Report of the Committee for Spermatophyta: 53

Richard K. Brummitt

The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AE, U.K. E-mail: r.brummitt@rbg-kew.org.uk

The previous report of this committee appeared in *Taxon* 50: 1179–1182 (2001 publ. 2002). Those voting on proposals in this report were R. K. Brummitt (Kew, Secretary), G. Davidse (St. Louis), T. V. Egorova (St. Petersburg), T. S. Filgueiras (Brasilia), I. Friis (Copenhagen, Chairman), K. Gandhi (Cambridge, Mass.), C. E. Jarvis (London), H.-W. Lack (Berlin), D. H. Nicolson (Washington); H. Ohashi (Sendai), A. E. Orchard (Canberra), G. Perry (Perth, W.A.), M. Thulin (Uppsala), P. Vorster (Stellenbosch) and R. L. Wilbur (Durham, N.C.). A minimum of 10 votes is required for recommendation by this committee that a proposal for conservation or rejection of a name be accepted or rejected.

(1442). To conserve *Veronica agrestis* L. with a conserved type (*Scrophulariaceae*). Proposed by M. M. Martínez-Ortega, J. A. Sánchez, S. Cafferty & E. Rico in Taxon 49: 99–100 (2000).

After lengthy discussion in this committee, this proposal was withdrawn by the proposers in favour of a new typification by themselves and M. Thulin to be published in this issue of *Taxon* (51: 763–764).

(1447). To conserve *Diphyes* Cookson (fossil *Dinophyceae*) against *Diphyes* Blume (*Orchidaceae*). Proposed by W. K. Harris & R. A. Fensome in Taxon 49: 281–282 (2000). Votes to permit conservation if the Committee for Fossil Plants recommends it: 14–0, 1 abst. (no objection by this committee).

The name *Diphyes* Blume would apply to a segregate of the large genus *Bulbophyllum* if that were split up. Although it is not impossible that somebody may wish to do this some day, there seems to be no immediate threat that it will happen, and this committee would not wish such a future possibility to prejudice the current usage of the same name for the dinoflagellate genus.

(1464). To conserve *Paspalum dasypleurum* Kunze ex E. Desv. against *P. cumingii* Nees ex Steudel, *P. pachyrrhizum* Steud. and *P. paradisicum* Steud. (*Poaceae*). Proposed by F. O. Zuloaga & O. Morrone in Taxon 49: 561–563 (2000). Votes: 14-0, 1 abst.

The proposal was necessitated by the establishment of the correct date of publication of the name concerned, which is now seen to be antedated by three names all published on the same page by Steudel. The name *P. dasypleurum* has been applied consistently to a species widespread in Chile and Argentina, sometimes used as a forage or pasture grass. It would seem unfortunate to have to replace a well established name by something else just because of an adjustment of the date of publication, and the committee recommends conservation as proposed.

(1465). To conserve *Brasilicactus* Backeb. against *Acanthocephala* Backeb. (Cactaceae). Proposed by A. B. Doweld in Taxon 49: 564–565 (2000). Votes: 7-7, 1 abst. (not recommended).

Nomenclatural problems with these two names seem to have been glossed over hitherto because they are regarded by many as synonyms of the larger genera *Notocactus* or *Parodia*. The segregate genus was first given the name *Brasilocactus* by Frić in 1935, but this was without a Latin description and therefore invalid. It was validly named *Acanthocephala* by Backeberg in 1938, but in 1942 Backeberg himself concluded that this was a later homonym of *Acanthocephalus* Kar. & Kir. 1842 in *Compositae* and he published a new name *Brasilicactus* (one letter different from Frić's name) for the genus. This committee agrees with the present proposer that *Acanthocephala* and *Acanthocephalus* are not to be treated as homonyms. They do not feel that the citation of only seven authors who have used *Brasilicactus* demonstrates common usage of the name. Some members of the committee also note the existence of the name *Brasilicereus* Backeb., in use for a different genus of cacti from Brasil, and wonder whether there might be more confusion between these similar names for two genera of cacti in Brasil than there would be between *Acanthocephala* in *Cactaceae* and *Acanthocephalus* in *Compositae* of Central Asia. Conservation is not recommended, and if the segregate genus of *Cactaceae* is recognised, it should be called *Acanthocephala*.

