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NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA ET REJIENDA SPERMATOPHYTORUM

H. W. Rickett (New York) and F. A. Stafleu (Utrecht)

Pages 220-279 of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (1956) are occupied by a list of conserved and rejected names of genera of Spermatophyta. The origins and history of conservation have been discussed by Stafleu (Taxon 5: 85-95). As a result of his study it became evident that the list is no longer in harmony with current concepts of nomenclature and the rules for maintaining them. The desirability of a general revision of the list is obvious; such a revision was begun by Stafleu several years ago. It proved, however, an impossible task for one person to achieve in the intervals between ordinary duties. Consequently application was made by The International Association for Plant Taxonomy to the National Science Foundation (Washington) for a grant in furtherance of this project. The grant was awarded early in 1958, enabling the present authors to work together for some seven weeks in Holland and England, principally in the Institute of Systematic Botany of the University of Utrecht and the Botany Department of the British Museum (Natural History). During this period we completed the verification (begun by Stafleu alone) of almost every citation in the list, and the evaluation of every conservation and rejection in the light of the current rules of nomenclature. The final manuscript was prepared later, in Utrecht and New York; an additional conference of the authors was made possible by Stafleu's visit to the United States in December, 1958.

A proposal has been presented to the Ninth International Botanical Congress, to be held at Montreal in 1959, to replace the current list of conserved and rejected names of genera of Spermatophyta by a new list based on that which follows (see Synopsis of Proposals, Regnum Vegetabile 14: 79. 1959).

Our sincere thanks are due to the officers and botanists of the several institutions whose facilities and cooperation we have enjoyed, particularly to the following:

Dr. J. Lanjouw, Director, Institute of Systematic Botany, University of Utrecht.
Dr. J. J. Swart, of the same Institute.
Dr. H. J. Lam, Rijksherbarium, Leiden.
Dr. R. Lorentz, Librarian, Teyler's Stichting, Haarlem.
Mr. J. S. L. Gilmour, Director, University Botanic Garden, Cambridge.
Mr. J. E. Dandy, Head, Botany Department, British Museum (Natural History).
Mr. W. T. Stearn, of the same institution.
Mr. R. Ross, of the same institution.
Miss P. Edwards, Librarian, Botany Department, British Museum (Natural History).
Dr. G. Taylor, Director, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.
Mr. Ch. E. Hubbard, Keeper of the Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.
Mr. V. S. Summerhayes, The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.
Mr. A. A. Bullock, of the same institution.
Mr. N. Y. Sandwith, of the same institution.
Dr. H. E. Moore, Bailey Hortorium, Ithaca.
Dr. R. C. Rollins, Director, Gray Herbarium, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Miss L. Schwarten, Librarian, Harvard University Herbarium.
Dr. R. S. Cowan, Department of Botany, U.S. National Museum, Smithsonian Institution, Washington.

Although several of the reasons for the changes that we propose in this publication have already been discussed at some length in the paper by Stafleu mentioned above, we are of the opinion that a fuller survey should be given here. The remainder of this introduction is devoted to this survey.

1. Errors and Mistakes

The list of *nomina conservanda et rejicienda* for Spermatophyta that now appears in the *Code* was started by the Vienna congress of 1905. Since then it has been reprinted again and again (four editions of the *Rules* and two of the *Code*), and it is understandable that in this repeated reprinting several mistakes have crept in: erroneous citations, changes of spelling, etc. We realize that our list also contains such mistakes, but we hope to have eliminated more old ones than we have made new ones. In works such as this ultimate precision is hypothetical only. Another item, which may be of lesser interest, is the inconsistency in the use of certain abbreviations of titles and the like to which various authors have drawn our attention. We have tried to bring the list into accord with the rules and recommendations also in this respect, and particularly to make it consistent within itself.

2. The Effect of Changes in the Rules

It is well known that the rules of nomenclature have been repeatedly changed since the Vienna congress. This continual changing can be attributed only partly to a certain wilfulness on the part of nomenclatural legislators. Most of the changes, including all the important ones, have been a direct result of the development of scientific plant taxonomy and of the growing tendency among all taxonomists to adhere to some one system of nomenclature rather than to competing systems or to no system at all. The number of taxonomists who now consistently ignore the international rules is very small. The result of these tendencies has been that a growing number of taxonomists have been actively engaged in perfecting the rules and in regulating our use of historical works, rather than adhering simply to unwritten tradition.

A few examples will illustrate this development.

a. *The Absolute Homonym Rule*. Before the Cambridge congress of 1930 it was possible to use a later homonym if the earlier one was illegitimate. This rule worked
quite well in the nineteenth century, but in the twentieth a growing group of taxonomists became opposed to it. If they had adhered strictly to the requirement of "illegitimacy" for the earlier homonym, all would perhaps have gone well. This, however, was impossible, since no sharp distinction was made at that time between "correct" and "legitimate". Many earlier homonyms that were legitimate but later taxonomic synonyms were regarded as no obstacle to the use of a later homonym; it is clear that confusion was inevitable, because the decision whether or not a later homonym was available became taxonomic (subjective) rather than objective. The rule "once a homonym always a homonym" or rather "once a later homonym, always illegitimate" (except for conservation) was adopted at Cambridge in 1930; this put an end to what had become a very confused situation.

One of the results of this decision, however, was that many names that were in common use appeared to be later and therefore illegitimate homonyms. It was the express understanding at the Cambridge congress that such cases should be dealt with by conservation, and an impressive number of *nomen conservanda* was added to the list (see Kew Bull. 1935: 341-544).

Another, more unexpected result of the adoption of the absolute homonym rule was that several conservations made in the past now became superfluous. Under the old system a name that was a later homonym might be available to replace a well-known but later taxonomic synonym; the well-known name could be saved only by conservation. After 1930 the competing name would be illegitimate anyhow because of the earlier homonym. Examples of this sort of superfluous conservation are:

3050 *Dontostemon*, 3122 *Caylusea*, 3753 *Clianthus*, 3810 *Alysicarpus*, 4077 *Tod-dalia*, 5600 *Agonis*, 5259 *Amphirrox*.

An equally unexpected result of the introduction of the absolute homonym rule was that by the above-mentioned stream of new *nomen conservanda* a number of names were declared illegitimate that had hitherto been legitimate and that had competed with well-known other names for which conservation had been invoked. Such conservations now became superfluous. [It should be pointed out that a name rejected in favour of a later homonym becomes illegitimate (unavailable) under the *Code*, since distinct taxa cannot bear the same name. It can never replace any other name. See also 4a below.]

An example of such a chain of events is the following: The name 4297 *Securinega* Commerson ex A. L. Jussieu (1789) is conserved over its taxonomic synonym *Acidoton* P. Browne (1756). *Securinega* is a legitimate name but when it competes with the earlier *Acidoton* the former would be the correct name for the taxon. Later, however, 4415 *Acidoton* Swartz (1788) was conserved over its earlier homonym *Acidoton* P. Browne (1756). This means that the latter is no longer available to replace *Securinega* and that this name stands without conservation.

The case of 5528 *Weihea* is slightly different. This name was conserved over *Richaea* Thouars (1806) for which it was an avowed synonym. *Weihea* was illegitimate on publication since *Richaea* itself was legitimate. The conservation of 6254 *Richea* R. Brown (1810) over *Richaea* Thouars (1806) makes the latter illegitimate, but this does not mean that *Weihea* is now available without conservation. *Weihea* was (Art. 64) "nomenclaturally superfluous when published" (italic ours), and cannot be used without conservation. Notwithstanding the absence of an earlier competing name, therefore, the conservation of *Weihea* remains necessary.

b. *Descripicio generico-specifica*. Before the Cambridge congress it was not possible to accept as validly published names provided with a combined generic and specific description. It was on this account perhaps that several generic names pub-
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lished by P. Browne in 1756, even those that were monotypic, were considered to be not validly published. After 1930 this was no longer true, and such publication was treated as valid (as had been done in the past by tradition).

c. The Kew Rule. The type species of many names in the present list carry names different from those hitherto adopted. The principal reason for this is that an astonishingly large number of cases of continuance of the "Kew rule" came to light. Under this rule no epithet had priority outside its combination with a generic name. If a species was transferred from one genus to another, its epithet was not necessarily retained but was often replaced by a new one. Such new epithets are now illegitimate; Art. 55 says expressly that the original epithet, if legitimate, must be retained (with certain exceptions).

