the 1993 choice of Satyanarayana, who in turn in 2001 (in Bull. Bot. Surv. India 42: 145) continued to consider *D. ferruginea* as the type of *Dunbaria*. It should be noted that *D. latifolia* Wight & Arn., often merged with *D. ferruginea* (see below), has been transferred to *Rhynchosia*, as *R. courtallensis* (Van der Maesen in Rheedea 5: 54–59. 1995); a nomen novum because a *R. latifolia* from the U.S.A. already existed in that genus.

Dunbaria is currently accepted for a genus of 20 species (Van der Maesen, l.c. 1998: 1–109), with 7 species in India, 11 in Indo-China, 10 in China, 1 in Japan, and 9 in Malesia (Indonesia, the Philippines, New Guinea, Malaya). *Dunbaria ferruginea* is the only original species that is available to assure stability of names for this well-delimited genus, therefore we propose to conserve *Dunbaria* with *D. ferruginea* as the conserved type.

Since there has been much confusion between *D. ferruginea* and *D. latifolia* (nowadays *Rhynchosia courtallensis*), and according to Art. 10.1 of the ICN (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012) the type of a generic name is the type of a name of a species, we provide additional details on the lectotypes of these species names. The confusion already existed in the original collection of "*Wight* Herb. Propr. 878", a collection that consists of many sheets. An old note on one of these type sheets in K states that two species are mixed up. The fact that these sheets are a mixture of *D. ferruginea* and *D. latifolia* was already noticed by Wight and Arnott themselves, who described these two species from (among others) these sheets and for both of them cited the material as "*Wight! cat. n.* 878 (partly)". They also provided one of the important distinguishing characters: "legume about 4–5-seeded" and "legume 1–2-seeded" respectively. Van der Maesen (l.c. 1995: 54, 56) listed six characters in which these species differ, among others "5–6 ovuled ovaries" and "1–2 ovuled ovaries".

Despite this confusion, we think it is best for each of these species names to continue the tradition to retain *Wight 878* p.p. specimens as their lectotypes, with lectotypes in K and isolectotypes in other herbaria. The first-step lectotypifications (to *Wight 878* p.p.) were made by Van der Maesen in 1998 (l.c.: 40) and 1995 (l.c.: 56) respectively. At those times the appropriate sheets in Kew were annotated; an action, however, that did not constitute effective publication of this further type indication. Therefore, second-step lectotypifications (see ICN Art. 9.17 and Ex. 12) are given here: *Wight 878*, at Kew with barcode 000556304 is the lectotype of *Dunbaria ferruginea* (with an isolectotype at G) and the same collection at Kew with barcode 000556303 is the lectotype of *D. latifolia* [= *R. courtallensis*] (with isolectotypes at A, BM, C, G and P).

(2123–2124) Proposal to conserve *Cytisus podolicus* (*Chamaecytisus podolicus*) against *Cytisus bucovinensis*, and *Cytisus blockianus* (*Chamaecytisus blockianus*) against *Cytisus kerneri* and *C. marilauni* (*Leguminosae*)

Dániel Pifkó[1] & Myroslav Shevera[2]

1 *Department of Botany, Hungarian Natural History Museum, P.O. Box 222, 1476 Budapest, Hungary*
2 *M.G. Kholodny Institute of Botany, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Tereschenkivska St. 2, 01001 Kyiv, Ukraine*
Author for correspondence: *Dániel Pifkó, pifko@nhmus.hu*

(2123) ***Cytisus podolicus*** Błocki in Allg. Bot. Z. Syst. 1: 137–138. 1895, nom. cons. prop.
Typus: "Probabin pr. Horodenka (Galiciae orient.-australis)—in collibus gipsaceis, 22.V.1891, *B. Błocki*" (LW No. 126608).
(=) *Cytisus bucovinensis* Simonk. in Math. Term. Közlem. 22: 369. 1888, nom. rej. prop.
Lectotypus (vide Pifkó in Ann. Hist.-Nat. Mus. Natl. Hung. 97: 23. 2005): Bucovina. Ad viam caesaream prope Sereth, 07.1836, *F. Herbich* (BP No. 207305; isotypus W-ZooBot No. 1935-0004011).

Chamaecytisus Link (= *Cytisus* Desf. sensu lato sect. *Tubocytisus* DC.) is regarded here as a monophyletic, morphologically uniform, separate genus, unlike Cristofolini's treatment of *Chamaecytisus* as the section *Tubocytisus* of *Cytisus* (Cristofolini in Webbia 45: 187–219. 1991; Cristofolini & Troia in Taxon 55: 733–746. 2006).

