cultivated in the Chelsea Physic Garden of London. A careful examination of the detailed illustration and protologue of C. glabra, however, showed that these do not correspond well to the current concept of this species and do not support the usage of the name. This was already noted by Candolle (I.c.), though he finally adopted this name in place of C. alpina and was followed by the great majority of the later authors.

A first element showing that Miller’s plant could not be safely attributed to the species currently going under the name C. glabra lies in the habit. The illustrated plant has the typical habit of the annual taxa of the C. major group, while there are no elements to believe it a perennial species such as that to which C. glabra is currently applied, which is characterised by a rosette of basal leaves mainly persisting during the flowering period. Miller himself wrote about C. glabra that “it is also an annual plant”, which is in line with the strictly annual habit of C. major and in contrast with the perennial habit of C. glabra/alpina. A second element is the shape of the corolla, i.e. large, tubulose, without longitudinal folds between lobes and appearing truncate due to the tiny, reflexed lobes, as in the taxa of the C. major group. Further, Miller’s plant has entirely purple-violet corollas, while this character is never found in C. glabra/alpina; in the latter the corolla has a purplish belt only at the throat. Completely purplish corollas are found in C. major L. subsp. purpurascens (Boiss.) Selvi & Cecchi from the South of the Iberian peninsula (Selvi & al. in Taxon 58: 1290–1308. 2009), a race that has been widely cultivated in Europe for a long time for its ornamental value. Indeed, annual plants raised in the botanical garden of Firenze University from commercial seeds of C. major subsp. purpurascens perfectly match Miller’s illustration of C. glabra in habit, leaf morphology (without tubercles and hairs) and in the possession purple flowers. The protologue (“Cerinthe (Glabris) folii oblongo-ovatis, glabris, amp lesbi- caulis, corollis obtusiusculis, patulis. Honeyworth with a purplish red flower”) is practically identical to that given for C. major, and the legend to Miller’s illustration (“Cerinthe aurundam major flore ex rubro purpurascente”) further suggests to refer this plant to C. major subsp. purpurascens.

A further element for the identification of Miller’s plant is the detailed drawing of the nutlet, where a broad and concave basal areola with a distinct rim is clearly visible. Based on our morphological and phylogenetic analysis of the genus, this character occurs in the C. major group (Cerinthe sect. Ceranthe) while the taxa of C. sect. Ceranthe, including the species to which the name C. glabra is applied, have a narrower and mainly planar basal cicatrix (Selvi & al., I.c.).

Hence there are valid reasons to believe that the name C. glabra has been misapplied by the great majority of post-Linnean botanists, and, as such, it should be replaced by C. alpina. Although the latter has been adopted by important botanists (e.g. Boissier, Fl. Orient. 4: 149, 1879; Huter, Sched. Fl. Exs. Austr.-Hung.: 94. 1884; Degen, Fl. Velb.: 578. 1937; Popov, Fl. SSSR: 269. 1953), the traditional epithet glabra is in current usage in the modern taxonomic literature so that its substitution would cause a disadvantageous nomenclatural disruption (Art. 14.2 of the ICBN; McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006). Accordingly, we propose to conserve C. glabra with a conserved type that, although not corresponding to Miller’s illustration, fits the current concept of this species and supports its continued usage. The proposed type is a collection from the Italian side of the Maritime Alps, near to the French border, and is in agreement with the geographical indication given in the original description of C. glabra: “this grows in Italy and the south of France”.
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The reason for this dual usage of names is not taxonomic. An original specimen for *Antidesma scandens* Lour. (Fl. Cochinch.: 617. 1790), on which the name *Humulus scandens* (Lour.) Merr. (in Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc., ser. 2, 24(2): 138. 1935) is based, cannot be located (Small, l.c. 1978, 1997; Zhou & Bartholomew, l.c.). Such a specimen may not exist because “Loureiro did not consistently prepare such specimens, and some of those he did prepare have been destroyed” (Merrill in Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc. 72(4): 231. 1933). In fact, most of Loureiro’s specimens for *Flora Cochinchinensis* were never kept at all, with parts of them occurring in three European herbaria: formerly 37 specimens in Lisbon that were reportedly destroyed in the 1870s (Candolle, Phytographie: 429. 1880; Gomes, Mem. Acad. Real. Sci. Lisboa, 2 Cl. Sci. Moraes 4(1): 25–31. 1868; Moore, J. Bot. 63: 245. 1925; Merrill, l.c. 1935: 12–15), about 230 specimens currently in BM (Candolle, l.c.; Moore, l.c.; Merrill, l.c. 1935: 19), and about 83–90 specimens in P (Candolle, l.c.; Moore, l.c.; Merrill, l.c. 1935: 13–19). From the writings of Moore (l.c.: 245–256, 281–291) and of Merrill (l.c. 1935: 13–18, mostly excerpted from Gomes, l.c.) it is evident that no specimen reported among the material at Lisbon, BM or P can be taken as original material of *Antidesma scandens*; further searching at BM and P by the senior author confirms this assessment.

In making the combination *Humulus scandens*, Merrill (l.c. 1935: 138) stated: “Loureiro’s poor description, based on a nearly glabrous form of which he saw only staminate specimens, applies unmistakably to the species currently known as *Humulus japonicus* Sieb. & Zucc. No other known Kwangtung species in any family remotely conforms to the characters indicated by Loureiro.” However, Merrill’s conclusion has been rejected by others (Fernald, l.c.; Davis in Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 44: 274. 1957; Miller in J. Arnold Arbor. 31: 197. 1970; Small, l.c.) and ignored in several major floras, as noted above. To this day, a neotype has not been designated for Loureiro’s name, so its application remains uncertain. On the contrary, the application of the name *H. japonicus* is not in doubt, it having been lectotypified by Small (l.c.: 68) on a collection from Japan by Thunberg at L (no. 908.188-2514) that was annotated by Siebold.

In addition to its preponderance usage among taxonomic references, the name *Humulus japonicus* achieves greater usage than *Humulus scandens* in the general scientific literature as well. Keyword searches of articles in BIOSIS Previews (79 to 38), CAB Abstracts (89 to 40), and Google Scholar (584 to 460) for both binomials conducted on Sep 18, 2009 all favor usage of this name. In order to resolve this dual usage and retain the more widely used and confidently applied *Humulus japonicus*, we propose the outright rejection of *Antidesma scandens* under Art. 56 of the ICBN (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006).
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Add the following notes in App. IIB:

Under *Francoaceae*: “If this family is united with *Melianthaceae*, the name *Francoaceae* is rejected in favour of *Melianthaceae*.”

Under *Melianthaceae*: “Note: If this family is united with *Francoaceae*, the name *Melianthaceae* must be used.”

Proposal
As the work of the Angiosperm Phylogeny Group continues to evolve allowing a more precise placement of families into monophyletic groupings there are occasional situations where adoption of the nomenclaturally correct name would obscure a better known and more widely adopted family name. Such is the case with *Francoaceae* A. Juss. (l.c.) and *Melianthaceae* Horan. (l.c.). The family *Francoaceae* is small with just two genera (*Francoa* Cav. and *Tetilla* DC., both monospecific) and is confined to west-central Chile in South America. *Melianthaceae* is only slightly more species-