The original Kew rule had an even wider scope: no name or epithet had priority outside its own rank (still our present Art. 60), neither had any epithet priority outside its "own combination" (that is, e.g. under another generic name). Art. 60 is what remains of the Kew rule, and this last remnant is also weakened by such provisions as Art. 27, under which the use of the same epithet for two infraspecific taxa within the same species "even if they are of different rank" is prohibited. A similar provision exists for infrageneric taxa (Art. 21), and a proposal not unlike this has been put forward for family names and for names of taxa between family and genus in rank.

d. The Type Method. The introduction of the type method has had many consequences for the list of nomina conservanda. Under the present rules it is sufficient — indeed mandatory — to conserve a generic name with a given type-species; no indication of the circumscription is necessary or even desirable. Each individual taxonomist is free to decide what circumscription to adopt. The list of nomina rejicienda contains names that must be rejected in case an author uses the conserved name with such a circumscription that it competes with certain other names based on different types.

In the old rules the names were conserved for a given circumscription. This made the citations sometimes long and complicated (see e.g. 1482 Epipactis, 1393 A Paphiopedilum, 1614 Epidendrum, 2513 Nymphaea), and in other cases it resulted in conserving a name under a later author (e.g. 9592 Taraxacum). This procedure amounted to the creation of a later homonym under the old rules, this is no longer necessary provided the conserved type-species was among the original species of the first author. This is the reason that for a large number of names it is now possible to give the first author who used the name with the conserved type.

A consequence of the type method is that several conservations that were made to preserve a certain circumscription are now maintained to conserve a certain choice of type. In such cases there is no need to mention any nomina rejicienda because none would be earlier than the conserved name. [See also 6 (5) below.]

3. The Effect of New Information

In this revision much new information has been incorporated in the list. Some of this had already been published elsewhere, some was sent to us by colleagues, and the remainder was found by us during our work. It is impossible to mention by name every primary source of our information, but wherever it came from, it has been verified by us unless it is otherwise stated.

A few examples of such changes follow.

a. Earlier publications of conserved and rejected names have been established. Several books appear to have been overlooked: e.g. Philip Miller's Gardeners
Dictionary, Abridged edition 4 (1754), contains many names which were cited as of a later date, and this notwithstanding the circumstance that Druce had in the beginning of this century pointed out the importance of this book and that several of the names were listed as of Miller in the fifth supplement to the Index kewensis.

J. G. Zinn's Catalogus plantarum horti academici et agri gottingensis (1757) is another example of an overlooked book that contains much information that tends to stabilize non-Linnaean (1753) names that were conserved. The overflow from the pre-1753 period is most manifest in these publications, but is also noticeable in a host of smaller works to which Rothmaler, for example, has drawn attention (Repert. Sp. Nov. 53: 1. 1944). Many names hitherto attributed to Adanson will also be found in the works of Miller, Zinn, Boehmer, and others.

In general our bibliographic work has resulted in the discovery of more facts that have a stabilizing influence than those that have a disturbing one. It is often said that the digging up of old books has disastrous results for well-known names. This has certainly been true for many names, but it may also be pointed out that, in this revision at any rate, such work has shown that many well-known names are older than has been generally assumed, and are thus often safeguarded against obscure synonyms. Taraxacum Zinn (1757), for instance, has no competing earlier synonyms, as far as we know.

b. Precise Dates of Publication. It is becoming clear that it is often necessary to verify the dates of publication given on title-pages. It is also often necessary to have precise information on the actual date (day, month) of publication. Much bibliographic search of this kind has been made in recent years. Some of the results are summarized by Mrs. van Steenis-Kruseman and Mr. William T. Stearn in Flora malesiana (ser. 1. 4 (5). 1954). In the bibliography that follows the present list we refer often to this work, and to other publications of a like nature. The dates shown in our list of nomina conservanda agree with those in our bibliography, and when conclusions are based on more detailed information about dates, this will be found in the bibliography and is not repeated under each conserved name.

c. Application of the Code. Several nomina rejicienda appeared to be nomina nuda, vernacular names, names published in other ranks, names based on totally different types, often in quite different families. The elimination of these names simplifies many of the cases and has the effect of making a number of conservations superfluous (e.g. 2202 Fagopyrum P. Miller; 1901 Zelkova Spach).

4. The Status of Nomina Rejicienda

The meaning of "rejected" as applied in nomenclature is unfortunately open to some misunderstanding. The phrase nomina rejicienda — "names to be rejected" — has here and where it is generally used a special meaning: names to be rejected because of the conservation of another name based on the same type, of another name for the taxon, or of a later homonym. Except for conservation, nomina rejicienda are in accord with the rules and would be maintained in use. But "rejection" appears in the Code also in another way. Section 6 (Articles 62-72) treats of the rejection of names that are not in accord with the rules, in other words that are illegitimate. (Names that are not validly published are, according to Art. 6, not names; they have no nomenclatural status and the question of "rejection" does not arise for them.)

The status of nomina conservanda is explained in Art. 13. That of nomina rejicienda is nowhere explicitly treated, but is implicit in various provisions of the Code. The following statements seem to us to follow from the interpretation of the rules.
[They apply only to names of taxa in categories subject to conservation, i.e., according to the current Code, to "genera, families, orders, and intermediate taxa" (Art. 14).]

a. All earlier homonyms of a conserved name, as well as later homonyms, are illegitimate. It is true that it is nowhere stated, as it was in older codes of nomenclature, that more than one taxon cannot bear the same name; but this is certainly implicit in Art. 64 (2). It would be of advantage for this to be more clearly stated in the Code, e.g. by a second note under Art. 64 (2) reading: "Earlier homonyms of conserved names are always illegitimate".

b. All names based on the same type as that of a conserved name (nomenclatural synonyms) are illegitimate. This follows from Principle IV and Art. 7. A taxon can bear only one correct name, the application of which is determined by its nomenclatural type. Sparmannia Buchoz (1779) is illegitimate for this reason, since the conserved name 7592 Rehmnia is based on the same type. Sparmannia Buchoz is illegitimate also as being an earlier homonym of a conserved name (4957 Sparmannia Linnaeus fil.).

c. Names based on different types from that of the conserved name but considered to be synonymous (taxonomic synonyms) are not, ipso facto, illegitimate. Here the question arises of the exact meaning of Art. 14 Note 3. This has been fully discussed by Stafleu (Taxon 5: 89, 90) and by Rickett and Stafleu (Taxon 7: 153); it is sufficient here to point out that the Note as it appears in the current Code is a relic of "circumscription" as a means of applying names, and that proposals to be presented at the Montreal congress seek to modify it in accord with the type method. Assuming that such a clarification is effected, the choice of a taxonomic synonym as a correct name, unless it is listed as a nomen rejiciendum, depends wholly on taxonomic judgment, and is not determined by conservation. If a taxon that bears a conserved name is united with another which bears a legitimate name of its own not listed as a nomen rejiciendum, the two names compete without regard to conservation. A name listed as a nomen rejiciendum in favor of a conserved name, but based on a different type, is still available when the corresponding taxon is regarded as distinct from that which bears the conserved name (Art. 14 Note 4). Examples are found under Art. 14 Notes 3 and 4 in the Code. (See also 6 (3) below.)

d. By Art. 64 (2) a later homonym is unavailable even if an earlier homonym is "illegitimate, or is generally treated as a synonym on taxonomic grounds." Conservation, therefore, against a nomenclatural or taxonomic synonym that is itself a later homonym is superfluous (see 2a above), and cannot affect the status of the earlier homonym(s) involved. Examples may be found under 2163 Helosia, 2261 Suaedea, 7810 Didymocarpus.

5. INCLUSION OF REJECTED NAMES IN THE LIST

In making the revision that follows we have followed the policy of the committees for Spermatophyta appointed at the Stockholm and Paris congresses (1950, 1954) in the listing of nomina rejicienda: only those names should be mentioned that have a real effect on the conservation in question. We have extended this general policy so that we cite only those earlier names that could replace or render illegitimate the conserved name if these were not conserved. When conservation was effected solely for lectotypification, or when the name to be conserved is illegitimate but has no name to replace it, we do not cite nomina rejicienda. A large number of names now in the list of nomina rejicienda have no bearing at all on the use of the corresponding conserved names, and citation of them makes the cases concerned less clear at first sight.
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We have accordingly limited citation of *nomina rejicienda* to the following:

1. The earlier legitimate nomenclatural synonyms if available (=).
2. The *first* earlier homonym (H).
3. Earlier taxonomic synonyms the rejection of which has been authorized by a congress (\(\Rightarrow\)).
4. The original spelling (first orthographic variant based on the same type) if it has priority over the conserved spelling (V).

