



Lectotypifications of Some Generic Names of Gesneriaceae

C. V. Morton; Dale Denham

Taxon, Vol. 21, No. 5/6. (Nov., 1972), pp. 669-678.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0040-0262%28197211%2921%3A5%2F6%3C669%3ALOSGNO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-G>

Taxon is currently published by International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/iapt.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

LECTOTYPIFICATIONS OF SOME GENERIC NAMES
OF GESNERIACEAE

C. V. Morton†* and Dale Denham**

Summary

We have been looking up the original publication of all the generic names of the family Gesneriaceae for the *Index Nominum Genericorum*. Dr. B. L. Burtt has in various publications chosen lectotypes for many of the Old World genera, but many of the New World ones have not as yet been properly lectotypified. Generally, the proper lectotype is obvious, even though it has not been formally designated, and these we have chosen here. There are only a few names, like *Diplocalyx* K. B. Presl (still wholly dubious), *Orobanchia Vandelli* (also dubious), and *Gesnera* Mart. (non L.) that must remain 'provisional' for the time being.

Agalmyla Blume, Bijdr. 766. 1826.

Lectotype: There were two original species, *A. staminea* (Vahl) Blume and *A. asperifolia* Blume, the former being based on *Cyrtandra staminea* Vahl (1804), which was based on *Justicia parasitica* Lam. (1791). Since there was no reason to change the epithet from *parasitica* to *staminea*, the latter is superfluous and illegitimate. Miquel (Fl. Ind. Bat. 2:722. 1858) retained *A. staminea* in *Agalmyla* and placed *A. asperifolia* Blume as a doubtful species of his new genus *Busea* (op. cit. 733), thus clearly choosing *A. staminea* as lectotype. The correct name of the type species is *A. parasitica* (Lam.) Kuntze, Rev. Gen. Pl. 469. 1891. *Agalmyla asperifolia* is now *Chirita asperifolia* (Blume) B. L. Burtt.

Aikinia R. Brown ex Wallich, Pl. Asiat. Rar. 3: 65, t. 288. 1832.

Lectotype: *Aikinia brunonis* Wallich, op. cit. 66. 1832.

There were two original species, but *A. brunonis*, was obviously the principal one. The second species, *A. horsfieldii* Wallich, was appended only. *Aikinia* is considered by Brown (in Bennett & R. Brown, Pl. Jav. Rar. 120. 1840) a synonym of *Epithema* Blume (1826). *Aikinia* Wallich, Pl. Asiat. Rar. 3: 46, t. 273. 1832, is invalid, published only as a synonym. Wallich had intended to publish a grass genus as *Aikinia*, and had a plate already engraved as *Aikinia elegans* Wallich, but found at the last minute that the genus had been previously described by Kunth as *Ratzeburgia*.

Anetanthus Hiern ex Benth. & Hook., Gen. Pl. 2: 1025, May 1876; Hiern, Vidensk. Medd. Naturhist. Foren. Kjoeben. 1877-78: 93.

Lectotype: Bentham and Hooker in adopting Hiern's name indicated that the genus contained four or five species, some of which were indicated but no new combinations were proposed, the Index Kewensis to the contrary notwithstanding. The first combination made under the genus is *Anetanthus gracilis* Hiern (loc. cit.), which is here designated lectotype. This is the natural and indeed the only possible lectotype, since this is the only species known to Hiern and therefore must have been the basis for the new genus.

Anodiscus Benth. & Hook. Gen. Pl. 2: 998. May, 1876.

Type: *A. peruvianus* Benth. in Hook., Icon. Pl. 12: 87, t. 1199. May, 1876.

* Department of Botany, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

** University of Colorado Museum, Boulder, Colo. 80302, U.S.A.

Concerning the dates of publication of the "Genera Plantarum" and this part of the "Icones Plantarum," see below under *Monopyle*. If *Monopyle* is to be dated from the "Genera" rather than the "Icones" then *Anodiscus* must be dated likewise, for these two genera were described at the same time in the "Genera" and illustrated at the same time in the "Icones." We consider these publications to have been issued simultaneously.

Antonia R. Brown ex Wallich, Pl. Asiat. Rar. 3: 65. 1832 (non Pohl, 1831).

Although sometimes cited (e.g. by Dalla Torre and Harms) as though validly published, this is a *nomen nudum* only. It is stated to be an intended change of name for *Loxotis* R. Brown, but *Loxotis* was published only later, in 1835. The type was intended to be *Wulfenia obliqua* Wallich (cf. R. Brown in Bennett & R. Brown, Pl. Jav. Rar. 104. 1840).

Besleria L., Sp. Pl. 619. 1753; Gen. Pl. ed. 5, 271. 1754.

