

probably is of *E. fragilis*. If it were designated as the lectotype of Host's name, *E. major* would have been widely and persistently used in the sense of *E. nebrodensis*, i.e., not including the type of *E. major*, and then Art. 57.1 of the *ICN* would need to be applied.

We might propose the name *E. major* for conservation under Art. 14.1 of the *ICN* with a conserved type belonging to *E. nebrodensis*. However, this would not clarify the confused nomenclatural history of the name *E. major*. Therefore, we propose instead its rejection under Art. 56.1.

Author information





SB, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2568-7278>

EDG, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9349-1328>

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to N. Turland (Botanic Garden and Botanic Museum, Freie Universität, Berlin) and John McNeill (Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh, Scotland, U.K. & Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, Canada) for useful suggestions and editorial comments.

(2805) Proposal to conserve *Eulophia*, nom. cons., against the additional name *Geodorum* (Orchidaceae: Eulophiinae)

Mark W. Chase,^{1,2}  Maarten J.M. Christenhusz,²  Pankaj Kumar³  & André Schuiteman¹ 

¹ Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AB, U.K.

² Department of Environment and Agriculture, Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia, Australia

³ Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden, Lam Kam Road, Tai Po, New Territories, Hong Kong S.A.R., P.R. China

Address for correspondence: Mark W. Chase, m.chase@kew.org

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12480>

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

- (2805) *Eulophia* R. Br. in Bot. Reg.: ad t. 573 ('578'). 1 Nov 1821 ('*Eulophus*') [*Orchid.*], nom. et orth. cons.
 Typus: *E. guineensis* Lindl. (in Bot. Reg.: t. 686. 1 Feb 1823), typ. cons.
- (=) *Graphorkis* Thouars in Nouv. Bull. Sci. Soc. Philom. Paris 1: 318. Apr 1809 (nom. cons.) (etiam vide), nom. rej.
- (=) *Geodorum* Andrews in Bot. Repos.: ad t. 626. Jun 1811, nom. rej. prop.
 Typus: *G. citrinum* Andrews
- (=) *Lissochilus* R. Br. in Bot. Reg.: ad t. 573 ('578'). 1 Nov 1821, nom. rej.
 Typus: *L. speciosus* R. Br.

Phylogenetic analyses of the orchid subtribe *Eulophiinae* (Martos & al. in *Taxon* 63: 9–23. 2014; Bone & al. in *Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* 179: 43–56. 2015) have clearly demonstrated that the genus *Eulophia* as currently circumscribed is not monophyletic, with *Acrolophia* Pfitzer (*Entwurf Anordn. Orch.*: 59. 1887), *Geodorum* Andrews (in *Bot. Repos.*: ad t. 626. 1811), *Oeceoclades* Lindl. (in *Edwards's Bot. Reg.*: ad t. 1522. 1832) and several other genera embedded. Most names in the other embedded genera exist in *Eulophia*, but not for species published as *Geodorum*, an older name. *Eulophia* in the broad sense (including *Acrolophia* and *Oeceoclades*) is a relatively large genus (c. 250 species; Chase & al. in *Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* 177: 151–174. 2015). It has a pantropical distribution, but with

the greatest species diversity in Africa where it is important in many floras. It figures to a minor extent in horticulture. *Geodorum* is found in tropical Asia and Australasia and has only 9 species (Chase & al., l.c.), none commonly found in horticulture. It differs from *Eulophia* in the entire lip (versus mostly lip 3-lobed) and in its inflorescence structure: the flower-bearing apex is nodding. To avoid the need to transfer *Oeceoclades* and *Acrolophia* to *Eulophia*, Martos & al. (l.c.) and Bone & al. (l.c.) proposed to segregate *Orthochilus* Hochst. ex A. Rich. (*Tent. Fl. Abyss.* 2: 284. 1850) from *Eulophia*, emphasizing that the sepals of these species are similar in colour to the petals, whereas those in *Eulophia* s.str. are dissimilar. However, this difference and others mentioned by those authors also occur often in *Eulophia* s.str., if comparisons are made with the Asian/Australasian species. Even if exclusion of the genus *Orthochilus* as advanced by Martos & al. (l.c.) and Bone & al. (l.c.) is accepted, the issue of the priority of *Geodorum* over *Eulophia* s.str. would still need to be addressed because Bone & al. (l.c.) found *Geodorum* to be deeply embedded in a clade that includes the type of *Eulophia*. Indeed these authors (l.c.: 53) indicated their submission of a proposal to conserve the latter name over the former; however, no such proposal was ever submitted.

We advocate instead a broad generic concept of *Eulophia* including all these genera, all of which, except *Geodorum*, have been included by at least some authors in *Eulophia* in the past. *Geodorum* preceded *Eulophia* by 10 years, and both names are still in common

use. To provide taxonomic stability in the group, we intend to combine all genera in the *Eulophia* alliance under a single genus, a move that will necessitate only 26 name transfers thanks to the historical treatment under *Eulophia* of the species more recently segregated as other genera. We therefore propose rejection of the name *Geodorum* in favour of the already conserved name of the largest genus, *Eulophia*. The name *Eulophia* has a complex history, reviewed in Summerhayes & Hall (in *Taxon* 11: 201–203. 1962), but none of these difficulties affects further conservation of the modern concept of the genus. If *Geodorum* is not rejected, all names in *Eulophia* s.l. (c. 250) will need new combinations, whereas if it is rejected against *Eulophia*, only the 9 species of *Geodorum* and a few others (18) will need transferring to *Eulophia*. Even if only *Eulophia* s.str.

were to be synonymized under *Geodorum*, the number of transfers needed would still be around 200.