(1446). To conserve *Eriocactus* Backeb. against *Eriocephalus* Backeb. (*Cactaceae*). Proposed by A. B. Doweld in Taxon 49: 566–568 (2000). Votes: 2-13, 1 abst. (not recommended).

This case has striking similarities with the previous one. In 1938 Backeberg named a new genus of cacti as *Eriocephala*. In 1942 he considered that to be a later homonym of *Eriocephalus* L. in *Compositae* and published a substitute name *Eriocactus*. The latter has been used by seven authors cited in the proposal, but most people include the genus in either *Notocactus* or *Parodia*. In 1999 the present proposer, Doweld, concluded that *Eriocactus* was an illegitimate substitute for *Notocactus* and published a nom. nov. *Peronocactus*, but he now considers that his argument was unfounded. The committee feels that *Eriocephala* should not be treated as a homonym of *Eriocephalus*, and is the correct name if the segregate genus is recognised. Again, in comparable circumstances to the previous proposal, there is a question of whether *Eriocactus* might be more confusable with a different name *Eriocereus* (A. Berger) Riccob. (both being applied to Brasilian cacti) than *Eriocephala* would be with *Eriocephalus,* which is used for a genus of South African *Compositae*. The committee declines to recommend conservation. The correct name for the segregate genus is *Eriocephala*.

(1467). To conserve *Wulffia* Neck. ex Cass. over *Tilesia* G. Mey. (*Asteraceae*). Proposed by H. Robinson & V. A. Funk in Taxon 49: 569–570 (2000). Votes: 8-6, 1 abst. (not recommended).

The name *Wulffia* was originally regarded as validated by Necker in his Elementa Botanica 1790, but this work has long been rejected as a source of generic names and is now proscribed under Appendix 5 of the Code. Validation is now attributed to Cassini in 1823, but this is later than the competing synonym *Tilesia* G. Mey. 1818. The latter was therefore taken up by Pruski in Novon 6: 414 (1996) and Fl. Venez. Guyana (1997), by Zuloaga & Morrone in Cat. Pl. Vasc. Argent. (1999), by a molecular paper in 1999, and by Webster & Rhode in Univ. Calif. Publ. Bot. 82: 64 (2001). The genus has only three species, but one of these is widespread as a weed in the New World. Some members of the committee have been influenced by the usually identical pronunciation of *Wulffia* with *Wolffia* Horkel ex Schleid., the latter being a well known genus of *Lemnaceae*. Although a small majority of the committee have favoured conservation as proposed, the necessary two thirds majority has not been obtained. Conservation is not recommended, leaving *Tilesia* as the correct name.

(1468). To conserve *Rumex alpinus* L. with conserved type (*Polygonaceae*). Proposed by S. Cafferty & S. Snogerup in Taxon 49: 571–572 (2000). Votes: 13-1, 1 abst. (recommended).

Linnaeus described the species in 1753 but seems to have adopted a completely new concept of it in his Syst. Nat. in 1759, the latter having been almost universally followed since. The three elements in the Species Plantarum in 1753 are referable to other species of *Rumex* or to a species of *Persicaria*. This was realised by López González in 1988, who took up the name *R. pseudoalpinus* Höfft for the species long known as *R. alpinus*, this being followed in Med Checklist in 1989 and an atlas of Spanish plants in 1996. However, the species is a large, conspicuous and well known plant of the European Alps, it is still known under the name *R. alpinus* in many current Floras of central Europe, and it has been illustrated as such in many popular works. The committee recommends conservation of *R. alpinus* with a new type as proposed.

(1471). To reject *Galanthus reflexus* Herb. (*Amaryllidaceae*). Proposed by A. P. Davis in Taxon 49: 813–814 (2000). Votes: 14-0, 1 abst. (recommended).

This name has virtually never been taken up at specific rank since it was published in 1845, but the epithet has been applied at infraspecific rank to a range of taxa under various species. No original material is known. When the epithet has been taken up it has usually been applied under *G. nivalis* L., but close examination of the protologue shows that this cannot be right. The description and the original locality in western Turkey indicate that *G. reflexus* must have been either what is currently called *G. gracilis* Celak. 1891 or *G. elwesii* Hook. f. 1875, most probably the former, and would be the earlier name for either. Both of these names are important in horticulture and are adopted in recent monographs by the proposer. The committee recommends rejection of the name as proposed.