The genus *Chamaecytisus* is distributed from the Canary Islands to Anatolia, occurring throughout the entire Mediterranean region and Europe except for the western and northern parts. More than 200 taxa have been described, representing 28–35 species, and reflecting different taxonomic interpretations in various publications (Cristofolini, l.c.; Heywood & Frodin in Tutin & al., Fl. Eur. 2: 90–93. 1968). Since these taxa are treated with different taxonomic concepts in the regional flora works, a taxonomic revision considering their types is crucial.

Chamaecytisus podolicus (Błocki) Klásk. is an endemic species of the Podolian Upland in Ukraine and Moldavia (Yakovlev & al., Legumes N. Eurasia: 724. 1996; Kagalo in Acta Bot. Fenn. 162: 137–140. 1999). Supposedly it occurs in Romania, its record from Belarus is doubtful and it has been erroneously reported from the Carpathian Basin. The name was lectotypified by Krytzka & al. (in Bot. Zhurn. (Kiev) 56: 610. 1999) by the specimen at Lviv cited above (LW 126608). There are syntypes at KRAM (122818!), LW (208531!, 208532!), and W (1926-0012419!, 0031004!).

Cytisus bucovinensis was described by Simonkai (l.c.) in his monograph on the genus *Cytisus* s.l. in Carpathian Basin from the southern part of the Podolian Upland near the village "Sereth" (Siret, Suceava County, Romania), close to the Romanian–Ukrainian border, i.e., outside of the Carpathian Basin. *Cytisus podolicus* was described by Błocki (Allg. Bot. Z. Syst. 1: 137–138. 1895) from the nearby village Probabin (Ukraine, Ivano-Frankivska County), ca. 60 km N of Siret. The names of both species are validly published being accompanied by descriptions and their type specimens are available in suitable condition for identification representing the most important morphological characters. [The absence of a number for *C. bucovinensis* and the dagger (†) preceding the name was used by Simonkai (e.g.,

Enum. Fl. Transsilv.: 21. 1887) to indicate a species that was either cultivated or reported in error from the region concerned (occurring only in neighbouring areas).] Two descriptions of *Cytisus podolicus* were published by Błocki in two different journals more or less at the same time, and practically with the same text: (1) in Allg. Bot. Z. Syst. 1: 137–138. (July–August, 1895), as cited above, in a paper entitled "Zwei neue Cytisus-Arten (sect. Tubocytisus) aus Ostgalizien"; (2) in Oesterr. Bot. Z.. 45: 303–304. (August, 1895). Klásková (in Preslia 30: 214. 1958) made her new combination, *Chamaecytisus podolicus* (Błocki) Klásk., on the basis of the description in the journal Allg. Bot. Z. Syst. The same description was considered also by Krytzka & al. (l.c.: 606–616) when they selected the lectotype of *C. podolicus*. Although we cannot be certain that the "July–August" publication appeared before the "August" one, we also accept it here as the place of first publication of *C. podolicus* and recommend the future use of this (i.e., Allg. Bot. Z. Syst. 1: 137–138. Jul–Aug 1895) as the protologue.

Investigating the type materials of both *C. podolicus* and *C. bucovinensis*, as well as the living population of the former near Probabin (the type locality), the most important morphological characters of these species described by Simonkai and Błocki turned out to be the same, i.e., branches densely pubescent (the hairs shorter than the cross-section of branches); upper leaf surface is hairless (young leaves sometimes with sparse hairs); flowers congested in terminal heads and blooming in summer, but flowers at the leaf-axils blooming in spring; flowers are 25–30 mm long; corolla bright yellow (mistakenly published as pale yellow by Heywood & Frodin, l.c.); vexillum hairless or with just sparse hairs; calyx 1.1–1.5 cm long with dense, erect or appressed hairs. This combination of characters does not exist in any other taxa, and no differential characters were found either in the descriptions or on the type specimens of the two species.

Cytisus bucovinensis and *C. podolicus*, two validly published species names, are regarded as applying to the same species (with the priority of *C. bucovinensis*) according to the facts that the morphological characters of the two species are the same, and their type locations are very close to each other (ca. 60 km) in a similar geomorphological region.

