

BM. Finally, Jarvis (Order out of Chaos: 381. 2008) supported Rankin Rodríguez & Greuter's (l.c.) position in this regard in view of there being no grounds to reject the lectotypification by Jacobs (l.c.). Thus, given Rankin Rodríguez & Greuter's (l.c.) interpretation that the type for *C. baducca* L. is Rheede's plate, according to them this binomial should be reserved for the Asian species, whereas the first available name for the American species is then *C. frondosa* Jacq.

We oppose Rankin Rodríguez & Greuter's (l.c.) position favoring the formal rejection of *Capparis baducca*. Although Jacobs (l.c.) selected an original element cited in the protologue (thus fulfilling Art. 9.2; McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012) that cannot be superseded under Art. 9.19, we agree with Prado's (l.c.) conclusion that the specimen at BM is the more appropriate choice to fix the application of *C. baducca*. Jacobs's choice, although not in conflict with the protologue of *C. baducca* (as the chosen plate is part of the protologue), does conflict with the diagnosis, which says: "... *inermis, foliis ovato-oblongis per spatia confertis perennantibus*". The Asian plant said to be illustrated by Rheede (l.c.) on tab. 57 is armed with straight patent thorns up to 2 mm long, occasionally wanting (Jacobs, l.c.) as on tab. 57 itself, and regularly scattered leaves, and this species clearly does not match Linnaeus's diagnosis. This suggests to us that Linnaeus described the plant based primarily on material in his herbarium (and not on the figure). The plant at BM (bar code No. 000628729) agrees perfectly with the diagnosis: the specimen is unarmed with clustered leaves.

The main papers where the American taxon is called *Capparis baducca* are Macbride (in Publ. Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Bot. Ser. 13(2/3): 984–1006. 1938), Standley & Steyermark (in Fieldiana, Bot. 24(4): 383. 1946), Loveless (in J. Ecol. 48: 495–527. 1960), Gmelin & Kjaer (in Phytochemistry 9: 601–602. 1970), Molina Rosito (in Ceiba 19: 1–118. 1975), Cowan (Listados Floríst. México 1: 1–123. 1983), Breedlove (Listados Floríst. México 4: 1–246. 1986), Renner & al. (in AAU Rep. 24: 1–241. 1990), Iltis (l.c. 1991: 60–63), Ibarra Manríquez & Colin (in Revista Biol. Trop. 43: 75–115. 1995), Mendoza (in Caldasia 21: 709–794. 1999), Martínez Salas & al. (Listados Floríst. México 22: 1–55. 2001), Weaber & China (in Caribbean J. Sci. 39: 273–285. 2003), Oswald & al. (in Caribbean J. Sci. 42: 53–66. 2006). Papers of lesser scope are omitted here.

Among the principal papers where the American taxon is called *Capparis frondosa* Jacq. are Dodson & al. (Fl. Jauneche: 194. 1985), D'Arcy (in Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 17: 130. 1987),

Jorgensen & León-Yáñez (in Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 75: 383. 1999), Balick & al. (in Mem. New York Bot. Gard. 85: 76. 2000), Iltis (in Stevens & al., Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 85(1): 571. 2001), Hall & al. (in Amer. J. Bot. 89: 1826–1842. 2002), Correa & al. (Cat. Pl. Vasc. Panamá: 1–599. 2004), Linares (in Ceiba 44: 105–268. 2005), Cornejo & Iltis (in Novon 15: 393–404. 2005, in Harvard Pap. Bot. 13: 229–236. 2008), Funk & al. (in Contr. U.S. Natl. Herb. 55: 234. 2007), Hokche & al. (Nuevo Cat. Fl. Vasc. Venezuela: 312. 2008), Idárraga-Piedrahita & al. (Fl. Antioquia 2: 1–939. 2011). Papers of lesser scope are omitted here.

Since the arguments by Nicolson (l.c. 1978) against usage of *Capparis baducca* for the endemic southern Indian species appeared, the name *C. rheedei* DC. (Prodr. 1: 246. 1824) has completely replaced it there, as in Ramesh (in Saldanha, Fl. Karnataka 1: 314. 1985), Raghavan (in Sharma & Balakrishnan, Fl. India 2: 285. 1993), Londhe (in Singh & Karthikeyan, Fl. Maharashtra State 1: 213. 2000), and Kundu (in Thaisia 17: 59–95. 2007).

