on deciduous trees (especially poplars) in parks, avenues and forests. It is known not only among mycologists and mushroom pickers (it is often depicted in mushroom books) but also among phytopathologists and foresters. Among them, it is traditionally known as *Pholiota destruens* (Brond.) Gillet. This name was widely used for more than 100 years until 1986 when Kuyper & Tjallingii-Beukers (in Persoonia 13: 81. 1986) showed that the correct name was *Pholiota populnea* (Pers. : Fr.) Kuyp. & Tjall.-Beuk. This was the first name change of this common fungus and many users still have problems accepting it. Nevertheless, they have mostly demonstrated good will and learned to use the name *P. populnea* (which is user-friendly at least from etymological point of view). However, the "transmigration" of the common fungus *Pholiota destruens* to "*Nemecomyces populneus*" would be too drastic for most users and would decrease the credibility of professional mycologists dealing with taxonomy and nomenclature.

To avoid disadvantageous nomenclatural changes, we propose to conserve the well-known (even if mostly at the subgeneric level so far) name *Hemipholiota* (Singer) Bon 1986 against the mostly forgotten name *Nemecomyces* Pilát 1933 as allowed by ICBN Art. 14.

(1811) Proposal to conserve the name *Leptodontium proliferum* against *Tortula umbrosa* (*Pottiaceae*, *Bryophyta*)

María J. Cano* & M. Teresa Gallego

*Departamento de Biología Vegetal (Área de Botánica), Facultad de Biología, Universidad de Murcia, 30100 Murcia, Spain. *mcano@um.es (author for correspondence)*

(1811) ***Leptodontium proliferum*** Herzog in Biblioth. Bot. 87: 33, fig. 8. 1916, nom. cons. prop.
Typus: Bolivia, Cochabamba, Tunariseen, *Herzog 3429* (JE; isotypi: BM, CANM, H, NY, M, S).

(=) *Tortula umbrosa* Dusén in Ark. Bot. 6(10): 9, t. 3, figs. 4–12. 1906, nom. rej. prop.
Lectotypus (vide Cano & Gallego in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 156: 214. 2008): [icon in] Ark. Bot. 6(10): t. 3 figs. 4–12. 1906 – Epitypus (vide Cano & Gallego in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 156: 214. 2008): Chile, Región IX (Aisén), Guaitecas, 1897, *Dusén 667* (S).

Leptodontium proliferum is a species distributed in the Andes of Bolivia, Colombia and Peru (Churchill & al. in Ruizia: 112. 2000), Mexico (Zander, Moss Fl. Mexico: 263. 1994), Chile (Ireland & al. in Trop. Bryol. 28: 67. 2006) and Lesotho (Hoddgetts & al. in J. Bryol. 21: 151. 1999), which grows on decaying organic material (Zander in Bryologist 75: 236. 1972). It is mainly characterised by dimorphic leaves, with the upper oblong-lanceolate which bear spherical to cylindrical cluster of numerous obovoid to claviform propagula on the excurrent costa and lower leaves oblong to ovate, with the costa percurrent or subpercurrent. The name of this taxon has been consistently accepted and widely used in bryological literature from its description in 1916. It was accepted in the taxonomic revision of the genus in the New World of Zander (l.c., 1972), in which the name was lectotypified by the Herzog specimen cited above. In addition, the name has been used in South American and African checklists, e.g., by Hermann (in Bryologist 79: 135. 1975), Florschütz-de Waard & Florschütz (in Bryologist 82: 226. 1979), Menzel (in J. Hattori Bot. Lab. 71: 209. 1992), Delgadillo & al. (in Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 50: 90. 1995), O'Shea (in Trop. Bryol. Res. Rep. 1: 58. 1999; 4: 82. 2003; 6: 118. 2006), Churchill & al. (l.c.), and important floristic treatments such as Sharp & al. (Moss Fl. Mexico: 263. 1994) and Churchill & Linares (Prodr. Bryol. Novo-Granatensis 2: 686. 2000). *Leptodontium proliferum* is also included in the taxonomic treatment of *Pottiaceae* at the generic level of Zander (in Bull. Buffalo Soc. Nat. Sci. 32: 311. 1993), in the *Mosses of the Tropical Andes* webpage of Missouri Botanical Garden (http://mobot.mobot.org/W3T/Search/andes/andesintro.htm), and it is recognized in the world checklist of mosses (Crosby & al., Checklist of Mosses: 145. 1999).

In preparing the taxonomic revision of the genus *Tortula* Hedw. in South America, the name *Tortula umbrosa* was found to be synonymous with and to antedate *Leptodontium proliferum*. *Tortula umbrosa* was described by Dusén (l.c.) on the basis of one specimen collected by the author in Región X (Los Lagos), Chile. As discussed by Cano & Gallego (l.c.), this specimen was not located in S or in any other herbarium from which specimens were studied. Other specimens labelled under this name at S were not mentioned in the protologue. Therefore, Cano & Gallego (l.c.) lectotypified the name from the illustration published in the original description and noted that *Tortula umbrosa* was conspecific with *Leptodontium proliferum*, with "*umbrosa*" being the earlier published epithet. After its description, no new information has been published relating to this name and it has only appeared in local checklists, e.g., by He (in J. Hattori Bot. Lab. 85: 169. 1998). In addition, it is included as an insufficiently known species by Crosby & al. (l.c.: 252).

