

Flammula (Fr.) P. Kumm. is currently in use, whereas *Flammula* (Webb ex Spach) Fourr. has been abandoned and placed in synonymy with *Ranunculus* L. (l.c.), and therefore the former should be conserved, but I note the complicated long debated typification of the name and further propose that *F. flavida* be conserved as type of the basionym, *Agaricus* “trib.” *Flammula* Fries (l.c.). Finally, I note that when Earle (l.c.) published the new generic name *Visculus*, he simultaneously listed “*Flammula* (Fries) Quél. 1872. Not *Flammula* DC. 1818” in synonymy while listing as type “*Agaricus gummosus* Fries”. If *Visculus* is interpreted as a replacement name, it would be typified with *A. flavidus* whereas if it is interpreted as a new genus, it should be typified by the named species. Earle (l.c.: 386) also listed “*Flammula*

gummosa (Lasch) Quél.” as type of “*Flammula* (Fr.) Quél.”, which would be the first lectotypification, but being based upon a largely mechanical system of typification (Earle, l.c.: 374–375), it was arguably superseded (Art. 10.5(b)) by Clements & Shear’s (l.c.) lectotypification by *A. flavidus*. In harmony with the decision by Donk (l.c. 1962), the type of *Visculus* is accepted as that stated by Earle, i.e., *A. gummosus*, while stabilization of the typification of *Flammula* by *A. flavidus* via conservation is here proposed.

Acknowledgement

John McNeill is thanked for his guidance and advice regarding the validity of the name *Flammula* (*Ranunculaceae*) and for editorial help.

(2129) Proposal to conserve the family name *Asphodelaceae* (*Spermatophyta*: *Magnoliidae*: *Asparagales*)

Ronell R. Klopper,¹ Gideon F. Smith² & Abraham E. van Wyk³

¹ Biosystematics Research & Biodiversity Collections Division, South African National Biodiversity Institute, Private Bag X101, 0001 Pretoria, South Africa / Department of Plant Science, University of Pretoria, 0002 Pretoria, South Africa

² Office of the Chief Director: Biosystematics Research & Biodiversity Collections, South African National Biodiversity Institute, Private Bag X101, 0001 Pretoria, South Africa / Acocks Chair, H.G.W.J. Schweickerdt Herbarium, Department of Plant Science, University of Pretoria, 0002 Pretoria, South Africa / Centre for Functional Ecology, Departamento de Ciências da Vida, Universidade de Coimbra, 3001-455 Coimbra, Portugal

³ H.G.W.J. Schweickerdt Herbarium, Department of Plant Science, University of Pretoria, 0002 Pretoria, South Africa

Author for correspondence: Ronell R. Klopper, R.Klopper@sanbi.org.za

(2129) *Asphodelaceae* Juss., Gen. Pl.: 51. 4 Aug 1789, nom. cons. prop.
Type: *Asphodelus* L.

Asphodelaceae comprises around 12 genera and about 1060 species (Africa, Mediterranean basin, Arabian Peninsula, west and central Europe, Madagascar, Central Asia, Australia, New Zealand), *Hemerocallidaceae* some 19 genera with about 117 species (tropical and temperate Eurasia, Australia, New Zealand, several Pacific islands, Madagascar, western South America, southern Africa), while *Xanthorrhoeaceae* s.str. has one genus with some 28 species (restricted to Australia, including Tasmania). The Angiosperm Phylogeny Group (APG II in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 141: 399–436. 2003 & APG III in 161: 105–121. 2009) combine these three families into *Xanthorrhoeaceae* s.l., although APG II provided the option to also use *Asphodelaceae* and *Hemerocallidaceae*, under the system of so-called “bracketed families”. APG III, however, did away with this option, thus leaving *Xanthorrhoeaceae* as the only choice.

The name *Asphodelaceae* was published in Jussieu’s *Genera Plantarum* (1789: 51), which is used as the formal starting date for family nomenclature. *Hemerocallidaceae* was established by Robert Brown (Prodr.: 295. 1810), followed by *Xanthorrhoeaceae* by Dumortier (Anal. Fam. Pl.: 60, 62, 103. 1829). Thus both *Asphodelaceae* and *Hemerocallidaceae* predate *Xanthorrhoeaceae*. Neither *Asphodelaceae* nor *Hemerocallidaceae* appears in the list of conserved family names in Appendix IIB of the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006) nor will either appear in the forthcoming Appendices to the *Melbourne Code*, whereas the name *Xanthorrhoeaceae* has been conserved and is therefore listed. Thus

Xanthorrhoeaceae has priority (through conservation) over the other family names in the expanded family concept of APG III.

