

(2938) Proposal to reject the name *Genista multicaulis* (Leguminosae)**P. Pablo Ferrer-Gallego,¹ Salvador Talavera^{2†} & Llorenç Sáez^{3,4}**¹ *Servicio de Vida Silvestre y Red Natura 2000, Centro para la Investigación y la Experimentación Forestal (CIEF), Generalitat Valenciana, Avda. Comarques del País Valencià 114, 46930 Quart de Poblet, Valencia, Spain*² *Departamento de Biología Vegetal y Ecología, Universidad de Sevilla, 41012 Sevilla, Spain*³ *Systematic and Evolution of Vascular Plants (UAB), Associated unit to CSIC, Dept. BABVE, Faculty of Biosciences, Autonomous University of Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Barcelona, Spain*⁴ *Societat d'Història Natural de les Balears, c/ Margarida Xirgu 16, 07003 Palma de Mallorca, Islas Baleares, Spain*Address for correspondence: P. Pablo Ferrer-Gallego, flora.cief@gva.esDOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12869>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2938) *Genista multicaulis* Lam., *Encycl.* 2: 617. 14 Apr 1788 [Angiosp.: *Legum.*], nom. utique. rej. prop.Lectotypus (vide Cardona & al. in *Orsis* 2: 21. 1986): “*genista multicaulis*. lam. dict./49” (P barcode P00296004).

The name *Genista multicaulis* was established by Lamarck (*Encycl.* 2: 617. 1788), based on plants cultivated in the Botanical Garden of Paris presumably from material collected by Claude Richard in Mahon (Menorca, Balearic Islands, Spain), and cited as: “Cet arbuste est cultivé depuis long-temps au Jardin du Roi, où il fleurit rarement. On le dit originaire de Mahon, d’où il fut apporté par M. Richard (v. v.)” (This shrub has been cultivated for a long time in the Jardin du Roi, where it rarely blooms. It is said to be from Mahon, from where it was brought by Mr. Richard (v. v.)).

Although *Genista multicaulis* was described in detail, its identity (including its generic placement) has remained obscure since its publication and the name has been little known and used. This name was usually ignored by subsequent authors, and was proposed as a nomen ambiguum by Talavera (in *Fl. Iberica* 7(1): 72. 1999). On the other hand, Cambessèdes (in *Mem. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris* 14: 232. 1827) and Walpers (*Repert. Bot. Syst.* 5: 504. 1846) treated *G. multicaulis* as a synonym of *Anthyllis hermanniae* L. (*Sp. Pl.*: 720. 1753). Later, Pau (in *Bull. Acad. Int. Géogr. Bot.* 16(205–206): 75. 1906; in *Brotéria, Sér. Bot.* 22: 114–115. 1926) accepted this view and created two new combinations under the genus *Anthyllis* L.: *A. hermanniae* var. *multicaulis* (Lam.) Pau (l.c. 1906) and *A. multicaulis* (Lam.) Pau (l.c. 1926). However, from the study of Lamarck’s original material of *G. multicaulis* at P (see below) by Cardona & al. (in *Orsis* 2: 5–25. 1986) and later by Benedí (in *Anales Jard. Bot. Madrid* 56: 285. 1998) and Talavera (l.c.) it has been considered as belonging to the genus *Genista* L.

Lamarck’s name *Genista multicaulis* has priority over two species belonging to the *G. cinerea* (Vill.) DC. complex: *G. majorica* Cantó & M.J. Sánchez (in *Candollea* 43: 78. 1988) and *G. ausetana* (O. Bolòs & Vigo) Talavera (in *Anales Jard. Bot. Madrid* 57: 206. 1999) [= *G. cinerea* subsp. *ausetana* O. Bolòs & Vigo in *Butll. Inst. Catalana Hist. Nat.* 38: 69. 1974] (see López González, Árbol. Arbust. Peníns. Ibér. 2: 951. 2001). *Genista majorica* is endemic to mountain areas in northern Mallorca (Cantó & Sánchez, l.c.; Cantó & al. in *Lazaroa* 18: 20. 1997; Talavera, l.c., 1999). This species was described from material collected in “Gorç Blau” (Mallorca, Balearic Islands, Spain), the holotype is preserved at MAF [No. 124034]. *Genista ausetana* is distributed in E and NE Spain and S

France (Cantó & Sánchez, l.c.; Cantó & al., l.c.; López González, l.c.; Tison & al., *Fl. France Médit.*: 652. 2014; POWO, <http://powo.science.kew.org/>), and is a parent of the hybrid *G. xuribe-echebarriae* Urrutia (*G. ausetana* × *G. scorpius* (L.) DC.), which occurs in NE Spain (see Urrutia in *Estud. Mus. Ci. Nat. Álava* 6: 49. 1991; Elorza & al. in *Fl. Montiber.* 71: 113. 2018).

