

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR SPERMATOPHYTA

Conservation of Generic Names, IX

Rogers McVaugh, Secretary *

The previous report in this series was published in Taxon 17: 85–87. 1968. The present report was prepared by the Committee whose members are listed below, except that Prof. J. Léonard was compelled by pressure of other duties to resign from the Committee at the end of 1967, and took no part in the balloting on these proposals.

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

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.

280. *Danthonia* Lamarck & De Candolle (1805) vs. *Sieglingia* Bernhardt (1800). (2–9) (Regn. Veg. 40: 20. 1965).

The Committee agrees that the name *Danthonia* should be conserved, but the present proposal is unacceptable. The proposed lectotype, *D. provincialis*, might be acceptable as a species, but the name is illegitimate and the type of the name *provincialis* (that is, the type of *Avena calycina* Vill.) is a specimen presumably of hybrid origin. Furthermore another species, *Danthonia spicata*, was designated as lectotype as early as 1914, and has been treated as the type of the name *Danthonia* in many publications on grasses

in the last half-century. The Committee declines to accept this proposal. Any subsequent proposal for the conservation of the name *Danthonia* should include *D. spicata* as lectotype, or show good reason why another species should be designated.

★

612. *Prestoea* J. D. Hooker (1883) vs. *Martinezia* Ruiz & Pavón (1794) and *Oreodoxa* Willdenow (1807). (8–2, 1 abstention) (Regn. Veg. 34: 54–55. 1964).

Both *Martinezia* and *Oreodoxa* have been wrongly applied to such an extent that they have the status of *nomina confusa* and it would be unfortunate to take up either one for the genus that has been called *Prestoea* in recent palm literature. The conservation of *Prestoea* stabilizes the nomenclature of a group of about 35 species of palms, held to be generically distinct from *Euterpe*. See the following proposal.

The Committee recommends the conservation of *Prestoea*, noting however that it is unnecessary to add *Euterpe* J. Gaertn. to the list of names rejected in favor of *Prestoea*. Differences in embryo-structure indicate with reasonable certainty that *Prestoea* Hook. and *Euterpe* Gaertn. are different genera, even though neither of Gaertner's original species can be positively identified with any known palm.

★

631. *Euterpe* Martius (1837) vs. *Euterpe* J. Gaertner (1788), *Martinezia* Ruiz & Pavón (1794) and *Oreodoxa* Willdenow (1807). (9–1, 1 abstention) (Regn. Veg. 34: 54. 1964).

The name *Euterpe* in the sense of Martius has been in general use for more than a century, both in the restricted sense for a genus of about 30 species, and with the broader circumscription that includes *Prestoea* as well (see the preceding proposal). The present proposal aims to protect *Euterpe* Mart. against *Euterpe* Gaertn., of which it is a later homonym (Martius having excluded *Euterpe* Gaertn. from the genus as he circumscribed

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

it). *Euterpe* Mart. is also to be conserved against *Martinezia* R. & P., and *Oreodoxa* Willd., the types of which are both species of *Prestoea*, in the event that the genus *Euterpe* is so broadly construed as to include *Prestoea*.

The Committee agrees that the conservation of *Euterpe* Mart. would contribute toward nomenclatural stability. It wishes to point out, however, that the lectotype of *Euterpe* Gaertn. is properly *E. pisifera* Gaertn., not *E. globosa* Gaertn. as stated in the original proposal. *E. pisifera* was indicated (if not explicitly designated) as lectotype by Blume (1843), and Martius (1845), and more explicitly designated by J. D. Hooker (1883).

☆

1540. *Josephia* Wight (1851) vs. *Josephia* R. Brown (1809), *Josephia* Velloso (1825), *Josephia* Steudel (1840), *Sirhookera* Kuntze (1891). (1–10) (Taxon 16: 72. 1967).

The name *Sirhookera* Kuntze was validly proposed to replace *Josephia* Wight, the latter being a later homonym. The genus is a small one (2 species), not widely known outside its native country. The name *Sirhookera* is available and is already at least in limited use by Indian botanists. The Committee feels that the case for conservation of *Josephia* is not a strong one.

☆

2551. *Decaisnea* J. D. Hooker & Thomson (1854) vs. *Decaisnea* Brongniart (1829). (10–1) (Taxon 15: 334. 1966).

The name *Decaisnea* Hook. & Thoms. has become relatively widely known because the genus, although small, belongs to the small and morphologically interesting family Lardi-zabalaceae, and the name has been frequently cited in general botanical works. No other name has been used for the genus and no other name seems to be available. The Committee recommends conservation, noting that although "*Slackia* Griffith" (1848) was proposed as a *nomen rejiciendum* it was not validly published and does not need to be considered.

