

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR SPERMATOPHYTA

Conservation of Generic Names, VII

Rogers McVaugh, Secretary (Ann Arbor) *

The previous report in this series was published in Taxon 13: 180–182. 1964. Since the publication of that report the Committee has lost through death one of its most willing and able members, Y. I. Prokhanov (U.S.S.R.). The former secretary, H. W. Rickett, retired at his own request in order to be able to devote full time to other activities. A. C. Smith retired from the Committee for a similar reason. The present membership of the Committee is as follows:

A. R. Pinto da Silva, Chairman (Portugal)
R. C. Bakhuizen van den Brink (Netherlands)
G. Buchheim (United States)
A. Bullock (England)
F. R. Fosberg (United States)
Hiroshi Hara (Japan)
J. Léonard (Belgium)
Nils Hylander (Sweden)
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 considered 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. One member of the Committee abstained from voting. The voting members of the Committee were unanimous in their opinions on *Pigafetta*, *Astrocaryum*, *Montrichardia*, *Alocasia*, *Naravelia*, *Glochidion* and *Berchemia*; in all these cases abstentions are recorded as negative votes.

567. *Pigafetta* (Blume) Martius ex Beccari (1877). (10–2) (Taxon 12: 206. 1963).

The name *Pigafetta* is already conserved.

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

Beccari, in publishing the name, based it on *Metroxylon* subg. *Pigafetta*, which he attributed to Martius instead of to Blume, who had first proposed *Pigafetta* as the name of a section of *Sagus*. The lectotype of *Sagus* sect. *Pigafetta* Blume is *S. filaris* Giseke (1792), not *Pigafetta papuana* Becc. (1877). The Committee recommends that the citation of 567. *Pigafetta* be changed to read as follows:

567. *Pigafetta* (Blume) Martius ex Beccari, Malesia 1: 89. 1877 ('*Pigafettia*'), corr. J. D. Hooker in Bentham et Hooker, Gen. Pl. 3: 933. 14 Apr. 1883.

T.: *P. filaris* (Giseke) Beccari, Malesia 1: 91. 1877 (*Sagus filaris* Giseke) (*typ. cons.*).

*

668. *Astrocaryum* G. F. W. Mey. (1818) vs. *Avoira* Giseke (1792). (11–1). (Regn. Veg. 34: 54. 1964).

Astrocaryum has been used for nearly 150 years in all monographic and floristic works in which the genus is considered. It is a genus of about 47 species, of some economic importance. The name *Avoira* Giseke has never been taken up. The Committee unanimously recommends the conservation of *Astrocaryum*.

*

700. *Monstera* Schott (1830) vs. *Monstera* Adanson (1763). (0–12) (Taxon 11: 224. 1962).

Although widely known and used, especially for a species which is a very common cultivated plant, the name *Monstera* Adans. was superfluous and therefore illegitimate when published. It was stated in the protologue to be synonymous with *Dracontium* L.; its type according to Art. 7, note 4 is automatically that of *Dracontium*, i.e. *D. polyphyllum* L. It is proposed to conserve the name *Monstera* from the date of its publication by Schott (1830), with type *M. pertusa* (L.) de Vriese (1839), based on *Dracontium pertusum* L. Two generic synonyms for

Monstera are known to be available (*Tornelia* Gutiérrez ex Schott, 1858; *Serangium* W. Wood ex Salisb., 1866).

The Committee feels that the well-known name *Monstera* should be conserved, but declines to recommend the present proposal. The name *Monstera pertusa* (L.) de Vriese is illegitimate because it is a later homonym of *M. pertusa* (Roxb.) Schott (1830), an Old World species that is not a *Monstera* in the sense accepted here. The name applied by Schott (1830) to *Dracontium pertusum* L. was *Monstera adansonii*, also an illegitimate, superfluous name.