Lectotype: There were three species originally, *B. lutea* L., *B. cristata* L., and *B. melittifolia* L. Martius, in his "Nova Genera et Species Plantarum" (3: 43. 1829) kept *B. lutea* in *Besleria* and removed the other species to *Alloplectus* and *Episcia* respectively, thus effectively choosing *B. lutea* as lectotype of *Besleria*. It has been suggested that Browne removed *B. lutea* from *Besleria* by describing a genus *Eriphia* in 1756 (Hist. Jam. 270) which is considered to be the same as *B. lutea*, but this is a taxonomic opinion only that may be quite wrong. *Eriphia* was described as a new genus with no mention whatever of Linnaeus, or *Besleria*. A specific name was first proposed, as *E. jamaicensis* R. & S., by Roemer and Schultes in 1818, but again without any mention of *Besleria*. And so *Eriphia* has nothing to do with the lectotypification of *Besleria*; it may be a heterotypic synonym.

Boeica T. Anderson ex C. B. Clarke, Commelin. Cyrtandr. Bengal 118. 1874.

Lectotype: There were three original species — *B. fulva* Clarke, *B. griffithii* Clarke and *B. filiformis* Clarke. Clarke remarked that he had seen only *B. fulva* in flower, and this is therefore the suitable lectotype.

Busea Miquel, Fl. Ind. Bat. 2: 732. 1858.

Lectotype: As pointed out by Burt (Bull. Bot. Surv. India 5: 73-88. 1965), when originally proposed *Busea* contained five species including *B. decurrens* (Blume) Miquel, based on *Loxonia decurrens* Blume. This same species, *L. decurrens*, was the only and therefore type species of *Cyrtandromoea* Zollinger (Verz. Ind. Arch. 1: 58. 1854).¹ Miquel should have adopted the name *Cyrtandromoea* instead of proposing a new one, and therefore *Busea* is a superfluous name by Art. 63 of the Code. By Art. 7, Note 4, a superfluous name is to be typified by the type of the name that ought to have been adopted, and therefore the type of *Busea* is *B. decurrens* (Blume) Miquel (*Loxonia decurrens* Blume). It is true that Miquel was probably unaware of the existence of *Cyrtandromoea*, but this does not make his name any the less illegitimate. Recently, *Cyrtandromoea* has been excluded from the Gesneriaceae and included in the *Scrophulariaceae* by Burt (loc. cit.)

Calycopectus Oersted, Centralamer. Gesner. 46. 1858.

Lectotype: *Alloplectus concolor* Hook. Oersted referred three species of *Calycopectus* as "Species typicae," namely "*Alloplectus dichrous* DC. (Flor. des Serres 1846, Pl. IX), *A. concolor* Hook. Bot. Mag. 4371, [and *A.*] *pinelianus* Lemaire, Flor. des Serres II, livr. 8, t. 5." It is likely that Oersted never saw authentic material of *A. dichrous* (Spreng.) DC. but knew it only from the cited plate in the "Flore des Serres", which may indeed represent the species *A. dichrous* but that is not quite certain. This plate is copied from Hooker (Bot. Mag. Curtis t. 4216) and Hooker comments on the fact that de Candolle described the corolla tube as red,

1. Cited erroneously by Burt (op. cit. 83, 85) as '3: 58. 1885.'

whereas that of his plant was yellow. Therefore it seems best to choose as lectotype the second species listed, *A. concolor*, which is well illustrated and described and about which there are no complications, other than a lack of any detailed information as to its original habitat. The plant grown by Hooker had been received from Galeotti in Brussels and was reported to be from Brazil. It is likely that this is identical with the plant received by Lemaire from Galeotti and described as *Alloplectus Pinelianus* var. *bicolor* Lem. (Fl. des Serres 2: Aug. t. 5 1846).

Coccanthera Koch & Hanst., Ind. Sem. Hort. Bot. Berol. 1855, App. 17. 1855.

Lectotype: *C. devosiana* (Lemaire) C. Koch et Hanstein (*Codonanthe devosiana* Lemaire, Ill. Hortic. 2: 56. 1850). This is the second species described by Koch and Hanstein, about which there is no doubt, nomenclaturally or taxonomically. The first species is *Coccanthera hookeriana* C. Koch & Hanst., which is based on *Hypocryta gracilis sensu* Hook. (Bot. Mag. Curtis t. 4531, non Martius (1829), and *Codonanthe hookeri* Lemaire (Ill. Hortic. 2: 56. 1850); it is uncertain if this plant is different from that of Martius or not, and so it is a less suitable lectotype.

Codonanthesis Mansfeld, Repert. Sp. Nov. Fedde 36: 120. 1934.

Lectotype: There were two original species, with no indication that Mansfeld had either especially in mind in describing the genus. We choose the second, *C. ulei* Mansfeld [= *C. aggregata* (Mart.) Hoehne, Sellowia 9: 49. 1958] as lectotype, because it was based on a collection by Ule that is represented in other herbaria by isotypes. The first species was based on collections by G. Huebner; the types were destroyed in Berlin and there may not be duplicates elsewhere.

Codonophora Lindley, Bot. Reg. 13: sub t. 1110. 1 Dec. 1827.