In summary, conserving *Eulophia* against *Geodorum* would allow for a much smaller number of new combinations and new names when we combine these genera, and it keeps in use the name *Eulophia*, which figures significantly in many African floras and to a lesser extent in horticulture.

Author information

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

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

PK, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3469-5731>

AS, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6701-8158>

(2806) Proposal to conserve the name *Cistus violaceus* (*Helianthemum violaceum*) against *C. racemosus* (*Cistaceae*)

P. Pablo Ferrer-Gallego 

Servicio de Vida Silvestre, Centro para la Investigación y la Experimentación Forestal (CIEF), Generalitat Valenciana, Avda. Comarques del País Valencià 114, 46930 Quart de Poblet, Valencia, Spain

Address for correspondence: P. Pablo Ferrer-Gallego, flora.cief@gva.es

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12481>

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

(2806) *Cistus violaceus* Cav., *Icon.* 2: 38, t. 147. Apr–Nov 1793 [Angiosp.: *Cist.*], nom. cons. prop.

Lectotypus (hic designatus): [Spain], “Quart collibus” [Valencia, Quart de les Valls?], Mar 1792, *Cavanilles* (MA barcode MA 475544).

(=) *Cistus racemosus* L., *Syst. Nat.*, ed. 12, 2: 368; *Mant. Pl.*: 76. 15–31 Oct 1767, nom. rej. prop.

Lectotypus (hic designatus): *Le Monnier* in *Herb. Linnaeus* No. 689.56 (LINN).

The Old World genus *Helianthemum* Mill. (*Cistaceae*) constitutes a well-supported monophyletic group (Guzmán & Vargas in *Organisms Diversity Evol.* 9: 83–99. 2009; Aparicio & al. in *Taxon* 66: 868–885. 2017) that includes about 110 taxa of small herbs or subshrubs (at species and subspecies level). The genus is distributed in Macaronesia, North Africa, Europe, and West and Central Asia, with higher diversity concentrated in the western Mediterranean, and particularly in the Iberian Peninsula (Greuter & al. in *Med-Checklist* 1. 1984; López González in *Anales Jard. Bot. Madrid* 50: 35–63. 1992, in Castroviejo & al., *Fl. Iberica* 3: 365–421. 1993; Arrington & Kubitzki in Kubitzki, *Fam. Gen. Vasc. Pl.* 5: 62–70. 2003; Parejo-Farnés & al. in *Bot. Complut.* 37: 83–92. 2013). Some taxa first described by several authors in *Cistus* L., but currently included in *Helianthemum* (see, e.g., www.worldfloraonline.org) are taxonomically very complex, and have already been typified (see López González, l.c. 1992).

The name *Helianthemum violaceum* (Cav.) Pers. (*Syn. Pl.* 2: 78. 1806) (= *Cistus violaceus* Cav., *Icon.* 2: 38, t. 147. 1793) is applied to a very variable and diverse species, with a large number of synonyms

(López González, l.c. 1993: 377). The species is distributed in the Centre and West of the Mediterranean region: Iberian Peninsula, France, Italy, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco (Maire in *Bull. Soc. Hist. Nat. Afrique N.* 14: 118–158. 1923; López González, l.c. 1992, 1993; Tison & al., *Fl. France Médit.*: 982. 2014; <http://powo.science.kew.org/>).

This taxon was traditionally treated under *Cistus pilosus* L. (*Sp. Pl.*: 528. 1753) (see Willkomm, *Icon. Descr. Pl.* Nov. 2: 103–105, 1859, tt. 132–133. 1861, *Prodr. Fl. Hispan.* 3: 728. 1880; Grosser in Engler, *Pflanzenr.* IV. 193 (Heft 14): 70. 1903; Jarvis, *Order out of Chaos*: 422. 2007). However, the identity of *C. pilosus* has been misunderstood. A study of this name resulted in a type designation (Ferrer-Gallego in *Taxon* 70: 208–209. 2021). The identification of the type material prompted a proposal to conserve the name *C. laevis* Cav. (l.c.: 35) (= *Fumana laevis* (Cav.) Pau in *Bol. Soc. Esp. Hist. Nat.* 1: 209. 1901) against *C. pilosus* (Ferrer-Gallego, l.c.).

The protologue of *Cistus violaceus* includes a complete description followed by the provenance “Habitat in collibus aridis regni Valentini, Sagunti, Vallidignae”, the phrase “Florebat Maio”, and the comment “Diversus videtur a Cisto splendente D. de Lamarck foliis minimis, neque viridibus et splendentibus, quo ab Apenino Linnaei etiam differt. Calices colore et habitu characterem haud contemnendum suppeditant.” The protologue also includes an excellent illustration of this plant (Cavanilles, l.c.: t. 147), which can be considered original material of *C. violaceus*. Cavanilles’s drawing illustrates a plant with leaves and flowers, with several details of the flowers and fruits (image available at <https://bibdigital.rjb.csic.es/viewer/9680/?offset=39#page=134>).