The Committee suggests that it may be desirable rather to conserve the name *Monstera* as from the date of its publication by Adanson, with the type arbitrarily conserved as *Dracontium pertusum* L., one of the five original Linnaean species of *Dracontium* and therefore by implication one of those included in Adanson's *Monstera*. This would fix the name in its current usage without the subterfuge of ascribing to Schott a name which he merely adopted but did not create. A new proposal for the conservation of *Monstera* should be published if the name is to be retained, as the function of this Committee does not include the recommendation of unpublished proposals, or amendments to existing proposals, to the General Committee.

*

730. *Montrichardia* Crüger (1854) vs. *Pleurospa* Raf. (1838). (11-1). (Regn. Veg. 34: 55-56. 1964).

Montrichardia arborescens is an important constituent of the vegetation bordering saline and brackish creeks in the West Indies, Central and tropical South America. The name has been universally adopted in all relevant ecological as well as taxonomic literature. The specific epithet proposed by Rafinesque was illegitimate, and neither the generic name nor the epithet has been taken up subsequently. The committee recommends the conservation of *Montrichardia*, feeling that the number of species in the genus is irrelevant in comparison with the importance of the name in botanical literature.

*

752. *Alocasia* (Schott) G. Don (1839) vs. *Alocasia* Raf. (1837) (10-2) (Taxon 12: 208. 1963).

The name *Alocasia* in the sense of Schott and G. Don has long been in use for a genus of about 50 species in tropical Asia, some

now pantropically distributed as food plants or ornamentals. The name has been adopted by all recent authors, but usually (and erroneously) attributed to Necker. It is a later homonym of *Alocasia* Raf., which has never been adopted by any subsequent author and is a synonym of *Arisaema* Mart. (1831). No other generic name is available for the species pertaining to *Alocasia* (Schott) G. Don. The Committee recommends conservation.

*

1648. *Eulophia* R. Brown ex Lindley (1823) vs. *Eulophus* R. Brown (1821) (3-7, 2 abstained) (Taxon 11: 203. 1962).

The name *Eulophia* Lindl. (1823) has been conserved against the earlier *Graphorkis* (1809) since 1905. In the 1952 and 1956 editions of the Code the type species was stated to be *Serapias capensis* L., which now proves to be a member of another genus, not *Eulophia*. It is necessary to re-typify *Eulophia*. When *Eulophia* Lindl. (1823) was first conserved, it was not thought necessary to conserve it against *Eulophus* R. Br. (1821), although the names refer to the same genus. It is now proposed to designate as type *Eulophia guineensis* Lindl. (a species described in 1823 and thus unknown to Brown in 1821), and to add *Lissochilus* R. Brown, *Eulophus* R. Brown and *Eulophia* Agardh (1822) to the list of *nomina rejicienda*. The Committee feels that as Lindley in 1823 attributed the name to R. Brown and apparently at Brown's suggestion altered the name from *Eulophus* to *Eulophia*, the latter should be conserved as from 1821. This course has already been suggested by Rickett and Stafleu (Taxon 8: 259. 1959), who provided the appropriate citation, but failed to designate an acceptable lectotype. The Committee invites a new proposal embodying the selection of a lectotype from among the species mentioned by Brown in 1821.

*

(sub 2542) *Naravelia* A. P. DeCandolle (1817) vs. *Naravel* Adanson (1763) (10-2) (Taxon 12: 206. 1963).

The name *Naravelia* DC. pertains to a small genus somewhat doubtfully distinct from *Clematis*, for which no other generic name is known to be available. *Naravelia* DC. is clearly derived from *Naravel* Adans., which is illegitimate because a superfluous name for *Atragene* L. The writer of this proposal takes the view that *Naravelia* DC.

is not an orthographic variant of *Naravel* Adans., but "a new generic name dating from its publication by DeCandolle". The Committee views *Naravelia* as an orthographic variant, hence itself illegitimate and in need of conservation, which is recommended.

*

(sub 3197) *Lithophragma* (Nuttall) Torrey et Gray (1840) vs. *Pleurodotria* Rafinesque (1837) (8-4) (Taxon 12: 207. 1963).

