(1921) Proposal to reject the name *Scabiosa sylvatica (Dipsacaceae)*

Walter Gutermann

Department of Biogeography, Faculty Centre of Biodiversity, University of Vienna, Rennweg 14, 1030 Vienna, Austria; walter.gutermann@univie.ac.at

(1921) ***Scabiosa sylvatica*** L., Sp. Pl., ed. 2: 142. 1762 [*Dicot.: Dipsac.*], nom. utique rej. prop.
Lectotypus (vide Gutermann & al. in Österr. Bot. Z. 122: 262. 1972): Herb. Linnaeus No. 120.14 (LINN).

When Linnaeus first published the name *Scabiosa sylvatica*, he included references to two different species today classified in the genus *Knautia*, and presently known as *K. drymeia* Heuff. and *K. maxima* (Opiz) Ortmann (= *K. dipsacifolia* Kreutzer), both usually divided into several subspecies (cf. Ehrendorfer in Tutin & al., Fl. Eur. 4: 62–63. 1976). The discordance of the pre-Linnean references in the Linnean protologue has been well known at least since Briquet (in Annuaire Conserv. Jard. Bot. Genève 6: 103. 1902), but Linnaeus had designed his nomen specificum legitimum apparently from an Hortus Upsaliensis plant; accordingly, in 1972, we chose this specimen (which unequivocally corresponds to *K. drymeia* subsp. *drymeia*) as lectotype. The earlier name *Scabiosa pannonica* Jacq. (which corresponds solely to *K. drymeia*, but is inapplicable under *Knautia*, because of the independent *K. pannonica* Heuff. 1856) was referred by Linnaeus himself to his *S. sylvatica* as a synonym (Syst. Nat., ed. 12, 2: 112. 1767).

Transferred to *Knautia*, as *K. sylvatica* (L.) Duby, this name from the beginning remained a collective assemblage until the taxonomy of the two species involved was clarified by Wettstein (Beitr. Fl. Alban: 62–66. 1892) and Beck (Fl. Nieder-Österr.: 1147. 1983), but they disagreed in the application of the Linnaean binominal. Only Beck used it in the sense of *K. drymeia*; most authors followed the arguments of Wettstein and Briquet (l.c.) and applied "*K. silvatica*" to the species presently known as *K. dipsacifolia* or *K. maxima*. Especially since the monograph of Szabó (in Magyar Tud. Akad. Math. Termész. Közl. 31. 1911), and up to the year 1973, it has been widely and persistently used for this species which does not include the type of the Linnaean basionym. Resurrection of the name in concordance with Beck (l.c.) and the lectotype would result in complete nomenclatural confusion.

The name *K. sylvatica* is universally rejected in contemporary floras or checklists (e.g., Štěpánek & Kmeťová in Fl. Slovenska 4(2): 157, 170. 1985; Greuter & al., Med.-Checkl. 3: 182–183. 1986; Kerguélen, Index Syn. Fl. France: 101. 1993; Aeschimann & Heitz, Index Syn. Fl. Suisse: 121. 1996; Štěpánek in Květena České Republ. 5: 544–546. 1997; Wisskirchen & Haeupler, Standardliste Farn-Blütenpfl. Deutschl.: 278 1998; Mihelj ap. Nikolić in Natura Croat. 9 (Suppl. 1): 35. 2000; Mirek & al., Flower. Pl. Pteridoph. Poland: 98. 2002; Rothmaler, Exkursionsfl. Deutschl., ed. 10, 4: 543. 2005; Conti & al., Annot. Checkl. Ital. Vasc. Fl.: 116. 2005; Martinčič & al., Mala Fl. Slovenije: 500. 2007; Aeschimann & Burdet: Fl. Suisse, ed. 4: 297. 2008; Fischer & al., Exkursionsfl. Österreich: 815. 2008; Király, Új Magyar Füvészkönyv: 401. 2009) as a nomen ambiguum as proposed by us in 1972 following the former Art. 69, abandoned since the Leningrad Congress in 1975. A formal proposal for rejection, however, necessary under Art. 56 of the Vienna Code (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006), is still required and is here proposed.

(1922) Proposal to conserve the name *Moussonia* (*Gesneriaceae*) with a conserved type

Angélica Ramírez-Roa & Fernando Chiang

Departamento de Botánica, Instituto de Biología, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico, D.F. C.P.04510
Author for correspondence: *Angélica Ramírez-Roa, aramroa@ibiologia.unam.mx*

(1922) ***Moussonia*** Regel, Index Sem. Hort. Bot. Turic. [4]. 1847 [*Gesner.*], nom. cons. prop.
Typus: *M. deppeana* (Schltdl. & Cham.) Hanst. (*Gesneria deppeana* Schltdl. & Cham.), typ. cons. prop.

