

Dipteryx, *Baryosma* was never even cited (e.g., Bentham in Hooker's J. Bot. Kew Gard. Misc. 2: 233–244. 1850; Bentham in Martius & al., Fl. Bras. 15(1): 300–304. 1862; Ducke in Arch. Jard. Bot. Rio de Janeiro 4: 211–341. 1925, in Arch. Jard. Bot. Rio de Janeiro 5: 3–75 & 189–209. 1930; Macbride in Publ. Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Bot. Ser. 13(3, 1): 4–507. 1943; Lima in Steyermark & al., Fl. Venezuelan Guayana 6: 318–320. 1999). Additionally, a search on public online databases of herbarium specimens (e.g., Flora do Brasil, <http://floradobrasil.jbrj.gov.br/>; GBIF, <https://www.gbif.org/>; Reflora, <http://www.reflora.jbrj.gov.br/>; speciesLink, <http://www.splink.org.br/>) has not retrieved any single papilionoid legume specimen identified as *Baryosma*.

The transfer of *Dipteryx* to *Baryosma* would result in ca. 14 nomenclatural changes and updates for as many as 10,000 specimens among the tropical herbarium collections. We argue that this would be nomenclaturally disadvantageous. Therefore, in order to maintain the nomenclatural stability of a legume group with several economic uses and great ecological importance, we propose the addition, under Art. 14.12, of *Baryosma* to the names against which *Dipteryx* is conserved.

Author information

CSC, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1880-654X>

CNF, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1254-4550>

DBOSC, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7072-2656>

HCL, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2154-670X>

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. John McNeill for his clarifications about the conservation of *Dipteryx* and Dr. Luciano Paganucci de Queiroz for general discussions on nomenclature. The study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) – Brasil (Finance Code 001) provided to CSC (Ph.D. fellowship). DC's research in plant biodiversity is supported by grants from CNPq (Research Productivity Fellowship, grant no. 308244/2018-4; Edital Universal grant no. 422325/2018-0), Prêmio CAPES de Teses (grant no. 23038.009148/2013-19), FAPESB (grant no. APP0037/2016), and The Royal Society (Newton Advanced Fellowship no. NAF\R1\180331).

(2757) Proposal to reject the name *Antiarideae* (Moraceae)

Elliot M. Gardner,^{1,2} Nyree J.C. Zerega^{3,4} & Alexandre K. Monro⁵

1 Singapore Botanic Gardens, National Parks Board, 1 Cluny Road, 259569, Singapore

2 Case Western Reserve University, Department of Biology, 2080 Adelbert Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44106, U.S.A.

3 Chicago Botanic Garden, Plant Science and Conservation, 1000 Lake Cook Road, Glencoe, Illinois 60022, U.S.A.

4 Northwestern University, Plant Biology and Conservation Program, 2205 Tech Dr., Evanston, Illinois 60208, U.S.A.

5 Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Identification & Naming Department, Richmond, TW9 3AE, U.K.

Address for correspondence: Elliot M. Gardner, elliott.gardner@gmail.com

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12304>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2757) *Antiarideae* Dumort., Anal. Fam. Pl.: 16. 1829 [Angiosp.: Mor.], nom. utique rej. prop.
Typus: *Antiaris* Lesch.

Since 1847, members of the involucrate clade of *Moraceae* Gaudich. (nom. cons.), sister to *Ficus* L., have been treated as the tribe *Olmedieae* Trécul (in Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot., sér. 3, 8: 77, 126. 1847, ‘*Olmediae*’), or more recently as the tribe *Castilleae* C.C. Berg (in Acta Bot. Neerl. 26: 78. 1977). Investigation by an anonymous reviewer of a manuscript submitted to *Taxon* has recently revealed that *Antiarideae* Dumort. (Anal. Fam. Pl.: 16. 1829) has priority over both *Olmedieae* and *Castilleae* but has never been in regular use.

