



Generic Typification and Article 10.1 with Comments on the Typification of the Generic Names *Diamorpha*, *Leucaena*, *Odontonema*, *Picrodendron* and *Pseudolarix*

Author(s): Robert L. Wilbur

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (May, 1981), pp. 449-456

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1220145>

Accessed: 16/08/2012 05:05

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Taxon*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

**GENERIC TYPIIFICATION AND ARTICLE 10.1 WITH COMMENTS ON
THE TYPIIFICATION OF THE GENERIC NAMES *DIAMORPHA*,
LEUCAENA, *ODONTONEMA*, *PICRODENDRON*
AND *PSEUDOLARIX***

Robert L. Wilbur¹

Summary

Article 10.1 of the ICBN is discussed in reference to the typification of the generic names *Diamorpha* Nuttall (Crassulaceae), *Leucaena* Benth. (Leguminosae), *Odontonema* Nees (Acanthaceae), *Picrodendron* Planchon (Euphorbiaceae), and *Pseudolarix* Gordon (Pinaceae). It is argued that the nomenclatural type of each of these genera is the species described by their respective authors and not the binomial cited in each case in which the genus was thought to be monotypic when described or, in the case of *Leucaena*, its lectotype is the first species chosen in spite of its alleged binomial belonging to another genus.

Often nomenclatural progress seems even slower and less certain than taxonomic progress. Perhaps this is to be expected for systematists ought to be better biologists than lawyers and nomenclature is clearly more legalistic than biologic.

For about two decades the apparently straightforward requirement of Article 10.1 of the ICBN has been the subject of a surprising number of articles debating its meaning. The disputed passage is very brief and seemingly the essence of simplicity; consequently it seems a most unlikely basis for interpretational disputes. The passage reads as follows: "The type of a name of a genus . . . is a species . . ." It would certainly seem that no article would be less subject to differing interpretations than Article 10.1.

But as Nicolson (1980) has recently summarized, there are at least two viewpoints as to the meaning of "the type of a name of a genus . . . is a species." It is easier to restrict our discussion to monotypic genera although the principle is unchanged regardless of the size of the genus. The first viewpoint holds that the type of a monotypic genus must be the species whose binomial is mentioned in the original publication even though the author of the genus may have been so mistaken about the identity of the named species that the generic description would clearly exclude it "as a discordant element." The second viewpoint contends that the type of a seemingly monotypic genus is the species delimited in the generic description regardless of the binomial attached to that species. Nicolson puts it succinctly: in the first instance the type is the species named and not the species described, and in the second the type is the species described and not the species whose binomial is mentioned.

Possibly the all-time champion in nomenclatural disputes involving Article 10.1 is the series of papers surrounding the proper nomenclature for the Golden Larch of China, *Pseudolarix amabilis* (Nelson) Rehder or *Chrysolarix amabilis* (Nelson) H. E. Moore. Even a partial listing of the literature dealing with this topic is awesome and there is no certainty that we have heard the last of it: Moore (1965, 1966, 1973),

¹ Department of Botany, Duke University, Durham, NC 27706, U.S.A. This paper was written while the author was engaged in research supported by NSF Grant DEB-76-10185.

Bullock and Hunt (1966), Bullock (1966), McVaugh (1968), Hara (1977), Tjaden (1980), Hara and Brummitt (1980) and Nicolson (1980a). After fifteen years of being harangued, most readers of the debate are unable to state what the nomenclaturally proper name of this monotypic Chinese tree might be and no reader not a member of the ad hoc committee can predict what direction their deliberations have taken them and consequently what the type of *Pseudolarix* will officially be stated to be.

In a similar case, that of *Odontonema* (Acanthaceae), Nicolson (1980b) strongly suggests that no decision be made now, leaving the question "until the Sydney Congress (1981) deals with whatever proposals are made by the Committee on Generic Names." Actually I suspect that an unbiased reader of that seemingly never-to-be-ended *Pseudolarix-Chrysolarix* debate would conclude that the analysis presented by Bullock and Hunt (1966) was the clearest exposition of the matter yet offered and if followed consistently would satisfactorily resolve this and all similar problems in a simple, straightforward manner permitting future botanists to spend the maximum amount of time upon biological investigations and a minimum upon the legalistic chores that we obviously so badly handle. I strongly recommend Bullock and Hunt's interpretation to the Committee on Generic Names: "It is clear that the typification of a generic name is to be sought amongst the species available to and examined by the author of the name, whether or not those species were correctly identified" McVaugh (1968) proposed that "the type of the generic name" is the species of which the author had specimens on hand when preparing the protologue. The fact that the species had not yet been described botanically is irrelevant."