The type of *Genista multicaulis* was indicated by Cardona & al. (l.c.: 21) as “le type du *Genista multicaulis* (Herbier Lamarck, Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle de Paris)”. In P, there is only one relevant sheet, with barcode P00296004, that bears a stem with leaves and only one flower. The sheet bears two labels, a label handwritten by Lamarck: “*genista multicaulis*. lam. dict.” with the number “49”, corresponding to its species number in Candolle (*Prodr.* 2: 150. 1825), added in pencil, and a label handwritten by G. Aymonim in 1984: “cf. *Genista cinerea* DC. fa. *leptoclada* (Willk.) Pau”. This material is certainly identifiable as belonging to *G. ausetana*.

As noted above, Lamarck stated in the protologue that *Genista multicaulis* was based on a plant cultivated in the “Jardin du Roi” and he indicated only “(v. v.)” [*vidi vivam*], suggesting that he had not prepared a specimen. The sheet P00296004 lacks a collection date. However, there exist from the Lamarck Herbarium similarly labelled specimens of several other *Genista* species named by Lamarck in his *Encyclopédie* and indicated there only as “v. v.”, including a specimen of *G. triquetra* Lam. that contains descriptive text precisely matching its protologue. So it should not be concluded from Lamarck’s notation “v. v.” that a specimen was not prepared from the cultivated material seen. Therefore, the specimen P00296004 can be considered original material eligible for selection, as by Cardona & al. (l.c.), as lectotype.

After careful checking of this type specimen at P, several authors have also concluded that *Genista multicaulis* applies to the same species as *G. ausetana* (see Benedí, l.c.; Talavera, l.c.; Aymerich & Sáez in *Orsis* 29: 23–90. 2015), despite the fact that the latter species does not occur in the Balears. *Genista cinerea* subsp. *ausetana* was described from material collected in “Oristà versus Terricabres” [Lluçanès, Barcelona, Spain], and the holotype is preserved at BC (barcode BC 595864).

The epithet of *Genista ausetana* has consistently been accepted and continuously used at subspecies or more recently at species rank in relevant scientific literature (Bolòs & Vigo, *Fl. Països Catalans* 3: 453. 1989; Urrutia, l.c.; Greinwald & al. in *Biochem. Syst. Ecol.* 20: 75–81. 1992; Cubas & al. in *Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* 128: 423–434. 1998; Talavera & Salgueiro, l.c.; Cusma-Velari & al. in *Stud. Geobot.* 22:

55–64. 2003; Gómez-González & al. in *J. Biogeogr.* 31: 1659–1671. 2004; Pardo & al. in *Pl. Syst. Evol.* 244: 93–119. 2004; Rizzi & Feoli in *Fl. Medit.* 19: 141–160. 2009; Talavera, l.c.; Rivas-Martínez in *Itinera Geobot.* 18: 578, 594. 2011; Tison & Foucault, *Fl. Gallica*: 725. 2014; Elorza & al., l.c.; Lorda & Remón in *Munibe, Ci. Nat.* 66: 242. 2018), and is currently used in several international databases (e.g., The Plant List, <http://www.theplantlist.org/tpl1.1/record/tro-100341118>; TROPICOS, <https://www.tropicos.org/name/100341118>; POWO, <http://powo.science.kew.org/taxon/urn:lsid:ipni.org:names:1008873-1>; all accessed 21 Nov 2022).

In conclusion, use of the name *Genista multicaulis* in modern times is very rare and its resurrection would be undesirable for stability in the nomenclature of the *G. cinerea* complex. Therefore, to maintain nomenclatural stability for the name *G. ausetana*, we propose the rejection of the name *G. multicaulis* under Art. 56 of the

ICN (see Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018). The adoption of the present proposal will secure the current use of *G. ausetana*. However, if the present proposal is rejected, the obscure name *G. multicaulis* will have to replace the former name, which has been continuously in use for over two decades.

