

## (1524) Proposal to conserve the name *Ribes leptostachyum* Benth. against *R. leptostachyum* Decne. (Grossulariaceae)

Alina Freire Fierro

Herbario Nacional del Ecuador QCNE, Apartado 17-21-1787, Quito, Ecuador. Current address: Missouri Botanical Garden, P.O. Box 299, St. Louis, Missouri 63166, U.S.A. E-mail: aff@joethejuggler.com

- (1524) *Ribes leptostachyum* Benth., Pl. Hartw. 186. 1845 [*Dicot.: Grossular.*], *nom. cons. prop.*  
 Typus: Colombia, Cauca, "Popayán, in ascensu ad Páramo de Guanacas, altit. 10,000 ad 10,500 ped.", [76°11'W, 02°31'N], *Hartweg 1027* (K; isotypi: G, K, P, W).
- (H) *Ribes leptostachyum* Decne. in Jacquemont, Voy. Inde 4 (Bot): 65, t. 76. 1841, *nom. rej. prop.*  
 Typus: India, "In Kanawer inter Soungnum et in montibus Lapann, alt. 3500 m", *Jacquemont s.n.* (P).

*Ribes* is a shrubby genus of *Grossulariaceae* with about 150 species and an almost cosmopolitan distribution. While working on the treatment of *Grossulariaceae* for the Flora of Ecuador project, I came across a threat to the name *Ribes leptostachyum* Benth. of 1845, which has consistently been accepted for a species native from Costa Rica to Ecuador. There exists an overlooked earlier homonym: *R. leptostachyum* Decne. of 1841.

Bentham started his *Plantae Hartwegianae* in 1839; however, the page range 185–192, where *R. leptostachyum* was described, was actually published in September of 1845 (McVaugh, *Intro. Pl. Hartw.*, Reprint. 1970). *R. leptostachyum* Decne. was published in volume 4 (Botany) of Jacquemont's *Voyage dans l'Inde*. According to Zain-ul-Abadin (*Biologia* 4: 212–214. 1958) the page range 1–88 of this volume was probably published in 1841. The latest that this volume could have been printed is in 1844 (Stafleu & Cowan, *Regnum Veg.* 98: 404. 1979), a year before Bentham published the same name for the neotropical species.

According to Art. 53.1 of the ICBN (Greuter & al. *Regnum Veg.* 138. 2000), Bentham's name is illegitimate because it is a later homonym, and thus it can not be used. However, the conservation of *R. leptostachyum* Benth. would be totally justifiable because of its consistent use in taxonomic, anatomical, ecological and floristic works, for example: Janczewski (*Mém. Soc. Phys. Genève* 35: 414. 1907); Engler (in Engler & Prantl, *Nat. Pflanzenfam.*, ed. 2, 18a: 175. 1930); Williams (*Fieldiana* 29(6): 348. 1961); Stern & al. (*Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* 63, Suppl. 1: 219–220. 1970); D'Arcy (*Monogr. Syst. Bot.*

*Missouri Bot. Gard.* 18: 544. 1987); Kapelle (*Brenesia* 34: 132. 1991); Freire-Fierro (in Jørgensen & León-Yáñez, *Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard.* 75: 508. 1999), and Weigend & Binder (*Syst. Bot.* 26: 727. 2001).

The name *Ribes leptostachyum* Decne. has been cited as an accepted species only in the original publication more than 150 years ago. In the monograph of the genus (Janczewski, l.c.: 457, 509), and in subsequent works (e.g., Lu & Alexander in Wu & Raven, *Fl. China* 8: 448. 2001), this name has been cited only in the synonymy of *R. orientale* Desf.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Nick Turland (MO) for his helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript, and the Missouri Botanical Garden, the Ecuadorian Foundation for Development of Science and Technology FUNDACYT, and the Ecuadorian National Herbarium QCNE for institutional support.