

(1502–1507) Proposals to reject the names *Juncus cymosus*, *J. radicans*, *Luzula capillaris*, *L. hyperborea*, *L. interrupta*, and *Rostkovia brevifolia* (Juncaceae)

Jan Kirschner¹ & Zdeněk Kaplan¹

This is the second part of a set of proposals arising from the preparation by a consortium of specialists of a monographic account of the *Juncaceae* for the Flora of the World series. Whereas the first part (cf. Kirschner, *Taxon* 50: 1189–1192) comprised proposals to conserve names, the six proposals below are all to reject names under Art. 56 of the Code.

- (1502) *Juncus cymosus* Lam., *Encycl.* 3: 267. 1789 [Monocot.: Junc.], nom. utique rej. prop.
Lectotypus (vide Obermeyer & al. in *Leistner, Fl. S. Afr.* 4/2: 82. 1985):
Cap de Bonne-Espér., *Sonnerat* (P-LAM).

Since Buchenau's earliest account of *Juncus* of the Cape (*Abh. Naturwiss. Ver. Bremen* 4: 466. 1875), a relatively widespread species, extending from Cape Provinces to Mozambique and Zimbabwe, has almost exclusively been referred to as *Juncus lomatoxyllus* Spreng. (*Neue Entdeck. Pflanzenk.* 2: 108. 1821. T: 'in promontorio bonae spei' [Cape Peninsula], *Bergius*; holo: B, destroyed). The name *Juncus lomatoxyllus* was used several times by Buchenau (in *Bot. Jahrb. Syst.* 12: 153. 1890; in A. Engler, *Pflanzenreich* (4/36) 25: 98. 1906), in local floras (e.g., Obermeyer & al. in *Leistner, Fl. S. Afr.* 4/2: 82. 1985; Baker in *Fl. Cap.* 7: 27. 1897; Baker in *Fl. Trop. Afr.* 8: 94. 1902; Adamson & Salter, *Fl. Cape Pen.*: 164. 1950), and in taxonomic revisions (e.g., Adamson in *J. Linn. Soc. Bot.* 50: 18. 1935). Buchenau (l.c. 1875: 470–471) also discussed the problem of the name *Juncus cymosus* Lam. and concluded that its type belonged to *Juncus lomatoxyllus*; J. K. recently examined the type specimen with the same result.

The type of *J. cymosus* consists of two fragments—an inflorescence and a piece of a leaf. The inflorescence (the lectotype, selected by Obermeyer & al. in *Leistner, Fl. S. Afr.* 4/2: 82. 1985, who simultaneously excluded the leaf fragment) undoubtedly belongs to what is called *Juncus lomatoxyllus* nowadays, the leaf fragment remains unidentified but probably does not belong to the same species. A strict application of the priority rule would cause a replacement of a well-established name by an old, almost forgotten synonym. In order to maintain usage and nomenclatural stability, we propose that the name *Juncus cymosus* Lam. be rejected under Art. 56.1 of the Code.

- (1503) *Juncus radicans* Schlecht., *Linnaea* 18: 442. 1844 [*Monocot.: Junc.*], nom. utique rej. prop.

¹Institute of Botany, Academy of Sciences, CZ-25243 Průhonice 1, Czech Republic. E-mail: kirschner@ibot.cas.cz (author for correspondence); kaplan@ibot.cas.cz.

Lectotypus (vide Balslev in Fl. Neotrop. Monogr. 68: 118. 1996): Mexico, Veracruz, in rivulis Jalapa, *Schiede s.n.* (HAL).

The name *Juncus debilis* A. Gray (Man. Bot. 506. 1848) is currently in general use for a species distributed in eastern North America from Connecticut to Florida, Texas, Tennessee, and Missouri, with a disjunct occurrence in Mexico and Honduras. A selection of literature in which the name is used includes: Fernald in Rhodora 6: 34. 1904; Britton & Brown, Illustr. Fl. North. U. S. Can. & Brit. Possess. 1: 481. 1913; Small, Man. Southeast. Fl.: 286. 1933; Hermann in Papers Mich. Acad. Sci. 20 (1934): 46. 1935; Gleason & Cronquist, New Britton & Brown Illustr. Fl. Northeast. U. S. & Adjac. Can. 1: 398. 1952; Steyermark, Fl. Miss.: 414. 1963; Correll & Johnston, Man. Vasc. Plants Texas: 376. 1970; Godfrey & Wooten, Aquat. Wetl. Plants Southeast. U. S.: 560. 1979; Kartesz & Kartesz, Synon. Checkl. Vasc. Fl. USA Can. & Greenl. 2: 258. 1980; Clemants in New York State Mus. Bull. 475: 46. 1990; Yatskievych & Turner, Catal. Fl. Miss.: 237. 1990; Gleason & Cronquist, Man. Vasc. Pl. Northeast. U. S. Adjac. Can., ed. 2, 666. 1991; Balslev, Fl. Mesoamer. 6: 87. 1994; Kartesz, Synon. Checkl. Vasc. Fl. USA Can. & Greenl., ed. 2, 1: 341. 1994; Balslev in Fl. Neotrop. Monogr. 68: 118. 1996; Yatskievych, Steyermark's Fl. Miss. 1: 470. 1999.