The name *Moussonia* was validly published in 1847 by Eduard von Regel in a Zürich seedlist with *Moussonia elongata* as the only mentioned species and thus its obligate type. It was clearly delimited from other genera included in the same publication by means of the following diagnostic characters: "*STIGMA CAPITATUM. B. Annulus perigynus. ... *Corolla tubo medio inflato, basi circumtumido. – Plantae fruticosae. Annulus hypogynus crassus sinuosus*".

Reviewing and comparing the genera described by Regel (l.c.) in the same publication, it is clear that by indicating "(*Gesnera Auct.*)" following *M. elongata* that Regel had made a new combination based on *Gesneria elongata* Kunth (in Humboldt & al., Nov. Gen. Sp. 2, ed. f°: 318, ed. q°: 396, t. 192. 1818). For other genera in the same publication, Regel similarly pointed out the genera from which he had transferred species for his new combinations. Regel himself confirmed this the following year (in Flora 31: 248. 1848), when he indicated "Der Typus dieser Gattung" to be "*Gesnera elongata*", although again without authorship.

Hanstein (in Linnaea 26: 204–205. 1854), when including *Moussonia* in his study of *Gesneriaceae*, considered "*Moussonia elongata* R[egel]." as a new combination based on *Gesneria elongata* Kunth. However, in a later publication Hanstein (in Linnaea 34: 284–286. 1865) included *M. elongata* Regel and "*G. elongata* Mart. et Gal. Bull. Acad. Brux. 9. 2. p. 32. — *G. elongata* et *oblongata* hort. bot. Berol. neque *G. elongata* Hb. Bpl. Knth." under *M. deppeana* (Schltdl. & Cham.) Klotzsch ex Hanst., and referenced his earlier transfer (in Linnaea 29: 532–533, 574–577. 1859) of the Kunth name to *Brachyloma* Hanst., as *B. elongatum* (Kunth) Hanst.

Since *Gesneria elongata* Kunth and *Brachyloma elongatum* are

now synonyms of *Kohleria trianae* (Regel) Hanst. (Kvist & Skog in Smithsonian Contr. Bot. 79: 65. 1992), a species occurring only in Colombia, *Moussonia* would be a synonym of *Kohleria* Regel unless a different type is proposed (Skog in Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 65: 948. 1978). As now treated, the genus *Moussonia* is a separate group with 11 species (Wiehler in Selbyana 1: 22–31. 1975; Burtt & Skog in Gesneriana 1: 1–4, 1995; Skog & Boggan, http://.si.edu/gesneriad/, 2000), 12 species (Roalson & al. in Selbyana 25: 231–232. 2005), or about 24 species (Ramírez-Roa in Novon 17: 386. 2007), distributed from Mexico to Panama.

Regel described both *Moussonia* and *Kohleria*, keeping them separate from each other and from *Gesneria*, in the same publication where the name *M. elongata* appears, so what taxonomic entity was he designating by this name? Wiehler (l.c.) accepted Hanstein's idea (l.c. 1859: 575) that Regel described *Moussonia* using material of what was actually *M. deppeana* (= *Gesneria deppeana* Schltdl. & Cham.), but misidentified as *Gesneria elongata* Kunth. Schlechtendal & Chamisso, in reviewing Schiede and Deppe's Mexican collections, described *Gesneria deppeana* (in Linnaea 5: 110. 1830) using plants grown at the Berlin Botanical Garden, labelled *Gesneria elongata* H.B.K., from seeds collected by Deppe. According to Hanstein (l.c. 1859: 575) plants grown from the same seed lot in other European botanical gardens, perhaps also Zürich, were also given that name. Schlechtendal & Chamisso (l.c.) compared their species with *G. elongata* Kunth that was considered similar, but they mentioned only vegetative differences and not the nectaries or stigmas, basic characters that according to Regel (l.c.) distinguished *Moussonia* from *Kohleria*. However, according to Hanstein (l.c. 1859: 575) Regel was unaware of Schlechtendal & Chamisso's earlier publication distinguishing these two taxa.

