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PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT

(529) Proposal to conserve *Petalacte* D. Don (1826) against *Billya* Cassini (1825) (Compositae).

8995 *Petalacte* D. Don in Mem. Wern. Soc. 5: 552 (1826), *nom. cons. prop.* Type: *P. coronata* (L.) D. Don. (*Gnaphalium coronatum* L.).


*Petalacte* has been in continuous use for this genus of 1–3 species since proposed by D. Don. The only exception was Lessing’s misuse of *Petalolepis* Cassini, from which he excluded the two original Australian species and substituted two from S. Africa. Lessing was not followed by later authors. The genus was recently revised by Lundgren (in Bot. Notiser 127: 119–124. 1974) and this revision may be consulted for full references.

*Billya* Cass. has never been in use. No mention of the name was made by Lessing, by de Candolle, or by Harvey (in Flora Capensis), nor is it recorded in the original volumes of *Index Kewensis*; it did not appear in that work until Supplement XIII (1966). Airy Shaw (in Willis, Dict. ed. 8, 140. 1973) gives it as a synonym of *Helichrysum*. This is incorrect. Cassini described *Gnaphalium crispm* sens. Bergius, realizing that Bergius’s plant was misidentified as *G. crispus* L. (= *Helichrysum crispm* (L.) D. Don). This is true: we have examined Bergius’s specimen (at STB) and it is *Petalacte coronata*.

Conservation of *Petalacte* would not be justified merely to prevent a change of name for this small Cape genus. However the genus *Billia* Peyr. (1858) exists for two Central American species of Hippocastanaceae and is retained, for instance, by Standley in his Trees & Shrubs of Mexico (Contrib. U.S. Nat. Herb. 23: 690. 1923). *Billia* and *Billya* are not considered orthographic variants, but they are liable to confusion. Therefore to replace *Petalacte* by the unused *Billya* Cass. and to run the risk of confusion with *Billia* Peyr. is unjustified, and *Petalacte* is proposed for conservation.


(530) Proposal for the conservation of the generic name *Picrodendron* Grisebach (1859) against *Picrodendron* Planchon (1846) (Euphorbiaceae).

*Picrodendron* is a genus consisting of a single rather variable species of dicotyledonous trees found on Jamaica, Hispaniola, the Bahamas, Cayman and Swan Islands. Its fruits are sometimes eaten (Altschul, 1973) and its leaves have been employed for medicinal or tonic purposes (Roig y Mesa, 1945; Sawyer, 1955). Record and Hess (1943) state that its wood finishes smoothly and is resistant to decay, and hence has been used in turnery and naval construction. The tree is occasionally cultivated. Perhaps its greatest claim to fame is its long and checkered taxonomic history. Opinions regarding its relationships include placement in or association with Anacardiaceae (Macfadyen, 1837), Sapindaceae (Richard, 1845), Simaroubaceae (Planchon, 1846; Bentham & Hooker, 1862; Urban, 1920; Barker & Dardeau, 1930; Moscoso, 1943), Juglandaceae (Grisebach, 1859), Burseraceae (Grisebach, 1866), Terebinthaceae (Hallier, 1908), Euphorbiaceae (Fawcett & Rendle, 1917; Thorne, 1968; Webster, 1975, Hayden, 1977; Cronquist, 1978), and Bombacaceae (Hallier, 1923). The genus has also been considered a monotypic family, Picrodendraceae (Small, 1917), by numerous authors with the family being placed in Juglandales (Cronquist, 1968; Hutchinson, 1973), Rutales (Scholz, 1964; Takhtajan, 1966) and

Prior to its recognition as a distinct genus, plants now known as Picrodendron had been named Juglans baccata by Linnaeus (1759) based on a reference to a Juglans mentioned by Patrick Browne (1756) who had, in turn, referred to Sloane's (1725) illustration of this plant. Sloane's descriptive phrase was "Nux juglans trifolia, fructu magnitudine nucis moschatae" (Sloane, 1696, 1725), and this was modified by Browne to "Folii oblongi obtusi pinnat ternatis, fructibus singularibus baccatis ad alas," with a direct reference to Sloane (1696): "Nux Juglans trifoliata &c. Slo. Cat. 128. & H." In the absence of any evidence that Linnaeus examined herbarium specimens of Juglans baccata, we propose the Sloane (1725) illustration (tab. 157, fig. 1) serve as the type of the Linnaean name.

A Sagra collection of Picrodendron from Cuba (in the Richard herbarium at P!) was named Schmidelia macrocarpa by Richard (1845). Apparently the applicability of both Juglans baccata and S. macrocarpa was unknown to Planchon (1846) when he attempted to propose a new generic and specific name for this plant.