We have excluded from listed *nomina rejicienda* the following:

1. Illegitimate earlier nomenclatural synonyms. These names, being illegitimate, can never replace the conserved name even if it were not conserved.
2. Earlier homonyms that are themselves illegitimate because of a still earlier homonym (the first). (All earlier homonyms are, by Art. 14 Note 5, automatically rejected.)
3. Illegitimate earlier taxonomic synonyms.
4. Orthographic variants other than the original spelling.

*Note:* No name of the kind designated in the above paragraphs 1-4 could replace the conserved name, since these were already illegitimate before conservation became effective. They are discussed in notes under each case, but we propose that these notes be omitted from the list when it is incorporated in future editions of the *Code*.

5. Names that had not been validly published (according to current rules) before the date of the conserved name. Many of these may have satisfied the requirements for publication of earlier codes of nomenclature.

6. Names that have no priority over the conserved name. Some of these would replace the conserved name if these were not conserved. For the case as given, in which the name is conserved, they are of no importance.

6. **The Uses of Conservation**

It is not always realized that conservation has not always been used simply to protect a name against falling into the synonymy of an earlier name or because of the existence of an earlier homonym.

Conservation serves many purposes and it is doubtless because of this great flexibility that it has proved useful. Although some may still consider it the chamber of horrors of nomenclature, it may well be said that, since expediency and the maintenance of established custom are our all-important overriding principles, conservation is one of the most useful of our nomenclatural devices.

Conservation has been invoked for the following reasons:

1. To protect a name against an earlier homonym. Conservation has the effect of giving the illegitimate later homonym the standing of a legitimate name. The earlier homonym in its turn becomes illegitimate through this action (if this was not already the case), and is indicated in our list by (H).

   Example: 6045 *Polemannia* Ecklon et Zeyher (1837) vs. *Polemannia* Bergius (1826).

2. To conserve (that is, to make legitimate) a name that was illegitimate on publication because of the existence of an earlier nomenclatural synonym. In other words, the type-species of that name is also the type-species of another, earlier name
that is in accord with the rules. The earlier name is marked in our list with an identity sign (≡).

Example: 6064 Kundmannia Scopoli (1777) is conserved over Arduina Adanson (1763), both being based on Sium siculum Linnaeus.

3. To protect a legitimate name against falling into the synonymy of an earlier taxonomic synonym when the correct name has to be established. The two competing names are based on different types and may both be legitimate. If thought to be applicable to different taxa of generic rank, both are available. It is only when, on taxonomic grounds, both names are regarded as applying to one taxon of a given circumscription that only one of them can be the correct name. In such cases conservation serves to protect the well-known but later name from becoming incorrect. It would never have been illegitimate, neither does the rejected taxonomic synonym become illegitimate on this account: it becomes obligatorily incorrect in case of union of the two taxa.

Example: 6291 Labisia Lindley (1845), when considered to be congeneric with Angiopetalum Reinwardt (1826) must be retained for the combined taxon. If thought to refer to different genera, both names are available. (See also 4c above).

4. To declare legitimate a name that is illegitimate under the rules but for which there is neither an earlier available name, nor an earlier homonym.

Example: 2988 Neslia Desvaux was (on publication) a superfluous name for Rapistrum Haller (1768). The circumstance that the latter is no longer available because of the conservation of Rapistrum Crantz (1769) does not automatically obviate the necessity of conserving Neslia. The latter was illegitimate on publication and can be made available only by conservation. The later conservation of Rapistrum Crantz has no effect whatever upon the status of Neslia, because Art. 64 (1) expressly states that a name is illegitimate "if it was nomenclaturally superfluous when published".

5. To retain a certain choice of type. This is indicated in our list by the words typ. cons. (typus conservandus). A name originally published with several species but without clear indication of a holotype may have been lectotypified in different ways by later authors. If it is desirable to retain a later choice, this can be done by conservation. The conserved name may be legitimate even without conservation. (See 2d above.)

Example: 2513 Nymphaea Linnaeus (1753) could be typified in various ways. The conserved lectotype is Nymphaea alba, a species that was not chosen by the first author to lectotypify the genus (Salisbury in 1805 chose Nymphaea lutea) but by a later one (J. E. Smith in 1809).

6. To retain a name with a type different from that chosen by the original author, or with a type that was not even included in the original author’s circumscription. In the latter case this action amounts to conservation of a later homonym, although it is often simply the conservation of a misapplication.

Examples: 2035 Protea R. Brown was a misapplication of the name Protea Linnaeus (1753), for Brown excluded all species that had been included in 1753 but included some added by Linnaeus in 1771. The genus could not be conserved as from 1771 because Linnaeus did not provide a new diagnosis in that publication. It could be argued, however, that the genus should have been conserved as Protea Murray (1774). This author adopted the widest circumscription given by Linnaeus (1771) and provided a diagnosis. The misapplication by Brown in 1810, however, is current usage. Protea argentea Linnaeus (type of Protea Linnaeus, 1753) being excluded, and Leucadendron cynaroides Linnaeus (the chosen type) included. Linnaeus himself had changed the circumscription of his genus Protea in 1753. Brown took up the usage by Linnaeus before 1753.
6277 Galax Linnaeus (1753) is conserved with the type Galax aphylia Linnaeus. The historical type of Linnaeus was a quite different species.

471a Bulbostylis Kunth is conserved in spite of the fact that Kunth did not propose a new name: he merely emended Steven's genus Bulbostylis, but later it became clear that the two concepts were often treated as different genera. The usage of Kunth was conserved, and therefore a later homonym was artificially created.

7. To make sure that a name will be retained whose exact date of publication cannot be established. The competing names may be either earlier or later, but which is true cannot be said with certainty. In this way the conservation arbitrarily assumes that the rejected names are earlier. This should on no account be interpreted as an official decision on the dates of the books themselves. It is simply an arbitrary decision for each particular case. Conservation here declares a name legitimate (or correct) when its exact status is uncertain.

Examples: 1449 Pterostylis R. Brown (Mar 1810) is conserved over (=) Diplodium Swartz (1810; month unknown). It is possible that the later name is earlier and the conservation serves to maintain Pterostylis in case the genera are united and the publication by Swartz should be proved to be earlier than March.

2432 Moenchia Ehrhart (1788 trim? ) is conserved over Moenchia Roth (1788 "prim"). It is probable that Roth's publication was the earlier (the preface was dated 21 Jan., Ehrhart's preface 8 Apr.), but this is not certain.

8. To preserve a later spelling of a name. Such cases are indicated in our list by orth. cons. (orthographia conservanda). It is only rarely that conservation has been effected for this purpose alone, but a later but better-known spelling has often been chosen for a name conserved for other reasons. It should be pointed out here that in such cases the conserved name dates from its original publication with the original spelling. The rejected original orthography is indicated in our list by (V) (variant spelling); other rejected orthographies may be indicated in the text by orth. rej. It is not always sure that the "correction" as conserved was in agreement with the intention of the original author. Still, if the correcting author duly attributes the name to the original author, but effects without comment an orthographical change, it would be incorrect to attribute the name to the correcting author.

Examples: 739 Philodendron Schott (1829) ('Philodendrum'), corr. Schott 1832 (orth. cons.); 1265 Moraea P. Miller (1758) ('Morea'), corr. Linnaeus 1762 (orth. cons.); 1502 Zeuxina Lindley (1826) ('Zeuxina'), corr. Roeper 1827 (orth. cons.).

2314 Pupalia A. L. Jussieu (1803) is probably simply a later variant of Pupal Adanson (1763). However, since Jussieu did not mention Adanson, it is better to continue to attribute Pupalia to Jussieu.

9. To enforce the application of Art. 75 and its note. When two generic names, based on different types, are very much alike, it is always difficult to know whether Art. 75 applies or not; that is, whether "they are to be treated as variants, which are homonyms". The footnote says that when there is doubt, the names should be referred to the General Committee. In practice this has hitherto meant that one of them was conserved and the other rejected as a "homonym". Art. 75 gives little guidance in this matter: the deciding principle seems to be the danger of confusion. Since this is generally a matter of opinion, a decision by a committee is needed to settle such cases.

