

synonymy, was considered distinct by Jørgensen & León-Yáñez and as having been misapplied to Galápagos material. From the descriptions and illustrations in these publications it appears that the Galápagos plants are *B. acmella*, not *B. gayana*.

In most modern Floras, there is a general consensus to use the name *B. acmella* for the Asiatic species (e.g., Saldanha & Nicolson, Fl. Hassan Distr. Karnataka: 603. 1976; Ling Yong & al., Fl. Reipubl. Popul. Sin. 75: 348. 1979; Grierson in Dassanayake, Fl. Ceylon 1: 213. 1980; Hara & al., Enum. Fl. Pl. Nepal 3: 15–16. 1982; Matthew, III. Fl. Tamilnadu Carnatic 2: 356, t. 356. 1982; Matthew, Fl. Tamilnadu Carnatic 3: 767. 1983; Chowdhery in Hajra & al., Fl. India 12: 377–379. 1993; Matthew, Fl. Palni Hills S. India 2: 680–681. 1999; Wu Telin, Fl. Guangdong 8: 122–123. 2007). There is also general agreement to use the name *B. gayana* for the African species (e.g., Oliver, Fl. Trop. Afr. 3: 375. 1877 (which recognises occasional plants of *B. acmella*, as *B. rhomboidea*, in N. Africa and Moçambique); Hepper, Fl. W. Trop. Afr. 2: 237. 1963; Arnold & de Wet, Pl. S. Afr.: Names & Distrib.: 744. 2000; Leistner, Seed Pl. S. Afr.: Fam. & Gen.: 126. 2000; Germis-huizen & Meyer, Pl. S. Afr.: Annot. Checkl.: 196. 2003; Leistner, Seed Pl. S. Trop. Afr.: Fam. & Gen.: 90. 2005), two exceptions being Boulos (Fl. Egypt 3: 232. 2002) and Beentje & Hind (Fl. Trop. E. Afr. Compositae (part 3): 735–737. 2005), in both of which *B. gayana* is synonymised with *B. acmella*.

If *V. dichotoma* and *B. rhomboidea* are synonymous with *B. acmella*, as most authors agree, then there is no problem with this consensus view. However, if either is found to be conspecific with *B. gayana*, then the latter name is threatened. Is this likely? Perhaps.

The earliest name (apart from *V. acmella*) is *Verbesina dichotoma* Murray. There seems to be no extant specimen of Murray's plant, leaving only his description and plate to define his concept. Both lack definitive details of the achenes, which would place it in one or the other species. It is not known where Murray's seed came from, although Willdenow thought it came from India. Application of the name *V. dichotoma* thus rests on pure opinion, based on a vague description and indistinct illustration. Hemsley and later authors resurrected Murray's epithet for Galápagos plants, but confused matters by assigning some elements usually considered part of *B. acmella* to *B. dichotoma* while maintaining *B. acmella* as distinct.

The type specimen of *B. rhomboidea* has achenes, but these are somewhat immature. In the *Ecliptinae* I have found that achenes which are not fully mature when collected often fail to show the full ornamentation and shape of fully mature ones. The achenes on the *B. rhomboidea* type are somewhat intermediate between the two species in question, although one or two of the larger ones are relatively broad and slightly rugose, placing the specimen with the Indian taxon, but they could be (and have been, pers. comm.) interpreted the other way.

Thus both names potentially threaten the traditional name *B. gayana*, widely used in Africa and in a few countries elsewhere.

Current usage could be maintained by epitypifying *V. dichotoma* and *B. rhomboidea* with specimens of undoubted *B. acmella*. While this would be acceptable for *V. dichotoma*, where no original specimen survives, it is less satisfactory for *B. rhomboidea*, where a good type specimen (albeit immature) survives, and might later be proven to be in conflict with the epitype. A second solution would be to conserve the name *B. gayana* against *V. dichotoma* and *B. rhomboidea*. If the last two are considered to be conspecific with *B. acmella* (as most authors currently believe), then the name *B. acmella* has priority and they remain in synonymy in traditional fashion. However, if either *V. dichotoma* or *B. rhomboidea* are ever definitively determined to be conspecific with *B. gayana*, then this conservation action would protect traditional usage of the name *B. gayana* while leaving the names *V. dichotoma* Murray and *B. rhomboidea* Cass. available for use in a sense excluding the type of *B. gayana*. However, given the present fairly strong consensus on the taxonomy of the genus, it is unlikely that the names would ever be required in this sense. The third solution, and the one proposed here, is to reject both of the names *Verbesina dichotoma* Murray and *Blainvillea rhomboidea* Cass. Neither has been widely used in recent literature, and their rejection leaves the currently generally accepted names *B. acmella* and *B. gayana* completely free of doubt.

