

(2768) Proposal to conserve *Paepalanthus*, nom. cons. against the additional name, *Tonina* (Eriocaulaceae)

Christenhusz, Maarten J.M.; van den Berg, Cássio; Byng, James W.; Chase, Mark W.

DOI

[10.1002/tax.12333](https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12333)

Publication date

2020

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Taxon

Citation (APA)

Christenhusz, M. J. M., van den Berg, C., Byng, J. W., & Chase, M. W. (2020). (2768) Proposal to conserve *Paepalanthus*, nom. cons. against the additional name, *Tonina* (Eriocaulaceae). *Taxon*, 69(5), 1109-1110. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12333>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable). Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights. We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

(1827–28), so it is likely that the specimen came from there. The other possibility is *E. setigerum* (Sodiolo) Diels, which is distributed from Mexico to Bolivia, with additional records from Hispaniola (see Kessler & al. in *Phytotaxa* 353: 32. 2018). Cuming visited many of these countries during his second voyage (1828–30). The date of April 1834, which was written on the specimen, is not a collection date (Cuming was living in England from 1831 to January 1836) and does not help on identifying the origin of the specimen. The collection number “151” also does not help with this issue, since there are different species from different localities under “Cuming 151” (e.g., the syntype of *Lastrea propinqua* J. Sm., from the Philippines, K000235735). Without knowing the origin, the distinction between sterile specimens of *E. florencei* and *E. setigerum* is often impossible. In any case, *A. webbii* is much older and would displace any of the species names mentioned above.

The specimen from Panama (*Webb s.n.*), which was selected as the lectotype of *Acrostichum webbii* by Rouhan & Cremers (l.c.), certainly came from Panama and represents *E. setigerum*, which was originally described in *Acrostichum* by Sodiolo (in *Anales Univ. Centr. Ecuador* 4: 174. 1890). Although *A. webbii* (1845) has priority over *A. setigerum* (1890), it would be highly undesirable to have a rarely used name replacing a well-established one. The type of *A. setigerum* is at K, not at Q or QPLS as respectively suggested by Mickel (l.c. 1995: 279) and Mickel & Smith (in *Mem. New York Bot. Gard.* 88: 309. 2004). Because the species is widely distributed in the Neotropics, the name *E. setigerum* has been used in all major fern floras and checklists for the countries in which it occurs, such as for Mexico by Mickel & Smith (l.c.) and Mickel & Montes (in *Diego-Pérez & Fonseca, Fl. Guerrero* 37: 53–54. 2009), Mesoamerica by Mickel (l.c. 1995: 279), Colombia by Forero & Gentry (*Lista Anot. Pl. Depto.*

Chocó: 28. 1989) and Murillo-Pulido & al. (*Pteridóf. Colombia*: 248. 2008), Ecuador by Jørgensen & León-Yáñez (in *Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard.* 75: 133. 1999), Peru by Mickel (in *Fieldiana, Bot., n.s.*, 27: 160. 1991), and Bolivia by Sundue (in *Nee, Fl. Parq. Nac. Ambaró* 1: 291. 2011) and Kessler & al. (l.c.). Some older floras treated this species as *E. crinipes* C. Chr., a name that has been considered a synonym of *E. setigerum* since Mickel (l.c. 1995: 279). This was done for Haiti by Christensen (in *Kungl. Svenska Vetenskapsakad. Handl.* 16(2): 76. 1936), Guatemala by Mickel (in *Fieldiana, Bot., n.s.*, 6: 218. 1981), Chiapas by Smith (in *Breedlove, Fl. Chiapas* 2: 108. 1981), and Oaxaca by Mickel & Beitel (in *Mem. New York Bot. Gard.* 46: 172. 1988). Additionally, the name *E. setigerum* has appeared in several molecular phylogenetic studies, such as Rouhan & al. (in *Molec. Phylogen. Evol.* 33: 745–763. 2004), Lóriga & al. (in *Pl. Syst. Evol.* 300: 937–951. 2014), and Matos & al. (in *Int. J. Pl. Sci.* 179: 296–313. 2018), and in a study of perine evolution by Moran & al. (in *Int. J. Pl. Sci.* 171: 872–881. 2010).

Because of its long use, replacing *Elaphoglossum setigerum* with *E. webbii* would cause confusion. It seems best to reject the name *E. webbii* so that *E. setigerum* can continue to be used.

Author information

FBM, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2133-6032>

Acknowledgements

This research was partially funded by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES). I thank the curators of the herbaria mentioned above for loans and images of their specimens. I also thank John Wiersema, John McNeill, and Robbin Moran for constructive comments on the manuscript.

(2768) Proposal to conserve *Paepalanthus*, nom. cons. against the additional name, *Tonina* (*Eriocaulaceae*)

Maarten J.M. Christenhusz,¹  Cássio van den Berg,²  James W. Byng³  & Mark W. Chase^{1,4} 

¹ Department of Environment and Agriculture, Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia, Australia

² Laboratory of Plant Molecular Systematics, Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana, Bahia, Brazil

³ Botanische Tuin, TU Delft, Zuid Holland, the Netherlands

⁴ Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3DS, U.K.