Lectotype: *Codonophora grandiflora* Lindley (*Gesneria prasinata* Ker-Gawler). There were two original species: *C. lanceolata* (*Gesneria tomentosa* L.) and *C. grandiflora* (*G. prasinata* Ker-Gawler). From the manner in which Lindley refers to these it is clear that Lindley had *Gesneria prasinata* especially in mind, and this was evidently the opinion of Martius, for he described a new genus *Rhytidophyllum* to include *G. tomentosa*, thus inferentially leaving the name *Codonophora* to go with *G. prasinata*, which he considered as not sufficiently distinct from his *Gesneria*. However, the first subsequent worker to recognize the genus as *Codonophora* was Hanstein, who (Linnaea 26: 205. 1853 [Apr. 1854]) cited *G. prasinata* Ker as typical of the genus and who removed *G. tomentosa* to *Rhytidophyllum*, thus definitely lectotypifying *Codonophora* on *G. prasinata*. It has been suggested that *Codonophora* was published as a provisional name, but we do not believe that this is true. The name was not proposed as a name to be used if this should ultimately prove to be a distinct genus. Lindley professed that he was not able to segregate genera from the inclusive *Gesneria* of his time adequately because of lack of materials, but indicated that he was segregating two that were especially distinct, the two he called *Codonophora* and *Pentarhaphia*, names that were accepted by him and which were accepted by later botanists as well. Lindley was preceding Martius in restricting the name *Gesneria* to the red-flowered Brazilian species, but he can not quite be said to have proposed a different genus *Gesneria*, since he did not specifically mention the West Indian *G. humilis*, one of the two original Linnaean species. Martius was the first to exclude definitely the two original type species of *Gesneria* L. and to apply the name in a different sense to Brazilian species, and so by Art. 48 of the Code is considered to have published a "new" genus *Gesnera* Mart. in 1829.

Conradia Mart., Nov. Gen. Sp. 3: 38. 1829.

Type: Although *Conradia* was based partly on *Gesneria humilis* L., the lectotype of *Gesneria* L., it can not be considered as superfluous when published, for *G. humilis* was not chosen as the lectotype of *Gesneria* until many years later, in 1895 by Fritsch. It must actually be considered an illegitimate renaming of *Pentarhaphia* Lindl. (1827) for it included the type and only species of *Pentarhaphia*, namely

Gesneria ventricosa Swartz. That *Conradia* was an intentional, if unjustified, renaming is proved by Martius' remark that the name *Pentarhaphia* did not agree well in its meaning with all the species included [by Martius] in the genus.

Coronanthera Vieillard ex C. B. Clarke, in *Alph. de Candolle, Prodr.* 5: 170. 1883.

Lectotype: *G. deltoidifolia* Vieillard ex C. B. Clarke. This is the obvious and necessary choice, because this is the species on which Vieillard based his generic name. All the seven other original species were named by Clarke.

Cryptoloma Hanstein, *Linnaea* 29: 506. 1858.

Lectotype: There were several original species (listed op. cit. 534). The generic description gives a reference to an illustration of the corolla of *Brachyloma hondensis* (H.B.K.) Hanst. in *Linnaea* 26: t. 1, fig. 17. 1854). This species was evidently considered representative by Hanstein and is here designated lectotype: *Cryptoloma hondensis* (H.B.K.) Hanst. (*Gesneria hondensis* H.B.K.).

Cyrtanthemum Oersted, *Centralamer. Gesner.* 56. 1858.

There were two original species, *C. hirsutum* Oersted and *C. deflexum* Oersted, both of which are valid and closely related species of *Besleria*, belonging to sect. *Eubesleria* subsect. *Pedunculatae* of my revision. A choice of lectotype is necessarily arbitrary. We choose *C. hirsutum* (= *Besleria cyrtanthemum* Hanst.).

Dircaea Decaisne, *Rev. Hort. ser.* 3. 2: 456. Dec. 1848.

Type: *D. bulbosa* (Ker-Gawler) Decaisne (*Gesneria bulbosa* Ker-Gawler) Decaisne had nine original species, one of which was *D. bulbosa*. Earlier in 1838 Rafinesque had proposed a monotypic genus *Megapleilis*, based on *M. tuberosa* Raf., which is a renaming of *Gesneria bulbosa* Ker-Gawler. Thus there was already a generic name available for the genus containing *G. bulbosa*, and so *Dircaea* was superfluous by Art. 63 of the Code. Since it is superfluous, by Art. 7 Note 4, the type of *Dircaea* is the same as that of the name (*Megapleilis*) that ought to have been adopted, and so the type of *Dircaea* is *Gesneria bulbosa* Ker-Gawler.

Eriphia P. Browne, *Hist. Jamaica* 270. 10 Mar. 1756.