☆

3113. *Thylachium* Lour. corr. A. P. de Candolle (1790) vs. *Thilachium* (*Thilakium*) Lour. (1790) and *Thylacium* Lour. corr.

Spreng. (1790). (2–8, 1 abstention) (Taxon 15: 76. 1966).

This is a proposal to fix the spelling of a generic name in one form that became familiar in the 19th Century, in preference to two differently latinized forms used by the original proposer of the name, and in preference to another competing form established in 1818. It is argued that one or the other of the "corrections" (*Thylachium*, *Thylacium*) is etymologically more "correct" than either of the spellings used by Loureiro (*Thilachium*, *Thilakium*). There is no strong support for the proposal. The Committee is informed that Loureiro's latinizations were in accordance with Portuguese practice of his time, which aimed at preserving the sounds of Latin letters for Portuguese speakers. The name of the genus was originally spelled *Thilachium* (Lour. Fl. Cochinch. 342, and index. 1790), but the name of the one species was written *Thilakium africanum*. In the 1793 edition edited by Willdenow the name was consistently spelled *Thilachium*, and the Committee supports the continued use of this form.

☆

3201. *Vahlia* Thunberg (1782) vs. *Bistella* Adanson (1763). (9–2). (Taxon 15: 333. 1966).

The name *Vahlia*, for a small genus recently (1959) designated as the type of the family Vahliaceae, has been used by all authors since Thunberg until 1966, when *Bistella* Adans. was revived as the older name for the genus. *Vahlia* is relatively well-known because the genus is anomalous in the Saxifragaceae where it was often placed, and the name is mentioned in various general works. The Committee feels that to restore *Bistella* at this time would generate confusion without any compensating benefit, and recommends conservation of *Vahlia*.

☆

3718. *Tephrosia* Persoon (1807) (10–0, 1 abstention) (Taxon 16: 73. 1967).

The name *Tephrosia* is already conserved. This proposal is to add *Reinera* Moench (Suppl. Meth. Pl. 44. 1802) to list of *nomina rejicienda* under *Tephrosia*. The name *Reinera* has apparently never been adopted since its original publication. The identity of the type and only species can probably never be certainly established, but since the time of

Moench there has been general agreement that it represented a species of *Tephrostia*, *T. reflexa* (Moench) DC. The Committee recommends acceptance of this proposal.

☆

3812. *Lourea* Desvaux (1813) vs. *Lourea* J. St.-Hilaire (1812) and *Christia* Moench (1802). (2-8, 1 abstention) (Regn. Veg. 40: 25. 1965).

The long-accepted name for an Australasian genus of about 15 species was *Lourea* Necker (1790). Because of the decision at the Montreal Congress to reject the names published in Necker's *Elementa Botanica*, *Lourea* is treated as not having been validly published until 1813 (by Desvaux). It is then a later homonym of *Lourea* J. St.-Hilaire (1812). The oldest available name for the group that has been called *Lourea* Necker (and *Lourea* Desvaux) is *Christia* Moench (1802). This has recently been accepted by several authors, and some of the necessary new combinations have been made. The Committee feels that the conservation of *Lourea* Desv. at this time would contribute to nomenclatural confusion rather than to stability, and does not wish to accept the proposal.

☆

3864. *Glycine* Willdenow (1802) vs. *Glycine* Linnaeus (1753) (8-2, 1 abstention). (Taxon 15: 35. 1966).

The name *Glycine* is in general use for a small genus which, as interpreted in the most recent revision of the genus (1962) includes one very important cultivated plant, the soybean. As originally circumscribed by Linnaeus, *Glycine* included 7 species, none of which constitutes an acceptable lectotype. All but one have for more than a century been regarded as belonging to other genera. The seventh species, *G. javanica* L., proves upon examination of the Linnaean type to represent a species of another genus, *Pueraria*.

It is proposed to conserve the name *Glycine* from the date of its publication by Willdenow because this treatment includes the oldest valid name of a species that is now generally accepted as a *Glycine* (*G. clandestina* Wendl.), and the generic name is at the same time validly published. The Committee recommends the acceptance of the proposal.

☆

3910. *Dolichos* Lamarck (1786) vs. *Dolichos* Linnaeus (1753). (0-11). (Regn. Veg. 40: 26-27. 1965).

The Linnaean *Dolichos* originally included 12 species, of which only 2 remain in *Dolichos* even when the genus is accepted in a broad sense. Of these *Dolichos lablab* L. is generally admitted to be the only acceptable lectotype, and it was formally designated as such at least as early as 1924.

