

P. stenantha; therefore, neither Bonati nor Limpricht had seen the type of the name *P. stenantha* Franch. 1891. When I was visiting the herbarium of Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle in Paris (P), I did not find the potential type gathering. The above situation along with again the name *P. stenantha* named for an alternate-leaved species, it is possible that Franchet made a mistake: first he used the name, while the type was unavailable; he thought the name was still available, so it was used to name another species. If the type cannot be checked, this name will permanently become a 'question name' (nomen ambiguum)" (trans. from Chinese by the authors). In addition, Tsoong suggested that *P. stenantha* and *P. stenocorys* Franchet may be the same species on the basis of the original descriptions, but would need to check the type of *P. stenantha* to clarify their taxonomic relationships.

In the same article, Franchet (l.c. 1891: 140–150) described 17 new species in total using only collections of J.A. Soulié, except *Primula vialii* for which he also had a collection by J.M. Delavay. In order to find the potential type of *P. stenantha*, we searched for type specimens of the other 16 names (*Cyananthus petiolatus*, *Gentiana crassuloides*, *Gentiana rosularis*, *Primula vialii*, *Salvia brevilabra*, *Salvia tatsienensis*, *Salvia tricuspis*, *Saussurea tatsienensis*, *Saussurea scabrida*, *Saussurea souliei*, *Saussurea caudata*, *Saxifraga longistyla*, *Senecio plantaginifolius*, *Senecio setchuenensis*, *Senecio souliei*, *Tanacetum myrianthum*) to get some internal clues. After checking collections of J.A. Soulié deposited at the herbarium of P, we find that type specimens of 15 names (except *Primula vialii*) collected by J.A. Soulié are labeled as "Plantes de TA-TSIEN-LOU (SETCHUEN). M. l'abbé SOULIÉ Recu le 6 juin 1891" [sic!]. Based on this clue, we find that only the sheet P02969035 (*J.A. Soulié s.n.*) corresponds to the original material of *P. stenantha*. However, this specimen was identified as "*Pedicularis stenocorys* Franch." by Franchet himself, with modification for the specific epithet "*stenocorys*" annotated on the label. Herein, only this sheet can be selected as the lectotype of the name *P. stenantha*. If the proposed lectotype is accepted, it is clear that *P. stenocorys* (typified by *R.P. Mussot 304*) is conspecific with *P. stenantha*.

Nomenclaturally, the name *P. stenantha* has priority over the name *P. stenocorys*, however, to reduce *P. stenocorys* to a synonym of *P. stenantha* would be contrary to current usage. As mentioned above, the name *P. stenantha* is only correctly used by some researchers to refer to the whorled-leaved species (i.e., *P. stenantha* Franch. 1891) (Bonati in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 13: 137. 1921), while its taxonomic status was later treated as uncertain (Li, l.c.; Limpricht, l.c. 1924: 227; Tsoong, l.c.: 270). By contrast, the species under the name *P. stenocorys* is widely adopted in taxonomic revisions (Li, l.c.; Limpricht, l.c. 1924: 227) and checklists (Wang & Wu, Vasc. Pl. Hengduan Mount. Part II. 1994), and the current Chinese Floras (Tsoong, l.c.: 268–269; Yang & al., l.c.). Moreover, one subspecies (subsp. *melanotricha* P.C. Tsoong) and one variety (var. *angustissima* P.C. Tsoong) are placed under *P. stenocorys* (Tsoong, l.c.: 271). Therefore, to avoid the disadvantageous nomenclatural displacement of the most widely accepted epithet, the name *P. stenocorys* should be conserved against the prior name *P. stenantha*.

The gathering *R.P. Mussot 304* of *Pedicularis stenocorys* contains two sheets at P. The sheet with the barcode P00520824 has been annotated as the type on the sheet, and another sheet was previously deposited at Herbarium E. Drake, then it was transferred to the herbarium of P. The sheet P00520824 is designated above as the lectotype of *P. stenocorys*.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Dr. John McNeill for his valuable comments and suggestions; and to the herbarium of Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle (P) for providing online access to specimens. This study was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31200185), the West Light Foundation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the National Science and Technology on Basic Research Program (2013FY112600), the Large-Scale Scientific Facilities of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (2009-LSFGBOWS-01), and the U.S. National Science Foundation (DEB-1119098).