(1472). To conserve *Dicrastylis* Drumm. ex Harv. over *Mallophora* Endl. and *Lachnocephalus* Turcz. (*Lamiaceae*, or previously *Verbenaceae*, *Dicrastylidaceae* or *Chloanthaceae*). Proposed by B. L. Rye in Taxon 49: 815–816 (2000). Votes: 10-4, 1 abst. (recommended).

In 1978 Munir recognised two genera of Australian herbs and subshrubs, *Dicrastylis* with 26 species widespread in Western Australia, Northern Territory, Queensland, New South Wales and South Australia, and *Mallophora* with two species confined to a small area of SW Western Australia, with *Lachnocephalus* a synonym of the latter. The present proposer wishes to unite the two genera. The earliest name for the combined genus would be *Mallophora*, previously applied to a small and very local genus, whereas *Dicrastylis* would fall into synonymy. The latter name is much the better known and more widely applied, and is the basis for the family name *Dicrastylidaceae* which has been widely used (though replaced recently by *Chloanthaceae* which has priority). On this basis, the committee recommends conservation

of *Dicrastylis* over both *Mallophora* and *Lachnocephalus*, both being earlier than *Dicrastylis*. Munir (pers. comm.) would still prefer to recognise two genera, and his nomenclature would be unaffected by the committee's recommendation.

(1476). To conserve *Viscaria* Bernh. against *Steris* Adans. (*Caryophyllaceae*). Proposed by B. Oxelmann, M. Lidén & B. Jonsell in Taxon 50: 281–282 (2001). Votes: 12-2, 1 abst. (recommended).

The name *Viscaria* has been commonly used for a small north-temperate genus for more than a century. The competing synonym *Steris* is earlier and has been taken up by two or three authors in the last quarter of a century, but is very little known. The committee recommends conservation of the well known name.

(1477). To reject *Ocimum vaalae* Forssk. (*Lamiaceae*). Proposed by A. J. Paton, O. Ryding & S. Suddee in Taxon 50: 283 (2001). Votes: 13-1, 1 abst. (recommended).

This continues the tidying up of the names published posthumously by Forsskål in 1775. The work of J. R. I. Wood in Yemen in the 1970s and 1980s, and the catalogue of Forsskål's names published by Hepper & Friis in 1994, have established convincing evidence that *O. vaalae* must be an earlier name for *Plectranthus amboinicus* (Lour.) Spreng., although no original material has been discovered. The species is widespread and commonly cultivated in the Old World tropics, having well known culinary, medicinal and anti-bacterial properties. It is still cultivated in Yemen, and is still given the Arabic vernacular name "walah" that Forsskål recorded for it. The committee is sympathetic to the proposal to reject *O. vaalae* and keep *P. amboinicus* in use.

(1478). To conserve the spelling *Boophone* Herb. (*Amaryllidaceae*). Proposed by R. H. Archer, D. A. Snijman & R. K. Brummitt in Taxon 50: 569–571 (2001). Votes: 14-0, 1 abst. (recommended).

Herbert originally spelled the name as *Boophane* in 1821, but did not explain the derivation of the name. In later publications he used *Buphane* and *Buphone*, and argument about the correct spelling persisted for nearly two centuries. In 1939 it was noted that it was probably derived from its well known toxicity to cattle, and that *-phane* was a mistake for *-phone* meaning death. The spelling *Boophone* has been more or less universally used in tropical Africa since then, but in South Africa some have queried this derivation. However, an apparently conclusive statement by Herbert himself has been found in a publication of 1837, where he said that the generic name was derived from the bulbs being fatal to cattle. Conservation of *Boophone* is recommended to put an end to all arguments over the spelling.

(1479). To conserve *Bouteloua gracilis* (Kunth) Griffiths against *B. gracilis* Vasey (*Poaceae*). Proposed by K. N. Gandhi, J. H. Wiersema & R. J. Soreng in Taxon 50: 573–575 (2001). Votes : 14-0, 1 abst. (recommended).

Publication of the name *B. gracilis* based on *Chondrosum gracile* Kunth has been variously attributed to Lagasca 1816 or Steudel 1840, but these authors did not make the combination. The earliest author to make the combination was Griffiths in 1912, but by this time *B. gracilis* Vasey 1879 had been published for a different plant. Nonetheless, *B. gracilis* has been very widely adopted in the sense of Griffiths for a well known species on the Great Plains of North America. The committee recommends conservation as proposed.