Type: *E. jamaicensis* Roem. & Schult. in L., *Syst. Veg.* ed. 16, 3: 337. July 1818. This species is based solely on Browne's original description of *Eriphia*, in which Browne proposed no species. Roemer and Schultes did not know the plant except from Browne's description, nor did Poiret (in Lamarck, *Encycl. Méth. Suppl.* 2: 580. 23 Oct. 1811). The first identification of *Eriphia* with *Besleria lutea* L. was by Rafinesque, who published the name *Eriphia lutea* (L.) Rafinesque (*Sylv. Tell.* 77. 1838). Rafinesque did not see any authentic material of *Eriphia* and his identification with *Besleria* must have been based on the original description; this identification is only a matter of taxonomic opinion for *Eriphia* was published as a new genus without any reference at all to *Besleria*, with which it has therefore no nomenclatorial connection. Consequently, *E. lutea* can not at all be considered as a lectotype.

Eumolpe Decaisne in Jacques & Herincq, *Man. Gén. Pl.* 2:575. 1849.

Type: *Eumolpe fimbriata* Decaisne, loc. cit. The basis of this species is cited as "*Gloxinia fimbriata* Hort. Par., *Achimenes gloxiniaeflora* Ch. Lem." Although the epithet *fimbriata* was adopted by Decaisne, the name *Gloxinia fimbriata* Hort. can hardly be considered a proper basionym but merely an indication that the plant was known in Paris gardens by this name and indeed implies that the name had no author or place of publication previously. "*Achimenes gloxiniaeflora* Ch. Lem.", on the other hand, refers to the validly published name *Achimenes gloxiniaeflora* (Scheidw.) Forckel & Lemaire, *Fl. Serres* 4: t. 318 Feb., 1848., whose basionym is *Sinningia gloxiniaeflora* Scheidweiler (*J. Hort. Prat. Belgique* 5 (4): 124 [June?] 1847; *Allg. Gartenzeitung* 15:225. July, 1847.) By the Code, the correct name for the monotypic genus *Eumolpe* should bear Scheidweiler's specific epithet rather

than *fimbriata*. Actually, Decaisne's "*Gloxinia fimbriata* Hort. Par." doubtless refers to the valid publication of the species *Gloxinia fimbriata* A. Brongn. in an article signed by Decaisne, himself, in *Rev. Hort.* III, 1:364. Oct., 1847. This is not expressly stated, however, nor would it matter, because the epithet *gloxiniiflora* would still have priority. Strangely enough, still another publication of the name *Gloxinia fimbriata* exists. Kew Gardens received material from Paris under the garden name *Gloxinia fimbriata*. This bloomed in September, 1848, whereupon W. J. Hooker, unaware of its background or the earlier publication, described it as a new species *Gloxinia fimbriata* Hook. (*Bot. Mag. Curtis* 75: t. 4430. Mar., 1849).

Hooker's name is a later homonym of Brongniart's and illegitimate, but nevertheless it is the basis of the monotypic genus *Plectopoma* Hanstein. Hanstein (*Linnaea* 26: 201. 1853 [Apr., 1854]) cited: "*Gloxinia fimbriata* W. J. Hook. Bot. mag. 4430. *Achimenes gloxiniflora* Hort." as the basis for his species *Plectopoma fimbriatum*. Again, the "garden" citation "*Achimenes gloxiniflora*" has no nomenclatural significance, but this time, the illegitimate epithet *fimbriata*, was available to Hanstein, although by Art. 72 the combination must be treated as new. The type of *Plectopoma* is then correctly *Plectopoma fimbriatum* Hanst. All of these species, although not nomenclaturally synonymous, are undoubtedly based ultimately on a cultivated plant introduced by Ghiesbreght through the Royal Gardens at Laeken, Belgium, in 1844 and widely distributed thereafter. Unknown to both Decaisne and Hanstein the same rather characteristic plant had been described previously as *Gloxinia glabrata* Zucc. (*Flora* 15, Beibl.: 99. 1832) so that the plant should correctly be named *Eumolpe* and the correct name for the species is *glabrata*.

Gasteranthopsis Oersted, *Centralamer. Gesner.* 55. 1858.

There were two original species, *G. glabra* Oersted and *G. hirsuta* Oersted. In my revision of *Besleria* (*Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb.* 26: 395-474. 1939), I placed *Gasteranthopsis* as a synonym of *Besleria* sect. *Eubesleria* subsect. *Sessiles*, but without typifying it. Both species are valid species of this subsection. The first, *G. glabra*, can now be designated lectotype.

Gesneria L., *Sp. pl.* 2: 612. 1753; *Gen. pl. ed.* 5,267. 1754.

