

*Urtica involucrata* Roxb.: *Macaranga involucrata* is not native to India, but the type material was collected from a botanical garden where it was cultivated.) Baillon (in *Adansonia* 7: 96–97. 1866), soon after publishing the combination *M. involucrata*, concluded that *B. bengalensis* was based on a specimen of “*U. involucrata*” from a garden in Bengal, so he published the new combination *M. bengalensis* (Gaud.) Baill. The presumed original material, however, has no annotations that mention Gaudichaud or the name *Bruea*. Gaudichaud’s poor description could refer to *M. involucrata*, but can’t be clearly identified as doing so. Adoption of *M. bengalensis* would not only be disruptive, but might not be generally accepted since its correct application cannot be proven. (The type seems to be identifiable, but the question is whether it really is original material or not.) Rejection as a nomen ambiguum is appropriate and serves the goal of protecting a name in use.

**(2801)** To conserve *Coprosma grandifolia* (*Rubiaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by L. Perrie in *Taxon* 70: 211. 2021. Votes: 5–12–0 (not recommended).

*Coprosma grandifolia* Hook. f. is a New Zealand endemic species (vernacular name “konono”) that is common and has unusually large leaves, so is relatively familiar to the public. The name *C. australis* (A. Rich.) B.L. Rob. was formerly used for that species, but after it was noticed that the syntypes of *C. australis* belonged to *C. lucida* J.R. Forst. & G. Forst., *C. grandifolia* was adopted. For thirty years, nobody noticed that *C. grandifolia* had been illegitimate when published because Hooker had cited *Ronabea australis* A. Rich. in synonymy. Conservation, therefore, is requested to preserve the current use of its name. If the use of *C. grandifolia* had to be discontinued, there is an available synonym, *C. autumnalis* Colenso. The proposal says that *C. autumnalis* had “never been previously used in modern times as an accepted name” before publications of the past few years.

This sounds like a good case for conservation. However, there is more use of the correct name in online or gray literature than the proposal would suggest. Trial by Google indicates that there has rapidly been significant adoption of *Coprosma autumnalis*, including by the New Zealand Plant Conservation Network, Plants of the World Online, and the New Zealand Threat Classification System. Contrarily, Landcare Research’s NZ Flora pages and Māori Plant Use Database, and New Zealand Plants, still use *C. grandifolia*, as do most scientific papers mentioning the species. Given that the public is already moving towards using the correct name, most of us think that priority can be allowed to rule.

**(2802)** To conserve *Brugmansia aurea* Lagerh. against *B. aurea* Harrison (*Solanaceae*). Proposed by A. Hay in *Taxon* 70: 212–213. 2021. Votes: 16–1–0 (recommended).

*Brugmansia aurea* Lagerh. is the name in use for a well-known medicinal, psychoactive, and ornamental Andean species. The species appears in a variety of literature and is a parent of hundreds of hybrid *Brugmansia* cultivars. Its name is a later homonym of *B. aurea* Harrison, a much earlier name that was rapidly abandoned after its publication. As Hay recounts in the proposal, *B. aurea* Harrison was published with very little descriptive information, though the flower color was stated to distinguish it from *B. sanguinea* (Ruiz & Pavón) D. Don. A long time ago, the NCVF narrowly recommended treating it as not validly published, but the GC overruled us. Hay believes that *B. aurea* Harrison was a yellow-flowered form of *B. sanguinea*; in any case, the name is not in use. Without

conservation, the seldom-used synonym *B. pittieri* (Saff.) Moldenke would have to be adopted for *B. aurea* Lagerh. Horticulturists and other non-botanist stakeholders would certainly prefer conservation.

**(2804)** To reject *Ephedra major* (*Ephedraceae*). Proposed by S. Brullo & E. Del Guacchio in *Taxon* 70: 431–432. 2021. Votes: 17–0–0 (recommended).

*Ephedra major* Host has in the modern era mostly been used as the accepted name for a Mediterranean species that other botanists have called *E. nebrodensis* Tineo ex Guss. However, the proposal makes a good case that it is a nomen ambiguum and should not properly pertain to that species. The protologue cited a gathering by Portenschlag from Dalmatia and a pre-Linnaean synonym with an illustration. One duplicate of this gathering at W was implicitly treated as type, but it had been destroyed in World War II. There is other material collected by Portenschlag in Dalmatia at W and P but it cannot be proven to be original material, so the cited illustration would be the obligate lectotype. The illustration appears to be identifiable as *E. fragilis* Desf. The specimen at P (which was labeled by Kotschy as “*Ephedra major* Host”) has been identified as *E. foeminea* Forssk. Host’s protologue does not make it clear what species he intended to name. If *E. major* is rejected, the name *E. nebrodensis* has also been widely used, so its adoption will not be confusing.

**(2805)** To conserve *Eulophia*, nom. cons., against the additional name *Geodorum* (*Orchidaceae*). Proposed by M.W. Chase, M.J.M. Christenhusz, P. Kumar & A. Schuiteman in *Taxon* 70: 432–433. 2021. Votes: 17–0–0 (recommended).

The generic name *Eulophia* R. Br., used for a pantropical group of orchids, has already been conserved against *Graphorkis* Thouars and *Lissochilus* R. Br. The proposal authors favor a highly lumping molecular classification that will include several smaller genera. The only one of these that has never previously been included within *Eulophia* is *Geodorum* Andrews, the name of which is older. *Eulophia* in the strict sense includes about 200 species or infraspecific taxa, mostly in Africa, and there are about 50 names that would be transferred to *Geodorum* from other genera. *Geodorum* includes only 9 species, found in tropical Asia and Australasia. Conservation is needed to be consistent with prior actions.

**(2806)** To conserve *Cistus violaceus* (*Helianthemum violaceum*) against *C. racemosus* (*Cistaceae*). Proposed by P.P. Ferrer-Gallego in *Taxon* 70: 433–435. 2021. Votes: 12–5–0 (recommended).

*Cistus violaceus* Cav. is the basionym for *Helianthemum violaceum* (Cav.) Pers., a name used for a Mediterranean species. Most of the proposal describes the process of typification of *C. violaceus*. *Cistus racemosus* L. is an older name. Ferrer-Gallego selected a lectotype that makes it a synonym of *H. violaceum*. The combination *H. racemosum* (L.) Desf. has been published but was seldom used (though it does appear in some literature). Therefore, Ferrer-Gallego proposes conservation of *C. violaceus* vs. *C. racemosus* to preserve the name in use. The name *H. violaceum* has somehow been associated with that of *C. pilosus* L., which in Prop. 2798, above, Ferrer-Gallego identifies as properly applying to a species of *Fumana* (Dunal) Spach. In this proposal, he says that *H. violaceum* was “traditionally treated under *Cistus pilosus* L.”, which could make us doubt whether *H. violaceum* was really widely used in literature. However, there