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Proposal to reject *Festuca elatior* L. with comments on the typification of *F. pratensis* and *F. arundinacea* (Poaceae)


*Festuca elatior* L. (Poaceae) has long been regarded as a *nomen ambiguum* or a confused name because the Linnaean *nomen specificum legitimum* was established on two discordant elements. This matter has been repeatedly discussed (Hylander, 1945; Dandy, 1958a; Terrell, 1967; Linder, 1986; Scholz, 1987) and most authors have concurred that *F. elatior* should be abandoned. Typification of *F. elatior* was indirectly accomplished by Terrell (1967: 131) who executed an effective Art. 8.3 (Greuter & al., 1988) lectotypification of the name on a specimen in the Linnaean Herbarium (92.17, LINN!). Although the validity of such post-1953 lecto- and neotypifications might be challenged, Linder (1986: 59) explicitly lectotypified the name on the same specimen so that the type is now fixed. The specimen in the Linnaean Herbarium is representative of what is now routinely called *Festuca arundinacea* Schreber (1771: 57). The Linnaean name, *Festuca elatior*, has been variously interpreted (Terrell, 1967), with its application by some authors to the tall fescue, *F. arundinacea*, and by others to the meadow fescue, *F. pratensis* Hudson (1762: 37). In North America, for example, *F. elatior* was applied to the meadow fescue, but in Europe and Asia *F. pratensis* has been applied. Most, if not all of the recent European literature has consistently used *F. pratensis* for the meadow fescue (e.g., Clapham & al., 1987) and maintained *F. arundinacea* for the tall fescue without adopting the earlier Linnaean epithet as typified. Given the long tradition of *Festuca elatior* as an ambiguous name (Hylander, 1945; Dandy, 1958a), which the present Code (Greuter & al., 1988) does not permit and previous codes have not since the Leningrad Code (Stafleu & al., 1978), little would be gained and much lost in terms of nomenclatural stability if *F. elatior* was allowed to assert its rightful priority over *F. arundinacea*. Accordingly, we urge that our proposal to reject *F. elatior* L. be accepted.

Typification of *Festuca pratensis* Hudson

When Hudson (1762) proposed *Festuca pratensis* he cited a polynomial, ‘Gramen paniculatum elatius, spicis longis muticis et squamosis’, that appeared in the third edition of Ray’s ‘Synopsis’ (Ray, 1724) edited by Dillenius. According to Dandy (1958b: 103), Hudson used the folio volumes of dried plants arranged by Adam Buddle now in the Sloane Herbarium to ascertain the identity of British plants named in the ‘Synopsis’. Stafleu & Cowan (1979: 354) indicated that the extant specimens “collected by or identified by Hudson now in various herbaria (BM, CGE, E, K, LINN, UPS, in herb. Thunberg) are probably not those on which Hudson’s original descriptions were based.” Although no specific specimens were cited by Hudson, there are conceivably a number of dried specimens that can be termed ‘authentic material’. Accordingly, we lectotypify *F. pratensis* on the Buddle specimen seen by Hudson in the Sloane Herbarium and annotated with the Ray polynomial: *Festuca pratensis* Hudson, Fl. Anglica 37. 1762. LT.: H.S. 125.16 (BM-SL).

Typification of *Festuca arundinacea* Schreber

In describing *Festuca arundinacea*, Schreber (1771: 57) took his polynomial directly from Gmelin (1747: 111) and cited Scheuchzer (1719: 266) in synonymy. We have not
been able to locate any authentic material at Munich where Schreber’s herbarium is now maintained (or at BM, K, ER or PH) nor have we located any authentic Gmelin material among the items acquired by him. When Gmelin proposed ‘Poa panicula spicata, stricta, spicis oblongis, erectis, paucifloris, saepe aristatis’, he cited as his synonym Scheuchzer’s ‘Gramen arundinaceum, locustis viridi-spadiceis, loliaceis, brevius aristatis’. Fortunately, the latter is illustrated. This illustration is remarkably good as it even shows the short awns that distinguish \( F. \) \textit{arundinacea} from the typically muticous \( F. \) \textit{pratensis}. We hereby typify Schreber’s name accordingly:


We have been unable to locate a “typotype” (Stearn, 1957). As here typified, \textit{Festuca arundinacea} is taxonomically identical to the earlier \textit{F. elatior}, and if the latter name is not rejected as proposed here, the Linnaean binomial would have priority over Schreber’s name.

