name can continue to be used, with that orthography, for the group including *C. rhaponticum*. We now have to ask whether action to protect *Rhaponticum* is still timely, since some botanists have been using *Leuzea* and *Stemmacantha* for forty years. At least one species of this group is commercially important, so there are many references to it online and in scientific literature—however, many of these call it *Leuzea*. After two votes, the Committee is almost evenly divided.

(1842) To conserve *Rhaponticoides* Vaill. against *Bielzia* Schur (*Asteraceae*). Proposed by W. Greuter in Taxon 57: 1001 [and cf. 1015–1016]. 2008. Votes: 7–10–1 (neither recommended nor rejected).

After *Centaurea* L. was conserved with a conserved type, about 20 species of the former subg. *Centaurea* needed to be excluded from *Centaurea*. The only available generic name was *Bielzia*, which had never been used. Another name referable to this group would have been “*Rhaponticoides*” as published by Vaillant (in Phys. Abh. Königl. Akad. Wiss. Paris 5: 165. 1754) in a translation of a pre-Linnean work. The concept of “*Rhaponticoides*” represented there included 29 or 30 species from over a dozen genera; *C. centaurium* L. was chosen as type of “*Rhaponticoides* Vaill.” so that the name could be applied to the group of former *Centaurea* species. However, that work has since been recommended for suppression. Anticipating that action, Greuter (in Taxon 57: 1016. 2008) re-published the name, crediting it to Vaillant, to provide a place of valid publication. He then asked to conserve the newly validated *Rhaponticoides* against the correct name, *Bielzia*. The latter had not been used in prior literature, but neither had *Rhaponticoides* until 2003, though it has since been used in some literature. Many of the Committee thought that the correct name should have been adopted. After two votes, we cannot achieve a consensus regarding this proposal.

(1933) To conserve *Malus domestica* Borkh. against *M. pumila* Miller, *M. communis* Desf., *M. frutescens* Medik., and *Pyrus dioica*

Moench (*Rosaceae*). Proposed by G.-Z. Qian, L.-F. Liu & G.-G. Tang in Taxon 59: 650–652. 2010. Votes to conserve *M. domestica* against the four proposed names plus *P. praecox* Pall., *M. dasyphylla* Borkh., and *M. paradisiaca* (L.) Medik.: 11–7–0 (recommended).

Both *Malus pumila* and *Malus domestica* are very widely used names for the cultivated apple. *Malus domestica* became popular recently, beginning in western countries, and is now the dominant name. Its conservation against the correct name, *M. pumila*, and three other older synonyms was requested in this proposal. With the proposers’ permission, the proposal was amended to include *P. praecox* and *M. dasyphylla*, which also had priority over *M. domestica*. However, the NCVP ultimately chose to recommend against the proposal by a vote of 6–11–1 (Applequist in Taxon 63: 1359. 2014) because of the substantially greater history of use of *M. pumila*.

Some members of the General Committee were not satisfied with this decision, so the proposal was returned to the NCVP with instructions to discuss it further with reference to current usage. Such usage is difficult to quantify or to localize geographically. Wiersema (pers. comm.) generously searched several major online bibliographic indices for usage of “*Malus domestica*” (with or without an × or x preceding the epithet, as the name was formerly considered to represent a nothotaxon) and “*Malus pumila*”. In total, he found 32,445 references to “*Malus domestica*” and 49,874 references to “*Malus pumila*”. Before 1980, *M. pumila* was overwhelmingly dominant; the two names had roughly similar usage in the periods of 1981–1990 and 2001–2010, though *M. pumila* was used almost twice as often as *M. domestica* in the 1990s. However, from 2011 to 2016 the usage was overwhelmingly of *M. domestica*, 8503 uses vs. 424.

Several NCVP members looked at literature or commercial websites from their own nations; most reported that *M. domestica* was preferred, but since members are few in number and disproportionately from western countries, geographic coverage was very limited. Browsing on Google Scholar for post-2012 publications gave the impression that continued use of *M. pumila* in that era was largely by researchers in non-western countries, often in fields such as plant pathology, biomedicine, food science, and ecology. *Malus domestica* seemed to be most strongly preferred by researchers from anglophone, German-speaking, and Spanish-speaking nations and in the field of genetics or genomics, though it is now popular in all fields.

In a repeat vote taken on this ballot, a narrow majority now recommend the proposal. Because of the limited time available to us for discussion, it is not possible to report whether those members who changed their votes placed most weight on the newly received information on post-2010 patterns of usage, the apparent support of the General Committee for the proposal, or some other unidentified factor. Since the NCVP has now published two directly opposing recommendations regarding this proposal, the General Committee must take a definitive vote to dispose of the proposal.

(1969) [misnumbered 1947 in Taxon] To conserve *Trisetum* Pers. against *Trisetaria* Forssk. (*Gramineae*). Proposed by A. Quintanar & S. Castroviejo in Taxon 59: 1602. 2010. Votes: 3–13–2 (not recommended).

This is an older proposal that was never fully resolved by the pre-Melbourne NCVP. *Trisetum* is usually used for a group of about 70 perennial grasses that are widespread in northern and southern temperate regions. Though it originally included annual grasses, most recent authors place most or all annual species in *Trisetaria*. There are about 18 annual species, which have a narrower distribution. There is some evidence that the annual species should be placed into the

same genus as the perennial species. *Trisetum* is more widely used, but is a younger name. Using *Trisetaria* would require about 50 new combinations to be published. Quintanar & Castroviejo therefore sought to conserve *Trisetum*. At the time, the NCVP was divided on the merits of the proposal. Brummitt, the Secretary at the time, did not conduct a vote on the proposal partly because he wanted to see more evidence to support the proposed taxonomy. That did not happen, and after Melbourne the proposal was overlooked for some time.

The proposal cited the molecular data of Quintanar & al. (in Amer. J. Bot. 94: 1554–1569. 2007), which included ITS and *trnT-trnF* sequence data, presented separately because of their inconsistencies. Topologies were weakly supported in both trees, but showed that *Trisetum* was not monophyletic; species of *Trisetum* were scattered in a clade including species of *Rostraria*, *Gaudinia*, *Kolelaria*, *Parafestuca* and possibly others including *Avellinia*. It was noted that some annuals were put in *Rostraria* and that *Avellinia* had once been put in *Trisetaria*. No better molecular data have been seen. Wölk & Röser (in Taxon 63: 773–788. 2014) presented a phylogeny of other *Aveneae* in which the single included species of *Trisetum* and *Trisetaria* were not grouped together. It is not clear whether Quintanar & al., or others, would wish to recognize a huge *Trisetum*, including what are now considered to be several genera, or ultimately to break it up. In any case, existing molecular data appear too weak to justify any taxonomic action that does not have morphological support. This is probably why nobody has renamed these species in the nine years since their paper was published. Given the uncertain taxonomy and the probability that *Trisetum* should be reduced in size, the value of this proposal seemed limited. It is therefore not recommended.

(1979) To conserve *Odontarrhena obovata* C.A. Mey. against *O. microphylla* C.A. Mey. (*Brassicaceae*). Proposed by D.A. German in Taxon 59: 1897–1898. 2010. Votes: 12–4–2 (recommended).

This proposal by German was intended to protect the name *Alyssum obovatum* (C.A. Mey.) Turcz., the most often used name for a widespread species of *Alyssum* that extends from eastern Europe to eastern Asia and North America. Most literature from the past 60 years accepts this name. *Alyssum microphyllum* (C.A. Mey.) Steud. has sometimes been recognized as a different species, but most now treat it as conspecific with *A. obovatum*. The basionym of *A. obovatum*, *O. obovata*, dates to 1831, whereas the basionym of *A. microphyllum* dates to 1830. However, past authors usually chose to treat *A. microphyllum* as a synonym of *A. obovatum* or to ignore the problem. Hence, *A. obovatum* remains much more widely used. When the NCVP discussed this proposal in 2011, it received broad support. The proposal implied that a change in species concepts, broad vs. narrow, justified conservation as if the name had actually been misapplied. This is incorrect. However, most of us thought that the volume of literature using *A. obovatum* did justify conservation.

We did not vote on this proposal because German then identified another older name, *Alyssum fischerianum* DC., that he believed applied to *A. obovatum* sensu lato. Unless *A. obovatum* were also conserved against *A. fischerianum*, Prop. 1979 would be useless. German therefore submitted Prop. 2058 (in Taxon 61: 470. 2012) to conserve *O. obovata* against *A. fischerianum*. We learned that if *A. obovatum* were to be less broadly defined in future, *A. fischerianum* would become the correct name for a group of east Siberian populations now placed within *A. obovatum*. Since *A. fischerianum* had been broadly misapplied to a species in a different section of *Alyssum*, that would be confusing and undesirable. With German's permission, we voted 14–0–2 to reject *A. fischerianum* under Art. 56 (cf. Taxon 62:

1318. 2013). We should then have returned to Prop. 1979 and voted on it as well. However, the need to do so was accidentally overlooked. We have now voted on this proposal and recommend its acceptance.

(2095) To conserve *Scytophyllum* Bornem. (fossil *Pteridospermae: Peltaspermopsida*) against *Scytophyllum* Eckl. & Zeyh. (*Celastraceae*). Proposed by A.B. Doweld in Taxon 61: 1128–1129. 2012. Votes: 14–2–2 (recommended).

This proposal was published simultaneously with Prop. 2096, a proposal to conserve the fossil name *Scytophyllum bergeri* Bornem. with a conserved type. The Nomenclature Committee on Fossils has primary responsibility for both proposals. However, the NCVP should also give its opinion on the former proposal, and the General Committee has asked us to do so. The NCFossils strongly recommended Prop. 2095, which would conserve a fossil *Scytophyllum* against a living-plant *Scytophyllum*. The living plant genus, *Scytophyllum* Eckl. & Zeyh., had included only one species. It is now included in the much larger *Gymnosporia* (Wight & Arn.) Benth. & Hook. f.; *Gymnosporia* is a younger name but has been conserved against *Scytophyllum* Eckl. & Zeyh. Molecular data show *Gymnosporia* to be monophyletic, so there should be no need to use *Scytophyllum* Eckl. & Zeyh. in future. Therefore, we have no reason to object to this proposal and support the recommendation of the NCFossils.

(2121) To conserve *Brachypterum* (Wight & Arn.) Benth. (*Leguminosae*) against *Solori* Adans. Proposed by Y. Sirichamorn, F.A.C.B. Adema & P.C. van Welzen in Taxon 62: 179–180. 2013. Votes: 11–5–2 (recommended).