Antiarideae was described by Dumortier as a tribe of the family ‘*Ficineae*’ (i.e., *Ficaceae* Bercht. & J. Presl = *Moraceae*) characterized by involucrate pistillate inflorescences and based on *Antiaris* Lesch. (in Ann. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat. 16: 478. 1810). *Olmedieae* Trécul, characterized by subconcave pistillate inflorescences with imbricate involucre bracts, was based on *Olmedia* Ruiz & Pav. (Prodr.: 129. 1794) and also contained the genera *Pseudolmedia* Trécul, *Perebea* Aubl., *Helicostylis* Trécul, *Noyera* Trécul (now included in *Perebea*), and *Castilla* Cerv. (as ‘*Castilloa*’). Bureau (in Candolle, Prodr. 17: 281. 1873),

apparently unaware of Dumortier's name, expanded *Olmedieae* to include *Antiaris*, *Naucleopsis* Miq., and *Ogcodeia* Bureau (now included in *Naucleopsis*), and maintained *Maquira* Aubl. (which Trécul had doubtfully associated with *Olmedia*) as a distinct genus. Bureau's concept of *Olmedieae* persisted in treatments of *Moraceae* for a hundred years, subject of course to differences of opinion with regard to synonymies and generic limits and sometimes as a subtribe, as in works by Bentham and Hooker (Gen. Pl. 3: 341–395. 1880), Engler (in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. III(1): 83. 1888), Corner (in Gard. Bull. Singapore 19: 243. 1962) and Berg (in Fl. Neotrop. Monogr. 7: 1. 1972).

Berg (in Acta Bot. Neerl. 26: 73–82. 1977) reduced *Olmedia* to a section of *Trophis* P. Browne in the tribe *Moreae*. In order to maintain a tribe consisting of the remaining genera in the former *Olmedieae*, Berg described a new tribe *Castilleae* C.C. Berg, typified by *Castilla*, apparently unaware of the name *Antiarideae*. *Castilleae* has been used in major treatments of *Moraceae* since that time (Berg, in Bull. Jard. Bot. Natl. Belg. 47: 267–407. 1977; Berg in Fl. Neotrop. Monogr. 83. 2001; Berg & al. in Fl. Males., Ser. 1, Spermat. 17: 1–146. 2006), although a recent phylogenetic study supports the continued use of *Olmedieae* (Gardner & al. in bioRxiv 2020.04.08.030452, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.08.030452>, in *Taxon*, in rev.).

Antiarideae has appeared in very few generalized checklists of suprageneric names including Pfeiffer (Nomencl. Bot. 1: 1345. 1858) and Reveal's Indices Nominum Supragenericorum Plantarum Vascularium (<http://www.plantsystematics.org/reveal/pbio/fam/allspgnames.html>), but it has apparently not been taken up in any floras or specialized *Moraceae* treatments apart from a 2007 dissertation thesis (Ribeiro, Stud. Phylog. Taxon. Evol. Moraceae. Thesis, Univ. Estadual Campinas. 2007, <http://www.repositorio.unicamp.br/handle/REPOSIP/315027>).

By contrast, *Olmedieae*, and later *Castilleae*, have long been in widespread use. A Google Scholar (4 June 2020) search reports 178 records for *Olmedieae*, 147 records for *Castilleae*, and 2 records for *Antiarideae*. Likewise, a full-text search of the Biodiversity Heritage Library (4 June 2020) produced 69 records for *Olmedieae*, 9 records for *Castilleae*, and a single record for *Antiarideae*. Although the search engine results certainly do not capture all mentions of these names in the literature, they highlight the relative obscurity of the name *Antiarideae*.

Although unrelated to the historical disuse of *Antiarideae*, it bears mentioning that under the present *Code*, *Antiarideae* is a legitimate name only by virtue of the conservation of its type, *Antiaris*,

against the earlier homotypic *Ipo* Pers. (Syn. Pl. 2: 566. 1807). The original type of the former is *Antiaris toxicaria*, which is considered to be a new combination based on *Ipo toxicaria* Pers. because both authors referred to the “*Arbor toxicaria*” of Rumphius (Herb. Amboin. 2: 263–268. 1741), that by Leschenault (l.c.: 476, footnote) being considered an indirect reference (Art. 41.3) to Persoon's name. Had *Antiaris* not been conserved (Briquet in Wettstein & al., Verh. Int. Bot. Kongr. Wien.: 137. 1906), *Antiarideae*, typified by *Antiaris*, would be illegitimate under Art. 19.6 of the *ICN* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018), and priority in this case would go to *Olmedieae* or *Castilleae*, depending on whether *Olmedia* were included in the tribe.

