

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR SPERMATOPHYTA

Conservation of Generic Names, XI

Rogers McVaugh, Secretary *

The previous report in this series was published in Taxon 17: 462-466, 1968. The present membership of the committee is as follows:

A. R. Pinto da Silva, Chairman (Portugal)
R. G. Bakhuizen van den Brink (Netherlands)
C. Buchheim (United States)
A. A. Bullock (England)
F. R. Fosberg (United States)
Hiroshi Hara (Japan)
Nils Hylander (Sweden)
I. A. Linczevski (U.S.S.R.)
Rogers McVaugh, Secretary (United States)
R. D. Meikle (England)
C. G. G. J. van Steenis (Netherlands)
R. Tournay (Belgium)

Reports on proposals for conservation

As in previous reports, the votes for and against each proposal are shown in parenthesis immediately after the names involved; the affirmative votes precede the negative. Eight affirmative votes were required for a recommendation by the Committee to accept a proposal. Only ten members voted on the proposals listed below, but the results as reported are conclusive except in the cases of *Delphinium* and *Asperula*.

★

Proposal 221 [700] *Monstera* Adanson (1763), with type *M. adansonii* Schott [*Dracontium pertusum* Linnaeus]. (9-1). (Taxon 17: 230, 1968).

An earlier proposal to conserve *Monstera* from the date of its publication by Schott in 1830 was declined by this Committee (Taxon 16: 226, 1967). The Committee at the same time admitted the desirability of conserving the name *Monstera*, and invited a new and acceptable proposal.

Under the conditions of the present proposal, *Monstera* is conserved with one of the original species as the type of the name. The

Committee feels that this is acceptable, although it has been pointed out that strictly speaking the actual type was another species, viz. *Dracontium polyphyllum*, the type of the Linnaean name *Dracontium*, for which *Monstera* was an avowed substitute.

Conservation of the name *Monstera* Adanson, with type *Dracontium pertusum*, thus arbitrarily establishes the genus as independent of *Dracontium* Linnaeus, with type *D. polyphyllum*.

★

Proposal 222 [2539] *Delphinium* Linnaeus (1753, with type *D. peregrinum*) vs. *Delphinium* Linnaeus (1753, with type *D. consolida*). (7-3, 2 abstentions). (Taxon 17: 231, 1968).

Britton & Brown (1913), choosing the lectotype because of priority of position, designated *D. consolida* as type of the name *Delphinium*. By many workers today *D. consolida* is regarded as a member, and type-species, of another genus, *Consolida* S. F. Gray (1821). If *Consolida* and *Delphinium* are both to be maintained, another lectotype must be chosen for *Delphinium*. The Committee agrees that it is important to keep *Delphinium* in its commonly accepted sense. The divided vote apparently reflects the same dissatisfaction that is mentioned below under proposal 226, *Asperula*. Conservation should not be necessary, but under present rules (Art. 8), the choice made by Britton and Brown cannot be set aside unless it can be shown that they "misinterpreted the original description", which is impossible. They did not "misinterpret" anything; they simply made a bad choice, based on a mechanical system. To obviate the need for conservation in cases like *Delphinium* and *Asperula*, the Committee feels that the language of the Code should be made consistent with the intent as expressed in the "Guide for the Determination of Types".

★

Proposal 223 [2965] *A Armoracia* Gaertner, Meyer & Scherbius (1800), vs. *Raphanus*

* The Herbarium, North University Building, University of Michigan, Ann. Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.

Moench (1794), and *Armoracia* Bernhardt (1800) (10-0). (Taxon 17: 231. 1968).

Armoracia is the well-known name of a small genus of Cruciferae; one species, the type of the generic name, is widely used as the source of an important condiment. It is proposed to reject *Raphanis* because it is uncertain whether or not it is to be considered a homonym of *Raphanus* Linnaeus, and also because the competing name *Armoracia* is already well established and widely known. It is not known which of the two versions of *Armoracia* was published earlier; conservation will make this irrelevant.



Proposal 224 [3561] *Peltophorum* (Vogel) Benth (1840) vs. *Peltophorum* (Vogel) Walpers (1842). (9-1). (Taxon 17: 232. 1968).

This is a proposal to correct the citation of a name that is already conserved, Benth having published the name two years before Walpers, and having based the name on the same type. The Committee recommends acceptance of the proposal.



Proposal 225 [5992] *Heteromorpha* Chamisso & Schlechtendal (1826) vs. *Heteromorpha* Cassini (1817). (10-0). (Taxon 17: 232. 1968).