Brachypterum (Wight & Arn.) Benth. is a group of eleven legume species that were, until recently, usually treated as *Derris* Lour. sect. *Brachypterum* (Wight & Arn.) Benth. Geesink in 1984 proposed to segregate *Brachypterum* from *Derris*, but this was not generally accepted at the time. The type of *Solori* Adans., a name that has never been in use, belongs to this group. *Derris* is already conserved against *Solori*. Geesink (in Taxon 33: 743–744. 1984) therefore proposed to conserve *Brachypterum* against *Solori*. The Committee for Spermatophyta at the time rejected the proposal because *Brachypterum* itself had rarely been recognized as a genus, and there was no evidence that it should be.

After molecular data showed that the segregation of *Brachypterum* from *Derris* was correct, this proposal again sought to conserve the former. We voted against it, 4–11–1 (cf. Applequist in Taxon 42: 1324. 2013). Supporters favored protecting a generic name in use over an entirely unfamiliar synonym. Those who voted against it argued that *Brachypterum* had little history of use; that the publication of eleven combinations in *Solori* would not require much effort; and that Geesink, after the failure of his 1984 proposal, should have accepted *Solori* and published those combinations instead of continuing to favor *Brachypterum*. (As a rule, once a proposal has failed, authors should adopt the correct name instead of continuing to use the wrong name until enough history of use has been created that the nomenclature committees feel coerced to approve a duplicate proposal.)

The General Committee objected to the last argument. They observed that the conditions of the two proposals were different: Geesink had no evidence that his preferred taxonomy was correct, whereas Sirichamorn & al. did, so more people are now adopting *Brachypterum*. Therefore, they felt that NCVP members should not have considered the existence of Geesink's proposal in judging Sirichamorn & al.'s. We were asked to vote again on Prop. 2121, specifically *not* considering the history of the controversy. From that

viewpoint, enough of us have changed our votes that we now recommend this proposal. *Brachypterum* still has a short history of use at the generic level, but *Solori* still has none, and the needed combinations in *Solori* still have not been published. Accepting the name in current use seems reasonable.

(2360) To reject *Chenopodium caudatum* Jacq. (*Amaranthaceae*/*Chenopodiaceae*). Proposed by D. Iamónico, A.P. Sukhorukov & J.L. Revel in *Taxon* 64: 638–639. 2015. Votes: 13–3–2 (recommended).

Chenopodium caudatum was validly published with the illustration of a whole plant and floral detail; a later work included a description and gave its provenance as “Guinea Africae”. The illustration is the only material eligible as lectotype. It might represent the species now called *Chenopodium acuminatum* Willd. s.l. (an Asian species that does not occur in Guinea). However, the illustration is inaccurate, so cannot be relied upon. Early authors transferred *C. caudatum* to at least two other genera, but there is virtually no recent use of the name. Many authors treat *C. caudatum* or a replacement name, *Amaranthus gracilis* Desf., as a synonym of *A. viridis* L. A specimen that might be original material, though its status can’t be proven, is a species of *Amaranthus*, but probably not *A. viridis*. However, Jacquin’s illustration, as bad as it is, is clearly not compatible with identification as an *Amaranthus*. Since we cannot determine the correct application of this name, it seems very reasonable to get rid of it.

(2370) To conserve *Salvia cruikshanksii* Benth. (*Lamiaceae*) with that spelling. Proposed by L. Cairampoma, C. Martel & R. Claßen-Bockhoff in *Taxon* 64: 850–851. 2015. Votes: 6–10–2 (neither recommended nor rejected).

Salvia cruikshanksii is a suffrutescent, tomentose *Salvia* endemic to the Peruvian Andes. Benthham named the species after the collector of one of two specimens seen, Cruickshanks. Benthham misspelled Cruickshanks’s name both in the epithet and in the specimen citation. Most floristic literature maintained that spelling, but *Index Kewensis* corrected the epithet to “*cruickshanksii*” (which has been used in other genera) and several major databases have followed their lead. The two versions are almost equally used. Some think that this is an acceptable automatic correction of a typographical or orthographic error under Art. 60.1 of the *ICN*. The authors of this proposal feel that the correction is an “undesirable name change” that would threaten nomenclatural stability. After two votes, the Committee cannot achieve consensus on this proposal. It is not clear whether all those who oppose the proposal do so because they think the automatic correction is desirable, or because they think it is unnecessary to conserve the original and therefore usable spelling.

(2371) To conserve *Dalbergia polyphylla* Benth. against *D. polyphylla* Poir. (*Fabaceae*: *Papilionoideae*). Proposed by S.-J. Li, K.-L. Long, T.-Y. Tu & D.-X. Zhang in *Taxon* 64: 851–852. 2015. Votes: 3–14–1 (not recommended).

The illegitimate later homonym, *Dalbergia polyphylla* Benth., is in use for a Philippine legume. The earlier homonym, *D. polyphylla* Poir., has been ignored in most literature; the proposal authors agree that it is a synonym of *Glottidium vesicarium* (Jacq.) R.M. Harper. It is thus not in use, nor is it likely to be used in future. However, *D. polyphylla* Benth. does not seem to be much used outside the typical botanical literature (local checklists, etc.). A majority of the Committee considered that this was a case in which the principle of priority might be allowed to apply.

(2373) To conserve *Casearia* Jacq. against *Laetia* Loefl. ex L. and *Samyda* Jacq. (*Samydaceae*). Proposed by T. Samarakoon & M.H. Alford in *Taxon* 64: 853. 2015. Votes: 13–4–1 (recommended).

The proposal authors have been conducting phylogenetic studies of *Samydaceae*. A few genera are not monophyletic, including *Casearia* (which has about 200 species, widely distributed in tropical and subtropical regions). Almost all species of *Casearia* are found in a clade of about 215 species, within which four small genera or portions of small genera are embedded. These include the type and six other species of *Laetia* (which now has 10 species) and all nine species of *Samyda*. Both of those names have been conserved for various reasons, and *Laetia* is also older; thus, if no action is taken, *Laetia* would be the correct name for the entire group. Samarakoon & Alford wish to avoid this for two reasons. First, fewer than 30 names or combinations are available in *Laetia*, so over 180 new names or combinations would have to be published; if *Samyda* were used, over 100 new names or combinations would be needed. Second, *Casearia* is more familiar globally as many species are found in both the Old and New World tropics, whereas *Laetia* and *Samyda* occur only in the New World. Thus adoption of *Laetia* would require far more name-changing. The proposal acknowledges that *Samyda* might be desirable to preserve because it is the basis for a tribal and family name, but notes that it has a messy nomenclatural history and a limited distribution. A majority of the Committee considers conservation reasonable.

(2385) To conserve *Pteris semipinnata* L. (*Pteridaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by J. Mazumdar in *Taxon* 64: 1055–1056. 2015. Votes: 6–10–2 (neither recommended nor rejected).

Here and below (Prop. 2386), we have competing proposals to deal with a single problem. *Pteris semipinnata* is generally used for a subtropical fern found in scattered localities over much of southern and southeastern Asia. The existing lectotype material belongs to the very similar species *P. dispar* Kunze, as is an illustration in a book by Osbeck, who supplied the type specimen. Fraser-Jenkins and Ebihara, in Prop. 2386, say that *P. dispar* is a more temperate and eastern species, native to China, Taiwan, Japan and Korea. They say it is frequently confused with *P. semipinnata*, to the point that the *Flora of China* treatment gives a broader distribution that actually includes some *P. semipinnata*. Mazumdar in this proposal accepts that broader distribution for *P. dispar*.

If the rules are applied, *P. semipinnata* would become the correct name for *P. dispar*, increasing the already existing confusion between them, and the correct name for the subtropical species would become *P. alata* Poir. Mazumdar proposes to conserve a type that (presuming its own identity is not open to question) would allow the continued use of *P. semipinnata* in its traditional sense as well as of *P. dispar*. This proposal received less support than the alternative of Prop. 2386, but, probably because two competing options were available, neither one received solid support or rejection after two ballots.

(2386) To reject *Pteris semipinnata* L. (*Pteridaceae*). Proposed by C.R. Fraser-Jenkins & A. Ebihara in *Taxon* 64: 1056. 2015. Votes: 7–8–3 (neither recommended nor rejected).

This proposal offers the alternate means of preventing the redefinition of *Pteris semipinnata*. Fraser-Jenkins and Ebihara prefer simply to reject *P. semipinnata*, since it has been widely misapplied, and allow *P. alata* Poir. to be used for the subtropical species. Ebihara has already begun using *P. alata*. This action would preserve the use of *P. dispar* for the east Asian species. The proposal states that *P. semipinnata* is no more widely referred to than many other subtropical

Asian species of *Pteris*, so allowing its name to be replaced by an existing synonym will not be disruptive. The species is of no importance to commerce or conservation, though it has limited medicinal use, which has inspired some chemical research. This argument was convincing to some members of the Committee, but others favored Prop. 2385, so after two ballots no consensus was achieved.

(2387) To conserve *Dyschoriste humilis* Lindau (*Acanthaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by C. Ezcurra & C.I. Calviño in Taxon 64: 1057–1058. 2015. Votes: 7–10–7 (neither recommended nor rejected).

Dyschoriste humilis is a perennial herb of eastern South America. The name was published with a description and citation of specimens, but with the cited synonym of *Ruellia geminiflora* Kunth var. *humilis* Griseb. Hence, it is interpreted as a new combination based on that name. However, *Ruellia geminiflora* var. *humilis* was validly published only as a new combination based on *Dipteracanthus humilis* Nees. Hence, the name should be *Dyschoriste humilis* (Nees) Lindau, and it should be a nomenclatural synonym of *Dipteracanthus humilis* Nees. Unfortunately, it seems that the relationship between these names was frequently overlooked. Lindau himself later published the combination *Ruellia humilis* (Nees) Lindau for *Dip. humilis* without noting any relationship to *Dys. humilis*. *Dipteracanthus humilis* is now considered to be a synonym of *Ruellia geminiflora*; if *Dys. humilis* were likewise to be placed into that synonymy, there seems to be no existing synonym that could be used for the species now called *Dys. humilis*. The proposers therefore seek to conserve *Dys. humilis* with a conserved type, which is one of the collections studied by Lindau. The proposal does not claim that the name is widely used, outside the usual taxonomic literature. However, if it is not conserved as being distinct from *Dip. humilis*, a new name (for, technically, a new taxon) would have to be published. After two ballots, a consensus regarding the value of this proposal has not been obtained.

(2399) To conserve *Aloe parvibracteata* Schönland against *Aloe monteiroae* Baker (*Asphodelaceae: Aloioideae*). Proposed by R.R. Klopper, N.R. Crouch & G.F. Smith in Taxon 64: 1320. 2015. Votes: 9–8–1 (neither recommended nor rejected).