Chamaecytisus podolicus is treated at species level (though often in *Cytisus*) in most of the former, European or regional flora works, handbooks and checklists (Kreczetowicz in Komarov ed., Fl. URSS 11: 75–93. 1945; Heywood & Frodin, l.c.; Tzvelev in Fedorov, Fl. Partis Eur. URSS 6: 216–225. 1987; Yakovlev & al., l.c.; Kagalo, l.c.; Mosyakin & Fedoronchuk, Vasc. Pl. Ukraine: 346. 1999; Tzvelev in Fedorov, Fl. Russia 6: 326–340. 2002), furthermore it is very well-known in the taxonomic papers or monographs regarding this group, either as the genus *Chamaecytisus* or as *Cytisus* sect. *Tubocytisus* (Kreczetowicz in Bot. Zhurn. S.S.S.R. 25: 252–264. 1940; Skalická, Rad. Akad. Nauk. Umjetn. Bosne Hercegovine 72 (Sect. Nat.-Math. 21): 239–245. 1983; Shevera in Bot. Zhurn. (Kiev) 46(6): 35–38. 1989; Cristofolini, l.c.; Cristofolini & Troia, l.c.).

In contrast *C. bucovinensis* is not included or is mentioned only as a synonym of other taxa, e.g., Griuţescu (in Săvulescu, Fl. Republ. Socialist. Romania 5: 95. 1957) as *C. aggregatus* var. *bucovinensis*; Pifkó (l.c.: 21–32) as *Chamaecytisus supinus* subsp. *aggregatus*; in Tzvelev (l.c. 1987) as *Ch. albus*; Briquet (Étud. Cytises Alpes Mar.: 173. 1894; Ascherson & Graebner, Syn. Mitteleur. Fl. 6(2): 327. 1907) as *C. supinus*.

In order to retain the consistent use of the well-known name *Ch. podolicus* in botanical scientific literature we propose here the conservation of its basionym, *Cytisus podolicus*, against *C. bucovinensis*, a practically unknown name, as is *Ch. bucovinensis*, based on it.

(2124) ***Cytisus blockianus*** Pawł. in Szafer & al., Rosl. Polsk.: 389. 1924, nom. cons. prop.
Typus: "Fl. Galizien Hleszczawa pr. Tarnopol, 5 et 7 '90, leg. Blocki" (LW No. 070662; isotypi: LE, P Nos. P03453647 & P03453648).

(≡) *Cytisus kerneri* Błocki in Deutsche Bot. Monatsschr. 10: 107. 1892, nom. rej. prop.

(≡) *Cytisus marilauni* Borbás in Természetrajzi Füz. 19: 224. 1896, nom. rej. prop.

Chamaecytisus blockianus (Pawł.) Klásk. ex Czerep. (Svod Dopolnen. Izmenen. "Flore SSSR": 254. 1975) is an endemic species of the Podolian Upland occurring in Ukraine and Moldavia (Yakovlev & al., l.c.; Kagalo, l.c.). It is very similar to *Ch. podolicus* in its morphological character, habit and distribution, differing from the latter only by its appressed hairy shoots.

It was described as *Cytisus kerneri* by Błocki (l.c. 1892) from Podolia: "Hleszczawa und Mikulińce bei Tarnopol" [Gleshchava and Mikulince, Ukraine, Ternopilska County]. Later a more detailed description of the same species, *Cytisus kerneri*, was published by him (Błocki in Allg. Bot. Z. Syst. 1: 137–138. 1895; in Oesterr. Bot. Z. 45: 304–305. 1895). Błocki's *C. kerneri* was regarded as illegitimate (as a later homonym) by several, later authors, since the same name, attributed to Kanitz, was published in three places much earlier than Błocki's description. The first two were in 1865 (in Hunfalvy, Magyar Birodalom Term. Viszonyainak Leirása 3: 670 & 671 and 711 & 715. 1865), and the third in 1866 (in Mueggenburg & al. in Verh. K.K. Zool.-Bot. Ges. Wien 16 Abh.: 160. 1866). For this reason, no fewer than three replacement names have been proposed for Błocki's *C. kerneri*. The first was *C. marilauni* Borbás (l.c.): "Ezután az újabb Cytisus Kerneri Blocki = C. Marilauni Borb. lesz" [= "from now on the name *Cytisus marilauni* Borb. is used instead of *C. kerneri* Błocki"]. The next was *C. blockianus* applied by Pawłowski (l.c.) as "C. Błockianus Pawł. (C. Kerneri Bł. nec alior)". Finally *C. blockii* was published by Kreczetowicz (l.c. 1940: 256): "C. blockii V. Krecz. nom. nov. … *C. Kerneri* Błocki in Allg. Bot. Zeitschr. 1 (1895) 137, non Schultz, Kan. et Knapp. (1866)".