Heteromorpha Cham. & Schlecht. is an African genus of 15-20 species, well-known under that name. The name itself is a later homonym of *Heteromorpha* Cass., which is not in use, being a *nomen rejiciendum* vs. *Heterolepis* Cass. There is no name available to replace *Heteromorpha* Cham. & Schlecht., and conservation is recommended.



Proposal 226 [8485] *Asperula* Linnaeus (1753, with type *A. arvensis*) vs. *Asperula* Linnaeus (1753, with type *A. odorata*). (4-6). Taxon 17: 233. 1968).

The lectotype proposed by Britton and Brown (*Asperula odorata*, proposed in 1913), is generally considered today to belong to the genus *Galium*. If *Asperula* is to be maintained apart from *Galium*, another lectotype must be chosen. According to the Code, the choice made by Britton and Brown must stand unless it can be shown that these authors "misinterpreted the original description" (Art. 8).

The divided vote on this proposal in part reflects the opinion of the Committee that

the language of the Code is inconsistent with the intent of the Code. In the "Guide for the Determination of Types", which forms an unofficial part (pages 71-72) of the 1966 Code, it is stated that "Designation of a lectotype should be undertaken only in the light of an understanding of the group... Mechanical systems, such as the automatic selection of the first species... cited, ...should be avoided... In choosing a lectotype, all aspects of the protologue should be considered as a basic guide". (Par. 4, p. 71).

The Committee feels that although technically it cannot be shown that Britton and Brown "misinterpreted the original description", it is surely clear that they violated all the precepts set forth in the paragraph just quoted. Under the circumstances it seems better not to invoke conservation until some attempt can be made to bring the language of the Code into line with its intent, after which it should be possible to set aside the above mechanically made lectotypification of *Asperula*, and to select a new and more appropriate lectotype. See also proposal no. 222, *Delphinium*.



Proposal 230 [5015] *Kosteletzkya* Presl (1835) vs. *Thorntonia* Reichenbach (1828). (9-1). (Taxon 17: 331. 1968).

Kosteletzkya is a widely distributed, widely known, primarily tropical genus of Malvaceae, comprising some 15-20 species. The earlier, validly published name *Thorntonia* has apparently never been adopted except by its author. The Committee recommends conservation.



Proposal 233 [280] *Danthonia* De Candolle (1805, with type *D. spicata*) vs. *Sieglingia* Bernhardt (1800). (8-2). (Taxon 17: 444. 1968).

An earlier proposal to conserve *Danthonia*, with type *D. provincialis*, was declined by this Committee (Taxon 17: 325. 1968). The Committee at the same time expressed its opinion that *Danthonia* should be conserved, and pointed out that *D. spicata* had been suggested as lectotype as early as 1914.

The present proposal aims at keeping the name in its widely used and accepted sense, with an acceptable lectotype that was one of the species originally included in the genus by De Candolle. It is pointed out in the present proposal that in 1906 the name *Danthonia* was lectotypified by *Festuca decum-*

bens (the type of *Sieglingia*), and that this lectotypification can be set aside only by conservation of another species, in this case *D. spicata*, as type. The Committee recommends the acceptance of this proposal.

☆

Proposal 234 [471a] *Bulbostylis* C. B. Clarke (1893) vs. *Bulbostylis* Kunth (1837, nom. cons.). (3–7). (Taxon 17: 446, 1968).

The name *Bulbostylis* is already conserved; this proposal is to fix the date of valid publication some 56 years later than the date now accepted and established by conservation. No clear need for the change is stated in the proposal; it is however implied that Kunth's understanding of the genus was different from the current one, and moreover that Kunth's publication of the name was merely provisional. In spite of these considerations the Committee sees no advantage in making the name *Bulbostylis* more vulnerable to the extent of 56 years of priority if competing taxonomic synonyms arise. In any event the name will remain on the list of *nomina conservanda*.

☆

Proposal 235 [1399] *Loroglossum* L. C. Richard (1817). (0–10). (Taxon 17: 446, 1968).

Loroglossum was illegitimate because superfluous when published. It was replaced by *Himantoglossum* Spreng. (1826), which was also illegitimate. The name *Himantoglossum* has recently been recommended by this Committee for conservation (Taxon 17: 464, 1968). In the present proposal it is stated that "*Loroglossum* would be preferable [to *Himantoglossum*] because it is earlier; moreover it is already used largely in the modern literature". The Committee believes that usage favors *Himantoglossum* and feels that further consideration of *Loroglossum* is unnecessary.

