The type of *E. populifolia* Hook. clearly does not represent the common and widespread species to which the name is currently applied. Bentham (Fl. Austral. 3: 214, 243. 1867) doubtfully identified the original material of *E. populifolia* Hook. as belonging to *E. platyphylla* F. Muell. or *E. polyanthemos* Schauer. Subsequently, Maiden (Crit. Revis. Eucalyptus 1: 343. 1908) stated that Mitchell's specimen was "indubitable *platyphylla*, which is a synonym of *E. alba*". The present author, after visiting Mt Owen station (north of the town of Mitchell, Queensland), has determined that the original collection made by Mitchell's party came from a sapling of an unnamed subspecies of *E. tereticornis* Sm. (l.c.) that is endemic to that general area. This subspecies has exceptionally large and broad juvenile leaves, which match very well the type material of *E. populifolia* Hook. There are no other eucalypt species in the Mt Owen area that have leaves of this shape and size.

The species currently known as *E. populnea* is distributed over large areas of Queensland and New South Wales, and is abundant throughout its range. Much of its habitat is important as grazing land or for cropping. It is a species of considerable economic and ecological importance. For example, it is one of the food tree species for the Koala (*Phascolarctos cinereus*), and it is an important species for honey production.

The species is included in many Australian regional Floras, in ecological studies, and in forestry publications. Examples of the use of this name in floristic works include Stanley & Ross (Fl. S.E. Queensl. 2: 187–188. 1986), Chippendale (l.c.: 383), Brooker & Kleinig (Field Guide Eucalypts, ed. 1, 1. 1983; ed. 1, 3. 1994; ed. 2, 1. 1999), Harden (Fl. New South Wales, ed. 2, 2: 136–137. 2002), Boland & al. (Forest Trees Austral., ed. 4: 496–497. 1984; ed. 5: 450–451. 2006) and Melzer & Plumb (Pl. Capricornia: 241. 2007). Examples in horticultural works include Elliot & Jones (Encyc. Austral. Pl. 4: 183–184. 1986) and Holliday & Watton (Gard. Guide Eucalypts: 194–195. 1980). Examples in ecological or forestry work include Williams & Woinarski (Eucalypt Ecology, 1997) and Blake & Roff (Honey Fl. Queensl., ed. 3: 24–25. 1988).

Eucalyptus populnea is a dominant species or frequent component of 52 Regional Ecosystems in Queensland (Queensl. Herb. Reg. Ecosys. Desc. Database vers. 6.0b, 2012 [http://www.ehp.qld.gov.au/ecosystems/biodiversity/regional-ecosystems/index.php, accessed 25 Oct. 2012].

A subspecies, *E. populnea* subsp. *bimbil* L.A.S. Johnson & K.D. Hill has been described (Johnson & Hill in Telopea 4: 71. 1990), based on a specimen from the south-western plains of New South Wales. This taxon has not been universally accepted, but nevertheless its nomenclatural status would not be compromised by the success of this proposal. The location of the proposed conserved type for *E. populnea* (and hence for the autonymic subspecies) is only about 120 km from the type locality of *E. populifolia* Hook., and well within the region considered by Johnson & Hill (l.c.) to comprise *E. populnea* subsp. *populnea*.

Acceptance of this proposal will fix the application of the name *E. populnea* F. Muell., one of the most common and widespread species of *Eucalyptus* in eastern Australia, and its autonymic infraspecific taxon. If it is rejected, *E. populnea* would fall into synonymy with *E. tereticornis* Sm., and a new name would need to be coined for the poplar box. Loss of the name *Eucalyptus populnea* would cause serious upheaval to Australian taxonomists, ecologists and plant enthusiasts alike.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the late Gillian Perry for her help and encouragement and to Gordon Guymer for suggesting improvements to the manuscript.

(2114–2115) Proposals to reject the names *Hexasepalum* and *H. angustifolium* (*Rubiaceae*)

Andrea A. Cabaña Fader, Roberto M. Salas & Elsa L. Cabral

Instituto de Botánica del Nordeste (CONICET-UNNE), Sargento Cabral 2131, c.c. 209, C.P: 3400 Corrientes, Argentina
Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales y Agrimensura (UNNE), Avenida Libertad 5460, 3400 Corrientes, Argentina
Author for correspondence: *Andrea A. Cabaña Fader, andrecabfad@gmail.com*

(2114) ***Hexasepalum*** Bartl. ex DC., Prodr. 4: 561. Sep (sero) 1830 [*Dicot.*: *Rub.*], nom. utique rej. prop.
Typus: *Hexasepalum angustifolium* Bartl. ex DC.

(2115) ***Hexasepalum angustifolium*** Bartl. ex DC., Prodr. 4: 561. Sep (sero) 1830 [*Dicot.*: *Rub.*], nom. utique rej. prop.
Typus: Mexico. Hidalgo: Regio-Monte (Real del Monte) Mexicanorum, 1791–1792, *Haenke* (PR!; isotypi: G!, MO!).