Lectotype: Gesneria humilis L. *Gesneria* L. was based on the two species *G. humilis* and *G. tomentosa*. One of these, *G. tomentosa* L., was segregated by Lindley into a new genus *Codonophora* Lindl. (*Bot. Reg.* 13: sub t. 1110. 1827) and so it might be presumed that Lindley thus inferentially left the name *G. humilis* L. to go with and typify *Gesneria* L., but this was not really Lindley's intention, for *G. humilis*, was not mentioned at all by Lindley, and indeed this species would have been a discordant element in the genus as he suggested that it might be circumscribed. Surprisingly, until 1888, when Baillon (*Hist.* 10: 59-60) restored both Linnaean species to *Gesneria* L., all subsequent authors of the nineteenth century seem to have followed Lindley, and more specifically Martius, in definitely or inferentially excluding *G. humilis* and *G. tomentosa* from the taxon whose name they spelled *Gesneria* or *Gesnera*. Thus, *Gesnera* Plum., *Gesneria* Plum., *Gesnera* L., *Gesneria* L., *Gesnera* Mart. and *Gesneria* Mart. in this period without exception refer not to *Gesneria* L. but rather to *Gesnera* Mart. [= *Reichsteineria* Regel]. We considered the first positive lectotypification to have been made by K. Fritsch in Engler & Prantl, *Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien* 4(3b): 184 (1895), where Fritsch retained *G. humilis* in *Gesneria* L. and referred *G. tomentosa* L. to the genus *Rhytidophyllum* Mart., thus lectotypifying *Gesneria* on *G. humilis* L.

Gloxinia Regel, *Bot. Zeit.* 9: 89. 1851 (non *Gloxinia* L'Hér., in Ait. 1789).

≡ *Ligeria* Decaisne, 1848. During the first half of the nineteenth century, a number of showy Brazilian plants (e.g. *Gloxinia speciosa* Lodd. ex Ker) became popular in cultivation under the name *Gloxinia*, although some authors realized that the plants were not very close to the type *Gloxinia* L'Hér., which is *G. maculata* L'Hér. This use of *Gloxinia* persists even today among some gardeners. In

1848 Decaisne segregated *G. speciosa* and the other allied plants passing as *Gloxinia* as a new genus *Ligeria* Decaisne, typified by *G. speciosa* Lodd. ex Ker. Regel in 1851 agreed that Decaisne was theoretically right, but he preferred to retain the name *Gloxinia* as commonly used by florists, and consequently renamed *Gloxinia* L'Hér. as *Salisia* Regel (this then an illegitimate superfluous name) and applied the name *Gloxinia* to *Ligeria* Decaisne, thus in effect creating (by Art. 48 of the Code) a new genus *Gloxinia* Regel, which is of course an illegitimate later homonym of *Gloxinia* L'Hér. Since this genus already had a legitimate name in *Ligeria* Decaisne, *Gloxinia* Regel becomes a nomenclatural synonym of that, and is typified by *Gloxinia speciosa* Lodd. ex Ker. These plants, *Ligeria speciosa* and its allies, are currently included within the earlier genus *Sinningia* Nees (1825), the type of which, *S. helleri* Nees, is apparently not in cultivation now.

Hippodamia Decaisne, Rev. Hort. ser. 3. 2: 464, 15 Dec. 1848.

Lectotype: *H. insignis* (Martens & Galeotti) Decaisne (*Besleria insignis* Martens & Galeotti). Decaisne definitely says that he is calling the *Besleria insignis* of Martens and Galeotti *Hippodamia*, which may be considered designating a lectotype. However, he did include a second species in the genus, *H. guttata* Decaisne, and so it is best to designate a lectotype now formally. *Hippodamia guttata* is not described except as to flower color. Denham has compared the holotype of *H. guttata* with specimens collected by Heller in the same general locality in Mexico that probably was the source of the seed for the cultivated *Arctocalyx endlicherianus* Heller ex Fenzl (the lectotype for the genus *Arctocalyx*) and considers *H. guttata* fully conspecific with *A. endlicherianus*.

Hypocyrtia Mart., Nov. Gen. Sp. 3: 48. 1829.

Lectotype: *H. hirsuta* Mart. There were five original species — *H. gracilis* Mart., *H. aggregata* Mart., *H. hirsuta* Mart., *H. strigillosa* Mart., and *H. ciliosa* Mart. The first was long ago removed to *Codonanthe*, later the second was placed in *Besleria*, and the fifth in *Episcia*, thus leaving only the third and fourth species in *Hypocyrtia*, these two being representative of the genus as it has been conceived since Hanstein's treatment of 1854. It has been thought that Hanstein's listing of *H. hirsuta* in the column of "Species typicae" in his synopsis of the Gesneriaceae (Linnaea 26: 209. 1853 [Apr. 1954]) can be regarded as the selection of a lectotype, but Hanstein had no such intent, his "typicae" merely meaning typical (or representative) in a common (not nomenclatural) sense, which is shown by his sometimes listing two or more species for a single genus, and sometimes, as in the case of *Alloplectus*, even including species that were no part of the original genus and thus not possibly lectotypes. We can not find that anyone has ever formally selected a lectotype for *Hypocyrtia* and so we here choose *H. hirsuta*.

Leptoboea Benth., in Benth. & Hook., Gen. Pl. 2: 1025. 1876 (as "*Leptobaea*").

