

“*C. oblongifolia* Mutis” as nomina nuda “in Periodico de Santa Fe (1793) 465”, and *C. ovalifolia* as published by both Humboldt (l.c.: 118) and Mutis (l.c.). It appears to have been generally overlooked that, if not validly published by Mutis in 1793, then all four names were validly published by his student Francisco Antonio Zea (in *Anales Hist. Nat.* 2: 196–235. 1800), but all as superfluous and illegitimate names, since under each was cited one or more earlier names that ought to have been adopted.

If these four *Cinchona* species are not accepted as validly published by Mutis in 1793, then the names of two of the four species involved would have to be changed. The currently accepted names, *C. pubescens* Vahl (in *Skr. Naturhist.-Selsk.* 1: 19. 1790) for the taxon to which *C. cordifolia* Mutis [ex Zea, l.c.: 214] applies (Andersson, l.c. 1998: 30) and *Ladenbergia macrocarpa* (Vahl) Klotzsch, based on *C. macrocarpa* Vahl (l.c.: 20), for the taxon to which *C. ovalifolia* Mutis [ex Zea, l.c. 207] applies (Andersson, l.c. 1997: 288) would remain unchanged. However, *C. lancifolia* Mutis has no alternative name, as its only synonym (Andersson,

l.c. 1998: 38–39), *C. angustifolia* Ruiz & Pav. (Supl. *Quinologia*: 14. 1801), which would otherwise be a superfluous name for *C. lancifolia* Mutis, cited as a synonym by Ruiz and Pavón, is also a later homonym of *C. angustifolia* Sw. (in *Kongl. Svenska Vetensk. Acad. Handl.*, ser. 2, 8: 119. 1787). Moreover, if *C. lancifolia* Mutis is not validly published, *C. lancifolia* Mutis ex Zea (l.c.: 207) would be a superfluous name for *C. officinalis* L. (1753), precluding any later legitimate adoption of the binomial. *Ladenbergia oblongifolia* (Mutis) L. Andersson (l.c. 1994: 19), based on *C. oblongifolia* Mutis [ex Zea, l.c.: 211], which has been generally accepted since published by Andersson in 1994, would need to be replaced by the name previously accepted for this taxon, *L. magnifolia* (Ruiz. & Pav.) Klotzsch, based on *C. magnifolia* Ruiz & Pav. (*Fl. Peruv.* 2: 53. 1799).

Author information

JHK, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5461-1961>

JHW, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9383-2807>

(85) Request for a binding decision on whether *Argostemma* Wall. (*Rubiaceae*) and *Agrostemma* L. (*Caryophyllaceae*) are sufficiently alike to be confused

Duilio Iamónico 

Phytogeography and Applied Geobotany, Department PDTA, University of Rome Sapienza, 00196 Rome, Italy

Address for correspondence: *Duilio Iamónico, d.iamonico@yahoo.it*

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12116>

(85) *Argostemma* Wall. (1824) [Angiosp.: *Rub.*]
Agrostemma L. (1753) [Angiosp.: *Caryophyll.*]

Argostemma Wall.

The genus *Argostemma* (*Rubiaceae*) was validly published by Wallich (in *Roxburgh, Fl. Ind.* 2: 324. 1824) to accommodate four species, three from Nepal (*Ar. pictum* Wall., *Ar. rostratum* Wall., and *Ar. sarmentosum* Wall.) and one from Malaysia (*Ar. verticillatum* Wall.). *Argostemma* currently includes ca. 100 species distributed in the Old World tropics (particularly Southeast Asia, but with a few species in West Africa) (see, e.g., Robbrecht in *Opera Bot. Belg.* 1: 13–271. 1988; Lanorsavanh & Chantaranonthai in *Thai J. Bot.* 5: 21–25. 2013).

The first typification of *Argostemma* was made by Pfeiffer (*Nomencl. Bot.* 1: 262. 1873) who designated *Ar. sarmentosum* Wall. as the original type.