Acknowledgements

I thank Nicholas Hind (Kew) for useful and vigorous discussions on this and related nomenclatural problems in the *Heliantheae* alliance, and John Wiersema and John McNeill for valuable suggestions on an earlier draft of the paper.

(2111) Proposal to conserve the name *Inula* (*Asteraceae*) with a conserved type

María Santos-Vicente, M. Montserrat Martínez-Ortega & Enrique Rico

Departamento de Botánica, Universidad de Salamanca, 37007 Salamanca, Spain
Author for correspondence: María Santos-Vicente, m.santos@usal.es

(2111) *Inula* L., Sp. Pl.: 881. 1 Mai 1753, nom. cons. prop.
Typus: *I. hirta* L., typ. cons. prop.

The genus *Inula* L. as traditionally circumscribed comprises ca. 90–100 species widely distributed in Europe, Asia and Africa; ca. 65 species are Eurasian and North-African perennial herbs and ca. 25 species are Central and South-African perennial herbs and shrubs (modified from Anderberg in Pl. Syst. Evol. 176: 75–123. 1991 and Flann (ed.), 2009+ Global Compositae Checklist Accessed: 11 Nov. 2011). The delimitation of the genus is controversial and has been a matter of frequent discussion throughout botanical

history (e.g., Beck, Europ. Inula-Art.: 1–59. 1882; Anderberg, l.c. 1991). The original Linnaean (Sp. Pl.: 881–884. 1753) circumscription of *Inula* has notably changed to include further Linnaean genera such as *Conyza* L. (l.c.: 861–863, nom. rej. vs. *Conyza* Less., Syn. Gen. Compos.: 203–204. 1832, nom. cons.) (i.e., *I. bifrons* L., *I. candida* (L.) Cass. and *I. conyzae* (Griess.) Meikle). Also *Inula* has been split into several genera and many Linnaean species originally placed in *Inula* were subsequently transferred to them, e.g., *Pulicaria* Gaertn. (*P. dysenterica* (L.) Bernh., *P. odora* (L.) Rechb. and *P. vulgaris* Gaertn.) and *Limbarda* Adans. (*L. crithmoides* (L.) Dumort.).

Although no comprehensive taxonomic contribution is available for the whole genus, apart from the checklist published by Anderberg (l.c. 1991), the European and Eurasian species of *Inula* (i.e., ca. 30% of the known species) are revised in different monographs or taxonomic treatments within several Floras (e.g., Duby, Bot. Gall. 1: 267. 1828; Candolle, Prodr. 5: 463–473. 1836; Endlicher, Gen. Pl.: 393–394. 1837; Koch, Syn. Fl. Germ. Helv.: 358–360. 1837; Cosson & Germain, Fl. Descr. Anal. Paris 1: 411–414. 1845; Willkomm in Willkomm & Lange, Prodr. Fl. Hispan. 2: 42–46. 1865; Bentham in Bentham & Hooker, Gen. Pl. 2: 330–331. 1873; Beck, l.c.; Borbás in Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 8: 222–243. 1887; Hoffmann in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 4(5): 201–203. 1890; Grierson in Davis, Fl. Turkey 5: 54–73. 1975). Also, many Asian species (i.e., ca. 40% of the known species) are revised separately (e.g., Boissier, Fl. Orient. 3: 184–201. 1875; Avetissjan in Izv. Akad. Nauk. Armyansk. S.S.R., Biol. Sel'skokhoz. Nauki 11: 1–72. 1958; Gorschkova in Schischkin, Fl. URSS 25: 433–477. 1959; Yong in Yong & al., Fl. Reipubl. Popularis Sin. 75: 248–281. 1979; Rechinger in Georgiadou & al., Fl. Iranica 145: 77–96. 1980; Kaisar & Abid in Ali & Kaisar, Fl. Pakistan 210: 8–28. 2003).

In these works the European species are most commonly grouped into three or four sections, some of them nowadays recognised as independent genera. For instance, *Dittrichia* Greuter (1973) comprises the species formerly included in *I.* sect. *Cupularia* Gren. & Godr., such as *D. graveolens* (L.) Greuter and *D. viscosa* (L.) Greuter, and *Limbarda* groups the species from *I.* sect. *Limbarda* (Adans.) DC., e.g., *L. crithmoides*. The other two commonly accepted sections within *Inula* are *I.* sect. *Enula* Duby (= *I.* sect. *Bubonium* DC.) and *I.* sect. *Corvisartia* (Mérat) DC. (currently = *I.* sect. *Inula*). The latter was originally described by Mérat (Nouv. Fl. Env. Paris: 328. 1812) at generic rank and included only one species, *I. helenium* L. (l.c.: 881), the currently listed type of *Inula* (Anderberg in Regnum Veg. 127: 57. 1993). As far as we know, only a few later authors (i.e., Grenier & Godron, Fl. France 2: 173. 1850; Reichenbach f., Icon. Fl. Germ. Helv. 16: 12. 1853; Schur, Enum. Pl. Transsilv.: 311. 1866) have followed Mérat in splitting *Corvisartia* as an independent genus.