Aloe parvibracteata is a variable species that ranges from South Africa to Mozambique and Zimbabwe; it has been consistently recognized for more than a century in the literature on African *Aloe*. *Aloe monteiroae* had been described earlier from living material sent to Kew. The preserved material of *A. monteiroae* was very small and poor, and its description did not well match any known aloe species or population. Though at first it was included in taxonomic works as an accepted species, for several decades it was usually treated as a nomen ambiguum. Now, a population of *A. parvibracteata* in Mpumalanga, South Africa has been found that shares the characteristics of *A. monteiroae*. The proposal authors have concluded that they are conspecific (as did Carter in Fl. Zambesiaca 12(3): 70. 2001). *Aloe parvibracteata* is used for morphologically diverse populations, whereas *A. monteiroae* has been used only for an unusual variant of the species. Hence, conservation of *A. parvibracteata* is requested. After two ballots, it has not been possible to achieve consensus regarding this proposal.

(2404) To reject *Alyssum hyperboreum* L. (*Draba hyperborea* (L.) Desv., *Schivereckia hyperborea* (L.) Berkut.) (*Brassicaceae*). Proposed by S.L. Mosyakin in Taxon 64: 1326–1328. 2015. Votes: 7–10–1 (neither recommended nor rejected).

Alyssum hyperboreum and combinations based on it have been widely used for a *Draba* species of trans-Beringian distribution (i.e., northwestern North America and northeastern Asia). An available synonym for that species is *Draba grandis* Langsd. ex DC. Linnaeus's publication of *A. hyperboreum* includes a citation of a pre-Linnaean description by Krashennikov and a description of herbarium material received from him. That material was believed to have been grown in Russia from seeds collected in North America. It is argued that Krashennikov's description includes two different species, and that the origin of his cultivated material is uncertain. The lectotype in LINN and a possible isotype fragment at LE apparently do not belong to the trans-Beringian species. They have been suggested to belong to *Draba podolica* (Besser) Rupr., an Eastern European species. From viewing digital images, Mosyakin does not think that the type of *A. hyperboreum* is conspecific with the type of *A. podolicum* Besser (though he does not confirm that that type is consistent with the current usage of *A. podolicum*). However, he is certain that the type material of *A. hyperboreum* does not belong to the trans-Beringian species. He would therefore like to reject *A. hyperboreum* as ambiguous.

Even if someone else is able to identify the type material, if it belongs to any species other than the one for which it is now used, its redefinition would be confusing. In particular, applying *D. hyperborea* to *D. podolica* is said to be undesirable because *D. podolica* is red-listed and is known in horticulture. An alternative would have been to conserve a new type for *A. hyperboreum* to save the name *D. hyperborea*. Mosyakin apparently does not care if that name is lost, but others might. We were also informed that in some recent Russian and eastern European literature, *D. hyperborea* or *Schivereckia hyperborea* is accepted and used in a manner allegedly consistent with its current type. After two ballots, we have not reached a consensus on this proposal.

(2420) To conserve *Cathaya* Chun & Kuang (*Pinaceae*) against *Cathaya* Karav. (fossil *Gymnospermae*). Proposed by A.B. Doweld in Taxon 65: 187–188. 2016. Votes: 14–3–1 (recommended).

Cathaya is used for a single extant conifer species, which is endemic to China, and up to 23 fossil species. “*Cathaya* Chun & Kuang” first appeared in print in 1958, but was not validly published because it included two extant species and a fossil, without selecting one as the type. Chun & Kuang (in Acta Bot. Sin. 10: 245. 1962) later validated the name with a publication in which only the extant *C. argyrophylla* Chun & Kuang was included. However, before they did that, Karavaev (in Trudy Moskovsk. Obshch. Isp. Prir. 3: 127. 1961) had already described a Siberian fossil species in *Cathaya* and thus validly published the generic name. This was largely overlooked by researchers studying extant conifers. Most of the fossil species included in *Cathaya* are based only on pollen, and they seem to be heterogeneous. *Cathaya jacutica* Karav., the type of *Cathaya* Karav., has cones that are significantly different from those of *C. argyrophylla* or, it seems, the better-known fossil species of *Cathaya*. Doweld says that this species was probably more closely related to *Pseudotsuga* and needs to be placed in a separate fossil genus. If it remains the correct type of *Cathaya*, the extant species and associated fossil forms will all have to be transferred to a new genus, as no synonyms exist. Since *C. argyrophylla* is endangered in the wild and appears in horticulture, it receives some public attention. Conservation is recommended.

(2421) To conserve *Forsteronia* G. Mey. (*Apocynaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by M.E. Endress & B.F. Hansen in Taxon 65: 189. 2016. Votes: 12–4–2 (recommended).

This is one of two linked proposals dealing with generic names in *Apocynaceae*. As now defined, *Forsteronia* G. Mey. includes 42 Neotropical species. The publication of *Forsteronia* included two species, *F. corymbosa* (Jacq.) G. Mey. and *F. spicata* (Jacq.) G. Mey., whose basionyms were in *Echites*. Cassini (in Bull. Sci. Soc. Philom. Paris 1820: 7. 1820) specified *F. corymbosa* to be the “type”. This unusual early use of that word was overlooked by later authors, and Woodson’s (1935) superfluous designation of *F. spicata* as type was generally accepted until J.-S. Girard recently pointed out that there was a prior typification. Molecular data now show that *F. corymbosa* and three other species, which are also distinguished by morphological characters, are not closely related to the rest of *Forsteronia* (tribe *Mesechiteae*), and actually belong in a different tribe (*Odontadenieae*). If no action is taken, all species of *Forsteronia* as now defined would have to be transferred to *Aptotheca* Miers, requiring 41 new combinations, and the small group in *Odontadenieae* would be called *Forsteronia*. The proposal asks to conserve *F. spicata* as type, preserving the customary use of the name. A majority recommends the proposal.

(2422) To conserve *Pinochia* M.E. Endress & B.F. Hansen (*Apocynaceae*). Proposed by M.E. Endress & B.F. Hansen in Taxon 65: 189. 2016. Votes: 13–3–2 (recommended).

This proposal is linked to Prop. 2421, above. Before *Forsteronia corymbosa* was recognized to be the legal type of *Forsteronia*, it and three other species were found to form a natural group that was not closely related to the remainder of *Forsteronia*, including about 38 species. Since there appeared to be no existing generic name for the smaller group, Endress & Hansen published *Pinochia* for it, designating *P. corymbosus* (Jacq.) M.E. Endress & B.F. Hansen as type. When it was discovered that *F. corymbosa* was the correct type of *Forsteronia*, that made *Pinochia* illegitimate. If *Forsteronia* is conserved with a conserved type, as recommended, Endress & Hansen then wish to conserve *Pinochia* so it remains usable for the smaller group. The proposal admits that the name was published recently (so it cannot have been used in much literature) but argues that there is no point in requiring a new generic name to be published. We are usually not sympathetic when proposal authors seek to legitimize their own erroneously published names. However, in this case the authors acted in accordance with a generally shared belief that the type of *Forsteronia* was *F. spicata*, so they were not negligent. A majority of the Committee recommend conservation.

(2426) To conserve *Drynaria fortunei* T. Moore (*Polypodiaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by J. Mazumdar in Taxon 65: 388–389. 2016. Votes: 12–5–1 (recommended).

This proposal deals with a fern of southern and eastern Asia, which since 2010 has been called *Neolepisorus fortunei* (T. Moore) Li Wang. *Drynaria fortunei* is the basionym for that name and the previously used name, *Microsorium fortunei* (T. Moore) Ching. Moore described *D. fortunei* mostly from living cultivated plants, but he also cited a herbarium specimen, *Fortune 18* (now at K). Kuo (in *Taiwania* 30: 68. 1985) effectively designated that specimen as the lectotype and, noting that it had characters of *Lepisorus*, transferred the species to *Lepisorus*. Fraser-Jenkins (Taxon. Revis. Three Hundred Indian Pteridoph.: 70. 2008) identified *Fortune 18* as a specimen of *L. nudus* (Hook.) Ching. He attempted to retypify *D. fortunei* to allow the continued use of the epithet for the species to which it has usually been applied, but could not supersede Kuo’s choice of type. The proposed type in this proposal is the specimen that Fraser-Jenkins

wanted to designate as type. If the name and type are not conserved, an existing synonym will have to be brought into use for the species now called *N. fortunei*. According to two recent taxonomic treatments, the oldest such synonym is based on *Polypodium chinense* Mett. ex Kuhn. However, Fraser-Jenkins considers this to be a different species, *Microsorium chinense* (Mett. ex Kuhn) Fraser-Jenk. If *N. fortunei* can no longer be used, there may be disagreement over what name should be used. Therefore, the proposal is recommended.

(2427) To conserve *Stellaria* L. (*Caryophyllaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by V.N. Tikhomirov in Taxon 65: 389–390. 2016. Votes: 16–2–0 (recommended).

Stellaria is a well-known genus of 120 to 200 species that is widespread in temperate areas. Recent molecular studies have shown that it is not monophyletic. Most species belong in *Alsineae*; most of those form a clade, but the remainder are paraphyletic with regard to several genera. The current type of *Stellaria*, *S. holostea* L., is reported to be at the base of this grade, as sister to a large clade that includes most *Stellaria* species but also *Cerastium*, *Dichodon*, *Holosteum*, and *Moenchia*. There is no enthusiasm for lumping all of these other genera into *Stellaria*; rather, smaller monophyletic genera are to be split off from *Stellaria* as needed. To preserve *Stellaria* for the large group of species, rather than reducing it to perhaps only one species, conservation of a new type is necessary. If that is not done, we are told that most *Stellaria* species will have to be transferred to *Alsine* L., if that genus includes *Myosoton* Moench, or to *Larbrea* A. St.-Hil. if *Alsine* is instead broken up into smaller genera. An estimated 100 to 120 new combinations would be required in either scenario. Conservation seems appropriate.

(2428) To conserve *Drosera ×bezeana* E.G. Camus (*Droseraceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by J. Schlauer & A. Fleischmann in Taxon 65: 390. 2016. Votes: 6–11–1 (not recommended).

Drosera ×bezeana was described from a French specimen by Camus, who proposed that it was a hybrid between *D. rotundifolia* L. and *D. intermedia* Hayne. Such hybrids have since been found elsewhere in Europe and North America, and this name has become generally used for them. The holotype of *D. ×bezeana*, however, is now determined not to be a hybrid, but simply a specimen of *D. rotundifolia*. Bailey (in *Pl. Carnivora* 37: 45. 2015) has therefore proposed a new name, *D. ×eloisiana*, to replace *D. ×bezeana*. The authors of this proposal prefer to retain the older name, since Camus correctly specified the parentage of the entity to which it is now applied. There is some interest in this plant among horticulturists and collectors who specialize in carnivorous plants (most of whom seem to misspell the epithet *beleziana*). However, most of the Committee were not convinced that the name was used widely enough to make its replacement by *D. ×eloisiana* disruptive.