Examples: 968 Burchardia R. Brown (1810), nom. cons. vs. Burcardia Duhamel (1755); 1077 Lloydia H. C. L. Reichenbach (1830), nom. cons. vs. Lloydia Necker (1790); 1178 Vallota Herbert (1821), nom. cons. vs. Valota Adanson (1763); "post" 1834a Symphyoglossum Schlechter (1919), nom. cons. vs. Symphyoglossum Turczaninow (1849); 3022 Lepidostemon J. D. Hooker et Thomson (1861) (Crucif.), nom. cons. vs. Lepistemon Blume (1825) (Convolv.).
10. To protect a name from competition with an earlier homonym or synonym whose publication is of doubtful validity.

Example: 1208 Hippeastrum Herbert (1821) is conserved over Leopoldia Herbert (1821). The latter name is of doubtful validity but would displace Hippeastrum Herbert if accepted as validly published. (See Taxon 7: 185. 1958; this case is not yet included in the present list because no decision had been taken by the time of printing the "Paris Code").

11. To conserve a choice between names published in the same book or article. Since "page-priority" or other "mechanical" systems are not accepted in establishing types or priority, it may be necessary in rare cases to conserve an arbitrary choice.

Example: When 134 Chrysocephalon Trinius, Fund. Agrost. 187 (1820) and Centrophorum Trinius, l.c. 106 are united, the former, being conserved, is to be retained.

CYCADACEAE


T.: Z. pumila Linnaeus.

TAXACEAE


Phyllocladus L. C. Richard 1826 (nom. cons.) (15).


T.: N. japonica J. Gaertner.

Note: Thalamina C. Sprengel, Anleit. ed. 2. 2: 218 (1817), is a superfluous name for Podocarpus Labillardière (1806); the latter is not now available, but conservation of Phyllocladus L. C. Richard remains necessary because it was superfluous on publication.


Note: Thalamina C. Sprengel, Anleit. ed. 2. 2: 218 (1817), is a superfluous name for Podocarpus Labillardière (1806); the latter is not now available, but conservation of Phyllocladus L. C. Richard remains necessary because it was superfluous on publication.


T.: T. taxifolia Arnott.


T.: T. grandiflora Rafinesque.


PINACEAE


Note: Conservation superfluous. (≡) Dammara Lamarck, Enc. 2: 259 (1786), was not validly published; its date of valid publication is 1822 (by Link) (non Dammara J. Gaertner, Fruct. 2: 100 (1791) [BURSER.]) (see also Bakhuizen van den Brink, Taxon 4: 195. 1955).

(H) Cedrus Duhamel, Traité Arb. Arbust. 1: xxviii, 139. t. 52. 1755 [CUPRESS.].


(H) Cunninghamia Schreber, Gen. 789. 1791 [RUBIAC.].
≡ Malanea Aublet 1775.

T.: S. sempervirens (D. Don) Endlicher (Taxodium sempervirens D. Don).

Note: Conservation superfluous. Steinhauera K. B. Presl in Sternberg, Fl. Vorw. 2: 202. t. 49, 57 (1838), cannot replace Sequoia Endlicher when the two genera are united, because of Art. 58. See also H. Tate Ames et al., Taxon 7: 227 (1958).

WELWITSCHIACEAE

T.: W. mirabilis J. D. Hooker.

(H) Welwitschia H. G. L. Reichenbach, Handb. 194. 1837 [POLEMON.].

POTAMOGETONACEAE

T.: P. caulini König, nom. illeg. [Zostera oceanica Linnaeus, P. oceanica (Linnaeus) Delile].

Note: ≡ Caulinia A. P. Decandolle in Lamarck et Decandolle, Fl. Franç. ed. 3. 3: 156 (1805), is a later homonym of Caulinia Willdenow, Mém. Acad. Sci. Berlin 1798: 87 (1801) [NAIAD.].

T.: C. aequorea C. König.
T.: P. major Cavolini.

Note: The original spelling, used in all reference works, is Cymodocea. The orthography Cymodocia (cf. I.C.B.N. 1956, p. 221) was undoubtedly an error.

GRAMINEAE (POACEAE)

T.: V. prosera Wallich et Griffith, nom. illeg. [Ischaemum cuspidatum Roxburgh, V. cuspidata (Roxburgh) Griffith].

(H) Vossia Adanson, Fam. 2: 243, 619. 1763 prim. [AIZOAC.].
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(=) **Manisuris** Linnaeus, Mant. 164, 300. Oct 1771.  
T.: *M. myurus* Linnaeus.

T.: *C. grylleus* (Linnaeus) Trinius (Andropogon grylleus Linnaeus) (typ. cons.).  
(≡) **Pollinia** C. Sprengel, Pugil. 2: 10. 1815.  
(=) **Raphis** Loureiro, Fl. Cochinch. 552. 1790.  
(≡) **Centrophorum** Trinius, Fund. Agrost. 106. 1820.  
T.: *C. chinense* Trinius.

Note: Both Kunth and Beauvois cited *Andropogon fastigiatus* Swartz (erroneously attributed to Linnaeus by Beauvois). Beauvois’ application of *Andropogon fastigiatus* was evidently based on an error, but the combination **Diectomis fastigiata** is to be retained (Art. 55) for the real transfer of *Andropogon fastigiatus* to the genus **Diectomis**. This is why Kunth correctly cited *D. fastigiata* (Swartz) P. Beauvois himself. The reason for the conservation was perhaps that Kunth’s genus is really the one based on *Andropogon fastigiatus* and that P. Beauvois’s generic diagnosis was in conflict with this.


T.: *Z. pungens* Willdenow.  
Note: The spelling **Zoysia** has been universally accepted until the present time. The change to **Zoysia** seems to have been made for etymological reasons at the time of conservation; however this change has not been generally accepted and is also in contradiction to the first paragraph of article 73 [see e.g. Hitchcock and Chase, Manual ed. 2. 484 (1950); however, compare Roy. Hort. Soc. Dict. Gard. 4: 2312 (1951)].

171. **Setaria** Beauvois, Agrost. 51. 178. 1812.  
T.: *S. viridis* (Linnaeus) Beauvois (Panicum viride Linnaeus).  
(≡) **Osterdania** Necker, Elem. 3: 218. 1790.  

T.: *L. oryzoides* (Linnaeus) Swartz (Phalaris oryzoides Linnaeus) (typ. cons.).  
(≡) **Homalocenchrus** Mieg, Acta Helvet. 4: 307. 1760.

T.: *E. capensis* Thunberg.  

T.: *H. odorata* (Linnaeus) Wahlberg (*Holcus odoratus* Linnaeus) *(typ. cons.)*.

(=) **Savastana** Schrank, Baiersche Fl. 1: 100, 387. 1789.

T.: *S. hirta* Schrank.

(=) **Torresia** Ruiz et Pavon, Prodr. 125. 1794.

T.: *T. utriculata* Ruiz et Pavon (Syst. 251. 1798).

(=) **Disarrenum** Labillardière, Nov. Holl. Pl. Spec. 2: 82. t. 232. 1806.


**Note:** Labillardière wrote *D. antarcticum* and *Arista antartica*; these were corrected in "errata" to *D. antarcticum* and *Aira antarctica*.


**Note:** Conservation superfluous: (=) **Pallasia** Scopoli, Intr. 72 (1777), is to be treated as a later homonym of **Pallassia** Houttuyn, Nat. Hist. 2 (4): 382 (1775).

† 228. **Coleanthus** Seidel in Roemer et Schultes, Syst. 2: 11, 276. 1817.


**Note:** Conservation superfluous: **Coleanthus** Seidel is legitimate because it was a substitute name for (≡) **Schmidtia** Trattinick, Fl. Osterr. Kaiserth. 1: 12 (1816), non Moench, Meth. Suppl. 217 (1802).

257. **Holcus** Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. 1047. 1753.

T.: *H. lanatus* Linnaeus *(typ. cons.)*.


269. **Corynephorus** Beauvois, Agrost. 90, 159. 1812.


(=) **Heteranthus** Borkhausen, Botaniker 16-18: 71. 1796 (?).