However, this widely used name is threatened by an earlier name, *J. radicans* Schlecht. This latter name has never been adopted since its publication in 1844. It has seldom been cited since and then only as a synonym (Buchenau in Bot. Jb. Syst. 12: 333. 1890; Buchenau in A. Engler, Pflanzenreich (4/36) 25: 195. 1906; Clemants in New York State Mus. Bull. 475: 46. 1990; Balslev in Fl. Neotrop. Monogr. 68: 118. 1996).

To avoid the disadvantageous displacement of the well established name *J. debilis*, we propose to reject the name *J. radicans* under Art. 56.1 of the Code.

(1504) *Luzula capillaris* Steudel, Syn. Pl. Cyper.: 293. 1855 [*Monocot.: Junc.*], *nom. utique rejic. prop.*

Holotypus: [U.S.A.] Amer. sept. unita, 1826, *Leman [in herb. Lenormand]* (P).

J. K. has recently examined the type of the name *Luzula capillaris* Steudel and found that it refers to the species currently known as *L. echinata* (Small) F. J. Hermann (in Rhodora 40: 84. 1938; T: U.S.A., Alabama, Auburn, 17 Apr 1897, *Earl & Baker*; holo: NY). The species is the most common *Luzula* of the southeastern United States. While the earlier name has been completely ignored since it was first published, or, at most, explicitly cited as unclear (Buchenau in Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 12: 153. 1890; Buchenau in A. Engler, Pflanzenreich (4/36) 25: 98. 1906), the latter name is well established in the North American literature (e.g., Jones & Fuller, Vasc. Pl. Illinois: 127. 1955; Coffey in Castanea 35: 73. 1970; Correll & Johnston, Man. Vasc. Plants Texas: 378. 1970; Godfrey & Wooten, Aquat. Wetl. Plants Southeast. U. S.: 570. 1979; Kartesz & Kartesz, Synon. Checkl. Vasc. Fl. USA Can. & Greenl. 2: 259. 1980; Gleason & Cronquist, Man. Vasc. Pl. Northeast. U. S. Adjac. Can., ed. 2, 667. 1991; Kartesz, Synon. Checkl. Vasc. Fl. U.S.A. Can. & Greenl., ed. 2, 1: 343. 1994).

Luzula capillaris Steudel must, under strict priority, be adopted as the correct name for the taxon currently known as *L. echinata*. However, this would constitute an undesirable change for purely nomenclatural reasons. To avoid this and ensure nomenclatural stability, we propose that the name *L. capillaris* be rejected under Art. 56.1. of the Code.

- (1505) *Luzula hyperborea* R. Br., Chloris Melvilliana [Parry's 1st Voyage App.] 283. 1823 [*Monocot.: Junc.*], *nom. utique rej. prop.*
Lectotypus (hic designatus): "49 *Luzula hyperborea*. Melville Island, *Cptn Parry* s. d." (BM – upper left hand specimen).

