

effect, Greene independently re-lectotypified *Monardella* and thereby reduced it to the synonymy of *Monarda*. Greene thereupon erected a new genus, *Madronella*, a deliberate anagram, with its type designated as *Madronella odoratissima* (Benth.) Greene; there were in all 35 new combinations in *Madronella*, not including *Monardella caroliniana*, obviously. *Monardella montanum* (Michx.) Benth. is likewise excluded, without comment.

Greene's taxonomic concept of *Madronella* persists to the present, even though his nomenclature was adopted by only a few botanists: Frye & Rigg, Elem. Fl. Northwest: 195–196. 1914; Piper & Beattie, Fl. S.E. Washington: 216. 1914; Rydberg, Fl. Rocky Mts.: 750–751. 1917, ed. 2: 750–751. 1923; and in 13 or so new combinations. None of these authors made any reference to generic typification.

In 1925, Carl Epling (in Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 12: 1–106. 1925) sharply criticized Greene's nomenclature, and alleged that *Monardella odoratissima* had been adopted as the type-species of the genus (pp. 3–4). I cannot trace the origin of this statement; it may well be that Epling is unwittingly quoting himself, because at the end of the generic description (p. 33 of his monograph) he states “The type species is *Monardella odoratissima* Benth.” Typification is not mentioned in, for example, a 1912 predecessor work by Abrams (in *Muhlenbergia* 8(3): 26–36; 8(4): 37–44). Epling's lectotypification of *Monardella* was apparently unknown to, or rejected by, the compilers

of *Index Nominum Genericorum*, where the act is credited to Abrams (Ill. Fl. Pacific States 3: 648. 22 Mai 1951). In that work, *Monardella odoratissima* Benth. is explicitly designated as lectotype of the genus, but without any argument for overturning the earlier lectotypifications of both Pfeiffer and Greene. Rejection of the lectotypifications of both Pfeiffer and Greene is contrary to Art. 10.5 of the *Melbourne Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 154. 2012). *Monardella* is now being used in a sense contrary to its type, and therefore can only continue in use by conservation.

I have found no regional floras or checklists published since Epling's 1925 revision that have adopted *Madronella*. There are some 50 or more currently recognized taxa of *Monardella*, as given in Elvin & al. (in *Madroño* 60: 46–54. 2013). The genus is accepted in all floras of western North America (e.g., Hitchcock & al., *Vasc. Pl. Pacific N.W.* 4: 264–265. 1959; Schreve & Wiggins, *Veg. Fl. Sonoran Desert* 2: 1289–1291. 1964; Kearney & Peebles, *Arizona Fl.*: 746–747. 1969; Wiggins, *Fl. Baja Calif.*: 426–428. 1980; Cronquist & al., *Intermt. Fl.* 4: 308–310. 1984; Jokerst in Hickman, *Jepson Man.*: 718–722. 1993; Douglas & al., *Ill. Fl. Brit. Columbia* 3: 280. 1999; Allred, *Fl. Neomexic.*: 339. 2008; Sanders & al. in Baldwin & al., *Jepson Man.*, ed. 2: 842–850. 2012). Clearly, conservation of *Monardella* with the type selected by Epling will preserve current usage.

(2204) Proposal to conserve *Pedicularis stenocorys* against *P. stenantha* (*Orobanchaceae*)

Wen-Bin Yu, Hong Wang & De-Zhu Li

Key Laboratory of Biodiversity and Biogeography, and Plant Germplasm and Genomics Center, Kunming Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming, 650201, China
Author for correspondence: Wen-Bin Yu, yuwenbin@mail.kib.ac.cn

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/625.33>

(2204) *Pedicularis stenocorys* Franch. in Bull. Soc. Bot. France 47: 32. 1900. nom. cons. prop.

Typus: China. Sichuan: Kangding (Ta-t sien-lou), *R.P. Mussot 304* (P barcode P00520824!; isotypus: P barcode P02969036!).

(=) *Pedicularis stenantha* Franch. in Bull. Soc. Philom. Paris, ser. 8, 3: 149. 1891. nom. rej. prop.

Lectotypus (hic designatus): China. Sichuan: Kangding (Ta-t sien-lou), *J.A. Soulié* (P barcode P02969035!).