**Note:** The original publication of **Heteranthus** Borkhausen (1796) has not been seen by us.


**Note:** (≡) **Fibichia** Koeler, Descr. Gram. Gall. Germ. 308 (1802), is illegitimate because ≡ **Dactilon** Villars 1787.


T.: *S. pappophoroides* Steudel ex J. A. Schmidt.

**Note:** Another homonym: *Schmidtia* Trautinick, Fl. Österr. Kaiserth. 1: 12 (1816) [GRAM.].


T.: *D. americana* Beauvois '[Festuca diandra' A. Michaux, non Moench 1794].

**Note 1:** The original publication of *Corycarpus* Zea (1806) was not consulted by us. The name was spelled *Korycarpus* by Lagasca, Gen. Sp. 1: 4 (1816).

**Note 2:** (=) *Diaria* Rafinesque was not validly published until 1819.

T.: *Z. americana* Willdenow (*Apluda zeugites* Linnaeus, Syst. Nat. ed. 10. 1306. (1759)).

**Note:** Conservation superfluous: P. Browne’s publication is valid and the name dates from 1756.


(V) *Lamarkia* Moench, Meth. 201. 1794.  
(H) *Lamarckia* Olivi, Zool. Adriat. 258. 1792 [ALGAE].  
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381. **Scolochloa** Link, Hort. Berol. 1: 1136. 1827 sem. 2.  
(H) **Scolochloa** Mertens et Koch, Deutschl. Fl. 1: 374, 528. 1823 [GRAM.].  

*Note:* Conservation superfluous: *Panicularia* Heister ex Fabricius, Enum. 207 (1759), was an illegitimate substitute for *Poa* Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. 67 (1753), and in ed. 2 (1763) it was a renaming of *Poa aquatica* Linnaeus.

*Note:* (≡) **Atropis** Ruprecht was doubtfully validly published in 1845, being perhaps intended as a sectional name. Cf. Sprague, Kew Bull. 1940: 84.

T.: *P. bambusoides* Siebold et Zuccarini.  
*Note:* Conservation superfluous: *Phyllostachys* Torrey, Ann. Lyc. N.Y. 3: 404 (1836), was not validly published (nomen nudum provisorium). McClure's proposal (Taxon 6: 156. 1957) to place *Sinoarundinaria* Ohwi (1931) on the list is also superfluous: *Phyllostachys* Siebold et Zuccarini is legitimate without conservation and has priority.

**CYPERACEAE**

*Note:* Conservation superfluous: (=) **Hypaelyptum** Vahl, Enum. 2: 283. 1806.  
T.: *Schoenus mariscus* Linnaeus [*Cladium mariscus* (Linnaeus) Pohl].  
*Note:* The genus **Mariscus** J. Gaertner, Fruct. 1: 11 (1788), did not include the type species of the conserved name; it is illegitimate because of **Mariscus** Zinn. (1757).

T.: *F. filiformis* (Lamarck) H. A. Schrader (*Schoenus filiformis* Lamarck) (typ. cons.).

*Note:* (=) *Hypolepis* Beauvois ex Lestiboudois, Ess. Cyp. 33 (1819), is not available because of *Hypolepis* Bernhardi, Neues Journ. Bot. Schrader 1 (2): 34 (1806) [PTERID.], and *Hypolepis* Persoon, Syn. Pl. 2: 598 (1807) [RAFFL.].


*Note:* (=) *Pterolepis* H. A. Schrader, Gött. Gel. Anz. 1821: 2071 (1821), is not now available because of *Pterolepis* Miquel, Comm. Phytogr. 2: 72 (1839) (nom. cons.); (=) *Malacochaete* C. G. Nees, Linnaea 9: 293 (1834), was an illegitimate substitute name for Schrader’s name.

T.: *B. capillaris* (Linnaeus) C. B. Clarke (*Scirpus capillaris* Linnaeus) (typ. cons.).

*Note 1:* Kunth’s name was not intended as new: it was *Bulbostylis* Steven emended by him. This is the creation of a later homonym by conservation on account of typification!

*Note 2:* Another homonym: *Bulbostylis* A. P. Decandolle, Prodr. 5: 138 (1836) [COMPOS.].

*Note 3:* Svensson’s designation (N. Am. Fl. 18: 540. 1957) of *B. stenophylla* (Elliott) C. B. Clarke as type was later than the selection of *B. capillaris* (Linnaeus) C. B. Clarke, and the substitution was unintentional.


*Note:* *Triodon* L. C. Richard in Persoon, Syn. Pl. 1: 60 (1805), was not validly published, being mentioned in synonymy.
PALMAE (ARECACEAE)

542. **Pritchardia** Seemann et H. Wendland ex H. Wendland, Bonplandia 10: 197. 1 Jul 1862. 
   T.: *P. pacifica* Seemann et H. Wendland ex H. Wendland.

   T.: *W. filifera* (Linden ex André) H. Wendland (*Pritchardia filifera* Linden ex André).

**Note:** *Washingtonia* Rafinesque, Am. Mon. Mag. Crit. Rev. 2: 176 (1818), is a *nomen nudum.*

**Note:** (H) *Washingtonia* Winslow (Calif. Farmer 2: 58. 24 Aug 1854) was published “in anticipation of the future acceptance of the group concerned”; it was a provisional name (“if it should be properly ranked as a new genus”), the publication being consequently not valid. Conservation is therefore superfluous. Winslow’s obscurely published article is quoted in part (not always accurately) by W. J. Hooker (Journ. Bot. Kew Misc. 7: 26-29. 1855).

   T.: *P. papuana* Beccari.


594. **Chamaedorea** Willdenow, Sp. Pl. 4: 638, 800. 1806.

**Note:** (=) *Nunnexharia* Ruiz et Pavon, Prodr. 147. 1794.

**Note:** Dr H. E. Moore informs us (in litt.) that the genus *Morenia* Ruiz et Pavon, Prodr. 150 (1794) (T.: *M. fragrans* Ruiz et Pavon), may also be considered congeneric with *Chamaedorea* Willdenow (1806). A proposal to add this name to this case as a *nomen rejiciendum* may be put forward in due course.

   T.: *V. storeckii* H. Wendland (typ. cons.).

**Note:** For comment on the choice of type see Moore, Gent. Herb. 8: 483 (1957), and Taxon 7: 83 (1958). It is proposed to change the choice of type to *V. joannis* H. Wendland.


**Note:** The name was spelled *Orbignia* by Martius in both of his subsequent publications: Palm. Orbign. 125 (1844), Hist. Nat. Palm. 3: 302 (1845).
660. **Maximiliana** Martius, Palm. Fam. 20. 15 Apr 1824.


Note: *Maximiliana* Martius in Schrank (1819) is rejected against *Cochlospermum* Kunth (1824) (nom. cons.) (5250).

‡ 670. **Desmoncus** Martius, Palm. Fam. 20.

15 Apr 1824.


Note: Conservation superfluous: *Atitara*, Dict. Sci. Nat. 3: 277 (Dec 1816), was a vernacular name, not a validly published generic name.

**CYCLANTHACEAE**


T.: *L. lancifolia* A. T. Brongniart (*'lancaefolia').

**ARACEAE**


Note: Conservation superfluous: all publications of (≡) *Spathyema* Rafinesque prior to 1839 are invalid.


Note: (≡) *Candarum* H. G. L. Reichenbach ex Schott et Endlicher, Melet. Bot. 17 (1832), is illegitimate because of (≡) *Python* Martius (1831).


Note 1: *Baursea* Hoffmannsegg has never been validly published as a generic name. In 1824 (Verz. Pfl. 42) it was a *nomen nudum*; later (H. G. L. Reichenbach, Conspr. 44. 1828) it was a subgenus!

Note 2: Conservation superfluous except for the change in orthography.
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748. Zantedeschia C. Sprengel, Syst. 3: 756, 765. 1826. T.: Z. aethiopica (Linnaeus) C. Sprengel (Calla aethiopica Linnaeus). Note: (≡) Richardia Kunth, Mém. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris 4: 437 (1818), is unavailable, being a later homonym of Richardia Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. 330 (1753) [RUBIAC.]; it was also illegitimate on publication because it was a superfluous name for (≡) Aroides Heister ex Fabricius 1763.