Appendix IIB was based on a list initially compiled by Bullock in the late 1950s (for a full history of Appendix II see Taxon 53: 1081–1089. 2004). The original list (in Taxon 7: 1–35. 1958) contained *Asphodelaceae* (p. 6), *Aloaceae* (p. 5—established by Batsch, Tab. Affin. Regni Veg.: 138. 1802, and now generally included in *Asphodelaceae*), *Hemerocallidaceae* (p. 18) and *Xanthorrhoeaceae* (p. 35). However, in the next version of this list (Taxon 8: 154–181, 189–205. 1959) only *Xanthorrhoeaceae* was present (p. 205). Bentham & Hooker (Gen. Pl. 3: 748–836. 1883) included the alooid, asphodeloid and hemerocalloid genera under various tribes of the *Liliaceae* s.l. and treated *Xanthorrhoea* Sm. under *Juncaceae* (l.c.: 862–865). In *Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien* (2(5): 10–91. 1887) these plants are all included by Engler in *Liliaceae* s.l. Hutchinson (Fam. Fl. Pl., ed. 2: 591. 1959) also classified the alooid, asphodeloid and hemerocalloid genera in various tribes of *Liliaceae* s.l., but treated *Xanthorrhoeaceae* s.str. (l.c.: 660) as a separate family. These publications were all taken into consideration when the family names proposed for Appendix IIB were compiled.

Had *Asphodelaceae* been included in Appendix IIB, it would have priority and remain the name to use for the expanded APG family. This would be the preferable situation, since *Asphodelaceae* are by far the largest component of the APG family. Its members are also the best known, with many of them being of considerable global importance in horticulture and ethnopharmacology, even though the largest number of taxa is concentrated in southern Africa. The three largest genera, *Aloe* L. (±550 species), *Haworthia* Duval (±60 species with a multitude of infraspecific taxa) and *Bulbine* Wolf (±78 species)

are mostly restricted to southern Africa, but especially the first two are hugely popular amongst succulent plant collectors around the world.

In *Hemerocallidaceae*, members of *Hemerocallis* L. (day lilies) and some of the other genera are used as ornamentals or have reported medicinal uses. *Xanthorrhoeaceae* s.str. only comprise the so-called grass trees in the genus *Xanthorrhoea*. Members of this genus are sometimes included in plant collections, but are generally very little known outside their natural distribution ranges (Australia and Tasmania). Grass trees were used by the Aboriginal people for various purposes, most importantly for their gum used as an adhesive and to fix spears, etc.

The adoption of *Xanthorrhoeaceae* s.l. has not gained much acceptance since publication of APG II in 2003. Most authors preferred to use the “bracketed family” options, or the alternative conventional narrow family concepts (three distinct families), and subsequent research on members of *Asphodelaceae* and *Hemerocallidaceae* were mostly published under the latter two names. A search for publications covering the period 2003 to 2009 in Google Scholar (<http://www.scholar.google.com>, accessed 28 Nov 2012) showed 565 hits for “*Aloe* and *Asphodelaceae*”, 30 for “*Aloe* and *Xanthorrhoeaceae*”, 157 for “*Bulbine* and *Asphodelaceae*”, 31 for “*Bulbine* and *Xanthorrhoeaceae*”, 66 for “*Haworthia* and *Asphodelaceae*”, 6 for “*Haworthia* and *Xanthorrhoeaceae*” 104 for “*Kniphofia* and *Asphodelaceae*”, 9 for “*Kniphofia* and *Xanthorrhoeaceae*”, 122 for “*Hemerocallis* and *Hemerocallidaceae*” and 20 for “*Hemerocallis* and *Xanthorrhoeaceae*”. Many of the hits for *Xanthorrhoeaceae* either did not have this family name in the title or the article did not deal specifically with these genera, but were rather more general in scope.