The name *Luzula hyperborea* R. Br. is based on heterogeneous material consisting of the following four gatherings: 1) Melville Island, *Parry*: BM [two herbarium sheets safely referable to Parry's First Voyage; *Luzula confusa*, four plants, *L. nivalis* three plants], K [= *L. confusa*], PH [= *L. confusa*]; 2) Spitzbergen, Scoresby: BM [= *L. confusa*]; 3) Greenland, *Scoresby*: n.v.; and 4) Phipp's Voyage, *herb. Banks*: BM [= *Luzula confusa*]. Of the eleven plants (sometimes mounted together with others on one sheet) on the six herbarium sheets examined, eight plants belong to *Luzula confusa*, and three to *L. nivalis*. The upper left hand specimen at BM, chosen here as the lectotype is referable to the species to which the name *Luzula confusa* is generally applied. The original description includes some features pointing to *L. nivalis* (flat leaves and a leaf-like lower bract) but R. Brown himself says "bracteam umbellae saepissime, non vero semper, foliaceam", and also other characters allow us to conclude that the description mixes characters of the above two species. Most of the earlier students of *Juncaceae* have been aware of the heterogeneity (Buchenau, *Krit. Verz. Junc.* 103. 1880; Boivin in *Phytologia* 42: 414. 1979), and in this century, almost all authors of floras preferred the later names *L. confusa* Lindeb and *L. nivalis* (Laest.) Spreng. (or occasionally *L. arctica* Blytt for the latter species) to the older but ambiguous *L. hyperborea*. There are a few works adopting *Luzula hyperborea*, of which the most important one is that of Boivin (*Phytologia* 42: 414. 1979), who used the name instead of *L. nivalis* (Laest.) Spreng.

Luzula confusa Lindeb. (in *Bot. Not.* 1855: 9. 1855. T: [Norway] Dovre, 1854, *C. J. Lindeberg*; lecto: S, designated here) is the name threatened by a reinstatement of *Luzula hyperborea* under the application of the priority principle. Since 1855, it has been used, virtually without exceptions, in all the important northern floras and monographic accounts of *Luzula*. Its geographical range is typically circumpolar, and the species is widespread and common in the northern regions and in the mountains of Siberia. In northern Europe, intermediates are found between *L. confusa* and *L. arcuata* but in most of its range it is very distinct and readily distinguished from other species of the genus. Floras adopting the name *L. confusa* are numerous, e. g., Hultén, *Fl. Alaska*: 300. 1968; Novikov in *Fl. Evrop. Časti SSSR* 2: 82 (1976); Kovtonjuk in *Fl. Sibiri, Araceae–Orchidaceae*: 40. 1987; Novikov in *Sosud. Rast. Sovet. Dal'n. Vost.* 1: 84. 1985; Kreczetovich & Gontscharov in *Fl. SSSR* 3: 568. 1935; Tolmachev, *Arkt. Fl. SSSR* 4: 32. 1963; Chrték & Křísa in *Fl. Europaea* 5: 113. 1980; Lid, *Norsk Svensk Finsk Fl.*: 688. 1987; Coffey Swab in *Flora of North America North of Mexico* 22: 263. 2000.

The other name originally threatened is *L. nivalis* (Laest.) Spreng. [in Linn. Syst. Veg., ed. 16, 2: 111. 1825 ≡ *Luzula campestris* var. *nivalis* Laest. in Kungl. Vetensk.-Akad. Handl. 1822: 334 (T: Sweden, Lappmark, norra branten af Jegnapo-Jalle, 1821, *Laestadius*; lecto: S, designated here; isolecto: S, UPS; further authentic material: S, W, UPS)]. The species referred to as *L. nivalis* (until recently sometimes under the later name *L. arctica* Blytt in Norges Fl. 1: 299. 1861) is almost equally widespread in the northern regions of North America, Europe and Asia. Among the numerous works using *L. nivalis* we can mention Hultén, Fl. Alaska & Yukon 3: 438. 1943; Hultén, Fl. Alaska: 300. 1968; Novikov in Fl. Evrop. Časti SSSR 2: 82 (1976); Kovtonjuk in Fl. Sibiri, *Araceae – Orchidaceae*: 40. 1987; Novikov in Sosud. Rast. Sovet. Dal'n. Vost. 1: 84. 1985; Kreczetovich & Gontscharov in Fl. SSSR 3: 568. 1935; Lindman, Svensk Faner.-Fl., ed. 2. 170. 1926. The most important works with the name *Luzula arctica* Blytt used for *L. nivalis* are Chrtek & Křísa in Fl. Europaea 5: 113. 1980; Lid, Norsk Svensk Finsk Fl.: 688. 1987; Böcher & al., Fl. Greenl.: 217. 1968.

It should be added that the only monographs of the family (Buchenau in Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 12: 124. 1890; Buchenau in A. Engler, Pflanzenreich (4/36) 25: 70. 1906) do not use *L. hyperborea* as an accepted name (*L. confusa* and *L. arctica* are applied to the above two taxa).

In view of the above facts we consider it as appropriate to propose formal rejection of the name *Luzula hyperborea* in order to maintain nomenclatural stability.