779. Helicodiceros Schott in C. Koch, Ind. Sem. Hort. Berol. 1855 (Append.): 2. 1855. T.: H. muscivorus (Linnaeus f.) Engler (in A. et C. Decandolles, Monogr. Phan. 2: 605. Sep 1879) (Arum muscivorum Linnaeus f.). Note 1: The publication of the name Helicodiceros by Schott in 1853 (Oesterr. Bot. Wochenbl. 3: 369) was not valid, being based only on a reference to an existing species. Note 2: Dracunculus crinitus Schott was legitimate on publication. In a later publication Schott (Syn. Aroid. 1: 21. 1856) cited Arum crinitum Aiton as a synonym. The latter is illegitimate since the epithet muscivorum ought to have been adopted by Aiton, Arum muscivorum Linnaeus f. (Suppl. 410. 1781) being cited in synonymy. Helicodiceros muscivorus (Linnaeus f.) Engler is presumably the correct name for the type species.


RESTIONACEAE


816. **Hypodiscus** C. G. Nees in Lindley, Nat. Syst. 450. 1836.

   T.: *P. lamarckii* Kunth (typ. cons.).

**Note:** **Paepalanthus** “Martius” was conserved for *P. lamarckii* Kunth (1841). This species, however, is not included in *Paepalanthus* Martius (1835). The authority for the conserved name should be changed to accord with the type. It is not clear whether *Paepalanthus* Martius (1835) is accepted as a genus by the author or not. However, the conservation implies that the name has to be definitely accepted as validly published.

**ERIOCAULACEAE**

861. **Aechmea** Ruiz et Pavon, Prodr. 47. 1794.

878. **Pitcairnia** L’Hér. et G. Curtis, Prodr. 2: 1788.
   T.: *P. bromeliinaefolia* L’Hér.

   T.: *V. psittacina* (W. J. Hooker) Lindley (Tillandsia psittacina W. J. Hooker).

**BROMELIACEAE**

861. **Aechmea** Ruiz et Pavon, Prodr. 47. 1794.

878. **Pitcairnia** L’Hér. et G. Curtis, Prodr. 2: 1788.
   T.: *P. bromeliinaefolia* L’Hér.

   T.: *V. psittacina* (W. J. Hooker) Lindley (Tillandsia psittacina W. J. Hooker).

**COMMELINACEAE**


904. **Cyanotis** D. Don, Prodr. Fl. Nepal. 45. 1 Feb 1825.
   T.: *C. barbata* D. Don.

**Note:** **Zygomenes** R. A. Salisbury, Trans. Hort. Soc. London 1: 271 (1812), is a nomen nudum.

909. **Dichorisandra** Mikan, Del. Fl. Faun. Bras. t. 3. 1820.
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T.: *T. fugax* Scheidweiler. (H) **Tinantia** Dumortier, Anal. Fam. 58. 1829 [IRIDAC].
(=) **Pogomesia** Rafinesque, Fl. Tell. 3: 67. Nov-Dec 1837 ('1836').
T.: *P. undata* (Humboldt et Bonpland) Rafinesque (*Tradescantia undata* Humboldt et Bonpland).

**PONTEDERIACEAE**

T.: *E. azurea* (Swartz) Kunth (*Pontederia azurea* Swartz) (typ. cons.).
(=) **Piaropus** Rafinesque, Fl. Tell. 2: 81.1837 (1836).

Note: We have been unable to consult Kunth’s original dissertation of 1842.

Note: Conservation superfluous: Dennstedt’s publication (Schluess. 33. 1818) of *Reussia sarmentosa* is not valid as a combined generic and specific description, since it depends solely on a reference to a species, “Valli-kara.” Hence *Reussia* was not validly published at that time as a generic name.

† 924. **Heteranthera** Ruiz et Pavon, Prodr. 9. 1794.
Note: Conservation superfluous: *Phrynium* Loefling, Iter Hisp. 178 (1758), was not validly published; it was mentioned only as a synonym.

**JUNCACEAE**

937. **Luzula** A. P. Decandolle in Lamarck et Decandolle, Fl. Franç. ed. 3. 3: 158. 1805.
T.: *L. campestris* (Linnaeus) A. P. Decandolle (*Juncus campestris* Linnaeus) (typ. cons.).
(=) **Juncoides** Adanson, Fam. 2: 47, 564.1763 prim.

**LILIACEAE**

944. **Narthecium** Hudson, Fl. Angl. 127. 1762 med.
(=) **Narthecium** L. Gérard, Fl. Gallo-prov. 142. 1761 trim. 1 [LILIAC].
T.: *Anthericum calyculatum* Linnaeus (*calyculatam*).

T.: *A. muscaetoxicum* (Walter) A. Gray (*Melanthium muscaetoxicum* Walter) (typ. cons.).
(=) **Chrosperma** Rafinesque, Neogenyton 3. 1825.
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T.: *S. angustifolium* (Pursh) Kunth

(=) *Veratrum angustifolium* Pursh (type of *Veratrum* subg. Stenanthium A. Gray).


T.: *S. undulata* R. Brown (typ. cons.).

(=) *Schelhaneria* Fabricius, Enum. 161. 1759

[H] *Schelhammeria* T.:


Note: Another homonym: *Schelhammeria* Moench, Meth. Suppl. 119 (1802) [CYPERAC.].

967. **Tricyrtis** Wallich, Tent. Fl. Napal. 61. t. 46, 1826 sem. 2.


[H] *Compsoa* D. Don, Prodr. Fl. Nepal. 50. 1 Feb 1825.

T.: *C. maculata* D. Don.


(=) *Burcardia* [Heister] Duhamel, Traité Arb. Arbust. 1: xxx, 111. 1755 [VERBEN.].

≡ *Callicarpa* Linnaeus 1753.

Note: Another homonym: *Burchardia* Necker, Elem. 2: 76 (1790) [MYRTAC.].


T.: *A. dioica* R. Brown (typ. cons.).

(=) *Anguillaria* J. Gaertner, Fruct. 1: 372. 1788.

T.: *A. bahamensis* J. Gaertner.

≡ *Heberdenia* Banks ex A. Decandolle 1841 (nom. cons.) (6282).


(=) *Bulbine* J. Gaertner, Fruct. 1: 41. 1788

[H] [AMARYLL.].

T.: *B. asiatica* (Linnaeus) J. Gaertner

(≡) *Crinum asiaticum* Linnaeus.

Note: *Phalangium* (Linnaeus) P. Miller, Gard. Dict. Abr. ed. 4 (1754), ≡ *Anthericum* Linnaeus (1753). *Phalangium* Boehmer in Ludwig, Def. Gen. Pl. 362 (1760), also includes the type of *Anthericum* and is therefore not a separate genus; the name should not be listed here.

987. **Simethis** Kunth, Enum. 4: 618. Jul 1843.


Note: Conservation superfluous: *Pubilaria* Rafinesque, Fl. Tell. 2: 27 (1837), was not definitely accepted by its author; moreover there is no generic description, as required for a monotypic genus not based on a new species.


**Note 1:** Torrey’s genus is based on *Phalangium croceum* A. Michaux (1803). The citation of *S. album* E. M. Durand as the type must be an error: this new species of Durand was based on a specimen consisting of a few fragments only. The generic diagnosis is based on Michaux’ species. Torrey lumped several white-flowered species with Michaux’ (which, however, he cited first) and changed the name because he thought Michaux’ name was misleading. *S. album* Durand was the first combination made, apparently based on a white-flowered species.

**Note 2:** **Amblostigma** Rafinesque included *Phalangium croceum* A. Michaux on publication.

1007. **Chlorogalum** (Lindley) Kunth, Enum.  

T.: *C. pomeridiana* (A. P. Decandolle) Kunth (*Scilla pomeridiana* A. P. Decandolle) (typ. cons.).

**Note:** The holotype-species is Lindley’s *Ornithogalum divaricatum*, the other of Kunth’s two species, since reduced to *S. pomeridiana*.

1011. **Bowiea** W. H. Harvey ex J. D. Hooker, Bot. Mag. t. 5619. 1 Jan 1867.

T.: *B. solubilis* W. H. Harvey ex J. D. Hooker.

1018. **Hosta** Trattinick, Arch. Gewächsk. 1: 55. t. 69. 1812 (1814?).  
T.: *H. japonica* Trattinick.