Nicolson (1980b) has pointed out that the alleged disadvantage of typifying the genus by the species actually described rather than by the species mentioned is that such an approach "requires taxonomic judgment on the taxon circumscribed, as well as the intention of the author, creating potential disagreement over the species actually described and leaving the lectotypification open to subsequent challenge." The spectre of such a threat should, upon reflection by those who have followed the controversy surrounding such cases as *Diamorpha*, *Leucaena*, *Odontonema*, *Picrodendron* or *Pseudolarix*, prove most bearable; in all of these cases both the "taxonomic judgment on the taxon circumscribed" and "the intention of the author" have been abundantly clear while the controversy has centered completely upon the uncertainty of nomenclatural legalisms. Certainly one of the great goals of the ICBN is to provide botanists with regulations which will lead to nomenclatural stability.

Diamorpha

As pointed out by Wilbur (1977) the monotypic genus *Diamorpha* Nuttall is an excellent example of the continuing turmoil caused by the unsettled questions revolving about the proper typification of those genera in which the basionym of the only binomial mentioned turned out to be different from the species described. Michaux collected an undescribed species of *Sedum* on the flat, granitic outcrops north of Camden, South Carolina in April, 1795. This discovery was described as *Sedum pusillum* Michaux (1803). Nuttall visited the same locality in late 1816 or very early 1817 and collected withered and dead fruiting material of what he took to be Michaux's species. His specimens were incomplete but appeared to be the same as Michaux's brief description and Nuttall considered it to be the same. He was, however, convinced that the structure of the fruits of his plant (which he mistakenly thought was the same as Michaux's *Sedum pusillum*) was so strikingly different from those of all known species of *Sedum* L., and indeed unlike those of any member of the Crassulaceae known to him, that his species most clearly could not be a member of that genus. Nuttall (1818) first placed the species in the genus *Tillaea* L. but as he progressed in his study of the North American flora, he concluded that the plant was so distinctive that it merited generic recognition. The

unique feature that makes mandatory the recognition of a separate genus is found in the fruit that was well represented in Nuttall's winter collection. Still it is certain that Nuttall derived part of his description from Michaux's account. Nuttall included information from the flowers such as the color of the petals which could only have come from Michaux, since Nuttall's plants were collected in winter and only Michaux, whose very different species was thought to be identical by Nuttall, had at that time obtained flowers of either species. All other botanists thereafter confounded the two species until Asa Gray (1876) demonstrated their distinctness, having observed them both in the field in the spring of 1875 in flower.

