

species of *Aglaomorpha* and therefore the presence of nectaries is used as a second character to recognize species belonging to drynarioids such as the frequently cultivated *A. acuminata* or the New Guinea endemics *A. hieronymi* and *A. parkinsonii* (Roos, l.c.; Hennipman & al. in Kubitzki (ed.), *Fam. Gen. Vasc. Pl.* 1: 203–230. 1990; Schneider & al., l.c. 2010). These nectaries are however absent in *Christiopteris*.

*Aglaomorpha* is the oldest name and therefore has priority over *Drynaria* and *Christiopteris* Copeland (in Philipp. J. Sci. 12(6): 331–336. 1917). A case for uniting *Aglaomorpha* and *Drynaria* can be made because of the existence of ‘intergeneric’ hybrids (Hoshizaki in Amer. Fern J. 81: 37–43. 1991). About half the species are described in *Aglaomorpha*, but that name is nevertheless much less known than *Drynaria*, which over time has given its name to a certain type of venation and habit (with pinnatifid to pinnate, erect fertile leaves and entire or slightly lobed, humus-collecting leaves), and hence gave the name to *Polypodiaceae* subfamily *Drynarioideae* Crabb, Jermy & Mickel (which also includes the selligueloid ferns, see Christenhusz & al. in *Phytotaxa* 19: 7–54. 2011).

The only case against conserving *Drynaria* against *Aglaomorpha* is that in the original description of the genus Smith placed two

genera, *Dipteris* Reinw. and *Microsorium* Link., under his genus *Drynaria*, thus making this name superfluous, but as Morton (in *Taxon* 19: 647–647. 1970) already discussed, Smith considered his *Drynaria* as an aggregate and more recent authors have treated the genus in a much stricter sense (Roos, l.c.; Hennipman & al., l.c.). Morton subsequently proposed to conserve the generic name, ‘since there is no taxonomically synonymous generic name published’. This was accepted, but no generic name was rejected and thus we hereby need to reject *Aglaomorpha* against *Drynaria* to again prevent the small but well known name *Drynaria* J. Sm. from disappearing into synonymy. In addition to being conserved, the first use of *Drynaria* (by Bory, l.c. as the epithet of a subgenus of *Polypodium*) is in fact older than *Aglaomorpha*, but generic definitions of ferns were still vague and designation of species to genera was still in flux at the time when both these taxa were described. The conservation of *Drynaria* would also contribute to taxonomic stability with none of the currently known species of *Drynaria* having a combination in *Aglaomorpha*, whereas six out of 15 species of *Aglaomorpha* already have a combination under *Drynaria* (Roos, l.c.).

## (2055) Proposal to reject the name *Potamogeton dimorphus* (*Potamogetonaceae*)

Zdenek Kaplan

*Institute of Botany, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 252 43 Průhonice, Czech Republic; kaplan@ibot.cas.cz*

(2055) *Potamogeton dimorphus* Raf. in Amer. Monthly Mag. & Crit. Rev. 1: 358. Sep 1817 [*Monocot.: Potamogeton.*], nom. utique rej. prop.

Neotypus (hic designatus): [icon] “*Potamogeton diversifolium*” in Barton, Fl. N. Amer. 3: t. 84. 1822.

*Potamogeton* subsect. *Hybridi* Graebn. contains three species that occur in North and Central America. They differ particularly in shape and size of submerged and floating leaves and of fruits (e.g., Klekowski & Beal in *Brittonia* 17: 175–181. 1965; Reznicek & Bobbette in *Rhodora* 78: 650–673. 1976; Wiegleb & Kaplan in *Folia Geobot.* 33: 300–302. 1998; Haynes & Hellquist in *Fl. N. Amer.* 22: 53–54. 2000). *Potamogeton diversifolius* Raf. (in *Med. Repos.*, ser. 2, 5: 354. 1808) is characterized mainly by linear submerged leaves that are acute at apex and floating leaves mostly with a bigger lamina. *Potamogeton bicupulatus* Fernald (in *Mem. Amer. Acad. Arts.*, ser. 2, 17: 112. 1932) is a more slender plant, with filiform submerged leaves that are acuminate at apex and floating leaves mostly with a smaller lamina. Both species have the adnate portion of stipules mostly shorter than the free ligule and fruits usually with two entire-to-dentate lateral keels in addition to the dorsal keel. In contrast, *Potamogeton spirillus* Tuckerm. (in *Amer. J. Sci. Arts.*, ser. 2, 6: 228. 1848) has the adnate portion of stipules mostly longer than the free ligule and fruits with smoothly rounded sides without lateral keels. It differs from *P. bicupulatus* also by linear submerged leaves that are mostly obtuse at apex and floating leaves with a bigger lamina.