Wallich (l.c.), who described the “snow-white flowers” as “largish with respect to the size of the plant”, did not provide any explicit statement on the derivation of the name, but it appears to be from the Greek *argos* (ἀργος), “shining”, “bright” and *stemma* (στέμμα) “crown”,

“garland”, or “wreath”, presumably referring to the inflorescence (cf. Quattrocchi, *CRC World Dict. Pl. Names*: 192. 1999).

Agrostemma L.

The genus *Agrostemma* was published by Linnaeus (*Sp. Pl.*: 435–436. 1753) in the first edition of his *Species plantarum*, where the following four species were listed: *Ag. githago* L., *Ag. caeli-rosa* L. (≡ *Eudiathe caeli-rosa* (L.) Endl.), *Ag. coronaria* L. (≡ *Lychnis coronaria* (L.) Desr.), and *Ag. flos-jovis* L. (≡ *Lychnis flos-jovis* (L.) Desr.). *Agrostemma* was first typified by Britton & Brown (*Ill. Fl. N. U.S.*, ed. 2, 2: 61. 7 Jun 1913); this was affirmed by Green (in *Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.*: 156. Aug 1929) (cf. Art. 10.5 of the *ICN*—Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018). In current treatments of the *Caryophyllaceae*, only *Ag. githago* of Linnaeus’s species is retained in the genus (Oxelman & Liden in *Taxon* 44: 525–542. 1995; Oxelman & al. in *Pl. Syst. Evol.* 206: 393–410. 1997, in *Nordic J. Bot.* 20: 743–748. 2001).

Agrostemma currently includes 2–3 species, widely distributed as agricultural weeds, probably native to the Mediterranean region and Eurasia, and naturalized in the Americas (see, e.g., Hernández-Ledesma & al. in *Willdenowia* 45: 281–383. 2015).

The name *Agrostemma* was coined by Linnaeus on analogy with *Coronaria* and is derived from *agros* (ἀγρός), “field”, and *stemma* (στέμμα), “crown”, “garland”, or “wreath” (Graebner in Ascherson & Graebner, Syn. Mitteleur. Fl. 5(2): 3. 1913; cf. also Quattrocchi, l.c.: 72).

Conclusion

I am requesting a binding decision under the Art. 53.2 of the *ICN* as to whether *Agrostemma* L. and *Argostemma* Wall. are sufficiently alike to be confused and thus should be treated as homonyms.

On the basis of a careful check of literature, I noted that this confusion already exists and several authors used the two generic names erroneously. For example, Hecker (in Biochem. Physiol. Pflanzen 166: 461–467. 1974), in their research on *Agrostemma githago* RNA, reported in Material and Methods “*Argostemma*” when *Agrostemma* was clearly intended. Das (in Pandey, Taxon. Biodivers.: 122. 1995) listed “*Agrostemma sarmentosa*” (instead of *Argostemma*

sarmentosa) among the herbs of his *Flora of Darjeeling hills*. Das & Rahman (in Bangladesh J. Bot. 39: 215–222. 2010) in their “Note on Rubiaceae” recorded for the first time *Argostemma sarmentosum* in Bangladesh, but in the caption of “Fig. 1” (page 216) reported “Fig. 1. *Agrostemma sarmentosum* Wall.” Lanorsavanh & Chantarnothai (l.c.), in their paper entitled “Two new records of *Argostemma* Wall. (Rubiaceae) for Laos”, listed “*Agrostemma*” among the keywords. Van der Ent & Reeves (in Pl. & Soil 389: 104–418. 2015) reported in their Table 4 “*Agrostemma* cf. *hameliifolium*” instead of *Argostemma* cf. *hameliifolium* as indicated just one page before.

All things considered, I believe that is necessary to treat the names *Agrostemma* and *Argostemma* as homonyms.

Author Information

DI, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5491-7568>