
To justify our proposal to retain Zamia integrifolia, should it require conservation, we maintain that this name is widely used today when members of the Z. pumila complex are subdivided into as many as six species (Fralish & Franklin, Taxon. Ecol. Woody Pl. N. Amer. Forests: 129. 2002; Janick & Paull, Encycl. Fruit Nuts: 921. 2008; Nelson & al., Handb. Poisonous Pl.: 301. 2007; Ogden & Ogden, Pl.-Driven Design: 135. 2008; Stevenson & al. in J. Arnold Arbor., Suppl. Ser. 1: 367–383. 1991; Stevenson in Encephalartos 9: 3–7. 1987, in Encephalartos 9: 50. 1807) is the name in continuous use for about 200 years for the well-established name is not necessary. However, should the Committee find that distributed from SE Central Europe to Thrace, NW Anatolia, Ukraine, only (sub)endemic of the five European species of Convallaria latifolia is the name used by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) for its Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species enforcement (CITES). Use of the name Z. floridana was common well into the 1950s, and is occasionally found in the more recent horticultural (Everett, Encycl. Hort.: 3579. 1982; Gardner & Brussolini, Elegant Silvers: 55. 2005; Harrison, Groundcovers South: 84. 2006; Odenwald & Turner, Identi. Select. S. Pl. Landscape Design: 172. 2006) and general botanical (e.g., Bhatnagar & Moitra, Gymnosperms: 99. 1996; Skukla & al., Biol. Pollen: 48. 1998; Jain & al., Somatic Embryogenesis Woody Pl. 4: 450. 1999; Singh, Gymnosperm: 340. 2006; Mauseth, Botany: 515. 2009) literature and, especially in the latter case, then nearly always in reference to anatomical or morphological work published in the first two decades of the Twentieth Century.

Even if Zamia integrifolia is superfluous and our proposal not accepted, the correct name for the Florida plant may not be Z. floridana as maintained by Ward, but Z. media Jacq. (Pl. Hort. Schoenb. 3: 77. t. 397, 398. 1798), Z. tenus Willd. (Sp. Pl. 4(2): 846. 1806) or Z. dentata Voigt (in Syll. Pl. Nov. 2: 53. 1828; fide Osborne & al., World List Cycads: 224–239. 1999; see also Sass & al. in PLoS ONE 11: 1–10. 2007). Should conservation be necessary, preservation of the oldest and most commonly used name, Zamia integrifolia, for this plant will thus provide the greatest nomenclatural stability.
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2007 (Slovenia); Fischer & al., Exkursionsfl. Österr., ed. 3: 1067. 2008 (Austria); Király, Magyar Füvészkönyv: 480. 2009 (Hungary). As the species is characteristic for certain forest types, the name is also used in contemporary phytosociology (e.g., Davies & Moss, EUNIS Habitat Classific.: 105. 1999; Sarić, Veg. Serbia: 2. 2000; Willner & Grabherr, Wälder Gebüschs Österreichs 1: 143. 2007; Jarolímké & al., Diagn. Sp. Higher Veg. Units Slovakia: 277, 319. 2008); in syntaxonomy it serves to designate communities like Polygonota latifolii-Carpinetum.

Polygonatum latifolium was based on Convallaria latifolia, under which name Jacquin had thoroughly described the species which in Austria is restricted to the Pannonian district, being rather common in thermophilous hornbeam and oak forests and riverine woodland. Together with the description, an illustration was published in the notable Flora Austriaca; this had obviously been prepared from living plants most probably collected in the vicinity of Vienna. No exact locality was specified in the protologue, and to our knowledge no original herbarium material is extant. The excellent hand-coloured engraving is material suitable and available for lectotypification. Although the characteristic leaf indumentum is not depicted on the plate, it is detailed in the description: “Folia … subus ad nervulos minutissime & tantum ad lentem villosa”, and the identity of the plant is thus not in doubt. We are therefore proposing it as the type of the conserved name and consider it is unnecessary to designate a specimen as a conserved type.