Planchon (1846) based, in part, the genus Picrodendron on a plant which Macfadyen (1837) collected and had mistakenly called Rhus arborea (Miller) DC. After describing his new genus, typified by P. arboreum (Miller) Planchon, Planchon cited the source of his specific epithet and the specimen he examined thusly: "Rhus arborea, DC. prod. 2, p. 73; MacFadyen, fl. of Jam. in montibus Jamaicæ, MacFadyen, in herb. Hook." The specimen alluded to, Macfadyen s.n. (K!) from "near Hanson's Salt-pond" (Macfadyen, 1837), is indeed what is now commonly known as Picrodendron. Unfortunately Macfadyen had misapplied de Candolle's (1825) name and further confused the situation by citing a figure in Sloane (1725) which turns out to be an Allophylus (Sapindaceae). To Macfadyen, apparently, his fruiting specimen of Picrodendron compared more favorably, at least superficially, with Sloane's illustration of Allophylus (tab. 170) than with Sloane's rendition of a male specimen of Picrodendron (tab. 157).

An examination of Miller's specimen upon which he based Toxicodendron arboreum (BM!) and a specimen labelled Rhus arborea in the de Candolle collection (G-DC!) shows both to be Allophylus cobbe (sensu Leenhouts 1967) and not Picrodendron.

Grisebach (1859) was the first to note that Rhus arborea was not the same plant Planchon (1846) meant to describe, and attempted to correct the oversight. He carefully described the genus and characterized its single species which he called P. juglans, based on Juglans baccata. Grisebach's name is superfluous and was corrected to P. baccatum (L.) Krug & Urban in Urban (1893). Grisebach also placed Schmidelia macrocarpa in synonymy under his new species.

Planchnon's accurate description and citation of an authentic specimen of Picrodendron notwithstanding, Art. 7.10 of the Code (Stafleu et al., 1978) clearly states that a new name, P. arboreum (Miller) Planchon, is in all circumstances typified by the basionym, Toxicodendron arboreum Miller. As P. arboreum is the type of the genus Picrodendron, and the basionym of that type is a synonym of Allophylus cobbe, the species epithet cited by Planchon cannot apply to the plant he intended to circumscribe. This proves to be the same kind of conservation problem encountered with Odontonema (Baum & Reveal, 1980). The Code is not clear whether one is to accept "intent" (the plant described) or "stated fact" (the name cited) when dealing with a generic name. Art. 7.10 refers only to "a new name formed from a previously published legitimate name or epithet," while Art. 10.1 states the "type of a name of a genus... is a species." Some argue that one should follow the statements within the generic description (intent) rather than the nature of the type species (stated fact). The value of conservation, in the case of Picrodendron, is that it rids the problem of interpreting intent. Surely, the task of conserving a name is not so overwhelmingly difficult that it cannot be done, and thus the present Code should not be modified to accommodate the few examples of generic names published in the fashion reflected here.

It is realized that in practice conservation of generic names is only granted in cases involving well known genera, either of widespread distribution or of considerable economic importance in which denial of conservation would result in wholesale name changes and lack of stability in nomenclature. Surely the merits of the current proposal are of a different sort. The importance of conservation of the name Picrodendron rests not in the economic value of the plant nor in the difficulty of publishing a new combination for its sole species, but rather in maintaining some
degree of continuity between the current and still somewhat controversial status of the genus in classification and its long and intricate historical participation in classification of so many other plant families and in its historical importance as a prominent endemic genus in the floristics of the West Indies. Planchon's name, based on Macfadyen's specimen as reflected in his accurate description of a plant which cannot reasonably be confused with *Allophylus*, has consistently been applied to what is currently known as *Picrodendron* (*sensu* Grisebach) by all authors working with the plant since 1846.

Finally, there is a considerable body of literature on the anatomy of *Picrodendron* (Jadin, 1901; Solereder, 1908; Boas, 1913; Webber, 1936; Heimisch, 1942; Record & Hess, 1943; Metcalfe & Chalk, 1950; Hayden, 1977). The genus is included in such compendia as Erdtman (1952) and Gibbs (1974) and has served as a basis for comparison with the fossil *Rosenkranzia picrodendroides* Koch (1972). Clearly, the name *Picrodendron* is thoroughly ingrained in modern usage and its submersion as an obscure synonym of the unrelated genus *Allophylus* has little merit beyond blind adherence to the rules. Conservation of *Picrodendron* would further promote stability in nomenclature in allowing the sustained use of the family name *Picrodendraceae Small ex Britton & Small*, nom. cons. (with change of the type from *Picrodendron* Planchon to *Picrodendron* Grisebach, nom. cons.) and the tribe name *Picrodendreae*. We therefore propose:
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