Mus. Paris 3: 388. 1843; Grisebach, in Mart. Fl. Bras. 12(1): 42. 1858; Benth. & Hook. Gen. Plant. 1: 257. 1862; Niedenzu, in Engl. & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 3(4): 61. 1890, and in Engler, Das Pflanzenreich IV, 141: 386–460. 1928.

Banisteriopsis C. B. Robinson. Recognized by Small, North Amer. Flora 25: 132. 1910; Standley, Trees and Shrubs of Mexico, Contr. U.S. Nat. Herb. 23: 575. 1922; Britt. & Wilson, Fl. Porto Rico (1924); Cuatrecasas, Webbia 13: 485–512. 1958.

Proposed by C. V. MORTON (U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.).

★

(195) Proposal to conserve the generic name **Thryallis** Mart.

4239. *Thryallis* Mart. Nov. Gen. & Sp. 3: 77, *t. 230.* Jan.-Jun. 1829 (Malpighiaceae), *nom. cons. prop.*

Type species: *Thryallis longifolia* Mart., *loc. cit.*

Thryallis L. Sp. Pl. ed. 2, 554. 1762. Type: *T. brasiliensis* L., *loc. cit.: Nom. rej. prop.*

Argument: Linnaeus described the genus *Thryallis* with the single species *T. brasiliensis*, and thus there is no doubt about the typification of the genus. When Martius described *T. longifolia* [and a second species *T. latifolia, op. cit. t. 231*] he did not intend to describe a new genus, as is implied by Niedenzu in calling the genus *Thryallis* Mart.; he definitely ascribed the genus to Linnaeus and was merely describing two new species that he thought belonged there. However, subsequent authors, beginning with A. H. L. de Jussieu, have found that the two species described by Martius are actually generically different from the original *Thryallis brasiliensis* L. Rather irrationally, Jussieu retained the name *Thryallis* for the two species of Martius and referred the original Linnaean species to the later genus *Galphimia* Cav. (1799) as *Galphimia brasiliensis* (L.) Juss. (in St. Hilaire, Fl. Bras. Merid. 3: 71, *t. 178.* 1832). Such a procedure is contrary to our current Code but nevertheless the treatment by Jussieu has been generally adopted since, notably by Grisebach, Bartling, and Niedenzu. The first notice of this improper switch of the name *Thryallis* from one genus to another was made by Otto Kuntze, who restored *Thryallis* to its original sense, with *Galphimia* Cav. as a synonym, and proposed the new name *Hemsleyna* to replace *Thryallis sensu* Mart. (Rev. Gen. Pl. 1: 88. 1891). Kuntze's treatment was adopted by J. K. Small in his treatment of the Malpighiaceae for North American Flora (25: 150. 1910) but by scarcely anyone else.

Although the treatment by Kuntze and Small is certainly logically justifiable it is doubtfully advantageous to the stability of nomenclature. The transfer of the name *Thryallis* from one genus to another in the same family is bound to be confusing. The adoption of *Thryallis* Mart. and *Galphimia* Cav. by Niedenzu in his great monograph of the Malpighiaceae in Das Pflanzenreich (1928) is bound to have a continuing influence. There will not be such a monograph of the family again in the near future, if ever. Therefore there is reason to conserve the generic names in the sense of Niedenzu, even though these were not correct by our current Code. There is the further point that *Thryallis* Mart. has given its name to a subtribe of the family, the Thryallidinae Niedenzu (in Engl. & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 3(4): 53. 1890) and *Galphimia* Cav. has similarly given its name to the subtribe Galphimiinae Niedenzu (*loc. cit.*).

Niedenzu (Das Pflanzenreich IV, 141: 574. 1928) makes much of the fact that Linnaeus describes the ovary as monogynous, which is not true of *Thryallis* Mart. or *Galphimia* Cav. However, an error of observation in a diagnosis does not, fortunately, invalidate a name. If this were an important error making the genus *Thryallis* L. unrecognizable, then of course it would have to be placed among the *genera dubia* (not in the Malpighiaceae at all, for these do not have monogynous ovaries). But this is not the case, for the species *Thryallis brasiliensis* L., the sole type of *Thryallis* L., is recognized by Jussieu, Grisebach, and Niedenzu as a common Brazilian species under the name *Galphimia brasiliensis* (L.) Juss. If the species can be identified and recognized then certainly the genus based on it is identifiable and recognizable, even though it does contain an error in the diagnosis. As a matter of fact there is some doubt that the Linnaean *T. brasiliensis* is properly associated with this species of *Galphimia,* which makes the rejection of *Thryallis* L. all the more important.