With regard to websites, we found that in www.data.gbif.org *Capparis baducca* is cited for several countries of tropical America (e.g., it appears 71 times for Mexico and 13 times for Colombia), although it is also cited for India (twice). In the same website, *C. frondosa* has been treated as a synonym of *C. baducca*. On the other hand, www.theplantlist.org is among the principal sites where *C. frondosa* is considered the correct name for the American taxon. Additionally, searching the Google website (14 Dec 2012), we found the following score for both names: "*C. frondosa* Jacq." appears 27,300 times and "*C. baducca* L." appears 8450 times. We also searched in Google Scholar where the results were: "*C. frondosa* Jacq." appears 282 times and "*C. baducca* L." appears 112 times.

Based on the evidence provided above, we propose the conservation of *Capparis baducca* L., with the specimen at BM (bar code No. 000628729) as the conserved type, in order to preserve the use of a Linnaean name. If this proposal is accepted, *C. rheedei* DC. will become the correct and unambiguous name for the Asian species occasionally known as *C. baducca*. Thus, *C. baducca* will apply to a Neotropical species with a wide range in Central America, the Caribbean, and northern South America (Macbride, l.c.; Standley & Steyermark, l.c.; Loveless, l.c.; Gmelin & Kjaer, l.c.; Molina Rosito, l.c.; Cowan, l.c.; Breedlove, l.c.; Renner & al., l.c.; Iltis, l.c.; Ibarra Manríquez & Colin, l.c.; Mendoza, l.c.; Martínez Salas & al., l.c.; Weaber & China, l.c.; Oswald & al., l.c.), with *C. frondosa* Jacq. as its synonym.

(2134) Proposal to conserve the name *Phymaspermum* (Asteraceae) with a conserved type

Anthony Richard Magee,^{1,2} Ashton Kim Ruiters,² Patricia M. Tilney² & Ben-Erik van Wyk²

1 Compton Herbarium, South African National Biodiversity Institute, Private Bag X7, Claremont 7735, Cape Town, South Africa

2 Department of Botany and Plant Biotechnology, University of Johannesburg, P.O. Box 524, Auckland Park 2006, South Africa

Author for correspondence: Anthony Richard Magee, A.Magee@sanbi.org.za

(2134) *Phymaspermum* Less., Syn. Gen. Compos.: 253. Jul–Aug 1832 [*Angiosp.: Comp.*], nom. cons. prop.
Typus: *P. leptophyllum* (DC.) Benth. & Hook. f. ex B.D. Jacks. (Index Kew. 1: 37. 6 Sep 1893) (*Adenachaena leptophylla* DC.), typ. cons. prop.

Phymaspermum Less. (l.c.) was originally described with a single species indicated: "*Ph. junceum* *= *Osteospermum junceum* Thunb. fl. cap. p. 714", but has since been expanded to include ca. 18 species, all endemic to southern Africa. *Phymaspermum junceum* has been incorrectly interpreted by recent authors as a species described by

Lessing (Norlindh, Studies in the Calenduleae I.: 176. 1943; Källersjö in Nordic J. Bot. 5: 535–538. 1985; Germishuizen & al., Checklist S. African Pl.: 243. 2006) and distinct from *Osteospermum junceum* P.J. Bergius (Descr. Pl. Cap.: 334. 1767), an accepted species of *Osteospermum* L. (Sp. Pl.: 923. 1753). Lessing's inclusion of *O. junceum* Thunb. as a synonym, however, effectively links *P. junceum* via Thunberg (Fl. Cap., ed. 2: 714: 1823) and Linnaeus (Mant. Pl.: 290. 1771) to the basionym *O. junceum* P.J. Bergius. Since Lessing did not clearly exclude the type of the latter, his name must be regarded simply as a new combination, *P. junceum* (P.J. Bergius) Less., typified by the type of the basionym (Art. 7.3 of the *Melbourne Code*; McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012), even though the plant he described is clearly different from that of Bergius's. As such, *Phymaspermum* becomes a nomenclatural synonym of *Osteospermum*.

The name *Phymaspermum* could be retained by conserving either the generic name or the species name, *P. junceum*, with a conserved type (Art. 14.9). There are four sheets of *Osteospermum junceum* in Thunberg's herbarium (UPS-THUNB 20825, 20826, 20827, 20828). Three are of *O. junceum* P.J. Bergius, while the fourth (UPS-THUNB 20825) comprises two specimens. One is *O. spinosum* L. and the other, determined in Lessing's hand as "*Chrysanthemum junceum**", appears to be what we know today as *P. leptophyllum* (DC.) Benth. & Hook. f. ex B.D. Jacks. (Index Kew. 1: 37. 1893, 2: 514. 1894), based on *Adenachaena leptophylla* DC. (Prodr. 6: 49. 1838), although we cannot be completely certain without florets or fruit. Clearly Lessing based his genus on this specimen, although his description of the alternating ligulate and filiform florets is dubious (unless he confused the often alternating outer row of ligulate and disc florets). Conserving *P. junceum* with a new type, selected from a specimen of *P. leptophyllum* (preferably other than the original Thunberg specimen which is rather poor, lacking florets and fruit) would prevent it from becoming a nomenclatural synonym of *O. junceum* but would render *P. leptophyllum* synonymous with it. Conversely, conservation of the generic name

Phymaspermum with a conserved type (preferably *P. leptophyllum* as it is characteristic of the genus and in all likelihood matches the specimen originally seen by Lessing) will preserve all aspects of current usage, relegate the already enigmatic *P. junceum* into synonymy and avoid any disadvantageous nomenclatural changes to the currently recognized species. This is the option favoured by the authors.

