

no less disruptive, and the largest clade which could bear the name *Pavonia* would contain less than 50 species.

Of the 41 species currently recognised in *Malvaviscus*, *Malanchra* and *Peltaea*, 14 already have combinations in *Pavonia*, so if this proposal is accepted, just 27 new combinations or names would be required to combine the genera.

The least disruptive nomenclatural solution for the re-circumscription of *Pavonia* is to include the smaller genera *Malanchra*, *Malvaviscus* and *Peltaea* in a novel concept of *Pavonia*. However, the first two of these names pre-date the publication of *Pavonia*, so conservation is necessary before this can be achieved.

It is possible that some might suggest splitting up *Pavonia* further in future, and this is one of the reasons we prefer to conserve *Pavonia* (rather than rejecting the other names) so it does not prevent someone taking such action.

The *Pavonia* clade contains only a few species of minor or moderate horticultural importance (Fryxell, l.c. 1999: 9–10;

e.g., *P. hastata*, Yue & Ruter in HortScience 56: 732, 2021; *Malanchra capitata*, Cervantes-Ceballos & al., l.c.; *Malvaviscus arboreus*, Turner & Mendenhall, l.c.) and we consider nomenclatural stability to be the primary consideration in proposing conservation of *Pavonia*. The name *Pavonia* has already been conserved against *Lass* Adans. (Fam. Pl. 2: 400, 568. 1763) and *Malache* B. Vogel (in Trew, Pl. Select.: 50. 1772). If this proposal is successful, 27 new combinations will be required in *Pavonia*. If this proposal is not successful, c. 260 new combinations will be required in *Malvaviscus*, or New World *Pavonia* will need to be further divided, with up to 210 new combinations required. Conserving *Pavonia* will not prevent the segregation of genera if that is preferred by future authors.

#### Author information

RLB, <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0360-8321>

MMH, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7702-3898>

TGBM, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6405-8007>

## (2961) Proposal to conserve *Bellucia*, nom. cons., against the additional names *Myriaspora* and *Loreya* (*Melastomataceae*: *Henrietteae*)

Darin S. Penneys,<sup>1</sup> Fabián A. Michelangeli,<sup>2</sup> Walter S. Judd,<sup>3</sup> Frank Almeda<sup>4</sup> & Robert Douglas Stone<sup>5</sup>

1 University of North Carolina Wilmington, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403, U.S.A.

2 Institute of Systematic Botany, The New York Botanical Garden, Bronx, New York 10458, U.S.A.

3 University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, U.S.A.

4 California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California 94118, U.S.A.

5 School of Life Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg 3209, South Africa

Address for correspondence: Robert Douglas Stone, [StoneRD@ukzn.ac.za](mailto:StoneRD@ukzn.ac.za)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12969>

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

- (2961) *Bellucia* Neck. ex Raf., Sylva Tellur.: 92. Oct–Dec 1838 [*Melastomat.*], nom. cons. prop.  
 Typus: *B. nervosa* Raf., nom. illeg. (*Blakea quinquenervia* Aubl., *Bellucia quinquenervia* (Aubl.) H. Karst.) [= *Bellucia grossularioides* (L.) Triana (*Melastoma grossularioides* L.)].
- (H) *Belluccia* Adans., Fam. Pl. 2: 344, 525. Jul–Aug 1763 [*Angiosp.*: *Rut.*], nom. rej.  
 ≡ *Ptelea* L. 1753.
- (=) *Apatitia* Desv. ex Ham., Prodr. Pl. Ind. Occid.: 42. 1825, nom. rej.
- (=) *Myriaspora* DC., Prodr. 3: 165. Mar 1828, nom. rej. prop.  
 Typus (*hic designatus*): *M. egensis* DC.
- (=) *Loreya* DC., Prodr. 3: 178. Mar 1828, nom. rej. prop.  
 Typus: *L. arborens* (Aubl.) DC. (*Melastoma arborens* Aubl.).

The woody Neotropical genus *Bellucia* Neck. ex Raf. (Sylva Tellur.: 92. 1838) is typified by *B. nervosa* Raf. (l.c.: 93), an illegitimate name (≡ *Blakea quinquenervia* Aubl., Hist. Pl. Guiane 1:

525, t. 210. 1775) and a taxonomic synonym of *B. grossularioides* (L.) Triana (in Trans. Linn. Soc. London 28: 141. 1872) (*Melastoma grossularioides* L., Sp. Pl.: 390. 1753). The genus comprises 22 species as presently circumscribed (Judd & Penneys in Goldenberg & al., Syst. Evol. Ecol. Melastomataceae: 219–234. 2022). Because Necker's *Elementa botanica* (1790) is a suppressed work under Art. 34 of the ICN (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018), the generic name *Bellucia*, although first appearing in Necker (Elem. Bot. 2: 143. 1790), was not validly published until taken up by Rafinesque (l.c.).

Morphological character analyses (Judd & al. in Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 76: 476–495. 1989; Renner in Mem. New York Bot. Gard. 50. 1989) have found that *Myriaspora* DC. (Prodr. 3: 165. 1828) and *Bellucia* Neck. ex Raf. (l.c.) as previously circumscribed (Renner, l.c. 1989) are phylogenetically nested within *Loreya* DC. (l.c.: 178). In other words, *Loreya* is most likely paraphyletic if its circumscription excludes members of the other two genera. Penneys & al. (in Syst. Bot. 35: 783–800. 2010) proposed treating *Myriaspora* and *Loreya* as taxonomic synonyms of an expanded *Bellucia* and accordingly published nine new combinations at species rank. This

action was taken because of a change in circumscription, but *Myriaspora* and *Loreya* are both clearly older than *Bellucia*, and either one of them would be the correct name under a strict application of the principle of priority in Art. 11 of the *ICN*. Between *Myriaspora* and *Loreya* there is no priority because both names were published in the same work and on the same date (Stafleu in *Regnum Veg.* 94. 1976). While it is unfortunate that one of these names was not taken up instead of *Bellucia*, any attempt to do so now would be for purely nomenclatural reasons and contrary to currently accepted usage.

