



The Status of *Agyneia* and *Glochidion* (Euphorbiaceae)

Author(s): Grady L. Webster

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Jan., 1960), pp. 25-26

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1217352>

Accessed: 16/09/2013 13:24

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>

- PERTY, M. 1852. Zur Kenntniss kleinster Lebensformen ... Bern.
- PRINGSHEIM, E. G. 1936. Zur Kenntnis saprotropher Algen und Flagellaten. I. Über Anhäufungskulturen polysaprober Flagellaten. Arch. Protistenk. 87: 43-96.
- . 1956. Contributions towards a monograph of the genus *Euglena*. Nova Acta Acad. Leop. Carol. N.F. 18(125).
- RAILLIET, A. L. J. 1885-1886. Éléments de zoologie médicale et agricole. Paris.
- SENN, G. 1900. Flagellata. In Engler & Prantl, Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien ... 1(1a): 93-188.
- SKUJA, H. 1948. Taxonomie des Phytoplanktons einiger Seen in Uppland, Schweden. Symb. Bot. Upsal. 9(3).
- STEIN, F. 1859. Der Organismus der Infusionsthierie ... 1. Leipzig.
- . 1878. Der Organismus der Infusionsthierie ... 3(1). Leipzig.

THE STATUS OF AGYNEIA AND GLOCHIDION (EUPHORBIACEAE)*

Grady L. Webster (Lafayette, Ind.)

In their extensive revisions of the family Euphorbiaceae in the 'Pflanzenreich', Pax and Hoffmann treated most of the genera except those in the *Phyllanthus*-complex. For *Phyllanthus* and its allies, which include at least 1,000 species, no general revision has been made since that of Mueller Argoviensis in De Candolle's 'Prodromus' (1866). A survey of the taxa in the subtribe Phyllanthinae (s. lat.), made in connection with a revision of the West Indian species of *Phyllanthus* (Jour. Arnold Arb., 1956-58), has shown that extensive taxonomic and nomenclatural changes are needed to bring the classification up to date. It is the aim of the present article to review the nomenclatural problems in the Phyllanthinae which may affect students of the flora of the Old World tropics.

St. John (Taxon 6: 198-199. 1957) has already pointed out that the genus *Breynia* Forst. is a latter homonym of the Cappariaceae *Breynia* L.; he has consequently proposed that *Breynia* be placed on the list of concerned generic names. Although *Breynia* is a relatively small genus of about 30 species and is only weakly differentiated from *Sauropus*, its conservation appears warranted, as a cultivar of the type species *B. disticha* is rather well known as an ornamental, and several species are common in southern and eastern Asia.

However, the most urgent nomenclatural problem in the Phyllanthinae relates not to *Breynia* but rather to the large genus *Glochidion*

(Char. Gen. Pl. 113. pl. 57. 1776), which is represented by more than 200 species in the tropics of Asia and Oceania. *Glochidion* has been generally accepted as generically distinct from *Phyllanthus* since the dispositions of Hooker (Fl. Br. Ind. 5: 306. 1887) and Pax (Naturl. Pflanzenfam. ed. 1, 3(5): 23. 1890), and will surely be so treated in the future. Unfortunately, all recent workers appear to have overlooked the fact that *Glochidion* Forst. is a taxonomic synonym of the earlier *Agyneia* L. (Mant. Alt. 161. 1771). Linnaeus based his genus on two Chinese plants which are now considered a single species, *Glochidion puberum* (L.) Hutch. The type species of *Glochidion*, *G. ramiflorum* Forst. f., belongs in the same sect. (*Hemiglochidion*) as *G. puberum*, and there seems no doubt that they are in fact congeneric. Mueller (in DC. Prodr. 15[2]: 238. 1866) pointed out that *Agyneia* L. is synonymous with *Glochidion*, but upheld *Agyneia* in the completely different application given that name by Ventenat. This latter author (Descr. pl. nouv. jard. Cels. 23. pl. 23. 1800) mistook for Linnaeus's *Agyneia impubes* an entirely different plant already described by Linnaeus (Syst. ed. 13. 707. 1774) as *Phyllanthus bacciformis*. This completely altered usage of the name *Agyneia* has been perpetrated by Mueller and later authors up to the present time, although it is of course indefensible under current rules of nomenclature.