The name *Lithophragma* has been universally used for an American genus of about 20 species. The earlier name, *Pleurodotria*, has never been used except by its proposer. The Committee recommends the proposed conservation, feeling that there would be no advantage to nomenclature in resuscitating *Pleurodotria*.

*

4074. *Sargentia* S. Wats. (1890) vs. *Sargentia* H. Wendl. & Drude ex Salomon (1887) (10-2) (Taxon 12: 170. 1963).

Sargentia S. Wats. has been used since its publication in all monographic and floristic works in which the genus is considered. No other generic name is available for the taxon to which it applies. The name *Sargentia* H. Wendl. & Drude is known to have been used once (after the original publication), but never in any general work. *Sargentia* S. Wats. is a monotypic genus of limited distribution and limited economic importance, but the Committee feels its conservation is desirable because the alternative is the creation of a new name.

*

4302. *Glochidion* Forst. (1776) vs. *Agyneia* L. (1771) (11-1) (Taxon 9: 25-26. 1960).

Glochidion is a genus of more than 200 species, generally accepted as taxonomically distinct. *Agyneia* is an older name for the same genus, but which has been consistently misapplied since 1866 to species of a third and quite different genus. Failure to conserve *Glochidion* would necessitate the formation of at least 200 new combinations, as only about 10 valid combinations are available in *Agyneia*. Conservation of *Glochidion* legalizes long-established usage for this large genus, and the Committee recommends it.

*

4332. *Longetia* Baill. (1886) vs. *Austrobuxus* Miq. (1861) (7-4, one abstention) (Regn. Veg. 34: 59. 1964).

Longetia is a genus of 6 species ranging from southeastern Asia to New Caledonia. *Austrobuxus*, the identity of which has heretofore been in doubt, proves upon examination of the type to be congeneric. If the name *Austrobuxus* were to be accepted for the genus, at least 5 new combinations would be required.

The Committee finds itself divided on this case, with respect to the real need for conservation. The species known as *Longetia malayana* is stated to be a "common and important timber tree from West Malaysia", but there seems to be no question about the availability of the earlier name, *Austrobuxus*. The divided vote reflects an opinion held by several committee-members, that conservation is "not intended to obviate all inconvenient name-changes nor to circumvent awkward oversights".

*

4868. *Berchemia* A. P. DeCandolle (1825) vs. *Oenoplea* Michaux ex R. A. Hedwig (1806) (10-2) (Taxon 12: 170. 1963).

Virtually all authors since 1825 have adopted *Berchemia* for a small but well-known American genus. The name *Oenoplea* Hedw. was adopted (as *Oenoplia*) by Roemer & Schultes in 1819, but not by any subsequent author. It has been pointed out to the Committee that *Oenoplea* did not originate with Hedwig, but was based on *Rhamnus* subgenus *Oenoplia* Pers. (1805). The only species of subg. *Oenoplia* was *Rhamnus volubilis* Michx. It is probable that Hedwig, in raising subg. *Oenoplia* to the rank of genus with the spelling *Oenoplea*, erroneously attributed it to Michaux, whose name appeared first after Persoon's description of *R. volubilis*. The Committee unanimously recommends the conservation of *Berchemia*, with the further recommendation that *Oenoplea* should be cited as follows:

Oenoplea [erroneously attributed to Michaux by] R. A. Hedwig, Gen. Pl. 1: 151. 1806.

*

?5024a. *Bombacopsis* Pittier (1916) vs. *Pochota* Ramírez Goyena (1909) (0-11, one abstention) (Regn. Veg. 34: 60. 1964).

Bombacopsis was well described and characterized. From 1916 to 1963 it was used to a limited extent, for a few tropical American species. In 1963 the author of the present proposal, although by his own state-

ment reasonably certain that *Pochota* (1909) and *Bombacopsis* (1916) were synonymous, took up the later name, enlarged the generic concept and added a significant number of new species, then (1964) proposed the name for conservation, in order "to stabilize the name [*Bombacopsis*] and to avoid numerous new combinations".