**Note:** *Saussurea* Salisbury, Trans. Linn. Soc. 8: 11 (1807), is a nomen nudum.

1021. **Blandfordia** J. E. Smith, Exot. Bot. 1: 5. t. 4. 1 Dec 1804.  
T.: *B. nobilis* J. E. Smith.


**Note:** *Catevula* Medikus, Theodora 67. 1786.

T.: *L. gracilis* R. Brown (typ. cons.).

**Note 1:** Another homonym: *Laxmanna* Schreber, Gen. 2: 800 (1791) [RUTAC.].

**Note 2:** *Petrobium* R. Brown, Trans. Linn. Soc. 12: 113 (1816), was an illegitimate substitute name for *Laxmanna* J. R. et G. Forster (1776). The fact that the latter is no longer available has no effect on the illegitimacy of *Petrobium*. Brown’s name was still-born and can be saved only by conservation.

*Note:* Other homonyms: *Johnsonia* Adanson, Fam. 2: 343 (1763 prim.) (≡ *Cedrela* P. Browne, Hist. Jamaica 158 (1756)), [MELIAC.], and *Johnsonia* Necker, Elem. 2: 49 (1790) [SOLAN.].


(≡) *Abomon* Adanson, Fam. 2: 54, 511-512. 1763 prim.

1046. **Agapanthus** L'Héritier, Sert. Angl. 10. 1788.  

*Note:* Unavailable are (=) *Tulbaghia* Heister, Brunsvig. x (1753) (nom. rej. vs. *Tulbaghia* Linnaeus 1771, nom. cons., 1047) and (≡) *Mauhla* Dahl, Obs. Syst. Linn. 25 (1787), a superfluous name for *Abomon* Adanson (1763).

T.: *T. capensis* Linnaeus.  

(≡) *Abomon* Adanson, Fam. 2: 54, 511-512. 1763 prim.

(≡) *Abomon* Adanson, Fam. 2: 54, 511-512. 1763 prim.


*Note 1:* *Pseudoscordum* Herbert, Amaryll. 11 (1837), is a nomen nudum et provisorium.

*Note 2:* *Periloba* Rafinesque, Fl. Tell. 4: 87 (1838 med.), based on *Nolana paradoxa* Lindley, is to be removed from this case: it is a Nolanaee.

*Note 3:* C. V. Morton (Taxon 3: 21. 1954) demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Committee for Spermatophyta (see Taxon 7: 189. 1958), that *Geboscon* Rafinesque, Fl. Tell. 2: 19 (1837 quadr. 1), is not a synonym of *Nothoscordum* Kunth (but of *Allium* Linnaeus); conservation is therefore superfluous. Earlier publications of *Geboscon* did refer to *Ornithogalum bicalce* Linnaeus, but were invalid.


*Note:* *Hookera* J. E. Smith (Trans. Linn. Soc. 9: 275. post Apr 1808, MUSCI) was published later than Salisbury's name; Salisbury's plate 100 [sic] having been published on or before 1 Mar 1808.


*Note:* Other homonyms: *Bessera* C. Sprengel, Pugi. 2: 90 (1815) [EUPHORB.], and *Bessera* Velloso, Fl. Flum. 147 (1825) [NYCTAG.].  
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*(H) Lloydia* Necker, Elem. 1: 4. 1790 [COMP.].


**Note 1:** *Lloydia* R. A. Salisbury, Trans. Hort. Soc. London 1: 328 (1812), was not validly published (*nomen nudum*).

**Note 2:** *Rhabdocrinum* H. G. L. Reichenbach, Consp. 65 (1828), is also a *nomen nudum*.

**Note 3:** It is doubtful whether *Lloydia* Necker (1790) is indeed a homonym of *Lloydia*. They have here been treated as orthographic variants, thus making the conservation of *Printzia* Cassini (9059) superfluous (Art. 75, footnote!).


*(≈) Basilaea* A. L. Jussieu ex Lamarck, Enc. 1: 382. Aug 1758 (‘1783’).


*(≈) Terminalis* Rumphius, Auct. 40. 1755.

*(=) Taetsia* Medikus, Theodora 82. 1786.


**Note:** *Terminalis* Rumphius is doubtfully valid. There is no generic diagnosis. *Descripilio generico-specifica?*


*(≈) Acyntha* Medikus, Theodora 76. 1786.


*(H) Milligania* J. D. Hooker, Hooker’s Ic. Pl. 3: t. 299. 1840 [GUNNER.]


*(≈) Vagnerea* Adanson, Fam. 2: 496. 1763 prim. T.: ‘*Polygonatum* Corn. t. 33. 37. Mor. s. 13. t. 4 f. 7. 9’ (*Convallaria stellata* and *C. racemosa* Linnaeus).

*(≈) Polygonastrum* Moench, Meth. 637. 1794.


**Note:** (≈) *Tovaria* Necker, Elem. 3: 190 (1790) (non *Tovara* Adanson 1763), is illegitimate and also unavailable because of *Tovaria* Ruiz et Pavon 1794 (nom. cons.) (3081).

(=) **Valentinia** Heister ex Fabricius, Enum. ed. 2. 37. 1763. 


Note: (=) **Unifolium** Zinn, Catal. 104 (Mai 1757), is probably unavailable because of **Unifolium** Ludwig. Inst. ed. 2. 1757, which is a totally different genus.


Note: Conservation superfluous: **Sanseviella** H. G. L. Reichenbach, Conspl. 44 (1828), was not validly published.

T.: *O. japonicus* (Linnaeus f.) Ker-Gawler (*Convallaria japonica* Linnaeus f.). 

(=) **Mondo** Adanson, Fam. 2: 496. 1763 prim. 
T.: 'Kaempf. Amoen. t. 824'.


(=) **Enargea** Banks et Solander ex J. Gaertner, Fruct. 1: 283. 1788. 
T.: *E. marginata* J. Gaertner. 

(=) **Callixene** Commerson ex A. L. Jussieu, Gen. 41. 1789 sem. 2.

**HAEMODORACEAE**

† 1161. **Lachnanthes** S. Elliott, Sketch Bot. S.C. & Ga. 1: 47. 26 Sep 1816 ('1821'). 
T.: *L. tinctoria* Elliott. 

Note: Conservation superfluous. (≡) **Heritiera** J. F. Gmelin, Syst. 2: 113 (1791), (non W. Aiton 1789) is not available, and **Gyrotheca** Salisbury, Trans. Hort. Soc. London 1: 327 (1812), is a nomen nudum.

**AMARYLLIDACEAE**

1175. **Nerine** Herbert, Bot. Mag. t. 2124. 1 Jan 1820. 


(H) **Valota** Adanson, Fam. 2: 495. 1763 prim. [GRAM.]. 

Note: M. L. Green (Kew Bull. 1935: 528) states that **Vallota** and **Valota** are different names. **Valota** Adans. is still in use (Hitchcock, Chase) and there is no reason why both names should not co-exist! However, by this conservation Article 75 applies and the names are treated as orthographic variants of the same name.
T.: \textit{Z. atamasco} (Linnaeus) Herbert \[\textit{Amaryllis atamasco} Linnaeus ("ata-}
masca"), Sp. Pl. 292. 1753] (typ. cons.).

\textit{Urceolina} H. G. L. Reichenbach, 
Conspl. 61. 1828. 

Note: (≡) \textit{Urceolaria} Herbert, Appendix 28 (1821), is illegitimate because of \textit{Urceolaria} Willdenow ex Cothenius, Disp. 10 (1790).

1211. \textit{Urceolina} H. G. L. Reichenbach, 
Conspl. 61. 1828. 

Note: (≡) \textit{Urceolaria} Herbert, Appendix 28 (1821), is illegitimate because of \textit{Urceolaria} Willdenow ex Cothenius, Disp. 10 (1790).


\textit{Urceolina} H. G. L. Reichenbach, 
Conspl. 61. 1828. 

Note: (≡) \textit{Urceolaria} Herbert, Appendix 28 (1821), is illegitimate because of \textit{Urceolaria} Willdenow ex Cothenius, Disp. 10 (1790).


T.: \textit{P. cirrosa} F. Mueller.

\textit{Syringodea} J. D. Hooker, Bot. Mag. t. 6072. 1 Dec 1873. 
T.: \textit{S. pulchella} J. D. Hooker.