Although Nuttall's own collection played the largest role in his reaching the conclusion that the plant he had was a new genus, it is apparent that part of his account is attributable to Michaux's publication; in fact Michaux's observations of the flower of *Sedum pusillum* are formally quoted by Nuttall in his description of *Tillaea cymosa*. Nuttall first (p. 110) called what he presumed was a single species, although he actually was dealing with two species, *Tillaea cymosa* Nutt. placing *Sedum pusillum* Michx. in synonymy. It should be noted in passing that the type of *Tillaea cymosa* Nutt. is the same as that of *Sedum pusillum* (Article 7.9). On a later page (p. 293), although both names appeared simultaneously, Nuttall published the supposedly monotypic genus *Diamorpha* and made the combination *Diamorpha pusilla* (Michx.) Nutt., again supposing that his collection and that described by Michaux belonged to the same species. There can be no question but that the types of *Diamorpha pusilla* and *Sedum pusillum* are identical. The only binomial originally published in the genus *Diamorpha* was *D. pusilla* whose type is *Sedum pusillum*, which clearly is a member of the genus *Sedum* with a fruit completely unlike that of the genus *Diamorpha* which was so emphatically stressed by Nuttall in establishing the genus. Surely, though, it would be folly for anyone to consider that the type of the genus *Diamorpha*, so clearly based upon plants with fruits dehiscent by a dorsal flap on each carpel as emphasized by Nuttall in his original account, is *Diamorpha pusilla* (Michx.) Nuttall, a species dehiscent along the ventral suture. The type of the genus *Diamorpha* is Nuttall's species with the unique dorsal dehiscence which did not receive a valid binomial in the original publication, since it was confounded with Michaux's species by Nuttall and thereafter by all other authors until Asa Gray clearly differentiated the two species in the field in 1875. The *Index Nominum Genericorum* (Farr et al., 1979) statement that the type of the genus *Diamorpha* Nutt. is *D. pusilla* (A. Michaux) Nuttall should be considered, in my opinion, an error. The type of Nuttall's genus is a species which did not receive a valid name for nearly a century after the genus was described. The type of the genus *Diamorpha* Nutt. is *Diamorpha pusilla* in the sense of Nuttall but not of the basionym *Sedum pusillum* Michx.: *Diamorpha pusilla* sensu Nutt. = *Diamorpha smallii* Britton. To follow *Index Nominum Genericorum* and to accept *Diamorpha pusilla* (Michaux) Nuttall as the type of *Diamorpha* Nutt. would be to make *Diamorpha* Nuttall a synonym of *Sedum* L. and to ignore the emphasis that Nuttall made of the unique dehiscence of the fruit of the genus he called *Diamorpha* which so sharply contrasted with that of *Sedum*. Nuttall was mistaken in assuming that his plant and that described by Michaux were the same; he was not mistaken in claiming that the plants which he had collected were generically distinct from the genus *Sedum*. To ignore Nuttall's botanical insight and to typify the genus which he so clearly delineated on its unique fruiting characteristics by a species known to him only by its brief and incomplete original diagnosis of flowering material—and which turns out to be completely at variance with the stated features of his genus—would certainly be the result of an arbitrary, mechanical and insensitive system of nomenclature. It is to be hoped that the Committee on Generic Names will not saddle botany with so arbitrary a system as to mandate the typification of such genera by the species whose binomial was mistakenly mentioned rather than by the species whose features were so clearly delineated by the author of the genus.

Leucaena

The lectotype of the mimosaceous genus *Leucaena* Benth. has been the subject of debate since Williams (1964) opened the discussion. DeWit (1961) convincingly demonstrated that *Mimosa glauca* L., basionym of the widespread tropical shrub long known as *Leucaena glauca*, is actually a species of *Acacia*. Linnaeus himself initiated the confusion for, as shown by deWit, he completely changed his concept from a polyandrous *Acacia* in 1753 to the decandrous shrub, currently placed in *Leucaena*, by 1763. Willdenow (Sp. Pl. 4(2): 1075. 1806) based his combination *Acacia glauca* on the later usage of Linnaeus. Bentham (Jour. Bot. Hook. 4: 416. 1842) in proposing *Leucaena* included four species of which *L. glauca* doubtlessly the best known, was listed first and was most fully treated. Bentham made no reference to Linnaeus' *Mimosa glauca*, citing "*Acacia glauca*, Willd." in synonymy. Naturally no type was designated by Bentham since the type concept was the product of a later era. Britton and Shafer (1908, p. 526) first designated *Leucaena glauca* (L.) Benth. as the "type species" (=lectotype) while Britton and Rose (N. Am. Fl. 23: 121. 1928) confirmed the same choice in stating the type to be *Mimosa glauca* L.

Williams (1964) pointed out the undesirability of typifying *Leucaena* by *Mimosa glauca* L., for it would then "become a generic synonym of *Mimosa*." (Actually if Williams' reasoning were correct, *Leucaena* would become a synonym of *Acacia*.) Therefore Williams chose *L. diversifolia* (Schlecht.) Benth. as a more appropriate lectotype.