Inula helenium was first chosen as a lectotype for the genus by Britton & Brown (Ill. Fl. N.U.S., ed. 2, 3: 457. 1913). According to Art. 10.5(b) of the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006) this choice may be superseded because it was based on a

largely mechanical method of selection (Art. 10.5, Ex. 7), but Green (in Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.: 182. 1929) later confirmed this choice.

A recently published molecular phylogeny of the tribe *Inuleae* (Englund & al. in Cladistics 25: 319–352. 2009), as well as newly generated DNA sequence and morphological data on the tribe especially focused on the European species of *Inula* (Santos-Vicente & al., submitted), suggest that this genus is highly paraphyletic and that *I. helenium* and its sister species (*I.* sect. *Corvisartia*) should be segregated at generic rank from the remaining species of *Inula*.

In this situation, unless this conservation proposal is accepted, application of the name *Inula* would be restricted to the five *Corvisartia* species traditionally included in *Inula* (Santos-Vicente & al., submitted), and between 80 and 90 new combinations in some other genus or genera would be needed to accommodate the other species currently under *Inula*. In order to limit the number of name changes it is necessary to propose a conserved type for the generic name under Art. 14.9. We here propose *I. hirta* L. as a conserved type for *Inula*, based on the following reasons: (1) this species is clearly part of the protologue of the genus (Linnaeus, l.c.: 883); (2) it is nomenclaturally stable (no synonyms used); (3) it is not a very variable species from the morphological point of view (no subspecies have been described within it); and (4) the type associated with this name is unambiguous (lectotype designated by Anderberg in Taxon 47: 363. 1998).

To summarize, the present proposal is based on the facts that: (1) *Inula* s.l. is largely paraphyletic, (2) the currently listed type of *Inula* belongs to the small independent genus *Corvisartia* and (3) most of the species currently recognized in *Inula* would remain there if our proposal is accepted. We think that nomenclatural stability would be best served through conservation of the name *Inula* with a conserved type.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the Spanish Dirección General de Investigación (Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología and Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia) through the projects *Flora iberica VI* (REN2002-04634-C05-02; grant ref. BES-2003-2213 to M. Santos Vicente) and *Flora iberica VIII* (CGL2008-02982-C03-02/CLI) and by the Junta de Castilla y León through the project SA142A08.

(2112) Proposal to reject the name *Sisymbrium lineare* (Cruciferae)

Dmitry A. German

Centre for Organismal Studies, Heidelberg University, Im Neuenheimer Feld 345, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany;
and South-Siberian Botanical Garden, Altai State University, Lenina str. 61, 656049 Barnaul, Russia; oreoloma@rambler.ru

- (2112) *Sisymbrium lineare* DC., Syst. Nat. 2: 464. Mai (sero) 1821 [*Dicot.*: *Cruc.*], nom. utique rej. prop.
Lectotypus (German in Turczaninowia 15(2): 37. 2012): “*Sisymbrium lineare* DC.” [Siberia. Ex herb. Fischer, herb. Pallas] (G-DC No. G00203070, right-hand plant).

As recently revised (German l.c.: 37–43), original material of *Sisymbrium lineare* includes four elements belonging to two species, *Dontostemon micranthus* C.A. Mey. (in Ledebour, Fl. Alt. 3: 120. 1831) represented by the specimen selected as lectotype in G-DC and

the illustration (in Gmelin, Fl. Sib. 3: tab. 63. 1768; misprinted as “62” in Candolle, l.c.) and *D. integrifolius* (L.) C.A. Mey. (in Ledebour, Fl. Alt. 3: 120. 1831) represented by the specimen “*Cheiranthus leptophyllus* Pall.” (B-W 12116) and two small flowering shoots from this specimen, obtained by Candolle from Steven, and mounted on one herbarium sheet in G-DC with the complete plant of *D. micranthus* designated as lectotype. The original description unambiguously applies to the species currently known as *D. micranthus* (for details, see German, l.c.) preventing typification of the name *S. lineare* with material of *D. integrifolius* (that would have had minimal nomenclatural