

**(1467) Proposal to conserve the name *Wulffia* against *Tilesia* (Asteraceae)**Harold Robinson<sup>1</sup> & Vicki Funk<sup>1</sup>

(1467) *Wulffia* Neck. ex Cass. in F. Cuvier, Dict. Sci. Nat. ed. 2, 29: 491. Dec 1823  
[Comp.], nom. cons. prop.

Type: *W. baccata* (L.) Kuntze (*Coreopsis baccata* L.).

(=) *Tilesia* G. Mey., Prim. Fl. Esseq: 251. Nov 1818, nom. rej. prop.

Type: *T. capitata* G. Mey.

The present proposal is an attempt to conserve a long established usage of the generic name *Wulffia*, especially as regards *W. baccata*, one of its three species that is widely distributed in tropical America from Panama and the Lesser Antilles to southern Brazil. The name *Wulffia* is used in almost all floristic treatments from that of Baker (in Martius, Fl. Bras. 6: 173–174. 1884) to the present-day, including Aristeguieta (Fl. de Venezuela 10: 531–534. 1964), Funk (in Rhodora 93: 256–267. 1991) and Boggan & al. (Checkl. Pl. Guianas: 60. 1997) for the Guianas, Robinson & Funk (Comp. Ecuador, 1: 65–78. 1997), D’Arcy (Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 62: 1169–1172. 1975) for Panama, and O. Schulz (in Urban, Symb. Antill. 7: 95. 1911) and Nicolson (Smithsonian Contr. Bot. 77: 47. 1991) for the Lesser Antilles. The name has also been consistently used in all general treatments and discussions of the Tribe *Heliantheae*, e.g., by Benth. (in Benth. & Hook. f., Gen. Pl. 2: 163–533. 1873), Stuessy (Biol. Chem. Comp. 2: 621–671. 1977) and Robinson (Smithsonian Contr. Bot. 51: 1–102. 1981), and is the name under which innumerable specimens are placed in the herbaria of the world. A small usage of the name *Tilesia* has begun to build since the paper by Pruski (in Novon 6: 404–418. 1996) preliminary to Pruski (Guayana Highland Fl. 1997) and in the DNA study of Panero (in Amer. J. Bot. 413–427. 1999). This recent usage could never be meaningfully applied without reference to the long established use of the name *Wulffia* for this concept. Nevertheless, the usage of *Tilesia* is at present nomenclaturally correct, although it is deemed by us to be extremely undesirable, and this proposal is being made to avoid its use in works in the future such as the *Heliantheae* for the Flora of Ecuador (Robinson, in prep.).

The facts of the case have been well treated by both Cassini (l.c.) in his entry on *Melanthera*, and by Pruski (l.c. 1996). Both authors were correct for their time. Cassini chose the oldest name for the concept that was available at that time, there being no ban on the use of names from Necker in *Elementa Botanica* (1790–1791). In the *Montreal Code* (Regnum Veg. 23. 1961) these Necker names were exemplified as “unitary designations of species” and, as such, “not to be regarded as

<sup>1</sup> Department of Botany, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution MRC-166, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A. E-mail: robinson.harold@nmnh.si.edu (author for correspondence); funk@nmnh.si.edu.

generic names". This prohibition continued essentially in this form until the Tokyo Congress in 1993 when provision was made for suppressing publications for the purposes of valid publication of specified ranks and Necker's *Elementa Botanica* was included for publication of generic names—cf. Art. 32.7 & App. V, *Opera utique oppressa*, in the current *St. Louis Code* (Greuter & al., *Regnum Veg.* 138. 2000). Hence, the name *Wulffia* cannot date from Necker (l.c. 1790) but is dated from Cassini (l.c. 1823). In the period between these two works, two names were applied to the entity now known as *Wulffia*. One of these was a herbarium name, "*Chylodia* Richard", not validly published until mentioned by Cassini himself (l.c.) as possibly, but not certainly, synonymous with *Wulffia*. Over this, Cassini expressed his personal opinion that *Wulffia* should take precedence. He noted the possibility of confusion with respect to Richard's *Chylodia*, because of the near homonymy with *Chilodia* R. Br. (Prodr. 507. 1810) and proposed *Chatiakella* Cass. as an alternative to *Chylodia* Richard ex Cass.; being prior to 1953, these alternative names are both validly published. *Chilodia* and *Chatiakella* are based on the single species, *Chylodia sarmentosa* Rich. ex Cass., a taxonomic synonym of *Wulffia baccata*. Of these three generic names now understood to be first validly published in the same work, *Chylodia* Richard ex Cass. and *Chatiakella* Cass., have both been included in synonymy under *Wulffia* Neck. ex Cass., e.g., by Candolle (Prodr. 5: 563. 1836), whereas we are unaware of any treatment of *Wulffia* as a synonym of either *Chylodia* or *Chatiakella*. Consequently, *Wulffia* has precedence over *Chylodia* and *Chatiakella* without need of conservation.

The major problem is the second pre-Cassini name, *Tilesia* G. Meyer, based on a single species, *T. capitata* G. Mey., a taxonomic synonym of *Wulffia baccata*. The name was definitely validly published in 1818 before the validation of *Wulffia* by Cassini in 1823. The conspecificity of the material upon which *Wulffia* and *Tilesia* were based was suggested by Cassini (l.c.) and has been accepted since Schultz-Bipontinus (in *Linnaea* 21: 242–248. 1848) and Bentham (l.c.). The name has had only a brief usage as an entity separate from *Wulffia* in such works as Candolle (Prodr. 5: 549. 1836), and it has had absolutely no usage outside of synonymy or indices during the over 150 years since the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century until the paper by Pruski (l.c. 1996). Its priority over *Wulffia* is one of the unintended consequences of the sweeping rejection of generic names in Necker's *Elementa Botanica* (1790). *Tilesia* is essentially a name from nowhere, and we believe its rejection is necessary for nomenclatural stability.

One point of interest raised by Pruski (l.c. 1996) is the similarity of the names *Wulffia* Neck. ex Cass. of *Asteraceae* and the name *Wolffia* Horkel ex Schleiden (1844) of *Lemnaceae*. These two names have coexisted for 150 years with no essential confusion, so it does not seem likely that confusion will arise in the future. In any case, if the names are ever treated as homonyms, it is *Wolffia* of the *Lemnaceae* that is the junior name and that would need conservation to allow its continued use.