In his recent work on the Malpighiaceae of Colombia, José Cuatrecasas (Webbia 13: 550. 1958) suggested that it would be well to conserve *Thryallis* Mart. and *Galphimia* Cav. for convenience, but he did not make a formal proposition to this effect. However, if

Thryallis Mart. is conserved as here proposed then *Galphimia* Cav. becomes a correct name, since it has a different type from *Thryallis* L., and does not need conservation.

Thryallis Mart. Recognized by A. H. L. Jussieu, Ann. Sci. Nat. II, 13: 321. 1840; Griseb. in Mart. Fl. Bras. 12(1): 33. 1858; Benth. & Hook. Gen. Pl. 1: 254. 1862; Niedenzu in Engl. & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 3(4): 68. 1890; Niedenzu, Arb. Bot. Inst. Akad. Braunsberg 5: 10. 1914; Niedenzu, in Engler, Das Pflanzenreich IV, 141: 574. 1928.

Thryallis L. Recognized by Kuntze, Rev. Gen. Pl. 1: 89. 1891; Rose, Contr. U.S. Nat. Herb. 12: 7. 1909; Small, No. Amer. Fl. 25: 150. 1910; Standley in Trees and Shrubs of Mexico, Contr. U.S. Nat. Herb. 23: 568. 1922.

Proposed by C. V. MORTON and JOSÉ CUATRECASAS (U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.).

★

(196) Proposal to conserve the generic name **Eucnide** Zuccarini, 1844, against *Microsperma* W. J. Hooker, 1839 (both Loasaceae).

5384. *Eucnide* Zucc. Delectus Seminum in Horto R. Botanico Monacensi Collectorum Anno 1844, 4th unnumbered page, "Monachii, 28. Dec. 1844," original at Conservatoire et Jardin Botaniques, Genève.

Type species: *Eucnide bartonioides* Zucc., loc. cit.

A genus of about 11 species, distributed from southwestern United States through Mexico (including Baja California) to Guatemala.

Microsperma Hook. Icones Plantarum 3: pl. 234. 1839.

Type species: *Microsperma lobatum* Hook. (*"Microsperma lobata"*), loc. cit.

The monograph of Loasaceae by Urban & Gilg (Monographia Loasacearum. Nova Acta Akad. Leop.-Carol. 76: 1–370. 1900), the basic work on this family for over a half-century, was published before the first Rules of Botanical Nomenclature following the Vienna Congress. In this work *Microsperma* Hook., 1839, was rejected because of the name *Microspermum* Lagasca, 1816, in Compositae, and the matter has rested on this decision.

It seems unlikely that a taxonomist now would knowingly publish a generic name so similar to an already existing generic name as *Microsperma* is to *Microspermum* and, perhaps, even Hooker did this somewhat unwittingly. Bibliographically, however, *Microsperma* Hook. is a fact and, in view of the examples given in Art. 75, I.C.B.N., 1961, its status as a homonym must be reconsidered as it affects the availability of the generic name *Eucnide*.

It readily can be demonstrated that *Microsperma* (genitive *Microspermatis*) is a third declension noun while *Microspermum* (genitive *Microspermi*) is a second declension noun, hence the names are formed on different roots. The word *Microsperma* (derived from Greek, *micros*, small, and *sperma*, seed) was introduced and incorporated into Latin (ca. 425 A.D.) without any change (non-Latinized) as a neuter noun, although Hooker erroneously considered it to be of feminine gender. *Microspermum* (of the same derivation) is a Latinized noun of the same (neuter) gender but of much later incorporation into *Botanical Latin* than *Microsperma*. When used in specific combinations of neuter gender these generic names, e.g., *Microsperma lobatum* Hook. (*"M. lobata,"* erroneously) and *Microspermum nummulariifolium* Lag., seem rather similar. The name *Microspermum* of Lag. merely is a Latinized form of *Microsperma* of Hook., and through this Latinization, which does not seem to be necessary, *Microspermum* came to be in the second declension while *Microsperma* is in the third.

Since these genera are in different families, it can be argued that their names, therefore, are not likely to be confused. If it really is true that the names given in Art. 75, I.C.B.N., as examples "not likely to be confused," are, in fact, not confusing, e.g., *Monochaete, Monochaetum; Desmostachys, Desmostachya,* etc., it follows, then we guess, that *Microsperma* and *Microspermum* also ought not to be confusing. Since the name *Microsperma* was rejected in 1900, and by subsequent monographers, presumably because it was too similar to *Microspermum*, a strong precedent already is provided for the preservation of *Eucnide*. Some of the names among the examples given in Art. 75 may not be confusing because they are so well known and established through their use by monographers. In the case of *Microsperma,* however, the name is all but unknown in Loasaceae because monographers have preferred *Eucnide*.

Proposed by: W. R. ERNST (Washington,