Pedicularis stenantha was used to name one whorled-leaved and one alternate-leaved species by Franchet in 1891 and 1900, respectively. The first *P. stenantha* Franch. (l.c. 1891) was indicated as belonging to *P. ser. Lyratae* Maxim., and to be similar to *P. lyrata* Prain ex Maxim. The species was described in a paper devoted to new species in the collections sent to Paris by M. l'Abbé Soulié, but, although citing the locality (“Se-tchuen, circa Ta-t sien-lou”), Franchet did not designate in the protologue a numbered collection as type. Subsequent researchers failed to locate a type of this *P. stenantha*, so they treated it as a questionable species in *P. ser. Lyratae* (e.g., Li in Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia 100: 363. 1948; Tsoong in Fl.

Reipubl. Popularis Sin. 68: 270. 1963). The second species *P. stenantha* Franch. (l.c. 1900: 36) belongs to *P. ser. Flammeae* Prain (in Ann. Roy. Bot. Gard. (Calcutta) 3: 100. 1891). Bonati (in Mem. Soc. Bot. France 18: 28–29. 1910) overlooked the first species and used the name “*P. stenantha*” only in reference to the second species (Bonati, l.c. 1910: 32). Limpricht (in Repert. Spec. Nov. Regni Veg., Beih. 12: 485. 1922a) adopted the name *P. stenantha* Franch. 1891, but the species delimitation actually referred to the second species (see Limpricht in Repert. Spec. Nov. Regni Veg. 20: 203. 1924, in which the specimens cited in Limpricht (l.c. 1922a) as *P. stenantha* Franch. 1891 are included under *P. angustiflora* ≡ *P. stenantha* Franch. 1900). Limpricht (Repert. Spec. Nov. Regni Veg. 18: 244. 1922b) recognized this nomenclatural confusion and there proposed the name *P. angustiflora* to replace the later *P. stenantha*. In current usage, *P. angustiflora* is treated as a variety under *P. oederi* Vahl (Tsoong, l.c.: 334; Yang & al. in Fl. China: 178. 1998).

During his revision of Chinese *Pedicularis*, Tsoong (l.c.: 270, lines 19–25) stated that: “Bonati (1910) treated *P. stenantha* as an alternate-leaved species under the key of ser. *Flammeae*, while he did not mention the whorled-leaved *P. stenantha* in the following key of ser. *Lyratae*; Limpricht (1922[a]) also did not mention the whorled-leaved

P. stenantha; therefore, neither Bonati nor Limpricht had seen the type of the name *P. stenantha* Franch. 1891. When I was visiting the herbarium of Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle in Paris (P), I did not find the potential type gathering. The above situation along with again the name *P. stenantha* named for an alternate-leaved species, it is possible that Franchet made a mistake: first he used the name, while the type was unavailable; he thought the name was still available, so it was used to name another species. If the type cannot be checked, this name will permanently become a 'question name' (nomen ambiguum)" (trans. from Chinese by the authors). In addition, Tsoong suggested that *P. stenantha* and *P. stenocorys* Franchet may be the same species on the basis of the original descriptions, but would need to check the type of *P. stenantha* to clarify their taxonomic relationships.

In the same article, Franchet (l.c. 1891: 140–150) described 17 new species in total using only collections of J.A. Soulié, except *Primula vialii* for which he also had a collection by J.M. Delavay. In order to find the potential type of *P. stenantha*, we searched for type specimens of the other 16 names (*Cyananthus petiolatus*, *Gentiana crassuloides*, *Gentiana rosularis*, *Primula vialii*, *Salvia brevilabra*, *Salvia tatsienensis*, *Salvia tricuspis*, *Saussurea tatsienensis*, *Saussurea scabrida*, *Saussurea souliei*, *Saussurea caudata*, *Saxifraga longistyla*, *Senecio plantaginifolius*, *Senecio setchuenensis*, *Senecio souliei*, *Tanacetum myrianthum*) to get some internal clues. After checking collections of J.A. Soulié deposited at the herbarium of P, we find that type specimens of 15 names (except *Primula vialii*) collected by J.A. Soulié are labeled as "Plantes de TA-TSIEN-LOU (SETCHUEN). M. l'abbé SOULIÉ Recu le 6 juin 1891" [sic!]. Based on this clue, we find that only the sheet P02969035 (*J.A. Soulié s.n.*) corresponds to the original material of *P. stenantha*. However, this specimen was identified as "*Pedicularis stenocorys* Franch." by Franchet himself, with modification for the specific epithet "*stenocorys*" annotated on the label. Herein, only this sheet can be selected as the lectotype of the name *P. stenantha*. If the proposed lectotype is accepted, it is clear that *P. stenocorys* (typified by *R.P. Mussot 304*) is conspecific with *P. stenantha*.