(2429) To conserve *Acalypha communis* Müll. Arg. against *A. hirsuta* Mart. ex Colla (*Euphorbiaceae*). Proposed by J.M. Cardiel & P. Muñoz-Rodríguez in Taxon 65: 391. 2016. Votes: 13–4–1 (recommended).

This is the first of two proposals dealing with South American species of *Acalypha*. *Acalypha communis* is widely distributed in five countries. It is said to be the most common species in the north of the Southern Cone and is mentioned in many floristic works, as well as ethnobotanical and pharmacological literature. It is polymorphic and has complicated infraspecific taxonomy, with five subspecies now recognized. *Acalypha hirsuta*, which had a protologue too poor

to allow identification of the species involved, was largely ignored by later authors, and not even mentioned in most treatments of *Acalypha*. However, herbarium materials seen by Colla have been located and studied by Moraes & al. (in Harvard Pap. Bot. 19: 143–155. 2014). The specimen designated as lectotype of *A. hirsuta* has been identified as belonging to *A. communis*. The proposal seeks to avoid the replacement of a widely used, familiar name with a name that has virtually never been used. A majority of the Committee recommends that action.

(2430) To conserve *Acalypha brasiliensis* Müll. Arg. against *Acalypha subsana* Mart. ex Colla (*Euphorbiaceae*). Proposed by J.M. Cardiel & P. Muñoz-Rodríguez in Taxon 65: 391. 2016. Votes: 14–3–1 (recommended).

This case is almost exactly parallel to that of Prop. 2429. *Acalypha brasiliensis* is a somewhat less widely used name than *A. communis*: the species is found only in Brazil and Argentina, but has seven varieties described. *Acalypha subsana* was also mostly ignored in major treatments, although a couple of recent authors have listed it as an accepted species. Moraes & al.'s study (in Harvard Pap. Bot. 19: 143–155. 2014) determined that *A. subsana* is an older synonym of *A. brasiliensis*. Conservation of the name that has been generally used for 150 years is supported by a majority of the Committee.

(2431) To conserve *Astragalus membranaceus* Fisch. ex Bunge against *A. membranaceus* Moench (*Leguminosae*). Proposed by C. Du, W.L. Applequist, P. Liu & J. Ma in Taxon 65: 392–393. 2016. Votes: 14–3–1 (recommended).

This proposal deals with a widely used Asian medicinal plant that has historically almost always been called *Astragalus membranaceus* Fisch. ex Bunge. It is economically important (sold as *huangqi*) and a frequent subject of scientific study. The species was published simultaneously with *Astragalus mongholicus* Bunge, a very similar taxon that is also used in commerce but considered less desirable. Many recent authors lump that taxon into *A. membranaceus* as *A. membranaceus* var. *mongholicus* (Bunge) P.K. Hsiao, though some still recognize two species. Unfortunately, *A. membranaceus* Fisch. ex Bunge is illegitimate because of the prior existence of *A. membranaceus* Moench, though that name is itself illegitimate and is not used.

If *A. membranaceus* were not conserved, the correct name for it would depend upon what taxonomic treatment one prefers. If one species is recognized, it would be *A. mongholicus* var. *dahuricus* (DC.) Podlech. If two are recognized, it would be *A. propinquus* Schischk. Both of these are little-known, and *A. propinquus* has been used mostly for a species that was considered distinct from *A. membranaceus*. Zhu (in Nordic J. Bot. 23: 283–294. 2005) has proposed a third classification, in which both taxa are combined with the European *A. penduliflorus* Lam. Under that treatment, the correct name for *huangqi* is *A. penduliflorus* var. *dahuricus* X.Y. Zhu. However, this classification, which requires a very broad species circumscription, has not been widely adopted. Conservation of *A. membranaceus* is recommended to protect a name that is familiar to not only botanists, but businesses, health care providers, regulatory agencies, and others.

(2432) To conserve *Hymenaea stigonocarpa* Mart. ex Hayne (*Leguminosae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by I. Mascarenhas Soza, R. Barbosa Pinto & L. Paganucci de Queiroz in Taxon 65: 392–393. 2016. Votes: 14–3–1 (recommended).

This proposal deals with two Brazilian legume species. One of them occurs in northeastern seasonally dry forest vegetation called

“caatinga”; the other occurs in central plateau savanna vegetation known as “cerrado”. The two are sometimes called “jatobá-de-caatinga” and “jatobá-de-cerrado” respectively. We are told that the latter is “one of the most important species of the Cerrado flora” and that it is widely used as a food and a medicinal plant. For almost a century, the caatinga species has been called *Hymenaea velutina* Ducke, while the cerrado species has been called *H. stigonocarpa*. Original material of *H. stigonocarpa* had until recently been unknown, but these authors were able to demonstrate that a collection at M, *Martius* 2473, was original material. This specimen, which will now be the obligate lectotype, belongs to the caatinga species known as *H. velutina*. The epithet *stigonocarpa* also seems to refer to a feature of that species. The use of *H. stigonocarpa* for the cerrado species is certainly a misapplication, but it is of long standing and widespread. The proposal does not say whether other synonyms are available for *H. stigonocarpa*, but if it were to be applied to the caatinga species, given its very common use in recent literature for the cerrado species, substantial confusion could occur. Conservation of a new type is therefore recommended.

(2433) To conserve *Chalcas paniculata* L. (*Rutaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by D.J. Mabberley in Taxon 65: 393–394. 2016. Votes: 16–1–1 (recommended).

Murraya paniculata (L.) Jack (orange jasmine) is a well-known member of the citrus family. It is widely used in horticulture, and is of economic importance as a host for the insect vector of a serious disease of citrus crops. Older literature treated it as a variety or synonym of *M. exotica* L. (whose epithet is younger), but modern literature always uses *M. paniculata* (or, apparently much less often, recognizes the two as distinct species). Mabberley (in Taxon 65: 366–371. 2016) simultaneously published a paper with more details of taxonomy. In that paper, he distinguishes between *M. paniculata* s.l. (the broad view that encompassed *M. exotica*) and *M. paniculata* s.str. As traditionally circumscribed, *M. paniculata* includes at least two distinct geographic groups of wild populations, distributed in tropical Asia and Malesia, as well as cultivated orange jasmine, whose geographic origin is unknown. Mabberley thinks some of the wild populations should be excluded (some as *M. exotica*) and wants to be sure that the portion of the variation including cultivated plants should keep the name *M. paniculata*. Some of the wild populations do not have the typical morphology and are not known to be hosts to the crop disease that is the most important reason for public familiarity with the name.

The basionym, *Chalcas paniculata*, was lectotypified (by Nair in Regnum Veg. 127: 32. 1993) on a Rumphian plate (Herb. Amboin. 5: t. 17. 1747) cited by Linnaeus. This plate is not identifiable, but it definitely does not depict orange jasmine. It may be a mixture of a plant that is not a *Murraya* species and, possibly, *M. heptaphylla* Span. (Ironically, Rumphius's tabula 18 fig. 2 probably does depict *M. paniculata*.) Linnaeus's description was derived from a pre-Linnaean work by Burman rather than from Rumphius's plate. In view of the economic importance of orange jasmine, Mabberley proposes conservation with a conserved type. No specimens associated with Burman are known, but the *Ekeberg* specimen proposed as a type was held in Stockholm at the time of Burman's visit in 1760 and might have been seen by him. This action seems clearly appropriate.

(2434) To conserve *Ioichroma* Benth., nom. cons., against the additional names *Acnistus* Schott and *Pederlea* Raf. (*Solanaceae*). Proposed by J.M.H. Shaw in Taxon 65: 395–396. 2016. Votes: 11–6–1 (recommended).

Ichroma is a genus of perhaps 25 species, plus some suspected hybrids, whose name has already been conserved against three other generic names. Molecular data now demonstrate that *Acnistus arborescens*, the only species currently recognized in *Acnistus*, is embedded within the *Ichroma* clade. All three of Rafinesque's species of *Pederlea* are considered to be synonyms of *A. arborescens*, and *Pederlea* is not in use. Conservation of *Ichroma* against the older names *Acnistus* and *Pederlea* is proposed. The proposal acknowledges that *A. arborescens* has some familiarity to the public, and is relatively often mentioned in literature, because of its use as a food and in horticulture. However, Shaw believes that overall references to *Ichroma* species in taxonomic, horticultural, chemical, and ethnobotanical literature outweigh the widespread use of that one binomial, so proposes conservation. A narrow majority of the Committee concurs.

(2435) To conserve *Selinum microphyllum* Cav. (*Apiaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by M. Fernández, S. Martínez & C. I. Calviño in Taxon 65: 396–397. 2016. Votes: 11–6–1 (recommended).

This is another case in which conservation of a new type will prevent a name that has usually been used for one species from being applied to another. The proposal deals with two species of umbels from Argentina. They have overlapping distributions and altitude ranges. *Mulinum microphyllum* (Cav.) Pers. is considered to have a more northerly distribution and an altitude range of 800–1800 m (all in the Andes Mountains), while *M. hallei* Skottsb. has a more southern distribution extending to the coast, with an altitude range of 50–1200 m. The two are similar, but distinguishable and consistently treated as different species. Study of Cavanilles's original material and illustration of *Selinum microphyllum*, the basionym for *M. microphyllum*, reveals that the material he described was of the species now called *M. hallei*. Without conservation, that species would have to be called *M. microphyllum*, while the species now called *M. microphyllum* would be called *M. morenonis* (Kuntze) Speg. The proposal acknowledges that some literature between 1830 and 1903 correctly used *M. microphyllum* for the southern, lower-altitude species. However, it seems that its misuse for the northern higher-altitude species is ubiquitous in more recent literature. Conservation to preserve that usage is supported by a narrow majority.

(2443) To change the author, place, and date of publication of *Actinidiaceae* Engl. & Gilg, nom. cons. Proposed by A.N. Sennikov in Taxon 65: 633–634. 2016. Votes: 14–3–1 (recommended).

This is the first of six proposals by Sennikov to change the bibliographic information for family names conserved in Appendix IIB. Reveal (in Phytotaxa 6: 1–402. 2010) observed errors in the conserved authorship and/or place of publication of some names. Under the new Art. 14.15 of the *ICN*, such errors can only be corrected by formal conservation, which motivates this series of proposals. *Actinidiaceae* is currently said to have been published by Gilg & Werderm. in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam., ed. 2, 21: 36. 30 Jul 1925. Reveal (l.c.: 10) identified a slightly earlier place of publication. This is a straightforward correction of an error.