Since the original publication of *Dolichos*, 100 or more species have been ascribed to the genus. If this inclusive genus be taxonomically divided, as is now often advocated, the majority of the species fall outside the taxon that includes the type, *D. lablab*. A group of about 30 species (chiefly African) has become widely known under the name of *Dolichos*, at the same time the group including *D. lablab* has been referred to the genus *Lablab* Adans., which name is illegitimate. Another group of about 70 species (chiefly African and Indian) may represent still another distinct genus when *Dolichos* is construed in the narrow sense.

The alternatives are: 1) Conserve *Dolichos* Lamarck as proposed. This would provide a name for the largest of the genera resulting from the division of the inclusive *Dolichos*. It would be a wholly arbitrary typification, as the proposed type (*D. uniflorus* Lamarck) was not known to Linnaeus, and it would prevent the further use of the name *Dolichos* Linnaeus even when the genus was broadly circumscribed. It would mean that the illegitimate name *Lablab* would have to be conserved, or another name provided for that group, and it would mean the creation of new names for additional segregate genera.

2) Continue to recognize *Dolichos lablab* L. as the type of the generic name *Dolichos*. This would mean the creation of new generic names if it were thought desirable to recognize the several genera that have been separated from *Dolichos* sens. str.

3) Typify *Dolichos* Linnaeus in some other way. It has recently been suggested to the committee that if *Dolichos trilobus* L. be accepted as type, the number of necessary name-changes would be greatly reduced, there would be no further necessity to conserve *Lablab* Adans., and it would be possible for those not wishing to divide *Dolichos* to use the name for the genus in this inclusive sense.

The Committee, recognizing the practical

necessity of finding an acceptable solution, at the same time feels that the present proposal does not provide such a solution. Any acceptable solution should provide the greatest possible degree of stability in nomenclature, whether or not the genus *Dolichos* be taxonomically divided. The Committee unanimously expresses its dissatisfaction with the present proposal, and expresses its hope that a better solution may be found. The Committee is somewhat divided in its opinion as to what may be the best way out of the dilemma. There is strong feeling that in this instance it may be best to continue to recognize *D. lablab* L. as type, simply as a matter of adherence to the principle of priority, even though this may mean the creation of some new generic names. There is also some strong feeling that since the name *Dolichos* has been used widely for certain large generic groups that do not include the historic type of *Dolichos*, practicality may dictate the conservation of the name for one such group.

☆

4244. *Thryallis* Martius (1829) vs. *Thryallis* Linnaeus (1762). (10–1). (Taxon 16: 76. 1967).

It is proposed to conserve the name *Thryallis* for a Brazilian genus of about 3 species. This action would make it possible to use the name *Galphimia* Cav. (1799), without conservation, even though *Galphimia* is a synonym of *Thryallis* Linnaeus. The use of *Thryallis* Mart. in this sense is in accordance with current practice. If *Thryallis* Mart. is not conserved, the name *Hemsleya* O. Kuntze is available to replace it, but has been little used.

The names *Thryallis* L. and *Galphimia* Cav. have both been used, perhaps to about the same extent, for a second tropical American genus, this one of about 10 species.

The Committee feels that it would contribute to a stable nomenclature to fix the name *Thryallis* (in the sense of Martius) for the smaller genus (to which it is now generally applied), rather than for the larger genus to which the names *Galphimia* and *Thryallis* have both been applied to a somewhat confusing extent. The acceptance of this proposal is therefore recommended.

☆

4995. *Malvastrum* A. Gray (1849), with

type *M. wrightii* vs. *Malvastrum* A. Gray, with type *M. coccineum* (11–0). (Taxon 15: 311. 1966).

The name *Malvastrum* has been conserved since 1905. In 1890 *M. wrightii* was formally proposed as lectotype, but this was overlooked. In 1913 *M. coccineum* was proposed: this species, however, is not a member of the genus *Malvastrum* as currently interpreted, but a species of *Sphaeralcea*. The Committee unanimously recommends that reference to *M. coccineum* as the type of the name *Malvastrum* be removed from the list of *Nomina Conservanda*, and that it be replaced by *M. wrightii* [*M. aurantiacum* (Scheele) Walp.].

☆

5256. *Warburgia* Engler (1895) vs. *Chibaca* Bertoloni (1853). (8–2), 1 abstention). (Regn. Veg. 40: 27. 1965).

The name *Warburgia* is well known in East Africa for a genus of 4 species; one species is a very common constituent of upland forest. *Chibaca* was proposed as a monotypic genus of doubtful affinity, based on fruiting material, and only in 1937 recognized as identical with *Warburgia*. There seems to be no question that *Warburgia* and *Chibaca* are in fact identical, so that *Warburgia* cannot be used without conservation. As *Chibaca* has never been taken up in any flora or other work since its first description, the change from *Warburgia* to *Chibaca* would merely contribute to synonymy without any compensating benefits. The acceptance of the proposal is recommended.