Wilbur (1965) pointed out that Art. 10 of the ICBN stated that "the nomenclatural type of the genus . . . is a species" and not a specimen. As a consequence, the species best known to Bentham and the species first chosen as its "type" should be retained as its lectotype: *Leucaena glauca* sensu Benth. = *Leucaena leucocephala* (Lam.) deWit. The type of a genus should remain the same species regardless of the binomial applied to that species. Bullock and Hunt (1966) confirmed this nomenclatural reasoning in an aside.

Isely (Castanea 35: 253-254. 1970) challenged this conclusion since "*Leucaena glauca* sensu Benth. is but a ghost; it has no nomenclatural existence" and that, although the nomenclatural type of a genus is a species and not a specimen, the type species "must be typified by a specimen—or exceptionally a plate." It would not seem to me either necessary as claimed by Isely or desirable "to establish some kind of pseudotype" for Bentham's concept of *Leucaena glauca*; there has never been the slightest doubt as to the species Bentham was describing, although there have been too many papers written on how that "species" should be typified and what the lectotype of the genus should be. Isely (1973, p. 143) reaffirmed his conviction that Williams' interpretation of the Code in this matter was correct. Elias (Jour. Arnold Arboretum 55: 78. 1974) in the enviably succinct and eminently useful series comprising a Generic Flora of the Southeastern United States agreed with Wilbur (1965) and Bullock and Hunt (1966) that the lectotype of *Leucaena* is *L. glauca* sensu Benth. = *L. leucocephala* (Lam.) de Wit and specifically rejected the Williams (1964) and Isely (1970 and 1973) conclusion noting that "It is the species that Bentham had (not the name of that species) that is the type of the name *Leucaena*. There is no question about the identity of the species; he merely had the wrong name for it."

Since the above cited papers were published, an added complexity has been introduced by Gillis and Stearn (1974), who claim that the first binomial given to the plant which has long been treated as the lectotype of Bentham's *Leucaena* was *Mimosa latisiliqua* L. and consequently made the transfer *Leucaena latisiliqua* (L.) Gillis. If correct in their analysis, this last mentioned binomial would have priority over *Leucaena leucocephala* (Lam.) deWit and hence be the valid name for the lectotype of the genus *Leucaena*: *Acacia glauca* sensu Willd. = *Leucaena glauca* sensu Benth. However, deWit (1975) refuted the argument of Gillis and Stearn (1974)

and I am persuaded by his presentation that the correct name for the species is *Leucaena leucocephala* (Lam.) deWit.

It must be admitted that either no harm or only minimal damage would be done to our nomenclatural principles if Williams' (1964) proposal to lectotypify the genus *Leucaena* were to be adopted. Other than the fact that what was long known as *Leucaena glauca* was probably the most widely distributed and hence in all likelihood the species best known to Bentham, the designation of *Leucaena glauca* as the lectotype of *Leucaena* got off to a rather dubious start since it was first selected by Britton and Shafer (1908) under the discredited provisions of the American Code of Botanical Nomenclature (1907). Article 8 of the ICBN indicates that the designated lectotypes chosen under the guidelines of the American Code are to be considered arbitrary selections and hence "may be" superseded. A firmer ruling on the status under the ICBN of these so-called lectotypes chosen under the provisions of the American Code is desirable and it seems unfortunate that that marvelous bibliographic and nomenclatural tool, the *Index Nominum Genericorum*, so often relies upon the choices made under those American Code provisions so often greatly at variance with those accepted today. However, in the case of *Leucaena* Benth., ING has been exceedingly cautious stating merely that the type was "*non designatus*."

Still, until some more definitive ruling is made upon the acceptability of these lectotypes inspired by the provisions of the American Code, it would seem only appropriate to continue accepting the species best known to Bentham as the lectotype of the genus *Leucaena*. It would still seem to me a most dubious precedent to accept the reasoning of Williams (1964) or Isely (1970 and 1973) to disqualify *Leucaena glauca* sensu Bentham as the lectotype of the genus *Leucaena*.

Odontonema

The acanthaceous genus *Odontonema* Nees ex Endlicher of 1842 has recently been proposed by Baum and Reveal (1980) as a rejected name to be replaced by *Odontonema* Nees ex Kuntze of 1891 in a case revolving about the same nomenclatural question: Is the type of the genus the species whose binomial is mentioned even if the characters of that named species are in complete variance with the generic description or, on the contrary, is the generic type the species described and to which the name of another species may have been attached by mistake?