One of the earliest names pertinent to this group is *P. dimorphus* Raf. (l.c.). This was proposed by Rafinesque as a nomen novum to replace *P. diversifolius* W.P.C. Barton (*Fl. Philadelph. Prodr.* 1: 27. 1815), which was a nomen illegitimum when published because of the

existence of the earlier homonym *P. diversifolius* Raf. Barton did not indicate a type for his *P. diversifolius* in the protologue. However, in his following publications (Barton, *Comp. Fl. Philadelph.* 1: 96. 1818; Barton, *Fl. N. Amer.* 3: 38. 1822) Barton indicated that his *P. diversifolius* was “first discovered in Jersey, near Woodbury, where it is abundant, in a pool” and “detected in July, 1814”.

None of the previous monographers of this group was able to locate Barton’s type and they concluded that it is not preserved in his herbarium (Fernald, l.c.: 103; Reznicek & Bobbette, l.c.: 663). A recent inquiry to PH, where Barton’s herbarium is deposited, also did not yield this type (Alina Freire-Fierro, PH Collection Manager, pers. comm. 8 Jan. 2010). Interpretation of the taxonomic identity of *P. diversifolius* W.P.C. Barton therefore depends on the published data.

As already pointed out by Fernald (l.c.: 103), the descriptions of *P. diversifolius* W.P.C. Barton given in the protologue, particularly the features “foliis emersis natantibus, ... semiuncialibus, ...; submersis ... filiformibus”, and in the two subsequent Barton publications fit best to the species to which Fernald misapplied the name *P. capillaceus* Poir. (in Lamarck, *Encycl. Suppl.* 4: 535. 1816). According to Reznicek & Bobbette (l.c.) *P. capillaceus* sensu Fernald is now correctly called *P. bicupulatus*, which Fernald (l.c.) had formerly distinguished. They commented that “As all three species of this subsection occur in the Philadelphia region, there is no possibility of being completely certain of the application of the name [*P. dimorphus* ( $\equiv$  *P. diversifolius* W.P.C. Barton)] with only the description given by Barton.”

A better tool for interpretation of the name *P. diversifolius* W.P.C. Barton is the nice colour illustration of this species in Barton’s *Flora of North America* (3: t. 84. 1822), which shows a delicate plant with filiform submerged leaves that are acuminate at apex, i.e., the characteristics of *P. bicupulatus*. Barton indicated that the figures of this

work were “drawn from nature by W. P. C. Barton” and “the present little plant I detected in July, 1814”, i.e., before the name *P. diversifolius* W.P.C. Barton was first published in *Florae Philadelphicae Prodromus* after 2nd Oct. 1815, so the illustration may well be of an original plant on which Barton based his *P. diversifolius*. Since it cannot be conclusively determined to be original material and in the absence of an original type specimen, this illustration is here proposed as the neotype of *P. diversifolius* W.P.C. Barton.

*Potamogeton dimorphus* is therefore the earliest validly published and legitimate name for the species now called *P. bicupulatus* and has to be adopted as its correct name under the priority rule. However, *P. dimorphus* has only rarely been adopted by other researchers since its publication (as by Graebner in Engler, Pflanzenr. IV. 11 (Heft 31): 51. 1907; Morong & Taylor in Britton & Brown, III. Fl. N. U. S., ed. 2, 1: 86. 1913; Hagström in Kongl. Svenska Vetensk. Acad. Handl. 55(5): 136. 1916), who have all misapplied the name to the species now called *P. spirillus*. In contrast, the name *P. bicupulatus* is now a well-established and regularly used name, adopted in many Floras, regional checklists, and taxonomic, biosystematic, phytogeographic and ecological papers (e.g., Fassett, Man. Aquat. Pl.: 75. 1940; Klekowski & Beal, l.c.; Reznicek & Bobbette, l.c.; Hellquist in Rhodora 82: 331–344. 1980; Hellquist & Crow in Sta. Bull. New

Hampshire Agric. Exp. Sta. 515: 17. 1980; Wiegleb in Feddes Reptert. 99: 259. 1988; Rhoads & Klein, Vasc. Fl. Pennsylv.: 432. 1993; Reznicek in Biol. Conserv. 68: 210. 1994; Wiegleb & Kaplan, l.c.; Crow & Hellquist, Aquat. Wetl. Pl. Northeast. N. Amer. 2: 44. 2000; Haynes & Hellquist, l.c.; Magee & Ahles, Fl. Northeast, ed. 2: 114. 2007; Kaplan & al. in Syst. Bot. 34: 625–642. 2009).