\textit{Moraea} P. Miller, Fig. Pl. 159. t. 238. 27 Jun 1758 ("Morea"); corr. Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. ed. 2. 59. Sep 1762. 
T.: \textit{M. juncea} Linnaeus (typ. cons.).
1283. **Libertia** C. Sprengel, Syst. 1: 127. (H) **Libertia** Dumortier, Comment. 9. 1823 [LILIAC.].
1824 sero.


(=) **Tekel** Adanson, Fam. 2: 497. 1763 prim.
T.: 'Feuille t. 4'.

1284. **Bobartia** Ker-Gawler, Irid. Gen. 29. (H) **Bobartia** Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. 54. 1753 [CYPER.].
1287.

**Note 1**: **Hecaste** Solander ex Schumacher, Skr. Naturh. Selsk. Kjøbenhavn. 3 (1): 10 (1793) was not validly published because Schumacher did not accept this name.

**Note 2**: The publication of the generic name by R. A. Salisbury, Trans. Hort. Soc. London 1: 313 (1812), cannot be considered for conservation because there is no generic description and because Salisbury presumably continues the use of **Bobartia** Linnaeus. Ker-Gawler (1827) gives a diagnosis and for purposes of conservation his usage of the name **Bobartia** may be treated as new. The type-species has no legitimate name because both Salisbury and Ker-Gawler cite **Bobartia indica** Linnaeus in the synonymy. According to J. G. Baker this should apply to only a part of the Linnean taxon but nevertheless there is no legitimate name. **Bobartia juncea** Salisbury is illegitimate because both **Bobartia indica** Linnaeus and **Moraea spathacea** Linnaeus f. are cited, and **Bobartia spathacea** (Linnaeus f.) Ker-Gawler is illegitimate because **Bobartia indica** is cited without any indication of "ex parte." Baker (i.e.) also cites **Xyris altissima** Loddiges as a taxonomic synonym and if this is still thought to be the case this should be the basionym for the correct name of the type species.

1285. **Belamcanda** Adanson, Fam. 2: 60. (V) **Belam-Canda** Adanson, Fam. 2: 60. 1763. [**Belam-Canda**], 524 [**Belamkanda**].
T.: **B. chinensis** (Linnaeus) A. P. Decandolle (in Redouté, Lil. 3: t. 121. 1805) (**Ixia chinensis** Linnaeus) (**typ. cons.**).

**Note**: Unless the name is conserved in the spelling as corrected by Medikus the spelling would have to be Belam-Canda. Apart from that the conservation is hardly necessary: **Gemmingia** Heister is valid only if the original Heister diagnosis can be traced (not seen by us); Fabricius simply enumerates specific "names" (phrases). Furthermore Adanson's **Familles** may have appeared late in 1762 or early in 1763, probably before Fabricius' book.

T.: **G. fragilis** Labillardiére.

‡ 1292. **Eleutherine** Herbert, Bot. Reg. 29: t. 57. 1 Nov 1843.

**Note 1**: Conservation superfluous: **Galatea** Salisbury, Trans. Hort. Soc. London 1: 310 (1812), is a nomen nudum.

**Note 2**: For the legitimate name of the type species see Urban, Repert. Sp. Nov. 15: 305 (1918).

T.: **I. polystachya** Linnaeus ("polystachia") (**typ. cons.**).
1313. **Micranthus** (Persoon) Ecklon, Verz. Pl. 43. 1827.
T.: *M. alopecuroides* (Linnaeus) Ecklon (*Gladiolus alopecuroides* Linnaeus) (typ. cons.).

(H) **Micranthus** J. C. Wendland, Bot. Beob. 38. 1798 [ACANTH.].
T.: *M. oppositifolius* J. C. Wendland.
≡ *Phaulopsis* Willdenow 1800 corr. C. Sprengel 1817 (nom. cons.) (7932).

**Note 1:** Other homonyms: *Micranthus* Roth, Nov. Pl. Sp. 282 (1821) [LYTHR.]; *Micranthes* Haworth, Syn. Pl. Succ. 320 (1812) (homon.?).

**Note 2:** (=) *Beilia* Ecklon 1827 is a *nomen nudum*.

1315. **Watsonia** P. Miller, Gard. Dict. ed. 7. 1759.

nom. rej. vs. *Meriana* Swartz 1800 (nom. cons.) (5692).

**Note:** *Watsonia* P. Miller was superfluous on publication and the conservation must stand notwithstanding the circumstance that (≡) *Meriana* Trew (1754) is now unavailable because of *Meriana* Swartz (1800) (nom. cons.).

**MUSACEAE**

1321. **Heliconia** Linnaeus, Mant. 147, 211. 1771.


**ZINGIBERACEAE**


(H) **Alpinia** Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. 2. 1753 [ZINGIB.].
T.: *A. racemosa* Linnaeus.

**Note:** (=) *Languas* C. König (in Retzius, Obs. 3: 64. 1783) is a *nomen nudum*. *Alpinia* Linnaeus (1753) is also to be rejected in favour of *Renealmia* Linnaeus f. (1781) (nom. cons.) (1331).


LT.: *R. paniculata* Linnaeus.

**Note 1:** Another homonym: *Renealmia* Houttuyn, Nat. Hist. ser. 2. 8: 335 (1777) [GENTIAN.] (see also under no. 6544).

**Note 2:** (=) *Alpinia* Linnaeus 1753 is unavailable because of *Alpinia* Roxburgh 1810 (nom. cons.) (1328).

T.: *R. curciflora* Oliver.

(H) **Riedelia** Chamisso, Linnaea 7: 240 ('224'). 1832 [VERBEN.].
T.: *R. lippoides* Chamisso.

**Note:** Another homonym: *Riedelia* Meisner in C. F. P. Martius, Fl. Bras. 7: 171 (1863) [ERIC.]. *Riedella* Trinix ex Kunth, Enum. 1: 515 (1833), was not validly published.
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T.: T. pungens (Teysmann et Binnendijk) Miquel (Costus pungens Teysmann et Binnendijk).

Note 1: Conservation superfluous: Tubu tubu Rumphius (two words), was a vernacular name of a species.
Note 2: The original spelling of this name is Tapeinochilos, which should be retained. Conservation with a changed ending was presumably not intended.

MARANTACEAE

T.: P. placentaria Loureiro.

Note: Phrynium Loefling 1758 was not validly published (see 924).

CORSIACEAE


Note: Conservation on account of typification; the historical type is S. helleborine Linnaeus.

ORCHIDACEAE

T.: P. insigne (Wallich ex Lindley) Pfitzer (Cypripedium insigne Wallich ex Lindley) (typ. cons.).

(=) Cordula Rafinesque, Fl. Tell. 4: 46. 1838 med. ('1836').
(=) Stimegas Rafinesque, Fl. Tell. 4: 45. 1838 med. ('1836').
T.: S. venustum (Sims) Rafinesque (Cypripedium venustum Wallich ex Sims).


Note: Conservation on account of typification; the historical type is S. helleborine Linnaeus.


(=) Scopularia Lindley, Bot. Reg. 20: sub t. 1701. 1 Sep 1834 ('1835').
T.: S. burchellii Lindley.

T.: M. secunda Lindley.

T.: T. secunda (Thunberg) Lindley (Orchis secunda Thunberg).

T.: S. pilosum Lindley.

**Note:** Conservation superfluous: *Lysias* Salisbury, Trans. Hort. Soc. London 1: 288 (1812), is a nomen nudum.

T.: *S. bicornis* (Linnaeus) Thunberg (Prodr. 6. 1794) (*Orchis bicornis* Linnaeus) (typ. cons.).

(H) **Satyrium** Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. 924. 1753 [ORCHID.].

T.: *P. curta* R. Brown (typ. cons.).

(=) **Diploedium** Swartz, Ges. Naturf. Freunde Berlin Mag. 4: 84. 1810.


(H) **Limodorum** Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. 950. 1753 [ORCHID.].
T.: *L. tuberosum* Linnaeus.


(≡) **Collea** Lindley, Bot. Reg. 9: sub t. 760. 1 Dec 1823.

**Note:** The earlier publication of *Pelexia* Poiteau ex L. C. Richard, Mém. Mus. Hist. Nat. 4: 59 (1818) was not valid (no generic description).


**Note:** Conservation superfluous: *Gyrostachys* [sic] Persoon, Syn. Pl. 2: 511 (1807), was not accepted by Persoon himself, and *Ibidium* Salisbury, Trans. Hort. Soc. London 1: 291 (1812), is a nomen nudum.