Nees based his detailed description of the genus *Odontonema* upon a specimen apparently grown at the Berlin Botanical Garden under the name *Justicia lucida* Andr. but whose true identity, as shown by the description, was *Justicia bracteolata* Jacq. The detailed description of the anthers in both of Nees' accounts of *Odontonema* published in 1842 clearly indicate that the species described could not be a member of the genus *Justicia* L. *Justicia lucida* Andr. is a true *Justicia* now thought to be a synonym of the earlier *J. secunda* Vahl. Therefore, it could not have been the plant so carefully described by Nees. In spite of this fact, some botanists, including Baum and Reveal (1980), would claim that "the type of *Odontonema* Nees ex Endlicher is *J. lucida* Andr." although the species described was clearly *Justicia bracteolata* Jacq.

Baum and Reveal argue that "because the type of *Odontonema* Nees ex Endlicher was specifically implied to be *Justicia lucida* the typification must be overturned, and in its place substituted the actual plant Nees was describing." Obviously the concept of type was unknown to Nees as it was to all workers of that period. Baum and Reveal are attempting to impose their belief that the type of the generic name must be the binomial mentioned and not the species described. Just as in the case of *Diamorpha* such a procedure might well appeal to those who wish to turn such nomenclatural chores over to a systematically naive group of clerks, but it certainly will not appeal to those who find part of their pleasure in systematics in the inter-

pretation and understanding of their predecessors' endeavors. I hasten to state that the previous comment is not meant to impugn the systematic understanding of Baum and Reveal, for their outline of the taxonomic facts is clear; I merely disagree with their conclusion. As in the case of *Diamorpha* it would seem that the type of the genus *Odontonema* should be the species that Nees described regardless of the binomial erroneously applied to that species. The type of the genus *Odontonema* Nees ex Endlicher is therefore *Justicia lucida* sensu Nees, non Andrews = *Justicia bracteolata* Jacq. The proposed rejection of *Odontonema* Nees ex Endlicher and its replacement by conserving *Odontonema* Nees ex Kuntze as proposed by Baum and Reveal seems not only unnecessary but even worse; it shifts our nomenclatural procedures into new channels which, if sanctioned by the Sydney Botanical Congress, will result in a considerable nomenclatural upheaval and an almost limitless number of papers as we adjust to the new, but certainly not improved, manner of typification. After all, as Baum and Reveal clearly outline, the fact that *Justicia lucida* Andr. was not a member of the genus *Odontonema* was discovered almost at once and has been known by all serious students of the group since that time. Their mental adjustment has been that outlined by Baum and Reveal: "Kuntze did indicate, however, that the type of *Odontonema* was *Justicia lucida* Hort. but this he equated to *Thyracanthus bracteolatus*, and in turn created a new combination, *O. bracteolatum*." This has, I believe, been botanical practice until very recently; there has been advanced no reason why we should now change.

In an editorial note appended to Baum and Reveal's proposal, Nicolson (1980b) points out that there are two schools of nomenclaturists which interpret differently the ICBN (Art. 10.1). . . . One school . . . considers that the type of *Odontonema* must be the species named, *J. lucida* Andr. . . . The other school would argue that *Odontonema* is not monotypic since two species are involved in the circumscription, one named but not described (*J. lucida* Andr.) and one described but not named (*J. bracteolata*). Workers using this approach can argue that this is a lectotype situation and that one must select the species which corresponds most nearly with the original description." There seems to be at least three interpretations, the two outlined by Nicolson and the one advocated here.