Lectotype: *L. multiflora* (C. B. Clarke) Gamble, List Trees Bengal 58. 1878 (wrongly attributed to Bentham) (basionym *Championia multiflora* C. B. Clarke, Commel. Cyrt. Beng. 98, t. 68. 1874). There were two original species, neither named specifically by Bentham, but the reference cited is to the species called *Championia multiflora* C. B. Clarke two years previously, which is the suitable lectotype. The second species, collected by Griffith, did not receive a name until the publication of *Leptoboea glabra* C. B. Clarke in 1884 (in Hook. f., Fl. Brit. Ind. 4: 368. 1884). Concerning the spelling *Leptoboea* versus "*Leptobaea*" (and *Phylloboea* versus "*Phyllobaea*") see Burt, Notes Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 21: 194 (footnote). 1954.

Ligeria Decaisne, Rev. Hort. III, 2: 463. 1848.

Lectotype: *L. speciosa* (Lodd. ex Ker) Decaisne (*Gloxinia speciosa* Lodd. ex Ker, Bot. Reg. 3: t. 213. 1817). There were several original species. Hanstein (Linnaea 34: 280. 1865) proposed the subg. *Euligeria*, and the only one of the original species included in this subgenus was *L. speciosa*, which fixes this as the lectotype. The

original *G. speciosa* Lodd. (Bot. Cabinet 1: t. 28. 1817) must be considered a *nomen nudum*, for there was only a plate without analyses showing the essential characters.

Loboptera Colla, Mem. Accad. Sci. Torino, II, 10: 221. 1849.

Lectotype: *L. longe-pedunculata* Colla (based on "*Columnnea lindeniana* Hort. Hugh. Low" and "*Columnnea schiedeana* Brongn. in Herb. génér. de l'amateur"). This must be considered as a new species, since the first synonym cited is a horticultural name only and the second is presumably intended as "sensu Brogn. non Schlecht." The other species described, *C. subsessilis* Colla (based on "*Columnnea crassifolia* Lemaire ex Brongn. l.c.") does not agree so well with the generic description, which describes the corolla as "utrinque maculata," for *C. subsessilis* is described as having the "corolla rubra immaculata." The plate is labelled "*Columnnea subsessilis*," but since it shows the corolla as spotted it presumably really represents *C. longepedunculata*.

Locheria Regel, Flora 31: 251. 1848.

Lectotype: *L. hirsuta* (Lindley) Regel (*Achimenes hirsuta* Lindley).

There were three species originally — *L. hirsuta*, *L. pedunculata* (Benth.) Regel, and *L. multiflora* (Gardn.) Regel, but the last named was included only with a query. We can not find that anyone has definitely designated a lectotype before.

Macrochlamys Decaisne, Rev. Hortic. III, 3: 243. 1849.

Lectotype: There were five species originally mentioned — *M. patrisii* (DC.) Decaisne, *M. involucratus* Decaisne, *M. miquelii* Decaisne, *M. speciosus* Decaisne, and *M. guttatus* Decaisne, but the last four were at the time nomina nuda only, and still are. It might seem therefore that the first species, the only published one, would be a holotype, but still it is technically not the only original element, and so a lectotype must be designated. Leeuwenberg (Acta Bot. Neerl. 8: 43. 1959) called *Alloplectus coccineus* (Aublet) Martius the "type," but this is not possible, since this was not one of the original species. Therefore, *M. patrisii* (DC.) Decaisne (*Alloplectus patrisii* DC.) is here designated the lectotype. This species is considered by Leeuwenberg a taxonomic synonym of *A. coccineus*, very likely correctly.

Monopyle Moritz ex Benth. & Hook., Gen. Pl. 2: 997. May 1876.

The publication of this genus presents a troublesome case. The genus was described in the "Genera Plantarum" but no species were named. At the same time Bentham prepared a paper on the genus in which six new species were described in Hooker's "Icones Plantarum" (vol. 12, t. 1198, 1876). This is the natural sequence of events and has been assumed to be the chronological sequence also. However, in Stafleu's "Taxonomic Literature" t. 1198 of the "Icones Plantarum" is said to have come out in April, 1876, and p. 997 of the "Genera Plantarum" is said to have been published in May, 1876, in other words, the species were described a month before the genus was described. If this is really true, then the species would have to be considered not validly published, since one can not publish species in a genus that has not yet been published. This is an awkward situation, for it means that the six species would have to be validated by someone else at some later dates, which would be hard to establish. It seems best to consider that these publications came out simultaneously.

Lectotype: No species were named in the "Genera Plantarum." Bentham described six new species, among them *M. leucantha* Moritz. Since the name *Monopyle* was attributed to Moritz and since this is the only species collected and named by Moritz it is the obvious lectotype. The statement in my revision of *Monopyle* (Revista Universitaria [Cuzco, Peru], Año 33, no. 87: 98. 1945) that *Monopyle* was founded on *M. leucantha* Moritz is sufficient to indicate the choice of a lectotype in 1945.