Replacing the well-established name *P. bicupulatus* by *P. dimorphus*, which apparently has not been used for almost a century and little used (and misunderstood) before, would constitute an undesirable and disadvantageous change for purely nomenclatural reasons. To preserve nomenclatural stability, it is here proposed to reject the name *P. dimorphus* under Art. 56 of the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006).

#### Acknowledgements

I thank Alina Freire-Fierro for searching for the type of *P. diversifolius* W.P.C. Barton at PH. The present paper is a part of the study for a monograph of *Potamogetonaceae* within the framework of Species Plantarum Project—Flora of the World. The research was supported by grant no. 206/09/0291 from the Czech Science Foundation, and the long-term institutional research plan no. AV0Z60050516 from the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.

## (2056) Proposal to conserve the name *Myosotis sicula* against *M. gussonei* (*Boraginaceae*)

Federico Selvi<sup>1</sup> & Werner Greuter<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Università di Firenze, Dipartimento di Biotecnologie Agrarie, sez. Botanica, Piazzale Cascine 28, 50144 Firenze, Italy

<sup>2</sup> Herbarium Mediterraneum, c/o Orto Botanico, Via Lincoln 2/A, 90123 Palermo, Italy

Author for correspondence: Federico Selvi, selvi@unifi.it

(2056) *Myosotis sicula* Guss., Fl. Sicul. Syn. 1: 214. 1843 [*Dicot.: Boragin.*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: “(4) *Myosotis micrantha* Nob., Aprili, Majo. Affinis *M. caespitosae* (quae *M. lingulata*) quoad habitum [...]. In inundatis, stagnis, lacubus, sopra la Piana de’ Greci – Nicosia — Cotrano”, Gussone (NAP, herb. Sicul. Guss.).

(≡) *Myosotis gussonei* Jan, Elench. Pl.: 25. 1831 (*‘gussonii’*), nom. rej. prop.

The name *Myosotis sicula* Guss. applies to a small annual wetland species of forget-me-not that is widely if patchily distributed in the border countries and islands of the Mediterranean Sea, from Spain to Anatolia, Syria and Lebanon (Grau in Mitt. Bot. Staatssamml. München 6: 517–530. 1972; Greuter & al., Med-Checklist 1: 100. 1984), extending to North Africa (its presence in Tunisia has been confirmed recently by Le Floch & al., Cat. Synon. Fl. Tunisie, ed. 2, Errata: [2]. 2011). Since 1843 when it was published by Gussone the name has been in universal and unambiguous use throughout this large area, appearing in all relevant Floras and a vast secondary literature.

The species was first described by Gussone (Fl. Sicul. Prodr. 1: 207–208. 1827) from summer-dry ponds (“gurgi”) of the Sicilian mountains: “Piana de’ Greci al Gurgo de’ Ddingoli, Cotrano al Gurgo Lo Drago e Gurgolungo, Nicosia, Floresta; ec.” It was then named *Myosotis micrantha*, which is a later homonym of *M. micrantha* Pall.

ex Lehm. (in Neue Schriften Naturf. Ges. Halle 3(2): 24. 1817). In 1843, when publishing *Myosotis sicula*, Gussone again provided a full treatment. Nevertheless *M. sicula* is not the name of a new species but an avowed substitute (nomen novum) for *M. micrantha*. Not only is “*M. micrantha* Guss. ... non Pallas” cited in synonymy, but the descriptive text is by and large the same and the localities are identical; and then there is Gussone’s declared intent [translated from Latin]: “I changed the name because Pallas’s species [*M. micrantha*] is widely different, and older than mine.” This means that the name *M. sicula*, even if it were legitimate (see below), must be typified from an element used by Gussone in 1827, so that the recently designated lectotype (Selvi & Cecchi in Taxon 58: 625. 2009), a specimen collected in 1839, is at best a neotype. As an undoubted original specimen exists (an illustration of which can be seen at [www.ingentaconnect.com/content/iapt/tax/2009/00000058/00000002/art00025#](http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/iapt/tax/2009/00000058/00000002/art00025#), as Fig. 10), we prefer to list it as the nomenclatural type, abandoning the former designation. [Most plants on that sheet, two or three individuals or parts of one individual, clearly belong to a single gathering, even though three localities are mentioned on the label, so that they form a single specimen as defined in Art. 8.2 of the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006). However, the uppermost plant looks slightly different, and has a label scrap of its own associated with it: “Maggio. Gurgo di Pogiariello” (a locality not cited in the protologue), and we do not consider it as part of the type specimen.]