(1506) *Luzula interrupta* Desv., J. Bot. 1: 162, tab. 6, fig. 3. 1808 [*Monocot.: Junc.*], *nom. utique rej. prop.*
Holotypus: 'in America calidiore', *sine coll.* (P).

The name *Luzula interrupta* has for a long time been regarded as a synonym of *Luzula racemosa* Desv., a widespread C and S American species of the sect. *Alpinae* Chrtek & Křísa. J. K. recently examined the holotype at P and discovered that the specimen, also depicted on Plate 6, fig. 3 in the protologue, represents another taxon, a species generally known under the name *Luzula caricina* E. Mey. (Linnaea 22: 418. 1849. [T: "In sylvis Cordillerae Mexicanae prope Oaxaca, alt. 8000 ped.", *Galeotti 5757*; lecto (vide Balslev in Fl. Neotrop. Monogr. 68: 60. 1996): W; isolecto: K, P, W.]. Buchenau, in his later works (Buchenau in Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 12: 115. 1890; Buchenau in A. Engler, Pflanzenreich (4/36) 25: 67. 1906) also suggested a possibility that the name might be referable to the latter taxon.

The species in question is a remarkable endemic of Mexico, and has been recognized under *L. caricina* since 1849. The only exception was the brief use of *Luzula barbata* Liebm. 1850, a name soon relegated to the synonymy of *L. caricina* (Buchenau 1890). The name *Luzula caricina* appears in all the important publications dealing either with the taxonomy of the genus or with the flora of the region [e.g., Buchenau in Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 12: 115. 1890; Buchenau in A. Engler, Pflanzenreich (4/36) 25: 67. 1906; Balslev in Fl. Mesoamer. 6: 88. 1994; Balslev in Fl. Neotrop. Monogr. 68: 60. 1996].

In order to avoid reinstatement of a name that has been out of usage for almost two hundred years, rejection of *Luzula interrupta* Desv. is proposed.

- (1507) *Rostkovia brevifolia* Phil., *Linnaea* 29: 76. 1857 [*Monocot.: Junc.*], *nom. rejic. prop.*
Lectotypus (vide Balslev in *Fl. Neotrop. Monogr.* 68: 46. 1996): Chile, Laguna de Malvarco, i 1856, *Germain s.n.* (SGO 63044; isotypi: K, SGO 46499).

The only member of the Andean genus *Patosia* Buchenau, distributed from Bolivia to Chile and Argentina, has most often been called *Patosia clandestina* (Phil.) Buchenau. Works using the latter names include, for instance, Buchenau in *Bot. Jahrb. Syst.* 12: 64. 1890; Buchenau in *A. Engler, Pflanzenreich* (4/36) 25: 35. 1906; Barros in *Darwiniana* 10: 292. 1953; Balslev in *Fl. Neotrop. Monogr.* 68: 46. 1996; Balslev in *Asahi Shinbun World Pl.* 122/11: 37. 1996; Novara in *Zuloaga & Morrone, Cat. Pl. Vasc. Rep. Argent.* 1: 225. 1996. There are two names, originally of equal priority, referable to this taxon: *Rostkovia clandestina* Phil. (in *Linnaea* 29: 76. 1857; T: Chile, Coquimbo, Los Patos, *Philippi s. n.*; syn: K) and *Rostkovia brevifolia* Phil. (see above). It is Art. 11.5 that determines which of the two names or epithets of equal priority should be adopted. In the case of the *Patosia* species, Buchenau (*Junc. S. Amer.* 370. viii 1879) has long been believed to have been the first to accept one of the two epithets while simultaneously excluding the other; he preferred the name *Distichia clandestina*, and relegated *Rostkovia brevifolia* Phil. to synonymy. However, Grisebach (*Symb. Fl. Argent.* 318. iii-iv 1879) published the combination *Oxychloe brevifolia* (Phil.) Buchenau ex Griseb. and explicitly listed *Rostkovia clandestina* Phil. as a synonym. It should be mentioned that this probably was the last instance when the epithet *brevifolia* was used as an accepted name. As a result, under strict application of the priority rule, the epithet “*brevifolia*” should be used for the *Patosia* species, and a new combination would have to be created.

In order to avoid unnecessary nomenclatural changes (including a new combination) and maintain nomenclatural stability, we propose that the name *Rostkovia brevifolia* Phil. be rejected under Art. 56.1.

Acknowledgements

The work was supported by a grant no. 206/97/0936 from the National Grant Agency of the Czech Republic.