Skog (l.c.: 947) considered that *Moussonia elongata* Regel could be based on *Gesnera elongata* sensu M. Martens & Galeotti (in Bull. Acad. Roy. Sci. Bruxelles 9: 32–39. 1842). Wiehler (l.c.: 24–25) considered that Martens & Galeotti never actually published a new name. In their publication treating Galeotti's Mexican collections (Martens & Galeotti, l.c.), the entry for *Gesneria elongata*, unlike others, lacks a Latin description or "*Nobis*" written after the name, so they were just referring specimens from Galeotti's collections (Nos. 1903 and 1918) to the species previously published by Kunth. These specimens, possibly identified by Galeotti as *Gesneria elongata* Kunth, belong to *M. deppeana*.

Wiehler (l.c.: 28) and Skog (l.c.: 948) both discussed the problematic typification of this genus. They together with Kvist & Skog (l.c.: 3) maintained prior usage of the name by accepting *Moussonia* as based on the cultivated *Gesneria elongata* hort. from Mexico, which is now *Moussonia deppeana*. However, if Regel's only species name is based on *G. elongata* Kunth of Colombia, such usage can only be retained if a new type is conserved (Arts. 14.9 and 48.1, Note 2, ICBN). We herein propose to conserve *Moussonia* Regel with *Gesneria deppeana* Schltdl. & Cham. as the conserved type.

It is very likely that Schlechtendal, who was curator at the Royal Herbarium in Berlin until 1833 (Stafleu & Cowan in Regnum Veg. 112: 190. 1985), had deposited the holotype of *Gesneria deppeana* in that herbarium (B). Fritsch (in Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 50: 424–425. 1913), treating *Kohleria deppeana* (Schltdl. & Cham.) Fritsch (= *Moussonia deppeana*), identified the specimen *Schiede 186* at B with the same locality data "in sylvis [silvis] Jalapensibus" as given by Schlechtendal & Chamisso as the "Originalstandort der *Gesneria Deppeana* Schldl. et Cham.!". However, this specimen was most probably destroyed during the war (R. Vogt, pers. comm. 2003). Fortunately, there are two isotypes of *Schiede 186*, thus a lectotypification is here proposed:

Moussonia deppeana (Schltdl. & Cham.) Hanst. in Linnaea 34: 285. 1865. [≡ *Gesneria deppeana* Schltdl. & Cham. in Linnaea 5: 110. 1830] – Type: Mexico. Veracruz, in sylvis Jalapensibus, Oct., *Schiede 186* (holotype: B, destroyed; lectotype: HAL! here designated; isolectotype: OXF!).

Acknowledgements

We thank Lawrence E. Skog (US) for generous help providing literature and opinions; Gerrit Davidse and Peter Jorgensen (MO) for suggestions, advice and valuable comments to an earlier version of the manuscript; Alfonso Delgado Salinas (IBUNAM) for suggestions and valuable comments to the final version; John Wiersema for the revision of the manuscript and valuable additions to it; Linda Oestry (MO) for generous help providing access to specialized literature; Martin Ricker (IBUNAM) for kindly translating the German of Hanstein (1857); Maru García (MEXU) for valuable suggestions and loan requests of specimens; Gerardo Salazar, then curator of MEXU, for access to the collection and authorizing loan requests; Robert Vogt (B) for valuable information on the Schiede specimen; curators of HAL and OXF for loan of material; the curator of K for photographs of Galeotti's specimens; and Gerardo Varela (UAM-I) for English translation of an early version of the manuscript and continuous and generous help to the first author.

(1923) Proposal to conserve the name *Mitrastemon* (*Rafflesiaceae*) with that spelling

James L. Reveal

Adjunct Professor, Department of Plant Biology, 412 Mann Building, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853–4301, U.S.A.; jlr326@cornell.edu

(1923) ***Mitrastemon*** Makino in Bot. Mag. (Tokyo) 23: 326. 1909 ('*Mitrastemma*') [*Raffles.*], orth. cons. prop.
Typus: *Mitrastemon yumamotoi* Makino in Bot. Mag. (Tokyo) 25: 255. 1911.

The sole reason for this proposal is to allow the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants to concur with, or to reject the action of Tomitaro Makino who altered the spelling of his own generic name, *Mitrastemma* (1909), to *Mitrastemon* (1911), and to confirm or reject an action by this Committee's predecessor when the family *Mitrastemonaceae* Makino (in Bot. Mag. (Tokyo) 25: 252. 1911) was conserved and entered in 1966 into what is now App. IIB of the *International code of botanical nomenclature*. At the same