All three genera (*Bellucia*, *Loreya*, *Myriaspora*) were recognized by 19th-century monographers of the family (Naudin in *Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot.*, sér. 3, 16: 83–246. 1850 & *Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot.*, sér. 3, 18: 85–154. 1852; Triana in *Trans. Linn. Soc. London* 28: 1–188. 1872; Cogniaux in *Candolle & Candolle, Monogr. Phan.* 7. 1891) and in the *Flora Brasiliensis* (Cogniaux in *Martius, Fl. Bras.* 14(4). 1886–1888). The sole exception was Baillon (*Hist. Pl.* 7: 1–65. 1877), who considered *Loreya* to be a section within a broadly defined *Bellucia*, and *Myriaspora* as a synonym of *Maieta* Aubl. (*Hist. Pl. Guiane* 1: 443. 1775). The tradition of treating *Bellucia*, *Loreya*, and *Myriaspora* as separate genera continued in 20th-century floristic works (Wurdack in *Lasser, Fl. Venezuela* 8 (1–2): 1–819. 1973; Wurdack in *Harling & Sparre, Fl. Ecuador* 13: 1–406. 1980; Howard, *Fl. Lesser Antilles* 5: 532–579. 1989; Wurdack & al. in *Fl. Guianas, ser. A, Phanerogams* 13: 3–301. 1993; Almeda in *Fl. Mesoamericana* 4: 164–338. 2009) and in the family-wide classification of Renner (in *Nordic J. Bot.* 13: 519–540. 1993). A notable departure from this trend was the treatment for the *Flora of Peru* (Macbride in *Field Mus. Publ. Bot.* 13: 249–523. 1941), which followed Baillon (l.c.) in synonymizing *Loreya* under *Bellucia*, but neither of these works contravened the rule of priority because they were published prior to the decision made at the Montreal congress (Rickett & Stafleu in *Taxon* 8: 256. 1959) to invalidate the name *Bellucia* Neck. (l.c.).

Recent publications that have followed Penneys & al.'s (l.c. 2010) adoption of the expanded circumscription of *Bellucia* (with *Myriaspora* and *Loreya* listed as synonyms) include the *Vascular Plants of the Americas* (Ulloa Ulloa & al., 2018 onwards. <http://www.tropicos.org/Project/VPA>), the *Catálogo de plantas y líquenes de Colombia* (Almeda & al. in *Bernal & al.*, 2019. <http://catalogoplantasdecolombia.unal.edu.co>), the *Flora do Brasil 2020* (Goldenberg & al., 2020. <http://floradobrasil.jbrj.gov.br/reflora/>

[floradobrasil/FB19607](http://floradobrasil/FB19607)) [all websites accessed 6 Mar 2023], and a guide to curating New World Melastomataceae collections (Michelangeli & al., 2020. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202010.0203.v2>) as well as all relevant chapters in the edited book *Systematics, evolution, and ecology of Melastomataceae* (i.e., Ulloa Ulloa & al.: 3–28; Penneys & al.: 109–165; and Judd & Penneys: 219–234 in Goldenberg & al., l.c. 2022).

If *Myriaspora* or *Loreya* were to be taken up in place of *Bellucia*, then this would overturn currently accepted usage and require several new combinations at species rank (i.e., 8 in the case of *Loreya* and 21 in *Myriaspora*). Neither of these actions would serve the interest of nomenclatural stability. All needed species names already exist in *Bellucia* and therefore no new combinations are required. Workers outside the field of plant taxonomy (e.g., horticulturists, ecologists and invasive-species biologists) are more familiar with the name *Bellucia* than with *Myriaspora* or *Loreya*, because *Bellucia* have edible fruits and one of its species, *B. pentamera* Naudin (l.c. 1850: 105), has been introduced and become naturalized in the Caribbean islands, central Africa (Congo), Malaysia, and Indonesia (Renner, l.c. 1989; Dillis & al. in *Biol. Invas.* 19: 1329–1337. 2017 & in *Biotropica* 50: 598–605. 2018; Bordbar & Meerts in *Biol. Invas.* 24: 939–954. 2022; Solfiyeni & Syamsuardi in *Biodiversitas* 23: 3135–3146; 3667–3674. 2022; DeWalt & al. in *Goldenberg & al.*, l.c. 2022: 761–789).

*Bellucia* Neck. ex Raf. (l.c.) is already conserved under Art. 14 of the *ICN* against the earlier homonym *Bellucia* Adans. (*Fam. Pl.* 2: 344. 1763) and against the homotypic *Apatitia* Desv. ex Ham. (*Prodr. Pl. Ind. Occid.*: 42. 1825). The best course of action would be to conserve it against the additional names *Myriaspora* DC. (l.c.) and *Loreya* DC. (l.c.).

#### Author information

DSP, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0727-2829>  
FAM, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7348-143X>  
WSJ, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2391-2654>  
FA, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5091-6875>  
RDS, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2752-7788>

#### Acknowledgements

Our many thanks are due to John McNeill for useful discussion and to him and John Wiersema for their careful editing of the manuscript.