Should this conservation proposal not be accepted, the next available generic name would have to be reinstated for the remaining species. Three such names exist, all described by Candolle (l.c.: 26, 49, 76), viz. *Adenachaena* DC., *Brachymeris* DC. and *Oligoglossa* DC., but their adoption would require 13 to 17 new combinations depending on the generic name chosen. *Phymaspermum* has been recognized in all major treatments of the family for the last 181 years and is well established in the botanical literature particularly since its expansion by Bentham & Hooker (Gen. Pl. 2: 422–423. 1873) (e.g., Candolle, l.c.: 44; Harvey in Harvey & Sonder, Fl. Cap. 3: 160, 437. 1865; Källersjö, l.c.; Goldblatt & Manning in Strelitzia 9: 275. 2000; Germishuizen & al., Checklist S. African Pl.: 243. 2006; Kadereit & Jeffrey, Fam. Gen. Vasc. Pl. 8: 356. 2007; Oberprieler & al. in Funk & al., Syst. Evol. Biogeogr. Compos.: 638. 2009; Raimondo & al. in Strelitzia 25: 277. 2009). Furthermore, *Phymaspermum* is the nominate genus of the subtribe *Phymasperminae* (Oberprieler & al. in Willdenowia 37: 99. 2007), which would have to be renamed should conservation not be accepted.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. Mats Hjertson and Dr. Robert Vogt for providing digital images of specimens in Thunberg's herbarium (UPS-THUNB) and Botanical Museum Berlin-Dahlem (B), respectively; and Dr. John Wiersema for valuable comments. This work is based upon research supported by the National Research Foundation and Department of Science and Technology under the SABI Programme. Support from the South African National Biodiversity Institute and the University of Johannesburg is also acknowledged.

(2135) Proposal to conserve the name *Siphonandra* Klotzsch (*Ericaceae*) against *Siphonandra* Turcz. (*Rubiaceae*)

Paola Pedraza-Peñalosa & James L. Luteyn

The New York Botanical Garden, Institute of Systematic Botany, Bronx, New York 10458-5126, U.S.A.

Author for correspondence: Paola Pedraza-Peñalosa, ppedraza@nybg.org

- (2135) *Siphonandra* Klotzsch in Linnaea 24: 24. Mai 1851 [*Eric.*], nom. cons. prop.
 Typus: *S. elliptica* Klotzsch
 (H) *Siphonandra* Turcz. in Bull. Soc. Imp. Naturalistes Moscou 21(2): 581. 1848 [*Angiosp.: Rub.*], nom. rej. prop.
 Typus: *S. mexicana* Turcz.

Siphonandra Klotzsch (in Linnaea 24: 24. 1851) is a small, distinctive, high-elevation genus of *Ericaceae* endemic to the Central Andes from northern Peru (Amazonas) to northern Bolivia (Cochabamba). For nearly a century, *Siphonandra* Klotzsch contained only *S. elliptica* Klotzsch, a species that spans the entire geographical range of the genus (Luteyn in Sida 20: 14. 2002). *Siphonandra elliptica* Klotzsch is a replacement name for *Thibaudia elliptica* Ruiz

& Pav. (Fl. Peruv. 4: t. 384b. 1830–1833, non Blume 1826). Today, *Siphonandra* Klotzsch consists of five species of shrubs. Since its inception, the name *Siphonandra* Klotzsch has been used and cited in diverse publications. For example, Weberbauer (El Mundo Vegetal de los Andes Peruanos. 1945) mentions its distribution in Peru and his collections of *S. elliptica* are cited by Luteyn & al. (in Revista Peruana Biol. 15(1): 127–134. 2008) in their lectotypification of Peruvian *Ericaceae*. Other floristic works that include the taxon or make reference to its importance in the floristic composition of the Central Andes comprise national (Macbride in Publ. Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Bot. Ser. 13(5): 83–84. 1959) and regional treatments (Vásquez & al. in Arnoldoa 12: 122–125. 2005). Its wood anatomy and ecological trends were examined in recent studies of the wood of the tribe *Vaccinieae* (Lens & al. in Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 91: 566–592.