☆

5384. *Eucnide* Zuccarini (1845) vs. *Microsperma* Hooker (1839). (11–0). (Taxon 16: 77. 1967).

Eucnide is a genus of about 11 species, all American. The name has been well known since the monograph of Loasaceae by Urban & Gilg (1900). In this work the earlier name *Microsperma* was rejected because it was held to be a homonym of *Microspermum* Lag. (1816) (Compositae). The Committee holds that in view of some of the examples given in the present Code, and because *Microsperma* and *Microspermum* are in different families, they may not (at least in the opinion of some botanists) be homonyms. Under these circumstances *Microsperma* would supplant *Eucnide*. In order to avoid possible future

embarrassment and confusion, the Committee unanimously recommends the conservation of *Eucnide*.

☆

6505. *Crawfurdia* Wallich (post Aug 1826) vs. *Tripterospermum* Blume (Jul-Dec 1826). (1-10). (Taxon 16: 78. 1967).

The Committee declines to recommend the conservation of *Crawfurdia*, feeling that the case is less compelling than the proposal would indicate. There is some evidence that the use of the name *Tripterospermum* is more general than suggested in the proposal. Recent specialists in the Gentianaceae have tended to reinstate *Tripterospermum* as a valid genus distinct from *Crawfurdia*, and to reduce some or all species of *Crawfurdia* sens. str. to *Gentiana*. The conservation of *Crawfurdia* as proposed is unnecessary if *Tripterospermum* is considered to be a genus distinct from *Crawfurdia*, and also if *Crawfurdia* is included in *Gentiana* sens. str. It may be desirable only if *Crawfurdia* is maintained in the classical sense for all gentians for twining stems; this view is not supported by recent taxonomic opinion.

☆

7421. *Goetzea* Wydler (1830) vs. *Goetzea* Reichenbach (1828). (8-2, 1 abstention). (Taxon 15: 167. 1966).

The name *Goetzea* Wydler has been in uninterrupted use since 1830 for a small but anomalous group of species; the genus was recently (1965) made the type of the family name Goetzeaceae. As the name *Goetzea* Reichenbach was somewhat ambiguously proposed, as it has never been used except by the original proposer and is generally regarded as a synonym on taxonomic grounds, the Committee feels that it would be unfortunate if the name *Goetzea* Wydler were to be displaced by it. The acceptance of this proposal is therefore recommended.

☆

8874. *Lagenophora* Cassini (1818) vs. *Lagenifera* Cassini (1815). (4-6, 1 abstention). (Taxon 15: 75. 1966).

Cassini originally published the name of a genus as *Lagenifera*, then 3 years later changed it to *Lagenophora*, a form that has

since been universally used. It may be argued 1) That Cassini had no right to change the spelling of a validly published name, or 2) That he never accepted the earlier spelling and in 1818 merely corrected his own error. There is no strong support for the proposal, and the divided vote apparently reflects the opinion that as no new combinations are involved when the spelling of the generic name is corrected, conservation of one spelling so much like another does not seem desirable or necessary.

Summary

The Committee recommends the conservation of the following names as proposed: 612. *Prestoea*, 631. *Euterpe*, 2551. *Decaisnea*, 3201. *Vahlia*, 3864. *Glycine*, 4244. *Thryallis*, 5256. *Warburgia*, 5384. *Eucnide*, 7421. *Goetzea*. It recommends the proposed changes in the citations of the conserved names 3718. *Tephrosia* and 4995. *Malvastrum*. It does not support the proposals for conservation of 280. *Danthonia*, 1540. *Josephia*, 3113. *Thylachium*, 3812. *Lourea*, 3910. *Dolichos*, 6505. *Crawfurdia*, 8874. *Lagenophora*.

GENERAL COMMITTEE ON BOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE

The attention of all botanists is drawn to the publication of the IXth report of the Committee on Spermatophyta in this issue of *Taxon* (pp. 325-329). The general Committee will study this report and take a decision on 1 December 1968. Comments and proposals concerning the report should reach the secretary of the General Committee (Mr. R. Ross, Botany Department, British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London S.W. 7, England) before 1 November 1968.

Nomina conservanda

The General Committee has approved the proposal by the Committee for Spermatophyta to conserve the following names (for details see the Committee's seventh report, *Taxon* 16: 226-229. 1967): 668. *Astrocaryum*, 730. *Montrichardia*, 752. *Alocasia*, sub 2542. *Naravelia*, sub 3197. *Lithophragma*, 4074. *Sargentia*, 4302. *Glochidion*, 4868. *Berchemia*, 8969. *Filago*, 9009. *Podotheca* and a change in the citation of the name 597. *Pigafetta* (Blume) Martius ex Beccari, corr. J. D. Hooker.

F. A. STAFLEU