\section*{Acknowledgements}

We thank S. J. Darbyshire (DAO) for pointing out this problem and calling for a solution and F. R. Barrie (BM/MO) for assisting us in obtaining a photograph of the Hudson lectotype. D. H. Nicolson and J. H. Kirkbride kindly reviewed and commented on the manuscript. The study of early temperate North American types of vascular plants by Reveal is part of the Linnaean Plant Name Typification Project and is supported by National Science Foundation Grant BSR-8812816. This is Scientific Article A-6034, Contribution No. 8195, of the Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station.

\section*{Literature cited}


Scheuchzer, J. 1719. \textit{Agrostographia}. Bodmer, Zürich.


Proposed by: James L. Reveal and Edward E. Terrell, Department of Botany, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-5815, USA; John H. Wiersema, Systematic Botany and Mycology Laboratory, USDA/ARS, Bldg. 265, BARC-East, Beltsville, MD 20705, USA; and Hildemar Scholz, Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Museum Berlin-Dahlem, Königin-Luise-Strasse 6-8, W-1000 Berlin 33, Germany.

(997) Proposal to conserve the spelling of 4618 *Euonymus* (*Celastraceae*).


Linnaeus sometimes used different spellings of generic names. Before the Sydney Congress, the correct spelling was determined by Art. 74 of the Code (Stafleu, 1978). In Sydney, a proposal by Demoulin (1981) was accepted, to delete Art. 74 and to include a new rule in Art. 13. Demoulin's aim was a simplification of the orthographic section of the Code, and he qualified Art. 74 as "a cumbersome and subjective procedure". He assessed the impact of his proposal and found nine cases in which it would imply a change of spelling. Each of these cases was discussed briefly, and *Euonymus* fell in the category of names for which, in Demoulin's opinion, the 'Species plantarum' spelling is preferable: *Evonymus*.

The spelling *Euonymus* remains almost universally accepted. Therefore we do not agree with Demoulin and are proposing conservation of the 'Genera plantarum' spelling: *Euonymus*.

Demoulin argued there is no obligation to transcribe Greek ευ as "eu". On the other hand, *Euonymus* was one of the examples of Art. 74, which ruled that if Linnaeus subsequently to 1753-1754 did not consistently adopt one of the spellings, "the spelling which is more correct philologically is accepted, e.g. *Agrostemma* (not *Agrostema*), *Euonymus* (not *Evonymus*)".

We do not wish to enter into the philological discussion, nor do we think Demoulin's plea that *Evonymus* is more euphonic is relevant. Our only aim is stability. Only one of Demoulin's arguments remains to be discussed: his statement that *Evonymus* is widely used.

*Euonymus* is a genus of about 175 species, mainly occurring in temperate and tropical Asia. Four species are indigenous in Europe, several in North and Central America, a few in Africa and two in Australia. The most recent monograph (Blakelock, 1951) treated 176 species and listed 15 more names as incertae sedis. Since then, several new species have been described. It is probable that a modern revision would reduce the number of species.

We checked 131 post-1945 floras and checklists, comparing the pre- and post-Sydney (Voss & al., 1983) spellings. When available, we checked two editions of the same flora, to see if the spelling changed. From Table 1 it can be seen that, even in Europe, most floras before Sydney used the spelling (*Euonymus*) that was then in accordance with the rules. Since Sydney, the *Evonymus*-spelling has not yet extensively
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