(2205) Proposal to conserve the name *Pterygiella cylindrica* against *Brandisia praticola* (Orobanchaceae)

Wen-Bin Yu,¹ Robert R. Mill,² Hong Wang¹ & De-Zhu Li¹

¹ Key Laboratory of Biodiversity and Biogeography, and Plant Germplasm and Genomics Center, Kunming Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming, 650201, China

² Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh EH3 5LR, Scotland, U.K.

Author for correspondence: Wen-Bin Yu, yuwenbin@mail.kib.ac.cn

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/625.34>

(2205) *Pterygiella cylindrica* P.C. Tsoong in Fl. Reipubl. Popularis Sin. 68: 381, 419. 1963 [*Angiosp.*: *Orobanch.*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: China, Yunnan, Binchuan, Xiachan to Waxi, 14 Oct 1946, *T.N. Liou 21509* (PE barcode 00032314!);

(=) *Brandisia praticola* W.W. Sm. in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 10: 10. 1917, nom. rej. prop.

Holotypus: China, Yunnan, Mekong-Salween divide, Sep 1914, *G. Forrest 13350* (E barcode E00531969!; isotypi:

E barcode E00531970!, PE barcode 01456031!, PH barcode 00008060!).

The genus *Pterygiella* Oliv. (*Orobanchaceae*) currently comprises the three species *P. nigrescens* Oliv. 1896, *P. duclouxii* Franch. 1900 and *P. cylindrica* P.C. Tsoong 1963, while excluding *P. bartschioides* Hand.-Mazz. (= *Xizangia bartschioides* (Hand.-Mazz.) C.Y. Wu & D.D. Tao), and is endemic to southwestern China (Dong & al. in Pl. Divers. Resources 33: 581–594. 2011a). The last-named *P. cylindrica*

differs from the other two species by having terete, wingless stems, and 3-veined leaves. Subsequently, Hong (in Novon 6: 372. 1996) described *P. suffruticosa* D.Y. Hong on the basis of a collection *Qinghai-Xizang Exped. 14400* (PE, <http://www.nhpe.org/pe/01432027>) that was indicated as being of shrubby habit. However, morphological comparison of the type specimens of *P. suffruticosa* and *P. cylindrica* indicates that *P. suffruticosa* cannot be discriminated from *P. cylindrica*, a view that is also supported by morphometric and molecular data (Dong & al., l.c. 2011a). Field observations show that *P. cylindrica* is a perennial woody herb, and in particular that some plants with old woody stems resemble shrubs. This habit is also found in *P. nigrescens* and *P. duclouxii*. Therefore, *P. suffruticosa* should be considered conspecific with *P. cylindrica*.

Brandisia Hook. f. & Thomson is a fruticose genus that has been traditionally placed in *Scrophulariaceae*, although very recently it has been transferred to *Orobanchaceae* (McNeal & al. in Amer. J. Bot. 100: 971–983. 2013). Based on a collection from Yunnan (*G. Forrest 13350*, E, <http://data.rbge.org.uk/herb/E00531969>), Smith (in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 10: 10. 1917) described *B. praticola* W.W. Sm., because he considered the type gathering as being of shrubby habit. In his revision of *Brandisia*, Li (in J. Arnold Arbor. 28: 136. 1947) pointed out that the type of *B. praticola* should be regarded as belonging to *P. nigrescens*. After checking the holotype and isotype of *B. praticola* conserved at the Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh (E), as well as isotypes exchanged from E that are conserved at both the Institute of Botany (PE) of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (<http://www.nhpe.org/pe/01456031>) and the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia (PH) (http://ph.ansp.org/image_viewer.php?barcode=8060), all plants of the type gathering of *B. praticola* prove to be *P. cylindrica*, on account of their terete and wingless stems.