(2444) To change the place and date of publication of *Eucommiaceae* Engl., nom. cons. Proposed by A.N. Sennikov in Taxon 65: 633–634. 2016. Votes: 15–2–1 (recommended).

Eucommiaceae is now said to have been published in Syllabus, ed. 6: 145. Jun–Dec 1909. However, Reveal (in Phytotaxa 6: 65. 2010) reported that it had been published in the extremely rare 5th edition, and Sennikov has confirmed this. Like Prop. 2443, this is clearly appropriate.

(2445) To change the author, place, and date of publication of *Lardizabalaceae* Decne., nom. cons. Proposed by A.N. Sennikov in Taxon 65: 633–634. 2016. Votes to change the place and date of publication of *Lardizabalaceae* to Rafflesia: 12. Apr. 1821: 13–4–1 (recommended).

Lardizabalaceae has previously been credited in Appendix IIB to R. Br. in Trans. Linn. Soc. London 13: 212. 23 Mai–21 Jun 1821. Reveal (in Phytotaxa 6: 91. 2010) considered it to be validly published there. Sennikov did not think that Brown's publication was valid, so sought to substitute a report published in 1838 on an 1837 lecture by Decaisne. Brown's publication described an unusual placement character that was said to occur in three unrelated groups, including "*Lardizabaleae*", which were said to be differentiated from "*Menispermeeae*" by that character and by two others that were mentioned but not described. The proposal argued that this did not constitute a diagnosis of *Lardizabalaceae* because the character was also said to be found in other groups. Many of the Committee did not agree with this argument, and Sennikov himself ultimately agreed that Brown's publication could be considered valid. However, he then noted that there was a preprint of that publication (Rafflesia 12: Apr. 1821) dated slightly earlier than the now-accepted place of publication. He therefore proposed to amend the proposal to conserve that preprint as the place of publication. A majority supports that action.

(2446) To change the author, place, and date of publication of *Melanthiaceae* Batsch, nom. cons. Proposed by A.N. Sennikov in Taxon 65: 633–634. 2016. Votes: 14–2–2 (recommended).

Melanthiaceae is now credited to Batsch ex Bork., Bot. Wörterb. 2: 8. 1797. Batsch (Dispos. Gen. Pl. Jenens.: 30, 50. 1786) described the family as "*Melanthia*", but this was not validly published because priority for family names begins on 4 August 1789 (Art. 13.1). Batsch (Syn. Univ. Anal. Gen. Pl. 1793–1794) used family names he had previously used in 1786, including *Melanthia*, but he did not provide either descriptions or direct or indirect references to the previously published descriptions. Sennikov, offering Art. 38 Ex. 18 as a relevant example, considers Batsch in 1793–1794 to have indirectly referred to the 1786 descriptions by a general statement in the preface of vol. 1 of Syn. Univ. Anal. Gen. Pl. that begins: "In dispositione generum plantarum jenensium systema foemineorum florum, necessarium esse declaravi ..." Batsch also refers generally to the 1786 work in the preface to vol. 2. A majority of the Committee agree that this qualifies as an indirect reference.

(2447) To change the author, place, and date of publication of *Primulaceae* Batsch, nom. cons. Proposed by A.N. Sennikov in Taxon 65: 633–634. 2016. Votes: 13–3–2 (recommended).

The situation here is identical to that for *Melanthiaceae*. The name is currently credited to Batsch ex Borkh., Bot. Wörterb. 2: 240. 1797. Batsch in 1794 used *Primulae*, which he had previously described in 1786 (Dispos. Gen. Pl. Jenens.: 32, 59. 1786). He did not give a reference to the 1786 description, except in the general statements regarding the 1786 work in the prefaces to the two volumes of Syn. Univ. Anal. Gen. Pl. Therefore, Prop. 2446 and 2447 should be dealt with comparably. Sennikov has gone through other family names used by Batsch in 1793–1794 and says that no others threaten currently accepted places of publication.

(2455) To conserve *Andropogon caricosus* L. (*Poaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by A.R. Chorghé, S. Dey, S. Halder & P.V. Prasanna in Taxon 65: 885–886. 2016. Votes: 14–3–1 (recommended).

Dichanthium caricosum (L.) A. Camus is used for a cosmopolitan forage grass that is considered superior for use in pastures. It is widespread in Asia, and also recorded in parts of Mesoamerica, the Caribbean, Malesia, and Australia. Hence, it appears in a wide variety of botanical literature as well as nonspecialist literature. Its basionym is *Andropogon caricosus*. The only existing original material for *A. caricosus* is a Rumphius plate (Herb. Amboin. 6: 17, t. 7, fig. 2A. 1750) that Linnaeus had earlier identified as *Saccharum spicatum* L. (= *Perotis indica* (L.) Kuntze). Merrill (Interpret. Rumph. Herb. Amb.: 85. 1917) identified the plate as *Imperata cylindrica* (L.) P. Beauv. The proposal tells us that others have suggested it could even be a *Pennisetum* or *Setaria* species. Hence, conservation of a type that is identifiable and definitely consistent with current usage of the name is proposed. This action seems very reasonable.

(2456) To reject *Crocus purpureus* Weston (*Iridaceae*). Proposed by L. Peruzzi in Taxon 65: 886. 2016. Votes: 16–0–2 (recommended).

The entire protologue for *Crocus purpureus* Weston is: “idem [“*Crocus vernus latifolius*”], flore purpureo magno. / *Large purple crocus*.” No original material exists. It may have derived from a Bauhin polynomial, and thence from other sources that referred to a plant growing around Naples in Italy. However, there is no direct proof of that. It has almost never been used. It may refer to *C. neapolitanus* (Ker Gawl.) Loisel., or possibly to *C. vernus* (L.) Hill. The proposal indicates that the taxonomy of Italian crocuses is somewhat confused, but certainly this name has never been in common use, and the names that it might replace have been. Rejection is entirely appropriate.

(2457) To conserve \times *Brassolaeliocattleya* J.G. Fowler (*Orchidaceae*) with that spelling and against \times *Brasso-catt-laelia* T. Lawr. and \times *Laelio-brasso-cattleya* J.T. Veitch. Proposed by J.M.H. Shaw in Taxon 65: 887. 2016. Votes: 16–1–1 (recommended).

Three different nothogeneric names have been published for the three-genus hybrid formula *Brassavola* R. Br. \times *Cattleya* Lindl. \times *Laelia* Lindl. Their differences were intended to convey more information about what genera and/or intergeneric hybrids were crossed to produce them (e.g., \times *Brasso-laelio-cattleya* was *Brassavola* \times \times *Laeliocattleya*, whereas \times *Laelio-brasso-cattleya* was *Laelia* \times \times *Brassocattleya*). However, under Art. H.4.1 of the *ICN*, only one nothogeneric name for a given formula can be correct. Horticulturists have been using *Brassolaeliocattleya* exclusively, though that is the youngest of these names. The proposal says that 10,320 hybrid grexes are listed under *Brassolaeliocattleya*, and none under the others. Its conservation is therefore requested. The name is usually spelled without the hyphens that it originally included, but hyphens cannot be deleted from a genus (or nothogenus) name without conservation. Hence, the proposer wishes to take this opportunity to conserve the commonly used orthography. This proposal will certainly avoid annoyance for orchid enthusiasts and is strongly recommended.

(2458) To reject *Corylus virginiana* Münchh. (*Betulaceae*). Proposed by N. Holstein & M. Weigend in Taxon 65: 888. 2016. Votes: 16–0–2 (recommended).

This name is never used. The protologue contained a brief description of an American hazelnut species based on three pre-Linnaean literature sources, one of which was based upon another. Münchhausen himself said he did not see any material, and no original material associated with the pre-Linnaean literature could be found. It is not possible to determine the application of the name with certainty. It

might refer either to *Corylus americana* Walter or *C. cornuta* Marshall. Both names are slightly younger, and both species are widespread. Hazelnuts are also of economic and cultural value, increasing the usage of the names. Hence *C. virginiana* is an ambiguous name that could threaten widely used names, and rejection is strongly supported.

(2459) To conserve *Macroclinidium trilobum* Makino (*Asteraceae*) with that spelling. Proposed by C.-F. Zhang, L.-Q. Li & T.-G. Gao in Taxon 65: 889. 2016. Votes: 3–13–2 (not recommended).

We have recently dealt with another case in which Makino gave a species two different epithets in two publications. In this case, the epithets are very similar, and both specimens cited in the first publication are also cited in the second, so it is most logical to treat them as orthographic variants. The species was thought to have been validly published first in 1898 as *Microclinidium trilobum* Makino, and it has been consistently known as *Pertya triloba* (Makino) Makino or as *M. trilobum*. Older publications that spelled the epithet *trilobatum* were considered to be nomina nuda. However, it is now recognized that the name was validly published in 1894 with a brief Japanese description. In that publication, the epithet was given as *trilobatum*. The authors therefore seek to conserve the spelling that is in current use, *trilobum* or *triloba*. The species does not seem to appear in much scientific literature, and if the spelling *trilobatum* or *trilobata* were to be adopted, botanists would likely find it easy to recognize what species was meant because the change is so small. Most of the Committee therefore think that it would not be excessively disruptive to encourage the use of the correct spelling in future.

(2460) To conserve *Selenia* Nutt. (*Brassicaceae*) against *Selenia* Hill (*Hepaticae: Lunulariaceae*). Proposed by I.A. Al-Shehbaz & G. Davidse in Taxon 65: 890. 2016. Votes: 15–1–2 (recommended).

Selenia Nutt. is in current use for a genus of five species of *Cruciferae* that are native to the United States and Mexico. The name has been generally used for that group for almost 200 years. It is a later homonym of *Selenia* Hill, a name published with one species that is referable to the widespread liverwort species *Lunularia cruciata* (L.) Dumort. Hill’s work was mostly ignored by the botanical community. Hill cited Linnaeus’s polynomial of *Marchantia cruciata* L., along with two pre-Linnaean names, but not the binomial itself. The proposal considers this adequate, under Art. 10.2 and Art. 10.3 of the *ICN*, to make *M. cruciata* the obligate type of *Selenia* Hill; that species is the type of *Lunularia* Adans., which predates *Selenia* Hill. Hence, *Selenia* Hill is superfluous and will never be brought into use. This interpretation could be disputed, but if *Selenia* Hill is not a nomenclatural synonym of *Lunularia* Adans., it certainly seems likely to be a taxonomic synonym. If *Selenia* Nutt. were not conserved, a new generic name would have to be published for it. Conservation is recommended.