Of these three new names, *C. marilauni* would have to replace *C. kerneri* Błocki, if this were indeed an illegitimate later homonym of Kanitz's supposedly validly published "*C. kerneri*". However, Kanitz's "*C. kerneri"* is not a validly published name as it was without diagnosis or description in Hunfalvy (l.c.) or in Mueggenburg & al. (l.c.). On page 670 of the former it was listed among other taxa of the hills in the Carpathian Basin and on page 711 listed in an account of the distribution of flowering plants in Hungary which at that time was practically the same as the Carpathian Basin. A footnote to the page 670 entry (on p. 671) reveals that the intention was to include all *Chamaecytisus* species (i.e., *Cytisus* sect. *Tubocytisus* sensu Kerner in Verh. K.K. Zool.-Bot. Ges. Wien 13: 327–339. 1863) at infraspecific rank under *Cytisus kerneri*, something that is also indicated by "*Tubocytisus* Kerner" being in the synonymy of "*C. kerneri*" in the 1866 publication (Mueggenburg & al., l.c.). In each of these three places, several intended new combinations appear under the same species name, with authorship indicating their implicit basionyms in the 1865 publication, but with the binomials explicitly listed in 1866. Nowhere, however, is any synonym (nor any descriptive statement) associated with the intended species name, "*C. kerneri*". A name is not validly published "by the mere mention of the subordinate taxa included in the taxon concerned" (Art. 36.1(d) of the ICN, McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012). Moreover, for a previously published

description to validate the name of a species, it must be that of a species or infraspecific taxon (Art. 38.11(c)), and so the indirect reference to the description of *C.* sect. *Tubocytisus* in the 1866 publication also cannot validate "*Cytisus kerneri* Kanitz", which was, therefore, never validly published. Consequently, *C. kerneri* Błocki is a validly published name and has priority over all three later replacement names.

Since *C. kerneri* Błocki was regarded as an illegitimate name in the past, the international botanical literature did not use it, nor was *C. marilauni* taken up. However, *Cytisus blockianus* (or recently *Chamaecytisus blockianus*) is widely used in most European or regional floristic works, handbooks and checklists (Heywood & Frodin, l.c.; Tzvelev, ll.c. 1987, 2002; Yakovlev & al., l.c.; Kagalo, l.c.; Mosyakin & Fedoronchuk, l.c.), as well as in the taxonomic papers or monographs regarding the genus *Chamaecytisus* (Skalická, l.c.; Shevera, l.c.; Cristofolini, l.c.; Cristofolini & Troia, l.c.).

Although *Cytisus kerneri* Błocki and *C. marilauni* have priority over *C. blockianus*, the last-named is very well-known and widely used in botanical scientific literature and it should be conserved to avoid further confusion retaining a consistent use.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Sergei L. Mosyakin, László Lőkös, Zoltán Barina and Nóra Krokovay for their constructive comments on the manuscript. We also thank the Doctoral School of Biology of University of Pécs for their support.

(2125) Proposal to conserve the name *Dalbergia reticulata* Merr. (Recent *Leguminosae*) against *D. reticulata* Ettingsh. (fossil *Leguminosae*)

Qi Wang

State Key Laboratory of Systematic and Evolutionary Botany, Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100093, P.R. China; happyking@ibcas.ac.cn

(2125) ***Dalbergia reticulata*** Merr. in Philipp. J. Sci., C 10: 14. 1915 [*Dicot.: Legum.*], nom. cons. prop.
Typus: Philippines, Luzon, Province of Laguna, Mount Maquiling, 20 Apr 1914, *Villamil For. Bur. 21406* (PNH; isotypus: US No. 903113).

(H) *Dalbergia reticulata* Ettingsh. in Sitzungsber. Kaiserl. Akad. Wiss., Math.-Naturwiss. Cl. 11: 813. 1854 [Foss.], nom. rej. prop.
Typus: non designatus.