Picrodendron

In a similar case of generic typification, Hayden and Reveal (1980) argue that the probably monotypic genus *Picrodendron* Planchon in their opinion must be considered a synonym of *Allophylus* L. (Sapindaceae) in spite of the fact that Planchon's "accurate description and citation of an authentic specimen of *Picrodendron*" all point conclusively to the endemic West Indian genus and most assuredly exclude the genus *Allophylus*. In their opinion the fact that Planchon mistakenly included a reference to "*Rhus arborea*, DC., p. 73; MacFadyen, fl. of Jam. In montibus *Jamaicae*, MacFadyen, in herb. Hook." and based the binomial *P. arboreum* upon it, made the species described by Miller the type of the genus. MacFadyen's specimen is reported by Hayden and Reveal to be a representative of the genus *Picrodendron* but "an examination of Miller's specimen upon which he based *Toxicodendron arboreum* . . . and a specimen labelled *Rhus arborea* in the deCandolle collection . . . shows both to be *Allophylus cobbe* (L.) Raeusch . . . and not *Picrodendron*." Hence there can be no question but that the basionym of the binomial that became *Picrodendron arboreum* (Miller) Planch. is an *Allophylus* but again it would seem that the type of the genus is and should be the species described and not the species whose binomial was mistakenly thought to be the same as the species described. McVaugh's suggested clarifying example of Article 10.1 (1968) was that the type of the generic name should be "the species of which the author had specimens in hand when preparing the protologue" is imminently applicable and its incorporation into the Code would maintain nomenclatural stability but eliminate the innumerable changes or proposals to avoid change which the opposite interpre-

tation advanced in the past decade would necessitate. The type of *Picrodendron* Planchon is *P. arboreum* sensu Planchon whose earliest synonym is *Picrodendron baccatum* (L.) Krug & Urban.

The reason that the conservation of *Picrodendron* Grisebach and the rejection of *Picrodendron* Planchon as proposed by Hayden and Reveal (1980) should not be approved is not that the suggested conservation is so "overwhelmingly difficult that it cannot be done" but that there is no reason to do so. To suggest that Planchon was describing a member of the Sapindaceae in proposing with a detailed description the genus *Picrodendron* is nonsense and our Botanical Code does not now nor should it in the future require botanists to concoct such fiction. The added example in the Botanical Code suggested by McVaugh (1968) is not a modification but an illustration to prevent the misinterpretation of the Code that leads to such modifications in botanical practice as offered by Hayden and Reveal (1980) in proposing the rejection of names such as *Picrodendron* Planchon.

Pseudolarix

It seems neither desirable nor necessary to review the case of *Pseudolarix* Gordon vs. *Chrysolarix* H. E. Moore since it has been repeatedly discussed in the literature over the past fifteen years: e.g. Moore (1965, 1966, 1973), Bullock and Hunt (1965), Bullock (1966), McVaugh (1968), Hara (1977), Tjaden (1980), Hara and Brummitt (1980), and Nicolson (1980a). The essence of the case is that *Pseudolarix* was originally described as a new genus whose characteristics were derived from Chinese specimens of the, at that time, unnamed Golden Larch although the only binomial mentioned by Gordon was that of the Japanese Larch, *Larix kaempferi* (Lambert) Carrière, that was then so inadequately described that Gordon thought it to be conspecific.

Moore (1965) at first concluded that *Pseudolarix* was a later synonym of *Larix* since "the type-species of *Pseudolarix* is *Pseudolarix kaempferi*, based nomenclaturally on *Pinus kaempferi* Lambert, and *Pseudolarix* must be interpreted in this light and no other." The Japanese Larch, *Pinus kaempferi*, is now considered a member of the genus *Larix*, *L. kaempferi*. This conclusion has been heatedly debated over the past fifteen years and many, if not most commentaries, have supported Bullock and Hunt's view that the "specific name *Pseudolarix kaempferi* (Lambert) Gordon is a nomenclatural synonym of *Larix kaempferi* (Lambert) Carr. (the Japanese Larch); the latter, however, is most certainly not the type species of the generic name of *Pseudolarix* Gordon, which is the species Gordon described, that is to say the Golden Larch, about whose identity there is no dispute." McVaugh (1968) proposed this as an example to be appended to Article 10 "the type of the generic name *Pseudolarix* . . . is the species of which the author had specimens in hand when preparing the protologue. The fact that the species had not yet been described botanically is irrelevant."