Since less than 10 of the species of *Glochidion* have received valid names in *Agyneia*, failure to conserve the former would necessitate at least 200 new combinations. In view

*) Studies in the Euphorbiaceae, Phyllanthoideae, V.

of the general acceptance of *Glochidion* as a distinct genus, it is hereby proposed (69) that it be added to the list of conserved generic names and that *Agyneia* L. be rejected. This leaves at hand only the problem of the disposition of *Agyneia* sensu Vent. non L.

Mueller upheld Ventenat's generic concept on the basis of floral characters ('glandulae extrastaminalis laciniis calycis oppositae') and placed it next to *Sauropus*; in this he has been followed by most subsequent authors, including Pax and Hoffmann (Pflanzenr. IV. 147. XV: 212. 1922). However, Bentham (Gen. Pl. 3: 271. 1880) pointed out that the squamae or scales of *Agyneia* are not homologous with the floral disk in other genera of Phyllanthaceae, and that the genus was scarcely different from *Phyllanthus* sect. *Synostemon*. Examination of flowers shows that Bentham was correct, for the 'glands' appear to be merely the differentiated inner faces of the calyx-lobes. Consequently, it appears necessary to transfer the single species of *Agyneia*

sensu Ventenat to the taxon mentioned by Bentham. The first generic name published for that group is *Diplomorpha* Griff. (Not. 4: 479. 1854), which however is a later homonym of *Diplomorpha* Meissner (1841). The earliest available name then is *Synostemon* F. Mueller (Fragm. Phytogr. Austr. 1: 32. 1858). Although combined with *Phyllanthus* by Mueller and Bentham and with *Glochidion* by Pax and Hoffmann, *Synostemon* appears to be generically distinct from both. It differs from *Phyllanthus* in its pollen grain morphology and lack of a true floral disk, and from *Glochidion* by virtue of its habit, more or less free styles, and ventrally channelled bony seeds. Consequently, the species accepted by Mueller and by Pax and Hoffmann as *Agyneia bacciformis* is hereby transferred to *Synostemon*. *)

*) *Synostemon bacciforme* (L.) Webster, comb. nov. (*Phyllanthus bacciformis* L. Syst. ed. 13. 707. 1774).

NEWS AND NOTES

CORRECT NAME FOR THE TYPE OF THIELAVIA ZOPF

In 1876, Zopf established a new genus — named *Thielavia* — for the perfect state of an Ascomycete which he thought incorrectly to form a pleomorphic life cycle with the imperfect fungus *Torula basicola* Berkeley & Broome 1850. The only species mentioned, and becoming, therefore, type species was *Torula basicola* Berk. & Br. = *Thielavia basicola* (Berk. & Br.) Zopf. Much later, the imperfect fungus (*Torula basicola* Berk. & Br. = *Thielaviopsis basicola* [Berk. & Br.] Ferr. 1913) has, however, been proven to represent chlamydospore- and endoconidium-producing stages of a specifically distinct commensal the perfect state of which remains unknown.

The Code does not, in fact, permit the application of a basionym to more than one and the same taxon. Art. 59 entitled "Choice of names of fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle" is no exception to that principle. It implies only that "the author who first describes a perfect state may adopt the specific epithet applied to the corresponding [spaced types mine] imperfect state, but his binomial for the perfect state

is to be attributed to him alone, and is not to be regarded as a new combination".

Thielavia basicola (Berk. & Br. 1850) Zopf 1876 and *Thielaviopsis basicola* [Berk. & Br. 1850] Ferr. 1913 as stages belonging to two different species cannot bear the same epithet ("basicola") which refers, in both cases, to the basionym *Torula basicola* Berk. & Br.

In 1951, I proposed, therefore, a new name for the Ascomycete, *Thielavia renominata*.

Quite recently, Härrä (1959, p. 30) opposes my proposal, as follows: "Zwischen *Thielavia basicola* Zopf und *Thielaviopsis basicola* (B. et Br.) Ferr. besteht demnach neben der engen ökologischen Beziehung keine nähere systematische Verwandtschaft. Aus diesem Grunde [!] dürfen die beiden im Speziesnamen gleichlautenden Epitheta nebeneinander bestehen bleiben (Code ..), und der Vorschlag von Paclt (1951), *Thielavia basicola* in *Thielavia renominata* Paclt umzubenennen, ist gegenstandslos". Furthermore, he remarks (l.c., p. 28): "Zopf (1876) beschrieb einen Ascomyceten auf Wurzeln von *Senecio elegans* als einzige Art einer neuen Gattung *Thielavia*. Als Epitheton für diese Typusart wählte er 'basicola B. et Br.'. Berkeley und Broome (1850) verstanden