Dalbergia reticulata Merr. was instituted for a scandent legume shrub with racemose inflorescences and thin, prominently reticulate pods in Mount Maquiling, Luzon, Laguna Province of the Philippines (Merrill in Philipp. J. Sci., C 10: 14. 1915). Its pod was described as "narrowly oblong, membranaceous, about 7 cm long, 1.3 to 2 cm wide, apex rounded and minutely apiculate, base somewhat decurrent and with a slender stalk about 8 mm long, all parts of the valves prominently and rather laxly reticulate; seeds one or two, central, immature". The name is, however, antedated by *D. reticulata* Ettingsh., published by Ettingshausen (in Sitzungsber. Kaiserl. Akad. Wiss., Math.-Naturwiss. Cl. 11: 813. 1854) for a middle Miocene leguminous fossil-species on the basis of a disarticulated fruit and "leaf" from Tállya, Hungary. Hence, *D. reticulata* Merr., being a later homonym, is illegitimate according to Art. 53.1 of the ICN (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012) and a new name must be conferred to it unless Merrill's name is conserved over *D. reticulata* Ettingsh. under Art. 14.

Dalbergia reticulata Ettingsh. was originally diagnosed as "legumine stipitato elliptico, utrinque obtuso, compresso plano indehiscente, obsolete reticulato, margine alato, monospermo; foliolis ovato-rotundis, integerrimis, coriaceis nervis secundariis in rete tenerrimum solutis" and was based upon two specimens (Ettingshausen, l.c., t. 4, figs. 5, 6), but no holotype was designated. In view of the diagnosis, Ettingshausen's specific epithet is etymologically derived from one of the fruit characters. Subsequently, the fruit specimen (Ettingshausen, l.c.: fig. 6) was reassigned to another legume fossil-species *Copaifera longestipitata* Kováts (in Arbeiten Geol. Ges. Ungarn 1: 51. 1856) while the leaf specimen (Ettingshausen, l.c.: fig. 5) variously to either a fern fossil-species *Salvinia reticulata* (Ettingsh.) Heer (Fl. Tert. Helv. 3: 156. 1857; Brabenec in Rozpr. České Akad. Císaře Františka Josefa Vědy, Tř. 2, Vědy Math. Přír. 13(18): 2. 1904) or other non-leguminous fossil-species such as *Phyllites reticulata* (Ettingsh.) Florin (in Bull. Mineral.-Geol. Inst. Uppsala Univ. 16: 255. 1919) and *Koelreuteria*? *reticulata* (Ettingsh.) W.N. Edwards (Edwards & Wonnacott in Jongmans, Foss. Cat. Pars Pl. 14: 39. 1928). So far, it has been widely accepted that Ettingshausen's (l.c.) leaf specimen under *D. reticulata* actually belongs to a capsular valve impression of *Koelreuteria* Laxm. in *Sapindaceae* Juss. (e.g., Brown in J. Washington Acad. Sci. 36: 350. 1946; Rásky in Paläontol. Z. 32: 184. 1958; Bůžek in Rozpr. Ústř. Ústav. Geol. 36: 84: 1971; Teodoridis in Sborn. Nár. Mus. Praze, Řada B, Přír. Vědy 57: 122. 2002; Kvaček & al., Tert. Pl. North-Bohem. Brown-coal Basin: 94. 2004). However, the identity of Ettingshausen's (l.c.) fruit specimen under *D. reticulata* is still controversial. Bůžek (l.c.: 98) later re-assigned it to *Podogonium oehningense* (Koenig) Kirchh. (= *Podocarpium podocarpum* (A. Braun) Herend., see Kvaček & Hurník in Sborn. Nár. Mus. Praze, Řada B, Přír. Vědy 56: 16. 2000; Teodoridis, l.c. 2002 & Bull. Geosci. 78: 265. 2003; Wang & al. in Acta Palaeobot. 47: 240. 2007; Wang in Taxon 57: 661. 2008), in the extinct legume fossil-genus *Podogonium* Heer 1857 (≡ *Podocarpium* A. Braun ex Stizenb. 1851, see Herendeen in Taxon 41: 734. 1992; Wang in Acta Phytotax. Sin. 44: 200. 2006; Wang & al., l.c.). The present proposer agrees with Herendeen's (in Herendeen & Dilcher, Adv. Legum. Syst. 4: 6. 1992) viewpoint that *D. reticulata* Ettingsh. apparently differs from those non-winged fruits of *Podocarpium* (1.5–2.9 × 0.6–1.0 cm) in its winged, broader fruit body (3.1 × 1.6 cm). In addition, the fruit of *D. reticulata* Ettingsh. is noticeably different from that of *D. reticulata* Merr. (ca. 7 × 1.3–2 cm) as diagnosed above, so these two homonyms are not a case similar to Art. 11 Ex. 32 (i.e., *Metasequoia* Hu & W.C. Cheng [1948] having priority over *Metasequoia* Miki [1941]),