The Committee, although sympathetic to the proposal, feels strongly that whereas conservation of *Bombacopsis* would indeed preserve the *status quo*, such conservation would not be in the spirit of the Code, which stresses the need for conservation of names "that have come into general use", or which have been used in monographic and important floristic works up to the year 1890.

*

6362. *Butyrospermum* Kotschy (1865) vs. *Vitellaria* C. F. Gaertner (1807) (7-3, 2 abstentions) (Taxon 11: 226. 1962).

Butyrospermum has been extensively used in botanical and agricultural literature for an economically important African tree. The genus is monotypic. An older name which has been little used is *Vitellaria*. The Committee finds itself divided on the need for conservation. On the one hand a typical comment is "This is an excellent example of the desirability of conserving the name of a monotypic genus. The use of the name in literature . . . is impressive; *Vitellaria* is quite unknown". On the other hand, conservation of *Butyrospermum* would entail the adoption of a new specific epithet to replace the familiar *B. parkii*, and there is some feeling that as long as the name *Vitellaria* exists and can be typified, it should be taken up.

*

8969. *Filago* Linnaeus (*F. pyramidata* L., *typ. cons.*) (1753) vs. *Filago* Linnaeus (*F. pygmea* L., *typ. cons.*) (1753) (8-3, one abstention) (Regn. Veg. 34: 61. 1964).

The proposal is to stabilize the application of the name *Filago* in the sense of long-established usage, by conserving one of the original species, *F. pyramidata*, as type. If *Filago* L. be typified by *F. pyramidata*, as proposed by Hitchcock and Green (1929), the genus is preserved in its traditional sense. If, however, it be typified by *F. pygmea* L., as proposed by Holub & Chrtek (1962), *Filago* as now generally understood would take the name *Gifola* Cass. and the species now referred to *Evax* Gaertn. would be transferred to *Filago*.

The votes against the proposal apparently stemmed from the feeling that conservation was unnecessary, lectotypification in the same sense having been proposed long ago. It was pointed out, however, that there is precedent for the conservation of Linnaean genera for the same reason, *Holcus* and *Nymphaea* having already been conserved with a certain type in order to establish these names in a preferred sense.

*

9009. *Podotheca* Cass. (1822) vs. *Podosperma* Labill. (1806) (8-3, one abstention) (Regn. Veg. 34: 62. 1964).

Podotheca (1822) was proposed as a substitute for *Podosperma* (1806), presumably on the grounds that the latter was not sufficiently different from *Podospermum* DC. (1805, *nom. cons.*). *Podosperma* and *Podospermum* pertain to species of the same family (Compositae); both are neuter; at least some species of each now grow together in Australia; and at least some confusion of the two names has already occurred. This Committee feels that, in the language of Art. 75, they are "so similar that they are likely to be confused", and that *Podosperma* Labill. is on that account illegitimate. It follows that conservation of *Podotheca* is unnecessary.

The majority of the Committee felt, however, that failure to conserve *Podotheca* would leave open the whole question of the similarity of *Podosperma* and *Podospermum*, as many persons may argue from the examples given under Art. 75 that these two names are sufficiently different to permit them to apply legitimately to different genera. The Committee therefore recommends conservation of *Podotheca*, in the interest of permanent stabilization of nomenclature.

Summary:

The Committee recommends the conservation of the following names as proposed: 668 *Astrocaryum*, 730 *Montrichardia*, 752 *Alocasia*, sub 2542 *Naravellia*, sub 3197 *Lithophragma*, 4074 *Sargentia*, 4302 *Glochidion*, 4868 *Berchemia*, 8969 *Filago*, 9009 *Podotheca*. It recommends a change in the citation of 567 *Pigafetta* which is already conserved. It suggests the desirability of new proposals relative to 700 *Monstera*, 1648 *Eulophia*. It does not recommend conservation of 4332 *Longetia*, ?5024a *Bombacopsis*, 6362 *Butyrospermum*.