Nomenclaturally, the name *P. stenantha* has priority over the name *P. stenocorys*, however, to reduce *P. stenocorys* to a synonym of *P. stenantha* would be contrary to current usage. As mentioned above, the name *P. stenantha* is only correctly used by some researchers to refer to the whorled-leaved species (i.e., *P. stenantha* Franch. 1891) (Bonati in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 13: 137. 1921), while its taxonomic status was later treated as uncertain (Li, l.c.; Limpricht, l.c. 1924: 227; Tsoong, l.c.: 270). By contrast, the species under the name *P. stenocorys* is widely adopted in taxonomic revisions (Li, l.c.; Limpricht, l.c. 1924: 227) and checklists (Wang & Wu, Vasc. Pl. Hengduan Mount. Part II. 1994), and the current Chinese Floras (Tsoong, l.c.: 268–269; Yang & al., l.c.). Moreover, one subspecies (subsp. *melanotricha* P.C. Tsoong) and one variety (var. *angustissima* P.C. Tsoong) are placed under *P. stenocorys* (Tsoong, l.c.: 271). Therefore, to avoid the disadvantageous nomenclatural displacement of the most widely accepted epithet, the name *P. stenocorys* should be conserved against the prior name *P. stenantha*.

The gathering *R.P. Mussot 304* of *Pedicularis stenocorys* contains two sheets at P. The sheet with the barcode P00520824 has been annotated as the type on the sheet, and another sheet was previously deposited at Herbarium E. Drake, then it was transferred to the herbarium of P. The sheet P00520824 is designated above as the lectotype of *P. stenocorys*.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Dr. John McNeill for his valuable comments and suggestions; and to the herbarium of Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle (P) for providing online access to specimens. This study was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31200185), the West Light Foundation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the National Science and Technology on Basic Research Program (2013FY112600), the Large-Scale Scientific Facilities of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (2009-LSFGBOWS-01), and the U.S. National Science Foundation (DEB-1119098).

(2205) Proposal to conserve the name *Pterygiella cylindrica* against *Brandisia praticola* (Orobanchaceae)

Wen-Bin Yu,¹ Robert R. Mill,² Hong Wang¹ & De-Zhu Li¹

¹ Key Laboratory of Biodiversity and Biogeography, and Plant Germplasm and Genomics Center, Kunming Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming, 650201, China

² Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh EH3 5LR, Scotland, U.K.

Author for correspondence: Wen-Bin Yu, yuwenbin@mail.kib.ac.cn

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/625.34>

(2205) *Pterygiella cylindrica* P.C. Tsoong in Fl. Reipubl. Popularis Sin. 68: 381, 419. 1963 [*Angiosp.*: *Orobanch.*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: China, Yunnan, Binchuan, Xiachan to Waxi, 14 Oct 1946, *T.N. Liou 21509* (PE barcode 00032314!);

(=) *Brandisia praticola* W.W. Sm. in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 10: 10. 1917, nom. rej. prop.

Holotypus: China, Yunnan, Mekong-Salween divide, Sep 1914, *G. Forrest 13350* (E barcode E00531969!; isotypi:

E barcode E00531970!, PE barcode 01456031!, PH barcode 00008060!).

The genus *Pterygiella* Oliv. (*Orobanchaceae*) currently comprises the three species *P. nigrescens* Oliv. 1896, *P. duclouxii* Franch. 1900 and *P. cylindrica* P.C. Tsoong 1963, while excluding *P. bartschioides* Hand.-Mazz. (= *Xizangia bartschioides* (Hand.-Mazz.) C.Y. Wu & D.D. Tao), and is endemic to southwestern China (Dong & al. in Pl. Divers. Resources 33: 581–594. 2011a). The last-named *P. cylindrica*