Nautilocalyx Linden ex Hanst., Linnaea 26: 207. 1853 (Apr. 1854).

Hanstein cited "*N. hastatus* Linden Cat. 1851, p. 12., *Centrosolenia bractescens* Hook. Bot. mag. 4675." The 1851 Linden Catalogue must have received a very

limited distribution, for our efforts to find a copy have been unsuccessful. Sprague (Kew Bull. Misc. Inf. 1912: 87) also was unable to locate a copy and stated that: "There is no evidence to show that Linden's Catalogue of the year 1851 contained a botanical description of the genus or species." He therefore treated *N. hastatus* as a *nomen nudum* (p. 88). We follow Sprague in this regard pending the discovery of a copy of the Catalogue. If Linden's name was a *nomen nudum*, Hanstein ought to have taken up the epithet *bractescens*, which was validly published by Hooker in 1852. Therefore, the type species ought to be cited as: *Nautilocalyx hastatus* Linden ex Hanst., nom. illeg. (*Centrosolenia bractescens* Hook.). There is an earlier name for the species, namely *Centrosolenia bracteata* Planch. (Fl. des Serres 6: 322. 1851), which is not the type of *Nautilocalyx*, but a taxonomic synonym of the type species *Centrosolenia bractescens* Hook. Sprague considered that the name of the species is *N. bracteatus* Linden ex Planch., but this was published as a synonym only and so is not valid. The correct name is *Nautilocalyx bracteatus* (Planch.) Sprague, Kew Bull. Misc. Inf. 1912: 88, a name overlooked in the Index Kewensis and Gray cards.

Ortholoma (Benth.) Hanst., Linnaea 26: 209. 1853 [Apr. 1854].

Lectotype: *O. acuminatum* (Benth.) Hanstein (*Columnea acuminata* Benth.).
Bentham's section *Ortholoma* was not monotypic. He had four species, *C. acuminata* Benth., *C. scandens* L., *C. hirsuta* Swartz and *C. schiedeana* Schlecht. The first of these agrees best with the sectional description, an opinion evidently shared by Hanstein, for in raising *Ortholoma* to generic status he cited *O. acuminatum* as a "species typicae." However, he had a second species also, *O. warscewiczii* Hanst. (op. cit. 216). And as we have mentioned elsewhere, Hanstein in this paper in volume 26 of Linnaea did not mean his "species typicae" in a nomenclatural sense, for he often had several different species all called "species typicae." Later, when Hanstein considered *Ortholoma* as merely a subgenus of *Columnea* (Linnaea 34: 391. 1865) he included of the original species only *C. acuminata* and *C. warscewicziana*, and referred the other species mentioned by Bentham to *Eucolumnea*, which is obviously their correct disposition.

Parabesleria Oersted, Centralamer. Gesner. 52. 1858.

Lectotype: There were two original species, *P. triflora* Oersted and *P. costaricensis*, both of which agree with the original generic diagnosis. The first, *P. triflora* may appropriately be chosen as lectotype.

Petrodoxa Anthony, Notes Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 18: 203. Apr. 1934.

Lectotype: There were two original species, *P. argentea* and *P. cordifolia*, both new. The generic name *Petrodoxa* is derived from the Greek word *petra*, a rock. The habitat of the first species was not known, but the second was stated to grow on rocks by the collectors. Therefore, the generic name must have been chosen with reference to this species, and so *P. cordifolia* is here designated lectotype.

Phinaea Bentham in Bentham et J. D. Hooker, Gen. Pl. 2: 997. May 1876.

Lectotype: No species were named in the original publication but reference was made to several species of *Niphaea*, namely *N. albo-lineata* Hook., *N. rubida* Lem., and *N. crenata* Karst. The first of these to be transferred to *Phinaea*, and perhaps the only species known to Bentham by specimens, was *N. albo-lineata* Hook., which is here designated lectotype (= *Phinaea albolineata* (Hook.) Benth. ex Hemsl.

Platystemma Wallich, Pl. Asiat. Rar. 2: 41. 1831.

There were two original species, *P. violoides* Wallich and a second somewhat dubious species, *P. majus* Wallich. A. de Candolle (Prodr. 8: 279. 1845) reduced the second to probable synonymy, thus fixing *P. violoides* as lectotype.

Rhynchotechum Blume, Bijdr. 775. 1826.

= *Rhynchoeteuchum* Blume, Fl. Jav. Rhiz. viii. 1829.

The name "*Rhynchotechum*" has been a little mysterious, since the second part

“-techum” is meaningless. It was assumed by Endlicher and others that the letter “h” had been misplaced by a typographical error after the “c” instead of the “t”, and so the name was altered to *Rhynchothecum*. However, this was not Blume’s intention, for Blume himself altered the spelling to *Rhynchotoechum*, which is from the Greek “toichos,” often Latinized as “toecho,” meaning a wall. Since this change was made by Blume himself it ought to be adopted.