(1480). To reject *Holcus saccharatus* L. (*Poaceae*). Proposed by G. Davidse & N. J. Turland in Taxon 50: 577–580 (2001). Votes: 14-0, 1 abst. (recommended).

The name *Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench is very widely used for the fifth most important cereal crop of the world. Although no lectotype has ever been chosen for *H. saccharatus* (*Sorghum saccharatum* (L.) Moench), there seems to be general agreement that it applies to the same species and is the earlier name. A few authors have taken up *S. saccharatum* in recent decades, but *S. bicolor* is by far the most widely used name for the species. Rejection as proposed is recommended.

(1483). To conserve *Eryngium bourgatii* Gouan against *E. pallescens* Mill. (*Apiaceae*). Proposed by G. Nieto Feliner in Taxon 50: 585–586 (2001). Votes: 14-0, 1 abst. (recommended).

A well known and attractive species occurring from the Pyrenees to Morocco, with a subspecies in Turkey and Syria, has been known for more than two centuries as *Eryngium bourgatii* Gouan 1773. The species is also commonly cultivated as a garden plant for its conspicuous glaucous blue appearance. Examination of the type of *E. pallescens* Mill. 1768 shows that this is referable to the same species. Conservation of *E. bourgatii* is recommended.

(1490). To reject *Silene polyphylla* L. (*Caryophyllaceae*). Proposed by S. Cafferty, B. Oxelman & F. Eggens in Taxon 50: 923–924 (2001). Votes: 14-0, 1 abst. (recommended).

The name was published in 1753, when its distribution was indicated—apparently erroneously—as Central Europe. The only reasonable typification would make it conspecific with *S. portensis* L. from the western Mediterranean. This name has been thought to date from

1753, with *Silene polyphylla* falling into synonymy, but it was then invalid (in synonymy of *S. inaperta* L.) and was not validated until 1762. *Silene polyphylla* has been given as a synonym of *S. portensis* on several occasions, but has never been taken up as the correct name. Rejection as proposed is recommended.

(1491). To reject *Euphorbia pilulifera* L. (*Euphorbiaceae*). Proposed by H.-J. Esser & S. Cafferty in Taxon 50: 925–927 (2001). Votes: 14-0, 1 abst. (recommended).

The name was published in 1753 and was later applied to various species of the *Chamaesyce* group of *Euphorbia*. A lectotype was designated in 1911 that is referable to *E. parviflora* L. 1759, a species to which it has never been applied in practice. The name is not in current use, and the committee recommends rejection as proposed.

(1492). To conserve *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L. with a conserved type (*Malvaceae*). Proposed by P. A. Fryxell in Taxon 50: 929–931 (2001). Votes: 14-0, 1 abst.

This is a well known name, and a lectotype was chosen apparently uncritically in the Flora of Pakistan in 1979. A Commelin plate was nominated as the type, and this was the first lectotypification of the name. However, this plate is referable to another Linnaean species, *H. cannabinus*. Both species concerned are widespread, well known and economically important. The committee recommends acceptance of the proposal to re-typify *H. sabdariffa*.

Unpublished requests for decisions on homonymy

1. *Diospyros philippinensis* and *D. philippensis*

Submitted by S. Knapp & M. G. Gilbert (Natural History Museum, London).

(a) *Diospyros philippinensis* A. DC., Prodr. 8: 231 (1844). Type: Philippines, *Cuming 1142* (G-Boiss., holotype).

Name in use for an endemic species of the Philippines, with no known synonyms.

(b) *Diospyros philippensis* (Desr.) Gürke, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 4(1): 164 (1891). ≡ *Cavanillesia philippensis* Desr. in Lam., Encycl. 3(2): 663–664 (1792). ≡ *D. discolor* Willd., Syst. Pl. 4: 1108 (April 1806), nom. superfl. illegit. ≡ *D. embryopteris* Pers., Syn. Pl. 2: 624 (Sept. 1807), nom. superfl. illegit. Type: cultivated, herb. Lamarck? (P?).

= *D. mabolo* (Poir.) Lindl., Bot. Reg. 1828: t.1139 (1828): *Cavanillea mabolo* Poir. in Lam., Illustr. 2: t.454 (1823) ("*D. mabolo*" Roxb., Hort. Bengal.: 40 (1814), nom. nud.).