Florin is credited with preparing the treatment for the gymnosperms for the *Index Nominum Genericorum* (Farr et al., 1979) which appeared fourteen years after his death. The type of *Pseudolarix* is there stated to be *P. kaempferi* (Lambert) G. Gordon and the reader is advised to consult Moore (1965). No indication is given to the numerous other more recent papers that bear upon the subject and no hint that Moore (1973) has reached a new, if no more viable, conclusion. It is to be hoped that the ad hoc Committee on Typification of Generic Names will not be overly influenced by the conclusions reached by the compilers of the ING.

References

- American Code Botanical Nomenclature. 1907. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club* 34: 167-178.
Baum, V. M. and J. L. Reveal. 1980. Proposal to conserve *Odontonema* Nees ex Kuntze

- (1891) (Acanthaceae) with the type species *Justicia bracteolata* Jacq. against *Odontonema* Nees ex Endlicher (1842) with the type species *Justicia lucida* Andr. *Taxon* 29: 334–337.
- Britton, N. L. and J. A. Shafer. 1908. *North American Trees*. Holt. New York.
- Bullock, A. A. 1966. Postscript: In defense of *Pseudolarix*. *Taxon* 15: 264.
- and D. R. Hunt. 1966. The generic name of the Golden Larch. *Taxon* 15: 240–241.
- Farr, E. R., J. A. Leussink and F. A. Stafleu (Editors). 1979. *Index Nominum Genericorum*. 3 vols. W. Junk. The Hague, Netherlands.
- Gillis, W. T. and W. T. Stearn. 1974. Typification of the names of the species of *Leucaena* and *Lysiloma* in the Bahamas. *Taxon* 23: 185–191.
- Gray, Asa. 1876. Miscellaneous Botanical Contributions. *Proc. Amer. Acad.* 11: 71–72.
- Hara, Hiroshi. 1977. Nomenclatural notes on some Asiatic plants with special reference to Kaempfer's *Amoenitatum Exoticarum*. *Taxon* 26: 584–587.
- and R. K. Brummitt. 1980. The problem of *Pseudolarix kaempferi*: type method or circumscription method? *Taxon* 29: 315–317.
- Hayden, W. John and J. L. Reveal. 1980. Proposal for the conservation of the generic name *Picrodendron* Grisebach (1859) against *Picrodendron* Planchon (1846) (Euphorbiaceae). *Taxon* 29: 507–511.
- Isely, Duane. 1970. Legumes of the United States. V. *Albizia*, *Lysiloma*, *Leucaena*, *Adeanthera* and rejected genera of the Mimosoideae. *Castanea* 35: 244–260.
- McVaugh, Rogers. 1968. Proposal to add to Article 10. *Taxon* 17: 460.
- Michaux, A. 1803. *Flora boreali-americana* 1: 276.
- Moore, H. E. 1965. *Chrysolarix*, a new name for the Golden Larch. *Baileya* 13: 131–134.
- . 1966. In defense of *Chrysolarix*. *Taxon* 15: 258–264.
- . 1973. *Chrysolarix* renounced—A comedy of restoration. *Taxon* 22: 587–589.
- Nicolson, D. H. 1980a. Point of view on *Pseudolarix*. *Taxon* 29: 318.
- . 1980b. Editorial Note. *Taxon* 29: 337.
- Nuttall, T. 1818. *The genera of North American plants*. 1: pages 110 and 293.
- Tjaden, W. L. 1980. The Chinese Golden Larch. *Taxon* 29: 314–315.
- Wilbur, R. L. 1965. The lectotype of the mimosaceae genus *Leucaena* Benth. *Taxon* 14: 246.
- . 1977. Nomenclatural notes on the genus *Diamorpha* (Crassulaceae). *Taxon* 26: 137–140.
- Williams, L. O. 1967. A lectotype for the genus *Leucaena* Benth. *Taxon* 13: 300.
- de Wit, H. D. C. 1961. Typification and correct names of *Acacia villosa* Willd. and *Leucaena glauca* (L.) Bth. *Taxon* 10: 50–54.
- . 1975. Typification of *Leucaena leucocephala* (Lam.) de Wit, *Lysiloma latisiliquum* (L.) Bth., and *Acacia glauca* (L.) Moench. *Taxon* 24: 349–352.