Rhytidophyllum Mart., Nov. Gen. Sp. 3: 38. 1829 (as “*Rytidophyllum*”); 196. 1832.

Lectotype: The only species described and the only specific combination made in the text was *R. berterioanum* Mart., but *Rhytidophyllum* was not monotypic, for Martius also referred *Gesneria tomentosa* L. and *G. grandis* Swartz to the genus, and so there was no holotype. The first authors to pick a lectotype were apparently Britton and Wilson (Sci. Surv. Porto Rico 6: 207. 1925), who chose *Gesneria tomentosa* L. as lectotype. They must be followed. The specific combination *Rhytidophyllum tomentosum* (L.) Mart. was made by Martius in the Index to his volume, where he also corrected the spelling from “*Rytidophyllum*” (which is an incorrect transliteration of the Greek root “rhytis, rhytidos”) to “*Rhytidophyllum*,” a correct spelling and the one always adopted since.

Skiophila Hanst., Linnaea 26: 207. 1853 [1854].

Lectotype: *S. melittifolia* (L.) Hanst. Hanstein referred two species to *Skiophila* viz., *B. melittifolia* L. and *B. pulchella* Donn ex Sims. He later abandoned the genus, referring *melittifolia* to *Episcia* and *pulchella* to *Tussacia*, but did not indicate a type for *Skiophila*. This was effectively done by Bentham and Hooker (Gen. Pl. 2: 1006, 1007 May, 1876) who referred *pulchella* (as indicated by the citation of Bot. Mag., t. 1146) to *Tussacia* and retained the name *Skiophila* for *melittifolia* (as indicated by the citation of Bot. Mag. t. 4720), as *Episcia* sect. *Skiophila* (Hanst.) Benth. & Hook.

Tapina Mart., Nov. Gen. Sp. 3: 59, t. 225, f. 1. 1829.

Lectotype: There were two original species, *T. barbata* (Nees & Mart.) Mart. (*Gesneria barbata* Nees & Mart.) and *T. pusilla* Mart., neither of which were designated as the type. Hanstein (Linnaea 26: 209. 1853 [1854]) recognized *Tapina* as a genus and listed *T. barbata* as the “Species typicae,” but by this Hanstein merely intended “representative” and not nomenclaturally typical, as we have noted above. Later, Hanstein (in Mart. Fl. Bras. 8: 388, 390, 1864) segregated *T. pusilla* into *Ligeria* subg. *Stenograstra* and placed *T. barbata* in the monotypic *Ligeria* subg. *Tapina*, thus definitely choosing *T. barbata* as the lectotype of *Tapina*.

Tremacron Craib, Notes Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 10: 217. 1918.

Lectotype: *T. forestii* Craib. There were two original species, *T. forestii* and *T. mairei* Craib. The second is subject to just a little doubt, in that Craib thought that it might be the same as the earlier *Oreocharis mairei* Léveillé and consequently used the same specific epithet.

Tussacia Benth. London Journ. Bot. 5: 364. 1846 (non *Tussaca* Raf., 1814)

Tussaca Reichenb. Icon. Bot. Exot. 1: 28. 1827, nom. prov. (non *Tussaca* Raf., 1814).

The generic name *Tussacia* has often been credited to Reichenbach, but he only wrote: “Si in posterum species nostae quod fructum affinis, genere separarentur, ut jam separavit eas cl. Tussac, nomine tamen jam usitato Dalbergiae, non dubito quin suo ipsius nomine, editoris nempe splendissime cujusdam operis, hac splendidae plantae jure meritoque salutentur, Tussacam certe a cl. Rafinesque-Schmalz propositam, Orchideam, non receptisse videntur alii.” As pointed out by H. E. Moore (Baileya 2: 86, 87, 1954) Reichenbach did not accept *Tussaca* as a genus, but merely said that this would be an appropriate name to use if *Besleria pulchella* Donn should in the future be recognized as a different genus from *Besleria*; this is

the typical form of an invalid *nomen provisorium*. There is no generic description by Reichenbach. The name *Tussacia* was attributed by Leeuwenberg (Gesner. Guiana 329. 1958)² to Reichenbach in Möslers, Gemeinnütz. Handb. ed. 2. 1: XXXVI (1827), but there it appears as a *nomen nudum* only, as it does also in all accept the genus and give a generic description. Neither Moore nor Leeuwenberg definitely picked a lectotype for *Tussacia* Benth., evidently assuming that *pulchella* was necessarily the type, but Bentham's genus was not monotypic, for he described two new species, *T. rupestris* and *T. villosa*, and mentioned *T. pulchella* only in a comparison, and then without any author or cited reference. It seems best therefore to lectotypify *Tussacia* on one of the two described species; we choose *T. rupestris* Benth.

2. According to a letter I have recently received from Dr. Leeuwenberg, his thesis 'The Gesneriaceae of Guiana' was first published separately June 30, 1958, and later reprinted in the Acta Botanica Neerlandica in October, 1958.