Author information

PPFG, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7595-9302>

ST, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6173-6754>

LS, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4551-2432>

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Dr. John Wiersema and Prof. John McNeill for their advice, assistance, and valuable comments that improved this proposal.

(2939) Proposal to reject the name *Grewia oppositifolia* (*Malvaceae*)

I.M. Turner^{1,2} & Mayur D. Nandikar³ 

1 Singapore Botanical Liaison Officer, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, TW9 3AB, United Kingdom

2 Singapore Botanic Gardens, National Parks Board, 1 Cluny Road, Singapore 259569

3 APT Research Foundation, S.No. 36/1/1, M.N.199, Vadgaon Khurd, Sinhagad Road, Pune, Maharashtra, 411041, India

Address for correspondence: I.M. Turner, i.turner@kew.org

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12870>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2939) *Grewia oppositifolia* Buch.-Ham. ex DC., *Prodr.* 1: 509. Jan (med.) 1824 (*Angiosp.: Til. / Malv.*), nom. utique rej. prop. Typus: *Buchanan-Hamilton*, herb. Lambert (deest).

“*Grewia oppositifolia*” first appeared in William Roxburgh’s *Hortus Bengalensis*. Roxburgh (*Hort. Beng.*: 42. 1814) noted that this species had been first received at the Calcutta Botanic Garden in 1802 from Napaul [Nepal] among the collections of Dr F. Buchanan [Francis Buchanan-Hamilton]. But in the absence of a description or reference to one, the name was not validly published. It should be noted that Roxburgh did not claim authorship of the name, presumably having used the name supplied by Buchanan-Hamilton. Posthumously, a description of *Grewia oppositifolia* was published by Roxburgh (*Fl. Ind.*, ed. 1832, 2: 583. 1832), where the name was ascribed to Buchanan-Hamilton. However, before this, the name had been validated by two other authors. Firstly, A.P. de Candolle published *Grewia oppositifolia* Buch.-Ham. ex DC. (*Prodr.* 1: 509. 1824). The following year, David Don published *Grewia oppositifolia* Buch.-Ham. ex D. Don (*Prodr. Fl. Nepal.*: 227. 1825).

Drummond (in *J. Bot.* 49: 329, 362. 1911) noted that Buchanan-Hamilton applied the name “*Grewia oppositifolia*” to at least one specimen from Mysore in Southern India, as well as Nepal. Drummond considered Buchanan-Hamilton’s Mysore plant, as represented by a specimen in BM, to be the same as *G. emarginata* Wight & Arn. (*Prodr. Fl. Ind. Orient.* 1: 79. 1834). The Nepal plant, to which

Candolle, Don and Roxburgh referred, was a different species, known by the Hindi name “bhimal”.

In the brief protologue of *Grewia oppositifolia* Buch.-Ham. ex DC., Candolle referred to “*G. oppositifolia* (Buchan! in h. Lamb.)” and “in Nepauliâ. Roxb. cat. calc. p. 42. Genus proprium ex Wallich. (v.s. sine fruct.)”. The only definite specimen citation contained in the protologue is that of Buchanan-Hamilton in the herbarium of Lambert. The *Prodromus Herbarium* (G-DC) contains two sheets of “*Grewia oppositifolia*”. One sheet consists of flowering material including a label in Candolle’s hand “Inde. Roxburgh. M. Lambert. 1816”. It is likely that Candolle received this specimen from Aylmer Lambert during or after his visit to England in 1816 (Candolle, *Mém. Souvenirs.* 1862). The second sheet bears two flowering shoots; one is a specimen Candolle was sent by Nathaniel Wallich. It bears a printed label with “Napaul. M.^f Wallich. 1821” and a ticket in Wallich’s hand stating: “Genus Malvac. *Grewia* approximât.” The second mounted shoot has an associated ticket stating “*Grewia oppositifolia* B.”, but not in Buchanan-Hamilton’s hand (M. Watson pers. comm.). All the material belongs to the Himalayan species, and not the South Indian species. None of the specimens is labelled as collected by Buchanan-Hamilton or can be directly linked to him, so they do not represent syntypes for the name.

After his death, Lambert’s herbarium was split into lots and sold at auction. The Buchanan-Hamilton material was purchased for BM (Miller in *Taxon* 19: 525. 1970). The Buchanan-Hamilton specimen