Polygonatum hirtum (Bosc ex Poir.) Pursh (Fl. Amer. Sept. 1: 234. 1813) was presented as the correct name under the Code by Mill (in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 41: 53. 1983, adopted in Davis, Fl. Turkey 8: 83. 1984), at that time perfectly accurate since Convallaria latifolia Jacq. is a later homonym of C. latifolia Mill. (1768). The nomenclatural change was followed, however, in only a few Floras of the former U.S.S.R. (e.g., Czerepanov, Vasc. Pl. Russia: 190. 1995; Mosyakin & Fedoronchuk, Vasc. Pl. Ukraine: 19. 1999). The usage in these countries is not consistent as the name P. latifolium is still accepted by Tasheenovich (Fl. Carpathians: 455. 1998), Fedorov (Fl. Russia, Geltman’s English edition, 4: 376. 2001) and Sánchez (Rast. Srednii Polosy Evrop. Rossii: 455. 2007). Authors may have been reluctant to accept P. hirtum because Mill reported that its basionym, Convallaria hirta Bosc ex Poir. (in Lamarck, Encycl. 4: 369. 1797), was described from plants sent to Paris from North America; however, he expressed the opinion that “this provenance is highly improbable”. In addition he stated that P. hirtum is “somewhat unsatisfactorily typified” (without pointing to any particular type material). Nevertheless, the description provided by Poiret leaves us in no doubt as to its identity with P. latifolium. Moreover, this species is known to be an established introduction at some places in New England (Angelo & Boufford in Rhodora 102: 17, 74. 2000; Utech in Fl. N. America 26: 212. 2002; both as P. latifolium!), which may well date back to the late 18th century.

We can thus conclude that although more than two decades have passed since P. hirtum was indicated as the correct name, there is still an overwhelming majority favouring the use of the “traditional” and familiar name P. latifolium. Evidently, it would be reasonable to continue this widespread usage. This proposal was sent for review to Robert R. Mill (E), who introduced P. hirtum, and in recommending it for publication he wrote “I do think the proposal is a very reasonable one and hope it is accepted.” In the meantime the unfamiliar name P. hirtum has appeared in the “World Checklist of Liliiaceae” (Govaerts 2006, posted on internet at http://www.kew.org/wcsp/) where it is indicated as accepted name supported by Czerenpanov (l.c.) and Davis (l.c.). In pursuance with this proceeding nearly all Floras covering the area of the species would have to abandon for purely nomenclatural reasons a name well established for two centuries.

To avoid this disadvantageous change we have two possibilities to “save” the name Polygonatum latifolium: either to conserve this binomial against P. hirtum, or to conserve Convallaria latifolia Jacq. against the earlier homonym Convallaria latifolia Mill. making the former legitimate. We feel the second case is preferable. Miller’s binomial is universally regarded as a name for a luxuriant variant of C. majalis L., and subsequently a taxonomic synonym of it. The name has become obsolete in taxonomy and nearly so even in horticulture. We have not found any recent use of the epithet except in Ponert (in Feddes Repert. 86: 550. 1975) who had used it at the rank “convar.” to designate a group of cultivars (“Sorten”) within C. majalis. In any case, even after rejection against the conserved C. latifolia Jacq., Miller’s epithet can be used at any infraspecific rank (e.g., C. majalis subvar. latifolia Asch. & Graebn., Syn. Fl. Mitteleur. 1: 314. 1905, erroneously interpreted as a variety in Govaerts, l.c.).

Under Art. 14 of the present Code, conservation is possible to avoid unnecessary and disadvantageous nomenclatural change. We strongly believe nomenclatural stability is best served by adopting the widely accepted name Polygonatum latifolium and hope that more authors will use it in their publications until the General Committee has made a decision concerning our proposal.
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Typus: Lao PDR, Champasak Province, Pathoumphone District, Xepiane NPA, 14°47′13.1″ N 106°00′15.6″ E, 210 m alt., 8 Jun 2010, V. Lamxay FL 2118 (E; isotypi: P, National University of Laos, Faculty of Science Herbarium), typ. cons. prop.