(2461) To reject \times *Laburnocytisus* C.K. Schneid. (*Fabaceae*). Proposed by J.M.H. Shaw in Taxon 65: 891–892. 2016. Votes: 15–2–1 (recommended).

This proposal is intended to help to preserve the use of the later-published \times *Laburnocytisus* Trel. for a chimaeric graft-hybrid of *Cytisus* and *Laburnum*. The names of such graft chimaeras (here, material of *Cytisus* grafted onto *Laburnum* stock) are governed by the *International Code of Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants*, not the *ICN*. At the moment, the *ICNCP* forbids the use of the same name for a sexual hybrid (e.g., \times *Laburnocytisus*) under the *ICN* and a graft chimaera under the *ICNCP*, but the *ICN* does not. (A proposal to change that will be considered at Shenzhen.) Thus, continued use of \times *Laburnocytisus*

requires conservation under the *ICNCP*, which cannot be done while \times *Laburnocytisus* is available for use. The proposal says that the material Schneider named as \times *Laburnocytisus* was actually a chimaera, i.e., $+$ *Laburnocytisus*, and was incorrectly named under the *ICN*. It assures us that there is no known hybridization between *Cytisus* and *Laburnum*, and that lab attempts to create hybrids have failed. Hence, it is very unlikely that anyone will find a hybrid taxon for which we would want to be able to use \times *Laburnocytisus*. Its rejection, which will allow the conservation of $+$ *Laburnocytisus*, is therefore requested. Since this action will please the horticulturists while not inconveniencing the botanists, it is recommended.

(2462) To conserve *Miconia* Ruiz & Pav., nom. cons., against the additional names *Maieta* Aubl. and *Tococa* Aubl. (*Melastomataceae: Miconieae*). Proposed by F.A. Michelangeli, F. Almeda, M. Alvear & al. in *Taxon* 65: 892–893. 2016. Votes: 16–0–2 (recommended).

This proposal is straightforward, despite the excessive number of co-authors. The tribe *Miconieae* includes *Miconia*, a Neotropical genus of about 1050 species, and 16 other genera. Molecular systematists, including several co-authors, report that all 16 of those genera are embedded within *Miconia*. They see no easy way to divide this tribe up into monophyletic, morphologically distinguishable groups. Many would therefore prefer to lump all species of *Miconieae* into *Miconia*. Two of the other genera, *Tococa* and *Maieta*, have names that would have priority over *Miconia*. *Tococa* now includes 50 species and *Maieta* includes three, though published combinations for 40 others exist. Both have a narrower distribution than *Miconia*. If one of those names were to be used for all *Miconieae*, about 1900 new combinations or new names would be needed, versus fewer than 700 if *Miconia* were used. *Miconia* is already conserved against *Leonicenia* Scop., and conservation against two additional generic names to avoid changing an additional thousand species names seems entirely appropriate.

(2469) To reject *Aloe perfoliata* L. (*Asphodelaceae: Alooideae*). Proposed by R.R. Klopper, G.F. Smith, E. Figueiredo & A.E. van Wyk in *Taxon* 65: 1173–1174. 2016. Votes: 6–11–1 (not recommended).

Klopper & al. seek to reject four problematic aloe names that threaten names in current use for South African aloes. *Aloe perfoliata*, the type of *Aloe*, included sixteen varieties, most of which were unnamed. The first selected lectotype was LINN 442.1, which was annotated by Linnaeus. This specimen is an isolated raceme in poor condition, and its identity cannot be determined. Early authors applied the name to the species now called *A. ferox* Mill. or *A. maculata* All. More recent authors have applied it to the mitre aloe, *A. mitriformis* Mill., or sometimes to the Worcester aloe, *A. microstigma* Salm-Dyck. The description of *A. perfoliata* does not support confident identification with any of those. The proposal argues that allowing *A. perfoliata* to become the correct name for either *A. mitriformis* or *A. microstigma* would be undesirable, given the history of application of the name to other species. Rejection is therefore proposed.

One concern about this proposal is that the name *A. perfoliata* is in common current use. In fact, one reader of this proposal complained that a few decades ago, people were being instructed by the botanical experts to adopt *A. perfoliata*. We are informed that recent usage is for the species otherwise known as *A. mitriformis*. The Plant List (<http://www.theplantlist.org>) accepts *A. perfoliata*, listing among its synonyms *A. mitriformis*, which it claims is illegitimate. Indeed, *A. mitriformis* might be considered an illegitimate replacement for *A. perfoliata*. Miller did not cite the epithet itself, but did cite the species number, a translation of the species description, and the page number where the

species itself, not any of the varieties, appeared. A proposal to amend the *Code* (Prop. 342) would clarify that such unambiguous citations were equivalent to citation of the name itself. If that proposal passes at Shenzhen, *A. mitriformis* will certainly be illegitimate, though it could be conserved. Further, it is not desirable for the type of a generic name to remain unidentified, so some would prefer to see an epitype designated for *A. perfoliata*. Thus, a majority of the Committee are not convinced that rejection of this now widely used name is appropriate. This may create some future difficulty because, though the type of *A. perfoliata* cannot be identified, Klopper (pers. comm.) is confident that it is not *A. mitriformis*. If that can be proven, someone in future may seek to retypify this name to avoid having it redefined again.

(2470) To reject *Aloe obscura* Mill. (*Asphodelaceae: Alooideae*). Proposed by R.R. Klopper, G.F. Smith, E. Figueiredo & A.E. van Wyk in *Taxon* 65: 1173–1175. 2016. Votes: 16–1–1 (recommended).

This and the following proposal are among four proposals by Klopper & al. to reject problematic names in *Aloe*; the Committee does not have definitive votes to report for Prop. 2469 or 2472. Proposals 2470–2472 all seek to reject names that are typified by Dillenius's Plate 15 ("*Aloe africana maculata spinosa minor*"). Reynolds (Aloes S. Africa: 289. 1950), who believed that *Aloe obscura* was an abnormal form or hybrid of *A. saponaria* (Aiton) Haw. (= *A. maculata*), implied that Dillenius's plate should be the type. Klopper & al. accordingly designated it as lectotype. The plate seems to be largely consistent with *A. microstigma*, the Worcester aloe. However, there may be some doubt about that identity. The proposal says that *A. obscura* is now considered a doubtful taxon in sect. *Pictae* ("the maculate aloes"), but that if synonymized with *A. microstigma* (which also has spotted leaves), it will be transferred to sect. *Purpurascentes*.

Miller did not mention a specimen or illustration, but cited a polynomial synonym of Boerhaave (Ind. Alter Hort. Lugd.-Bat. 2: 130, no. 20. 1720). Dillenius also cited that polynomial as a synonym of his "*Aloe africana maculata spinosa minor*". However, Miller did not cite Dillenius. It is therefore questionable whether Dillenius's plate can be considered original material under Art. 9.3. Without the new typification, there would be no basis at all for assigning an identity to this name, and it is certainly ambiguous. Its use is uncommon. Rejection therefore seems reasonable.

(2471) To reject *Aloe picta* Thunb. (*Asphodelaceae: Alooideae*). Proposed by R.R. Klopper, G.F. Smith, E. Figueiredo & A.E. van Wyk in *Taxon* 65: 1173–1175. 2016. Votes: 16–1–1 (recommended).

Aloe picta has been treated as a synonym of *A. maculata*. As described, it included Linnaeus's *Aloe perfoliata*, unnamed vars. θ , λ , μ , and ν . Mottram (in *The Cactician* 1: 11. 2013) believed that Dillenius's Plate 15, which Linnaeus cited under var. μ , was the type of *A. perfoliata*. (However, Klopper & al. have demonstrated that it is not.) Mottram thought that in citing var. μ , Thunberg had included the type of *A. perfoliata*, and therefore chose that plate as the lectotype of *A. picta*. As noted above, the best guess about the identity of Plate 15 is that it pertains to *A. microstigma*. Like *A. obscura*, *A. picta* is a relatively rarely used older name that now threatens *A. microstigma*. Since *A. picta* has usually been considered conspecific with *A. maculata*, this would cause confusion. Rejection seems reasonable.

(2472) To reject *Aloe perfoliata* var. *saponaria* Aiton (*Asphodelaceae: Alooideae*). Proposed by R.R. Klopper, G.F. Smith, E. Figueiredo & A.E. van Wyk in *Taxon* 65: 1173–1175. 2016. Votes: 12–5–1 (recommended).

The same Plate 15 dealt with in the above proposals is the holotype of *A. perfoliata* var. *saponaria*, because it was the only element cited by Aiton. This taxon has been recognized at the species level as *A. saponaria* (Aiton) Haw. The proposal notes that the publication of *A. saponaria* cited *A. obscura* Mill. under *A. saponaria* var. *obscura* (Mill.) Haw., making *A. saponaria* superfluous but not illegitimate (Art. 52.3). The proposal claims that “*A. saponaria* has long been regarded as a synonym of *A. maculata*”, as has *A. picta*. Therefore, both should be rejected to protect *A. microstigma*. However, Vorster (pers. comm.) reports that *A. saponaria* was generally recognized as a distinct species before Glen & Hardy (in Fl. Southern Africa 5(1): 53. 2000) synonymized it with *A. maculata*. *Aloe saponaria* is still widely used in horticulture, and appears in Google Scholar far more often than either *A. maculata* or *A. microstigma*. Klopper (pers. comm.) assured us that this usage is for the species otherwise called *A. maculata*, which means that the reapplication of this name to *A. microstigma* (or some other species that Plate 15 might be thought to depict) would be disruptive. With apologies to the horticulturalists, rejection seems reasonable to avoid that outcome.

(2473) To conserve *Sobralia infundibuligera* Garay & Dunst. against *S. aurantiaca* Linden & Rchb. f. (*Orchidaceae*). Proposed by P. Baranow in Taxon 65: 1176. 2016. Votes: 11–6–1 (recommended).

Sobralia infundibuligera is a distinctive South American species found in three countries and frequently collected. It is occasionally confused with *S. macrophylla* Rchb. f., which has similar flowers. *Sobralia aurantiaca* has been treated as a synonym of *S. macrophylla*. However, Baranow has examined the type specimen of *S. aurantiaca* and has stated that it is undoubtedly *S. infundibuligera*. We were told that *S. infundibuligera* is the only name that has been used for that species, and that it has been used for more than 50 years. (For orchids, which seem to change genus every few years, that is a long time!) Baranow proposed conservation to avoid bringing an unfamiliar and previously misinterpreted name into use. A majority of the Committee considered that reasonable.