Nomenclaturally, the name *B. praticola* has priority over *P. cylindrica*. However, the name *B. praticola* has been overlooked by botanists during preparation of Floras (e.g., Tsoong & Yang in

Fl. Reipubl. Popularis Sin. 67(2): 17–28. 1979; Hong & al., Fl. China 18: 1–212. 1998; Tao, Fl. Yunnan. 16: 346–350. 2006), or has been misplaced as a synonym of *P. nigrescens* (Li, l.c.). On the contrary, the name *P. cylindrica* has been widely adopted in Floras (Tsoong in Fl. Reipubl. Popularis Sin. 68: 381, 419. 1963; Hong & al., l.c.: 210; Hong & Pan, Fl. Yunnan. 16: 312. 2006), journal articles (Lu & al. in Pl. Syst. Evol. 268: 177–198. 2007; Dong & al., l.c. 2011a; Dong & al. in J. Syst. Evol. 49: 189–202. 2011b; Dong & al. in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 117: 491–507. 2013), and checklists and similar works (IBCAS, Iconogr. Cormophyt. Sin. 4: 95. 1975; Wu & al., Index Fl. Yunnan. 2: 1624. 1984; Wang & Wu, Vasc. Pl. Hengduan Mount. 2: 1840. 1994; Shui, Seed Pl. Honghe: 385. 2003; Fu & al., Higher Pl. China 10: 222. 2004). Internet searches using Google for the two names, performed on 26 July 2013, yielded 1560 hits for *P. cylindrica* but only 84 for *B. praticola*, most of which either gave no information about the name, synonymized it with *P. nigrescens* (presumably following Li's treatment), or regarded it as “dubious” (TROPICOS) or “unresolved” (The Plant List). Therefore, to avoid the disadvantageous nomenclatural displacement of the most widely accepted epithet, we here propose that the name *P. cylindrica* should be conserved against the prior name *B. praticola*.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the curator of KUN for allowing us to study their specimens; and to E, PE and PH for providing online access to specimens. This study was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31200185), the West Light Foundation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the Large-Scale Scientific Facilities of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (2009-LSF-GBOWS-01), and the Special Program for Basic Research of Ministry of Science and Technology of China (2013FY112600). The Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh is supported by the Scottish Government's Rural and Environment Science and Analytical Services Division.

(2206) Proposal to conserve the name *Fontenellea brasiliensis* (*Quillaja brasiliensis*) against *Q. lancifolia* (*Quillajaceae*)

Federico Luebert

Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Biologie – Botanik, Altensteinstraße 6, 14195 Berlin, Germany and Departamento de Silvicultura y Conservación de la Naturaleza, Facultad de Ciencias Forestales y de la Conservación de la Naturaleza, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile; fluebert@fu-berlin.de

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/625.35>

(2206) *Fontenellea brasiliensis* A. St.-Hil. & Tul. in Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot., sér. 2, 17: 142. 1842.

Lectotypus (hic designatus): Brazil, Prov. de Rio-Grande, *Gaudichaud* (P barcode P02416153).

(=) *Quillaja lancifolia* D. Don in Edinburgh New Philos. J. 10: 231. 1831.

Holotypus: Brasilia, *Sellow* (G barcode G00386709; isotypi: B, K, P barcode P02416115)

The name *Quillaja brasiliensis* (A. St.-Hil. & Tul.) Mart. (Syst. Mat. Med. Bras.: 127. 1843) has long been applied to a tree

of northeastern Argentina, southeastern Brazil, northern Uruguay and eastern Paraguay (Zuloaga & al. in Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 107: 2824. 2008). This species differs from its congener, *Q. saponaria* Molina, in having lanceolate leaves with acute apex (versus ovate leaves with obtuse apex in *Q. saponaria*) as well as in its disjunct geographical distribution (*Q. saponaria* is native to central Chile with a disjunct population found in Andean Bolivia). Examined material of *Quillaja brasiliensis* is very homogeneous in terms of leaf morphology, with a very definite geographical range, and authors seem to agree in the application of a broad species concept that includes under this name all Brazilian, Argentinian and Uruguayan