Native of Philippines and widely cultivated in New World.

The latter species is most commonly known currently by the name *D. discolor*, but this is illegitimate. Authors who have used this name include Vidal y Soler, Rev. Pl. Vasc. Filip. (1886), Merrill, Dict. Pl. Names Philipp. Is. (1905), Whitford, For. Fl. Philipp. 2 (1911), Brown, Veg. Philipp. Mts. (1919), Webster, Food Pl. Philipp. (1924) and Molina, Enum. Pl. Honduras (1975). *Diospyros philippensis* has been used in Fl. China 15: 232 (1996) and Fl. Taiwan, ed. 2, 4: 93, t. 93 (1998). Asis & al., Pl. Philipp. (1971), have confused the two species, the name *D. philippinensis* in the index being referenced to *D. philippensis* in the text.

Committee votes: 13-1, 1 abst., that the names should be treated as homonyms. The committee understands that a proposal to conserve the name *D. discolor* will now be made.

2. *Vantieghemia* and *Van-Tieghemia*.

Request submitted independently by R. R. Mill (Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh) and J. L. Reveal (University of Maryland).

(a) *Vantieghemia* Kuntze, Revis. Gen. Pl. 2: 874 (1891), nom. superfl. illegit. (*Fungi*, *Mucorales*). Type as for *Syncephalis* Tiegh. & G. Le Monn. (1873).

(b) *Van-Tieghemia* A. V. Bobrov & Melikyan in Bot. Zhurn. 85(7): 58 (2000), *Gymnospermae*, *Podocarpaceae/Prumnopityaceae*.

Both names apparently commemorate the botanist P. E. L. van Tieghem (1839–1914). *Van-Tieghemia* is a segregate genus in the *Podocarpaceae* sensu lato related to *Prumnopitys* Phil. and confined to South America. Discussion of the case has raised several different viewpoints. On one hand it has been argued that the two names will be pronounced the same which suggests that they must be treated as homonyms. It has been argued that the hyphen is not part of the spelling and so the two names are actual homonyms. It has been noted that since *Vantieghemia* is an illegitimate name in *Fungi*, the name in *Gymnospermae* will never be confused with it. It has also been noted that our recommendation on this could affect future practice, and that it is undesirable to encourage authors to publish such near homonyms.

The committee vote is 11-2, 2 abst., that the names should be treated as homonyms even if they are not actual homonyms.

3. *Cornera* Furtado and *Corneria* A. V. Bobrov & Melikyan.

Request submitted independently by R. R. Mill (Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh) and J. L. Reveal (University of Maryland).

(a) *Cornera* Furtado in Gard. Bull. Straits Settlem., ser. 3, 14: 518 (1955). *Palmae*.

(b) *Corneria* A. V. Bobrov & Melikyan in Bot. Zhurn. 85(7): 58 (2000). *Gymnospermae*, *Podocarpaceae/ Prumnopityaceae*.

The two names almost certainly both commemorate E. J. H. Corner (1906–1996), though this was not explicitly stated by Furtado. *Cornera* is now widely regarded by palm specialists to be a synonym of *Calamus* L. Very similar arguments to those put forward in the case of *Vantieghemia* and *Van-Tieghemia* above have also been expressed in this case.

The committee has voted 11-3, 1 abst., that the names should be treated as homonyms.

4. *Pterogonium* Sw. and *Pterogonum* H. Gross.

Request submitted by J. L. Reveal (University of Maryland).

(a) *Pterogonium* Sw., Monthly Rev. 34: 537 (1 June 1801), *nom. superfl. illegit.* Type as for *Pterigynandrum* Hedw. (1 Jan. 1801).

(b) *Pterogonum* H. Gross, Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 49: 239 (1913). *Polygonaceae*.

Despite the fact that it is illegitimate, the name *Pterogonium* has been often used in North America for a genus of mosses with three species in North and South America, Europe, Africa and Asia. The name *Pterogonum* has been reduced to *Eriogonum* subgen. *Pterogonum* (H. Gross) Reveal in Sida 3: 82 (1967), but has occasionally been maintained at generic rank in recent literature. The genus has 11 species in western United States and northern Mexico. The chances of the name in mosses and the name in *Polygonaceae* being confused seem slender to most of the committee.

The Committee vote on treating them as homonyms is 4-10, 1 abst., i.e., the names should not be treated as homonyms.