After publication of APG III in 2009 (and removal of the “bracketed families” option), this trend continued to a great extent. However, the use of *Xanthorrhoeaceae* s.l. did increase after 2009. A search for publications covering the period 2010 to 2012 in Google Scholar (<http://www.scholar.google.com>, accessed 28 Nov 2012) showed 482 hits for “*Aloe* and *Asphodelaceae*”, 133 for “*Aloe* and *Xanthorrhoeaceae*”, 109 for “*Bulbine* and *Asphodelaceae*”, 23 for “*Bulbine* and *Xanthorrhoeaceae*”, 51 for “*Haworthia* and *Asphodelaceae*”, 19 for “*Haworthia* and *Xanthorrhoeaceae*”, 61 for “*Kniphofia* and *Asphodelaceae*”, 14 for “*Kniphofia* and *Xanthorrhoeaceae*”, 69 for “*Hemerocallis* and *Hemerocallidaceae*” and 20 for “*Hemerocallis* and *Xanthorrhoeaceae*”. Many of the examples using *Xanthorrhoeaceae*

were due to the forced requirement of certain journals to follow APG III, and no doubt some of these authors reluctantly adopted *Xanthorrhoeaceae* s.l. rather than one of its synonyms. Most post-2009 examples using *Xanthorrhoeaceae* s.l. come from the fields of biochemistry and pharmacology. Very few taxonomic papers were found that used this name for the broadly defined family, apart from those by members of the Angiosperm Phylogeny Group (e.g., Chase & Reveal in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 161: 132–136. 2009). Other articles include those by Zonneveld & Fritz on *Chortolirion* (in Bradleya 28: 27–36. 2010), Fritz on *Chortolirion* (in Aloe 49: 4–10. 2012) and Grace & al. on the economic botany of *Aloe* (in S. African J. Bot. 77: 980–987. 2011). Grace & al. have used the family *Asphodelaceae* in other publications dating from the same time period (e.g., in Biochem. Syst. Ecol. 38: 57–62. 2010), indicating a preference for the latter. Most taxonomic papers published on *Asphodelaceae* after 2009 dealt with the genus *Aloe* and were co-authored by at least one of us. Publications by other authors that used the family name *Asphodelaceae* include: Ramdhani & al. on *Haworthia* (in Taxon 60: 1001–1014. 2011), Thulin describing a new aloe (in Nordic J. Bot. 30: 1–3. 2011), Boatwright & Manning on *Trachyandra* (in S. African J. Bot. 76: 499–510. 2010) and on *Bulbine* and *Jodrellia* (in Bothalia 40: 59. 2010), Boatwright on *Asphodelus fistulosus* (in S. African J. Bot. 79: 48–50. 2012), and Khan & al. on *Eremurus* (in Pakistan J. Bot. 43: 2311–2313. 2011). Publications that used the family name *Hemerocallidaceae* include Boatwright & Manning on *Caesia* (in S. African J. Bot. 76: 542–529. 2010) and Nitta & al. on *Hemerocallis fulva* (in Amer. J. Bot. 97: 261–267. 2010).

Many scientists, amateur botanists and the general public are obviously not in favour of using the relatively obscure *Xanthorrhoeaceae* s.l., which in addition is not only difficult to pronounce but is also often misspelt. Based on a nomenclatural technicality, the name of the smallest, youngest, and least-known constituent of the APG family has priority and became the name of the expanded family concept. Conservation of the name *Asphodelaceae* would rectify a situation where an older and well-established name is being displaced for purely nomenclatural reasons. Such a step would not only promote nomenclatural stability, but also the information content and practicality of the expanded APG III family concept. It will further alleviate the frustration that is present amongst the botanical community and many other end-users of plant names related to this current disadvantageous nomenclatural change.

(2130) Proposal to conserve the name *Carex interior* against *C. scirpoides* (*Cyperaceae*)

James L. Reveal¹ & Kanchi N. Gandhi²

1 Department of Plant Biology, Cornell University, 412 Mann Building, Ithaca, New York 14853-4301, U.S.A.

2 Harvard University Herbaria, 22 Divinity Ave, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, U.S.A.

Author for correspondence: James L. Reveal, jlr326@cornell.edu

(2130) *Carex interior* L.H. Bailey in Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 20: 426. 15 Nov 1893, nom. cons. prop.

Typus: U.S.A., New York, Yates Co., Penn Yan, 1846, *Sartwell* in Caric. Amer. Sept. Exs. No. 36 (GH No. 00027275; isotypi: BH [2 sheets], G, NY, PH).

(=) *Carex scirpoides* Schkuhr ex Willd., Sp. Pl. 4: 237. 1805, nom. rej. prop.

Lectoyypus (hic designatus): Pennsylvania, 1803, *Muhlenberg* 52 (HAL No. 0103598).

Established tradition among caricologists has long held that *Carex scirpoides* Schkuhr ex Willd. (l.c.; Sect. *Stellulatae* (Kunth) Christ) is a later homonym of the unrelated *C. scirpoidea* Michx. (Fl. Bor.-Amer. 2: 171. 1803; Sect. *Scirpinae* (Tuck.) Kük.). If it is ruled