Failure to reject *Antiarideae* would compel the use of that obscure name for a major tribe of *Moraceae* going forward while rendering the names used for that tribe in the major treatments of *Moraceae* to date incorrect because the placement of *Antiaris* in the tribe has not been in doubt since Bureau included it. Rejecting *Antiarideae* will advance the same goal that likely motivated the conservation of *Antiaris*: to promote nomenclatural stability in *Moraceae* by preserving the use of names that have been in long-standing and constant use.

(2758) Proposal to conserve the name *Eremophila* against *Bontia*, *Myoporum* and *Andreusia* (*Scrophulariaceae*: *Myoporeae*)

Michael J. Bayly,¹  Rachael M. Fowler,¹  Bevan J. Buirchell,²  Robert J. Chinnock³ & Daniel J. Murphy⁴ 

¹ School of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, Victoria 3010, Australia

² Wise Owl Consulting, Como, Western Australia 6152, Australia

³ State Herbarium of South Australia, Adelaide, South Australia 5001, Australia

⁴ Royal Botanic Gardens Victoria, Melbourne, Victoria 3004, Australia

Address for correspondence: Michael J. Bayly, mbayly@unimelb.edu.au

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12305>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2758) *Eremophila* R. Br., Prodr.: 518. 27 Mar 1810 [*Myoporum* / *Scrophular*.], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: *E. oppositifolia* R. Br.

(=) *Bontia* L., Sp. Pl.: 638. 1 Mai 1753, nom. rej. prop.

Typus: *B. daphnoides* L.

(=) *Myoporum* Sol. ex G. Forst., Fl. Ins. Austr.: 44. Oct–Nov 1786, nom. rej. prop.

Typus (fide Webster in Pacific Sci. 5: 59. 1951): *M. laetum* G. Forst.

(=) *Andreusia* Vent., Jard. Malmaison: ad t. 108. Jul 1805, nom. rej. prop.

Typus: *A. glabra* (Andrews) Vent. (*Pogonia glabra* Andrews).

Eremophila R. Br. (Prodr.: 518. 1810), with ca. 230 named and accepted species (plus 59 segregate subspecies) all endemic to Australia, is one of seven genera commonly recognised (e.g., Chinnock, *Eremophila* Allied Gen.: Monogr. Myoporaceae. 2007) in the tribe *Myoporeae*

of the family *Scrophulariaceae* (as circumscribed by Oxelman & al. in Taxon 54: 411–425. 2005). When published, *Eremophila* included two species, *E. oppositifolia* and *E. alternifolia*; the former was designated as type by Smith (in Contr. Queensland Herb. 19: 4. 1975). Following the treatment of Chinnock (l.c. 2007), the other genera are: *Bontia* L. (Sp. Pl.: 638. 1753), with one species from the Caribbean-Bahamas; *Calamphoreus* Chinnock (l.c. 2007), with one species from Western Australia; *Diocirea* Chinnock (l.c. 2007), with four species from Western Australia; *Glycocystis* Chinnock (l.c. 2007), with one species from Western Australia; *Myoporum* Sol. ex G. Forst. (Fl. Ins. Austr.: 44. 1786), with 30 species in Australasia, the Pacific and Indian Ocean; *Pentacoelium* Siebold & Zucc. (in Abh. Math.-Phys. Cl. Königl. Bayer. Akad. Wiss. 4(3): 151. 1846), with one species from southern Japan and southern China, including Taiwan and Hong Kong.

Phylogenetic analyses of nuclear and chloroplast DNA sequences (Fowler & al. in Pl. Syst. Evol. 306: 52. 2020; Fowler & al. in Taxon, submitted) indicate that *Eremophila*, as usually circumscribed, is paraphyletic, with all other genera of *Myoporeae*