(2474) To reject *Aristolochia cordata* L. (*Aristolochiaceae*). Proposed by F.R. Barrie, M. González-Elizondo & M.S. González-Elizondo in Taxon 65: 1176–1177. 2016. Votes: 12–5–1 (recommended).

Aristolochia odoratissima L. is a widespread species in the Caribbean, Central America, and northern South America. Its name has been consistently used since 1763. *Aristolochia cordata* was validly published by reference to a description by Patrick Browne. The only original material is two published illustrations cited by Browne: one by Sloane, which is based on a known specimen at BM, and one woodcut by Hernandez that is not identifiable. Linnaeus later (Sp. Pl., ed. 2: 1362. 1763) published *A. odoratissima*, citing Browne and Sloane (whose figure now serves as its lectotype) but not Hernandez nor *A. cordata*. Therefore, *A. odoratissima* is legitimate but a junior synonym of *A. cordata*. Since *A. cordata* has scarcely been used for the past 250 years, while *A. odoratissima* is found in a fairly large amount of literature, rejection of *A. cordata* is requested to preserve the use of the younger name. A majority recommends it.

(2476) To reject *Cereus subrepandus* Haw. (*Cactaceae*). Proposed by A.R. Franck in Taxon 65: 1177–1178. 2016. Votes: 17–0–1 (recommended)

This is the second of three proposals by Franck to deal with problematic names of Cuban *Cactaceae*. (Prop. 2475 is not being dealt with at this time because of the probability that a change to the *Code*

being proposed at Shenzhen may affect its handling.) *Cereus subrepandus* has usually been treated as a synonym of *Harrisia gracilis* (Mill.) Britton. The description is too limited to know what species was meant. It seems to be probable, but not certain, that a species of *Harrisia* was described. Potentially, that could be some more recently described species whose name would be threatened. Since the name is not in use, rejecting it would have no possible negative effects, and that action is strongly recommended.

(2477) To reject *Cereus cubensis* Zucc. ex Seitz (*Cactaceae*). Proposed by A.R. Franck in Taxon 65: 1177–1178. 2016. Votes: 17–0–1 (recommended).

Cereus cubensis is reported to be a nomenclatural synonym of *Harrisia eriophora* Britton, an illegitimate but commonly used name that Prop. 2475 seeks to protect. However, it probably was intended to refer to a different species. (Proposal 2475 requested the conservation of *Cereus eriophorus* Pfeiff., which was illegitimate when published, to allow it to serve as a basionym for *H. eriophora* also illegitimate when published. At present, conservation of *C. eriophorus* would not render *H. eriophora* legitimate. However, a proposal to amend the *Code* in such a way that it would [Prop. 235] will be considered in the forthcoming Congress. For that reason, the NCVF has delayed consideration of Prop. 2475.) The protologue of *C. cubensis* states that it has large nocturnal flowers and a thick erect stem. The latter character is not typical of Cuban *Harrisia* species. Franck thinks that it probably described the species now known as *Dendrocereus nudiflorus* (Engelm. ex C. Wright) Britton & Rose. However, it could also be a species of *Acanthocereus* or *Hylocereus*. Franck therefore proposes that it should be rejected as ambiguous, which is entirely appropriate.

(2478) To conserve *Myriophyllum spicatum* L. (*Haloragaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by A.N. Sennikov in Taxon 65: 1178–1179. 2016. Votes: 15–2–1 (recommended).

Myriophyllum spicatum is an aquatic species that is widespread in Eurasia, North Africa, and (as an introduced weed) in the Americas. Its range overlaps with that of the Eurasian and North American *M. sibiricum* Kom. Both occur in Sweden, and the original material for *M. spicatum* includes elements of both species as now defined. The first effective typification was by Ghazanfar (in Nasir & Ali, Fl. West Pakistan 113: 4. 1977), who chose Herb. Linn. No. 1123.1 (LINN). This sheet includes two sterile fragments of *M. spicatum* on the right side and two fragments of *M. sibiricum*, one flowering, on the left side. Ericsson (in Nordic J. Bot. 27: 139. 2009) therefore restricted the typification, as allowed under Art. 9.17 of the *ICN*, to the right-hand plants.

Sennikov thinks that the sterile fragments on the type sheet should not count as original material under Art. 8.2 because the diagnosis of *M. spicatum* (“floribus masculis interrupte spicatis”, versus “floribus omnibus verticillatis” in *M. verticillatum*) mentions only inflorescence characters. Under that argument, the left-hand flowering fragment would be the only possible type on Herb. Linn. No. 1123.1, and this would redefine *M. spicatum* as applying to *M. sibiricum*. Some of us question this argument, since Linnaeus certainly saw all of the fragments on this sheet and could have considered vegetative characters in deciding what genus to put the species in. If Ericsson’s typification can stand, no action is necessary. If Sennikov’s retypification must be accepted, then it is certainly appropriate to conserve a different type. Both species are widespread and commonly referenced, and *M. spicatum* has only one usable synonym, which is unfamiliar and whose correct application is not certain. Since we could not reach a consensus on the identity of the current type (an

advisory vote on whether to accept Ericsson's choice of the sterile material was 10–7–1 in favor, we support the proposal.

Proposal 367 would amend the *Code* to explicitly state that all material seen by the author before publication of a protologue, and associated by the author with the name, is original material. If that proposal is accepted by the Nomenclature Section at Shenzhen, this conservation will be unnecessary and might appropriately be omitted from the Appendices. Because the taxa involved are widely referenced, it has not been considered desirable to, possibly, wait six years to determine the status of their names.

Proposals to suppress a work

(19) To add *Der sichere Führer in der Obstkunde* vol. 1–4 by F.J. Dochnahl [Genera and species] to the list of “Suppressed Works”. Proposed by N. Holstein & W. Greuter in *Taxon* 65: 401. 2016. Votes: 16–1–1 (recommended).

Dochnahl, a pomologist, proposed in this work a highly idiosyncratic “pomological nomenclature” paralleling normal botanical nomenclature, in which wild species of apples and other pome fruits were treated as genera or families and cultivated varieties were named as species, with Latin binomials. According to his count, he so published 143 “genera” and 4520 “species”. The proposal notes that those of his “species” that still exist are generally treated as cultivars under the appropriate code of nomenclature. Dochnahl's descriptions of orders, families, etc. are not validly published, but the genera and species would be. As of late 2015, the International Plant Names Index had not listed any of his names, which the proposal describes as “a real nightmare for current indexing systems”. None of these names has ever been used anywhere, and it would now be impossible to fix the meaning of most. This seems like a very solid case for rejection of the entire work.

(22) To add Miller, P. 1754. *The gardeners dictionary*, abridged edition 4. London (TL-2 No. 6056) [Species and infraspecific taxa] to the list of “Suppressed Works”. Proposed by J.H. Wiersema & K.N. Gandhi in *Taxon* 65: 638–639. 2016. Votes: 15–2–1 (recommended).

This was among three proposals (Props. 20–22) to suppress species and infraspecific names from works that did not consistently use binomial names for species. These three works were previously listed or were supposed to have been listed in the *Code* as suppressed, and were omitted from the *Tokyo Code* by editorial error. Since that *Code* was ratified at the St. Louis Congress, it is not possible to reintroduce those works into the list of “Suppressed Works” (*ICN App. VI*) without a new vote. Wiersema & Gandhi have suggested that we need not vote on Prop. 20 and 21 because actions to be proposed at the upcoming Congress by a committee dealing with such works will likely resolve the situation. However, it seems to be particularly important that Miller, *Gard. Dict.*, abr. ed. 4. 1754, be suppressed. It includes some binomials in proper form that would threaten later-published names (e.g., *Alkekengi officinarum*), and a few of these have been databased. Since binomial nomenclature was not consistently used, there had been some consensus in favor of not using species names from this work. It was listed as suppressed in three editions of the *Code* preceding the *Tokyo Code*, from which it was omitted by accident. The work is the source of numerous publications of generic names, which would not be affected by this proposal. The proposal is recommended unless it is rendered unnecessary by actions of the Nomenclature Section at Shenzhen.

(25) To add Glaziou, A.F.M. 1905–1913. *Plantae Brasiliae centralis a Glaziou lectae. Mém. Soc. Bot. France* 1(3): 1–661 (TL-2 No. 2030) [All ranks] to the list of “Suppressed Works”. Proposed by V. de Freitas Mansano & L. Cardoso Pederneiras in *Taxon* 65: 1181–1182. 2016. Votes: 17–1–0 (recommended).

This publication is a catalogue of label data and other data for Glaziou's ca. 22,700 collections made in Brazil. Glaziou included in the catalogue about 700 new names as “n. sp. in herb.” Because the label data included habit and flower color, some of these might be considered as validly published, though others certainly are not differentiated from congeners by those characters. However, it would be very burdensome to determine the status of those 700 names individually. Our late member Gill Perry made note of this publication (in *Taxon* 53: 1105. 2004) as one that might be suppressed to save a great deal of work, unless too many names from it had already been adopted. This proposal now examines that question. Glaziou's names in the International Plant Names Index are mostly annotated as “nomen” (i.e., nomen nudum). About two dozen have been accepted in Forzza & al.'s important list of Brazilian species names (*Cat. Pl. Fungos Bras.* 2010) or treated as basionyms of accepted names. We are told that these include five *Faramea* species, all of which have as descriptive text “Arbuste, fl. bleues” (shrub, flowers blue); those are obviously unacceptable as diagnoses. Most of the accepted names were later used by other authors who provided validating descriptions, so only authorship would change if this work was suppressed. NCVP member Prado (pers. comm.) thinks only one entirely new name would have to be published. It is strongly recommended that the work should be suppressed to reduce inconvenience and possible disruption.

Requests for a binding decision on whether names are sufficiently alike to be confused.

(10) Request for a binding decision on whether *Andinia* (Luer) Luer (*Orchidaceae*) and *Andina* J.A. Jiménez & M.J. Cano (*Pottiaceae*) are sufficiently alike to be confused. Requested by J. Freitas & L. Tonini in *Taxon* 63: 694. 2014. Votes: 11–7–0 (recommended to treat as homonyms).

The generic names in question differ only in the ending of *-a* versus *-ia*. Similar pairs of names have been voted to be confusable or not confusable depending upon individual circumstances, including their derivations and the likelihood of confusion in practice. Both of these genera are relatively recently published, and both occur in the Andes, for which they are named. *Andinia* (published in 2000) now includes 13 species of orchids. *Andina* (published in 2012) includes 7 species of mosses, all endemic to the Andes region. Against this proposal, one might say that it is unusual for vascular plants and mosses to be referred to in the same literature. In favor of the proposal, one might say that since the two genera occur in the same region, species of both might appear together in Red Lists and similar literature. Also, since *Andina* was published only five years ago, it cannot have been used in much literature, so if a replacement name had to be published, there would not be much disruption. A majority support the proposal.

