

(2639) Proposal to reject the name *Solanum frutescens* (*Solanaceae*)

Sandra Knapp,¹ Gloria E. Barboza,² Lynn Bohs³ & Tiina Särkinen⁴

¹ Department of Life Sciences, Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, United Kingdom

² Instituto Multidisciplinario de Biología Vegetal (CONICET-Universidad Nacional de Córdoba), Casilla de Correo 495, 5000 Córdoba, Argentina

³ Department of Biology, 1400 South, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, U.S.A.

⁴ Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh EH3 5LR, United Kingdom

Author for correspondence: Sandra Knapp, s.knapp@nhm.ac.uk

DOI <https://doi.org/10.12705/674.24>

The members of the Morelloid clade of *Solanum* (the black nightshades sensu Särkinen & al. in *Taxon* 64: 945–958. 2015) have long been considered difficult, and are nomenclaturally complex (e.g., Edmonds in *Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* 89: 165–170. 1984). As part of an ongoing revision of this group worldwide, we have encountered a name based on cultivated plants that appears to apply to a well-known species and that has priority over the name in current use, and whose uptake would cause considerable confusion in an already complex group. Rejection will stabilise nomenclature for species of the Morelloid clade of *Solanum*, and prevent use of destabilising names in the future.

(2639) *Solanum frutescens* A. Braun & C.D. Bouché in Braun & al., *App. Sp. Nov.* 1853: 9. Dec 1853–1854 (prim.). [Angiosp.: *Solan.*], nom. utique rej. prop.
Typus: non designatus.

Solanum frutescens was described by Braun & Bouché (in Braun & al., *App. Sp. Nov.* 1853: 9. 1853–1854) based on plants grown in the Berlin Botanic Garden from seeds sent by J.W.K. Moritz from Caracas. No specimens were cited, and it is probable that the taxon was described from living material. The protologue is, however, quite detailed but lacks the precise measurements that constitute diagnostic features in species of the Morelloid clade.

Bitter (in *Repert. Spec. Nov. Regni Veg.* 11: 222. 1912) later described *S. macrotonum*, basing it on a specimen in Berlin collected

by J.W.K. Moritz in Venezuela (*Moritz 1643* “Tovar, in campis” [i.e., Colonia Tovar in Aragua Province near Caracas]), without reference to Braun & Bouché’s (l.c.) earlier name, and stating that it had medicinal properties: “Utuntur succo in vulneribus inveteratis” (they use the juice for wounds in the elderly). This collection is represented in several other European and American herbaria (e.g., BM, F, HBG, K, P). Our extensive searches in European herbaria have revealed no other Moritz collections from the Caracas area.

Both the protologue of *S. frutescens* and that of *S. macrotonum* describe a long slender peduncle, reflexed pedicels, and a long-exserted style. The similarity of the descriptions, coupled with their both being based on material collected by Moritz in the area around Caracas, suggests these two names apply to the same species and possibly even to the same collection. The previously described *S. nigrescens* M. Martens & Galeotti (in *Bull. Acad. Roy. Sci. Bruxelles* 12(1): 140. 1845) also occurs in the Caracas area and could be the basis for *S. frutescens*, but differs in its more robust (usually shorter and stouter) peduncles.

Subsequent authors have almost completely ignored Braun & Bouché’s (l.c.) name. *Solanum macrotonum* has been adopted in monographic (Edmonds in *Kew Bull.* 27: 106. 1972; Soria & Heiser in *Ci. Naturaleza Ci. Nat.* 6: 56. 1963) and floristic works from Central and South America (D’Arcy in *Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard.* 60: 737. 1974 [“1973”]; Gentry & Standley in *Fieldiana, Bot.* 24: 181. 1974; Dodson & Gentry in *Selbyana* 4: 554. 1978; D’Arcy & al. in *Monogr.*

Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 45: 1127. 1993; Knapp in Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 75: 914. 1999; Correa & al., Cat. Vasc. Pl. Panama: 485. 2004; Bohs in Monogr. Syst. Bot. Missouri Bot. Gard. 131: 306. 2015; Monro & al. in Phytotaxa 322: 272. 2017; Ulloa & al. in Science 358: 1614–1617. 2017) with no mention of *S. frutescens*. Benítez de Rojas (in Revista Fac. Agron. (Maracay) 7: 62–63. 1974) listed both names as applying to species occurring in Venezuela, but with no further details. Nee (in Nee & al., Solanaceae IV: 306. 1999) placed *S. macrotonum* in the synonymy of *S. nigrescens*, but did not treat *S. frutescens*. Steyermark & Huber (Fl. Avila: 825. 1978) treated *S. macrotonum* as a synonym of *S. gollmeri* Bitter (itself a synonym of *S. nigrescens*) and did not mention *S. frutescens*. *Solanum frutescens* has not been synonymised with any other moreloid species in

any of these works. Neotypifying *S. frutescens* with a specimen of Venezuelan origin not collected by Moritz that corresponded to the other sympatric moreloids, *S. nigrescens* or *S. americanum*, could be considered to be in conflict with the protologue and could thus be superseded under Art. 9.19(c) of the ICN (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018).

It is likely that *S. frutescens* corresponds to the taxon now called *S. macrotonum*, and if it were to be brought into use, would have priority over that name. Rejection of *S. frutescens* A. Braun & C.D. Bouché would preserve usage of *S. macrotonum* Bitter and stabilise nomenclature in this complex of extremely similar and taxonomically difficult species.