Thus *T. umbrosa* has rarely been used since its description. In contrast, *Leptodontium proliferum* has been used by

numerous botanists and is widely employed in bryological literature. To preserve nomenclatural stability, we propose to conserve the name *Leptodontium proliferum* against *T. umbrosa*. If this proposal is declined, a new combination based on *Tortula umbrosa* will be required and would replace the widely used *Leptodontium proliferum*, which would be highly undesirable.

Acknowledgements

Financial support was provided by the Spanish "Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia" [Project CGL2007–60692/BOS].

(1812–1813) Proposals to conserve the name *Veronicaceae* (*Magnoliophyta*), and to conserve it against *Plantaginaceae*, a "superconservation" proposal

James L. Reveal[1], Richard Olmstead[2] & Walter S. Judd[3]

[1] *Adjunct Professor, Department of Plant Biology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853-4301, U.S.A.; Professor Emeritus, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742-5815 & Honorary Curator, New York Botanical Garden, Bronx, New York 10458-5126, U.S.A. jreveal@umd.edu (author for correspondence)*

[2] *Professor, Department of Biology & Burke Museum, Box 355325, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195-5325, U.S.A.*

[3] *Professor, 214 Bartram Hall, Department of Botany, P.O. Box 118526, University of Florida, Florida 32611, U.S.A.*

(1812) ***Veronicaceae*** Cassel, Lehrb. Nat. Pflanzenord.: 366. Apr–Mai 1817, nom. cons. prop.
Typus: *Veronica* L.

(1813) ***Veronicaceae*** Cassel, Lehrb. Nat. Pflanzenord.: 366. Apr–Mai 1817, nom. cons., to take precedence over *Plantaginaceae* Juss., Gen. Pl.: 89. 4 Aug 1789, nom. cons.

Add the following notes in App. IIB:

Under *Plantaginaceae*: "If this family is united with *Veronicaceae*, the name *Plantaginaceae* is rejected in favour of *Veronicaceae*.

Under *Veronicaceae*: "Note: If this family is united with *Plantaginaceae*, the name *Veronicaceae* must be used."

In 1999 (Reveal & al. in Taxon 48: 182), the name *Antirrhinaceae* Pers. was proposed for conservation with a superconservation proposal to maintain that name over *Plantaginaceae* Juss. when the latter was used in the broad sense proposed by the Angiosperm Phylogeny Group (in Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 85: 531–553. 1998). A decision on the proposal was delayed given the uncertainty of some of the nomenclature rules governing family names. This was resolved partially in 1999 in St. Louis but as several complications persisted it remained for the 2005 International Botanical Congress in Vienna to finally settle the problems so that a proposal could be considered by the committee for the appropriate taxonomic group (now the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants). As a result of the changes proposed in 1999 and 2005, coupled with the general adoption of *Veronicaceae* in the botanical literature, mostly in an informal sense, we are now formally withdrawing Proposal 1405 and submit the present proposal favoring *Veronicaceae* instead of *Antirrhinaceae*.

The widespread view that the traditional circumscription of *Scrophulariaceae* Juss., as defined by Cronquist (Integr. Syst. Class. Fl. Pl.: 951–953. 1981) and Takhtajan (Diver. Class. Fl. Pl.: 457–458. 1997), and supported by Holmgren (in Smith & al., Fl. Pl. Neotrop.: 348–350. 2004), cannot be maintained means that elements of that family are now widely scattered in other families (Judd & al., Pl. Syst., ed. 3: 481–486. 2008; Olmstead & Reeves in Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 82: 176–193. 1995; Olmstead & al. in Amer. J. Bot. 88: 248–361. 2001; Oxelman & al. in Taxon 54: 411–425. 2005; Tank & al. in Austral. Syst. Bot. 19: 1–19. 2006; Thorne & Reveal in Bot. Rev. 73: 67–182. 2007) with the largest concentration of its taxa (some 100 genera and 1,500 species) assigned, by nomenclatural default, to *Plantaginaceae*, otherwise the name of a well-defined clade that consists of three genera and 260 species (Brummitt in Heywood & al., Fl. Pl. World: 257. 2007).

Some authors (e.g., Doweld, Tent. Syst. Pl. Vasc.: xlix. 2001) fragment the broadly defined *Plantaginaceae*, as recently circumscribed by APG II (in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 141: 399–436. 2003), into several smaller families such as *Gratiolaceae* Martinov, *Chelonaceae* Martinov, *Antirrhinaceae*, *Veronicaceae*, *Plantaginaceae*, and *Callitrichaceae* Link, while others (e.g., E. Fischer in Kubitzki & al., Fam. Gen. Vasc. Pl. 7: 333–432. 2004; Brummitt in Heywood & al., Fl. Pl. World: 300–302. 2007) define *Scrophulariaceae* broadly and retain *Plantaginaceae* is a strict sense (Schwarzbach in Kubitzki & al., Fam. Gen. Vasc. Pl. 7: 327–329. 2004) although both Brummitt (l.c.: 301–302) and Kadereit (in