(11) Request for a binding decision on whether *Senecio petasioides* Greenm. ex Donn. Sm. and *Senecio petasitoides* H. Lév. (*Asteraceae*) are sufficiently alike to be confused. Requested by C. Ren, Y.-F. Deng & Q.-E. Yang in *Taxon* 63: 694–695. 2014. Votes: 6–12–0 (recommended not to treat as homonyms).

Senecio petasitoides was published in 1904 for a species from Guatemala. The epithet is derived from *S. petasitis* DC., which it

was noted to resemble. (The orthography, while legal, is poor; most botanists would have spelled it *petasitoides*.) This species has been transferred to *Roldana* La Llave, and two recent authors have treated it as a synonym of *R. oaxacana* (Hemsl.) H. Rob. & Bretrell or *R. petasitis* (Sims) H. Rob. & Bretell. *Senecio petasitoides* was published in 1910 for a species from Guizhou, China. Its epithet is derived from *Petasites* Mill. Handel-Mazzetti, who believed it to be a later homonym of *S. petasoides*, published a new name for it (in *Acta Horti Gothob.* 12: 301. 1938). This name, *Cacalia longispica* Hand.-Mazz., was published as a new taxon with a different type (from Sichuan, China). Later authors argued that the two names actually referred to different taxa. The former name was first resurrected in 1976 as *C. farfarifolia* Siebold & Zucc. subsp. *petasitoides* (H. Lév.) H. Koyama. Recent major Chinese floras recognize both as species of *Parasenecio* W.W. Sm. & J. Small, now called *P. petasitoides* (H. Lév.) Y.L. Chen and *P. longispicus* (Hand.-Mazz.) Y.L. Chen.

If *Senecio petasitoides* is treated as a homonym of *S. petasoides*, *P. petasitoides* could still be used, with authorship ascribed to (H. Koyama) Y.L. Chen. If it is not treated as a homonym, *P. longispicus* could still be used, with authorship ascribed to Y.L. Chen. Therefore this proposal would not be seriously disruptive. However, its relevance is questionable. We might suspect that *S. petasoides* and *S. petasitoides* were confusable if both were in use, but both have been transferred to other genera and one has been sunk in synonymy. Thus confusion will never occur in practice.

(42) Request for a binding decision on whether *Pittosporum napaulense* (DC.) Rehder and *P. napaliense* Sherff (*Pittosporaceae*) are sufficiently alike to be confused. Requested by R.K. Singh in *Taxon* 65: 402. 2016. Votes: 3–15–0 (recommended not to treat as homonyms).

This case involves names that are similar, but have different derivations and geographic distributions. *Pittosporum napaulense* (basionym published in 1824) is said to occur in eight southern Asian countries, including Nepal, as well as, strangely, Madagascar. (The Missouri Botanical Garden's online Catalogue of the Vascular Plants of Madagascar does not list it among the flora.) *Pittosporum napaliense* (published in 1941) is endemic to the Nepali coast on the Hawaiian island of Kauai. It is an endangered species and appears in the IUCN's Red List. The proposer seeks to have the latter name treated as a homonym of the former. He cites two evidences of "confusion". Quattrocchi (*CRC World Dictionary of Medicinal and Poisonous Plants*: 2969. 2012) lists *P. napaliense* as a synonym of *P. napaulense*. This is a definite case of confusion, though Quattrocchi's work is a compilation and not detailed scholarship. Second, Mathias (*Flowering Plants in the Landscape*: 81. 1982) spelled the binomial for Nepali plants as "*napauliense*." Comparable spelling errors can be made even when there is no similar name. These do not give us adequate reason to prohibit the use of a name that has been in use in Hawaii for 75 years with no other apparent problems.

(47) Request for a binding decision on whether *Huperzia rubricaulis* (Alderw.) Holub and *H. rubicaulis* S.K. Wu & X. Cheng (*Lycopodiopsida: Huperziaceae*) are sufficiently alike to be confused. Requested by D.-K. Chen, H. He & L.-B. Zhang in *Taxon* 65: 1184–1185. 2016. Votes: 2–16–0 (recommended not to treat as homonyms).

Huperzia rubricaulis is a New Guinean species. The combination, published in March 1985, is based on *Lycopodium rubricaulis* Alderw., which dates to 1917. *Huperzia rubicaulis* is a Chinese species published in October 1985. One author has considered *H. rubicaulis* to

be a synonym of the Himalayan *H. arunachalensis* (D.D. Pant & P.S. Pandey) Fraser-Jenk.; however, Chen & al. disagree. It seems likely that the authors of *H. rubicaulis* thought the epithet meant "red-stemmed", though in fact it means "having stems like *Rubus*". Most authors have not considered "*rubicaulis*" to be correctable to "*rubricaulis*", since the *Code* does not forbid (and indeed specifically permits in Art. 51.1) the use of epithets whose meaning is not true of the species to which they are applied. The species are from different regions and the epithets differ in a consonant and are pronounced differently. Therefore, the Committee does not support treating them as homonyms.

Requests for a binding decision on the adequacy for valid publication of a descriptive statement

(34) Request for a binding decision on the adequacy of the descriptive statement associated with *Erica longipedunculata* G. Lodd. (*Ericaceae*). Requested by I.M. Turner in *Taxon* 64: 1333–1334. 2015. Votes: 8–9–1 (no recommendation made).

This is among several requests relating to questionably published Loddiges names, having very little descriptive text, for which the NCVP has now voted twice and has not been able to achieve consensus regarding whether or not they are validly published. The potentially descriptive text for "*Erica longipedunculata* G. Lodd." is: "This is a very interesting species; when in bloom, which it is throughout several of the latter months of summer, we consider it singularly beautiful. It is rather dwarf in stature, and while yet in a young state, is frequently all covered with flowers: their long coloured stalks (whence the name) add much to the elegance of the plant. We do not find it more difficult to manage than the other kinds. Care should be taken to support it with a stick, as being extremely slender and brittle, it is very subject to be broken." We could not agree on whether this contained sufficient descriptive text to qualify for valid publication.

(35) Request for a binding decision on the adequacy of the descriptive statement associated with *Euonymus bullatus* Wall. ex G. Lodd. (*Celastraceae*). Requested by I.M. Turner in *Taxon* 64: 1333–1334. 2015. Votes: 6–11–1 (recommended not to treat as validly published).

The potentially descriptive text for "*Euonymus bullatus* Wall. ex G. Lodd." is: "The flowers, though not splendid, have a pleasing and rather singular appearance. The leaves are evergreen, and are very large and handsome." The proposal notes that this is the largest-leaved of 32 Indian species of *Euonymus*. Still, most of the Committee did not consider this text to be adequate for valid publication.

(36) Request for a binding decision on the adequacy of the descriptive statement associated with *Goodyera tessellata* G. Lodd. (*Orchidaceae*). Requested by I.M. Turner in *Taxon* 64: 1333–1334. 2015. Votes: 8–9–1 (no recommendation made).

The potentially descriptive text for this name is: "A native of the colder parts of North America. We received plants of it from New York and Philadelphia, in 1824, and many of them flowered in August and September. It appears to be the Helleborine palustris radice repente tessellatis foliis of Morison, Sect. 12, Tab. 11, No. 10. The leaves are beautifully marked, and remain during the whole of the winter: at this season the plants should be preserved in a cold frame, and in summer ought to be placed in a shady situation. We have found them to succeed very well in small pots planted in rich black peat earth, mixed with a portion of sawdust." The name has in the past been considered validly published because the character of

maculate leaves is specified. However, we could not obtain a consensus in favor of that position.

(40) Request for a binding decision on the adequacy of the descriptive statement associated with *Pittosporum angustifolium* G. Lodd. (*Pittosporaceae*). Requested by I.M. Turner in Taxon 64: 1333, 1335. 2015. Votes: 9–8–1 (no recommendation made).

The potentially descriptive text for this name is: “This has lately been introduced from New South Wales. It is of a delicate habit, having few slender straggling branches, and flowers in June.” The proposal notes that a recent author distinguishes the taxon to which this belongs from two others by its pendulous foliage. The *Horticultural Register* at the time made note of Loddiges’s publication and added “Flowers bright yellow.” The name has in the past been considered to be validly published by Loddiges. However, if the first publication were now considered not to contain a validating description, the second publication might. We could not agree on whether the first text constituted validating description.

(41) Request for a binding decision on the adequacy of the descriptive statement associated with *Tillandsia amoena* G. Lodd. (*Bromeliaceae*). Requested by I.M. Turner in Taxon 64: 1333–1335. 2015. Votes: 7–10–1 (no recommendation made).

The potentially descriptive text for “*Tillandsia amoena* G. Lodd.” is: “The flower stem comes out of the heart of the plant; but it throws up suckers afterwards, by which it is continued and increased.” To modern eyes that does not seem informative, but at that time, the

cup-shaped bromeliad form was not otherwise known in the genus *Tillandsia*. The name has been considered validly published and treated as the basionym of *Billbergia amoena* (G. Lodd.) Lindl. (1827). It would otherwise have been validated by Link in 1821. There is a synonym, *Bromelia pallida* Ker Gawl., dated 1819, whose epithet would have priority for this species if it were not considered validly published by Loddiges. This species is said to be widely referenced, so that a change of epithet would cause disruption, which could be minimized by conserving the name, authored by Link, against *B. pallida*. The Committee could not achieve a consensus on the adequacy of the descriptive text.

(45) Request for a binding decision on the adequacy of the descriptive statement associated with *Thea piquetiana* Laness. Requested by D. Zhao, J.A.N. Parnell & A. Dubéarnès in Taxon 65: 1183. 2016. Votes: 5–12–1 (recommended not to treat as validly published).

Thea piquetiana was questionably published by Lanessan in 1886. The only descriptive text Lanessan gave for *T. piquetiana* was “Arbuste de 1 à 6 mètres de hauteur. Mêmes propriétés.” Two other taxa mentioned in the work by Lanessan had overlapping heights: *T. chinensis* var. *cantonensis* Choisy (5–10 m) and *T. sasanqua* var. *loureiri* Laness. (3–4 m). Therefore, Lanessan could not have held the opinion that a height of 1–6 m distinguished this species from others. The proposal indicates that the name was published again by Pierre in 1887 (Fl. Forest. Cochinch.: t. 119. 1887) with a fuller description. It is recommended that that be treated as the place of valid publication.