Address for correspondence: Maarten J.M. Christenhusz, M.Christenhusz@kew.org

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12333>

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(2768) <i>Paepalanthus</i> Mart. in <i>Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot.</i>, ser. 2, 2: 28. Jul 1834 [<i>Eriocaul.</i>], nom. cons.
 Typus: <i>P. erigeron</i> Mart. ex Koern. (in Martius, <i>Fl. Bras.</i> 3 (1): 390. 10 Jul 1863) (typ. cons.).</p> | <p>(=) <i>Tonina</i> Aubl., <i>Hist. Pl. Guiane</i> 2: 856. Jun–Dec 1775, nom. rej. prop.
 Typus: <i>T. fluviatilis</i> Aubl.</p> <p>(=) <i>Dupatya</i> Vell., <i>Fl. Flumin.</i>: 35. 7 Sep–28 Nov 1829, nom. rej. Typus: non designatus.</p> |
|--|--|

Paepalanthus Mart. (in Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot., ser. 2, 2: 28. 1834) is the name of a widespread genus that in the broad sense includes 477 species found in subtropical and tropical America, Africa and Madagascar (Govaerts & al., World Checklist of Vascular Plants; <https://wcvp.science.kew.org>, accessed 29 Jun 2020). Molecular phylogenetic studies have shown that *Paepalanthus* is paraphyletic with Brazilian *Actinocephalus* (Kórn.) Sano (in Taxon 53: 99. 2004), while the North American *Lachnocaulon* Kunth (Enum. Pl. 3: 497. 1841) and the widespread aquatic *Tonina* Aubl. (Hist. Pl. Guiane 2: 856. 1775) are embedded within it (Andrade & al. in Taxon 59: 379–388. 2010; Giulietti & al. in Rodriguésia 63: 1–19. 2012; Trovó & al. in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 171: 225–243. 2013), but no taxonomic changes were made at the time of these phylogenetic studies. The genus was first expanded by Mabberley (Mabberley's Pl. Book. 2017), after which further combinations were made by Christenhusz & al. (Global Flora 4: 69. 2018), to make species names under those genera available for use under *Paepalanthus*.

Paepalanthus had already been conserved against the earlier *Dupatya* Vell. (Giulietti & al. in Taxon 47: 743–744. 1998), but it came to our attention that the widespread, monotypic, Neotropical genus *Tonina* has priority. *Tonina fluviatilis* Aubl. is in use in the aquarium trade, but a name change would have little effect on this trade. It is likely that the name *Tonina* will persist at least for some time in horticulture and may in the long run be used as a common name, rather than a scientific one. Adoption of *Paepalanthus fluviatilis* (Aubl.) Christenh. & Byng in horticultural and ecological studies seems to be only a matter of time. Overall, the name *Paepalanthus* appears much more frequently in the scientific literature than *Tonina*, as evidenced by a Google Scholar search on 22 July 2020 for either name coupled with “*Eriocaulaceae*”, with more articles including the former by 1730 to 300 and article titles by 147 to 3.

The name *Gilberta* Cothen. was also published before *Paepalanthus* in a relatively obscure publication (Cothenius, Disp. Veg. Meth.: 16. 1790), but in the original manuscript, a reference was made to “*Touina* [sic] Aubl. guian. p. 857”. Even though the spelling and page indicated were incorrect, it is unmistakably an illegitimate

superfluous name, homotypic to *Tonina*, and thereby unavailable for use, so it need not be considered further.

As an alternative to lumping these genera together, *Paepalanthus* could be split to maintain the genera *Actinocephalus*, *Lachnocaulon* and *Tonina*. *Actinocephalus* was originally described as a subgenus of *Paepalanthus* (Sano, l.c.: 99–107), with which it shares many characters, and has recently been shown not to be monophyletic (Andrino & al. in Bot. J. Linn. Soc.: boaa070. 2020 [<https://doi.org/10.1093/botlinnean/boaa070>]). Splitting the genus is likely to be taxonomically disruptive, as it could cause a further escalation of generic names (up to 10 new names have been suggested) that are likely to be difficult to distinguish in the field as they will be mostly based on minute technical characters. Moreover, the morphological diversity of this clade exhibits high levels of homoplasy, and concepts of the traditional subclassification of *Paepalanthus* are not consistent with the phylogenetic studies (Andrino & al., l.c.). This will result in recircumscription of the clades but will still leave us with *Paepalanthus* s.str. that lacks any synapomorphies to distinguish it from the new genera. A large number of new combinations will be required to satisfy the need to keeping the genera monophyletic, and a large number of species will not be able to be placed because they have not yet been sequenced and their morphology alone will make generic placement difficult if not impossible.

In addition, recognition of multiple genera will not reflect the close relationships and similarity of these taxa. Therefore, the most stable and least disruptive option is to maintain the conserved *Paepalanthus* and reject *Tonina* against it, allowing nomenclatural stability at the genus level and paving the way to reorganise the subgeneric classification of *Paepalanthus* s.l. as previously conceived.

Author information

MJMC, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1398-8743>

CvdB, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5028-0686>

JWB, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2344-8126>

MWC, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9927-4938>

(2769) Proposal to conserve the name *Distichia* Nees & Meyen (*Juncaceae*) against *Distichia* (Brid.) Brid. (*Neckeraceae*)

John C. Brinda  & Gerrit Davidse

Missouri Botanical Garden, 4344 Shaw Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63110, U.S.A.

Address for correspondence: John C. Brinda, john.brinda@mobot.org

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12334>

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

(2769) *Distichia* Nees & Meyen in Nees, Cyperaceae: 76. 1841 [*Junc.*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: *D. muscoides* Nees & Meyen.

(H) *Distichia* (Brid.) Brid., Bryol. Univ. 2: 787, 811. 1827 (ante 21 Nov) (*Neckera* [unranked] *Distichia* Brid., Muscol. Recent. Suppl. 4: 137. 18 Dec 1818) [Mosses], nom. rej. prop.

Typus (vide Van der Wijk & al. in Regnum Veg. 26: 135. Dec 1962): *D. pennata* (Hedw.) Brid. (*Neckera pennata* Hedw.).

Distichia Nees & Meyen (in Nees, Cyperaceae: 76. 1841) is a long-recognized genus of high-elevation cushion plants with three species distributed along the Andean cordilleras, including