☆

Proposal 236 [3898] *Eriosema* (De Candolle) G. Don (Oc. 1832) vs. *Euriosma* Desvaux (1826) and *Eriosema* E. Meyer (Pante Feb. 1832). (8–2). (Taxon 17: 447, 1968).

Eriosema is a large and important tropical genus of Leguminosae, including about 140 species. The Committee believes that conservation is desirable to preserve current usage. The lack of unanimity in the Committee stems from the feeling held by some members, that *Euriosma* is merely a new or "corrected" spelling derived from *Rhyncho-*

sia sect. *Eriosema* DC. (1825), the basionym of *Eriosema* (DC.) G. Don. Those holding this view would cite the publication of *Eriosema* as dating from Desvaux (1826); conservation then would be unnecessary.

The opposing, and seemingly irreconcilable, view, is that *Euriosma* was validly and intentionally proposed as a name different from *Eriosema*. Those advocating conservation of the latter argue that this confusion over *Euriosma* can never be settled, and that conservation is necessary to end the matter, as well as to preserve a familiar name.

☆

Proposal 237 [4712] *Phytocrene* Wallich (1831) vs. *Gynocephalum* Blume (1825). (9–1). (Taxon 17: 448, 1968).

The name *Gynocephalum*, independently proposed, was withdrawn by its author, Blume, in favor of *Phytocrene* (which he erroneously supposed to have priority of publication); thus although *Gynocephalum* has priority, it has not been used since 1849, since which date *Phytocrene* has been generally used for a genus of about 11 species, in southeastern Asia and Malesia. There would seem to be no advantage in returning to *Gynocephalum* at this late date, and the conservation of *Phytocrene* is recommended.

☆

Proposal 238 [4713]. *Miquelia* Meissner (Sep. 1838) vs. *Miquelia* Blume (Jun. 1838). (10–0). (Taxon 17: 449, 1968).

Miquelia Meissn. is a small genus of southeastern Asia and Malesia, generally known under this name since its publication. *Miquelia* Blume has generally been regarded as a synonym of *Staurothera* Benth. (1835). There is no known available name to replace *Miquelia* Meissn., and the Committee recommends its conservation, the only alternative being the creation of a new generic name.

☆

Proposal 239 [7650] *Lamourouxia* Humboldt, Bonpland & Kunth (1818) vs. *Lamourouxia* C. A. Agardh (1817). (9–1). (Taxon 17: 449, 1968).

Lamourouxia HBK. is a genus of 20 or more species, all American. The name has been universally used, and the Committee believes that it should be conserved; no other name is known to be available, and the alternative to conservation would be the creation of a new name. The name *Lamourouxia*

Ag. was an avowed substitute for the validly published *Claudea* Lamouroux, and was therefore illegitimate; it has been little used.

In the original proposal the lectotype was given as *L. virgata* HBK., this species having been designated as lectotype by Thieret in 1954. In a later communication from the proposer (Ernst), however, the Committee was advised of the existence of *Lamourouxia* sect. *Lamourouxia* Benth. (1846), which from the name may be supposed to include the type-species of the genus. Bentham's sect. *Lamourouxia* included one of the original species of the genus, *L. multifida* HBK., and other species. It may be argued that the only acceptable lectotype of the generic name is the type of the section that bears the generic name unaltered, viz. sect. *Lamourouxia*, and therefore that the later designation of *L. virgata* as lectotype was improper.

In view of these somewhat unusual circumstances, the Committee recommends the conservation of the name *Lamourouxia*, at the same time calling attention to the un-

certainty surrounding its valid typification. It is not within the province of this Committee to modify an existing proposal, but in the opinion of a majority of the voting members the creation of sect. *Lamourouxia* in 1846 narrowed the choice of a lectotype species to one of the members of that section. Thus the only acceptable lectotype of the generic name is *L. multifida*.



Summary: The committee recommends the conservation of 700 *Monstera*, 2965 *Armo-racia*, 5992 *Heteromorpha*, 5015 *Kosteletzkyia*, 280 *Danthonia*, 3898 *Eriosema*, 4712 *Phytocrene*, 4713 *Miquelia*, and 7650 *Lamourouxia*; is recommends a change in citation of 3561 *Peltophorum* (nom. cons.); it does not approve of the proposals on 471a *Bulbostylis* (nom. cons.) and 1399 *Loroglossum*; it declines to recommend at this time any action on 2539 *Delphinium* and 8485 *Asperula*, until the intent of the Code can be clarified.