From a single specimen Candolle (Prodr. 4: 561. 1830) described the genus *Hexasepalum* Bartl. ex DC. and the Mexican *H. angustifolium* Bartl. ex DC. as the only included species name and hence the type. This genus was defined by large flowers, calyces with six lobes, and indehiscent fruits. However, Candolle (l.c.) expressed doubts about the generic status of *Hexasepalum* and about whether it should better be included into *Diodia* L. However, he nonetheless described the specimen as a distinct genus, apparently following Bartling's annotation on the holotype of *H. angustifolium*. After its description, this generic name was only rarely mentioned again until 1880 when *Hexasepalum* was transferred by Baillon (Hist. Pl. 7: 391–392. 1880) to *Spermacoce* L. together with *Borreria* G. Mey., *Diodia*, *Dasycephala* (DC.) Benth. & Hook. f., *Mitracarpus* Zucc., and *Staelia* Cham. & Schltdl. A year later, *Hexasepalum* was considered as occupying an uncertain position (Hemsley, Biol. Cent.-Amer., Bot. 2: 6–66. 1881). In 1888, Schumann (in Martius, Fl. Bras. 6: 1–124) listed *Hexasepalum* in the synonymy of *Diodia* but did not formally combine its species. Lorence (in Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 73: 80. 1999) listed *H. angustifolium* as a synonym of *D. crassifolia* Benth.

or a related species. Currently, Govaerts (World Checkl. Rubiac., 2012 [http://apps.kew.org/wcsp/, accessed: 22 Sept. 2012]) considers *H. angustifolium* to be an uncertain name but lists the genus *Hexasepalum* as a synonym of *Diodia*. Similarly, Delprete & Jardim (in Rodriguésia 63: 101–128. 2012) list *Hexasepalum* as a synonym of *Spermacoce* L. without explanation. These works (Hemsley, l.c.; Schumann, l.c.; Lorence, l.c.; Govaerts, l.c.; Delprete & Jardim, l.c.) show that the taxonomic position and generic status of *Hexasepalum* still remains uncertain.

On the basis of an analysis of the holotype of *Hexasepalum angustifolium* deposited at PR, we conclude that this species falls within the circumscription of the species currently treated as *Diodella* Small (Fl. Miami: 177, 200. 1913), a genus widely distributed in the Americas from United States to Bolivia, Paraguay and Brazil, and introduced into Africa (Robbrecht & Berghen in Bull. Jard. Bot. Natl. Belg. 52: 247–248. 1982), Asia (Ravi & al. in J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 86: 277–278. 1989) and Australia (James & Allen in Harden, Fl. New South Wales 3: 495. 1992). Consequently, these genera are heterotypic synonyms.

Under this situation, the long-established and widely used legitimate name *Diodella* (Borhidi & Pérez in Acta Bot. Hung. 44: 237–280. 2002; Borhidi, Rubiac. México: 185. 2006; Borhidi & al. in Acta Bot. Hung. 51: 273–282. 2009; Bacigalupo & Cabral in Brittonia 57: 137. 2005, in Darwiniana 44: 98–104. 2006, in Wanderley & al., Fl. Fanerog. Estado São Paulo 5: 313–316. 2007; Bacigalupo & al. in Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 107: 2871–2920. 2008; Cabral & Cabaña in Rodriguésia 61: 119–121. 2010; Cabral & Salas, Lista Espéc. Fl. Brasil. 2010 [http://floradobrasil.jbrj.gov.br/2012/, accessed: 22 Sept. 2012]; Delprete & Cortéz in Rev. Biol. Neotrop. 3: 13–96. 2006; Delprete & al. in Reis, Fl. Ilus. Catarin. 1: 167–179. 2004; Delprete in Rizzo, Fl. Estad. Goiás Tocantins 40: 371. 2010; Wilbur in Rhodora 107: 408–413. 2005) cannot continue to be used because the genus *Hexasepalum* (1830) was validly published before *Diodella* (1913). With the application of the principle of priority, all 16 species described in *Diodella* would require transfer to *Hexasepalum*. This would be most disruptive nomenclaturally because the name *Diodella* is, at present, extensively used, while *Hexasepalum* has rarely been mentioned since its publication and generally treated as uncertain. Considering that, we propose to include *Hexasepalum* in the list of nomina utique rejicienda. Alternatively, *Diodella* could be conserved against *Hexasepalum*, but given the latter name's history we consider that the best decision is to reject *Hexasepalum* under Art. 56 of the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006).

Similar to *Hexasepalum*, *H. angustifolium* also falls within the circumscription of a well-known taxon, an endemic species of Mexico, *Diodella crassifolia* (Benth.) Borhidi. *Hexasepalum angustifolium* (1830) was described prior to the basionym *Diodia crassifolia* Benth. (Bot. Voy. Sulphur: 108. 1845) and for this reason it has priority. However, *H. angustifolium* has rarely been mentioned in the literature and always with uncertain position. On the other hand, the name *Diodella crassifolia*, or its basionym *Diodia crassifolia*, is a name widely used by many authors (Aviña & al. in Acta Bot. Mex. 53: 1–15. 2000; Borhidi & Pérez, l.c.: 237; Borhidi, l.c.: 185–186). For this reason, and in agreement with the criteria followed for the genus, we propose to reject the name *H. angustifolium* under Art. 56, preserving usage of the well-known name *Diodella crassifolia*.

Acknowledgements

We thank Antonio Krapovickas (CTES), Tom Ranker (University of Hawai'i at Manoa), Jefferson Prado (SP) and Fernando Zuloaga (SI) for helpful suggestions to make this proposal. Fred Barrie (MO c/o F) is specially acknowledged for helpful suggestions and improvements to resolve our nomenclatural conflict. We also are grateful to Guillermo Seijo (CTES) for the suggestions on the original manuscript.