

(1243) Proposal to conserve the name *Aechmea distichantha* (Bromeliaceae: Bromelioideae)

Jason R. Grant¹

(1243) *Aechmea distichantha* Lem., Jard. Fleur. 3: ad t. 269. 15 Feb 1853 [*Bromel.*],
nom. cons. prop.

Type: [icon in] Lemaire, Jard. Fleur.: t. 269. 1853.

(=) *Billbergia distichostachya* Lem., Jard. Fleur. 2: 96. Sept 1851 ('*distichostachia*'), *nom. rej. prop.*

(=) *Billbergia polystachya* Lindl. & Paxton, Paxt. Fl. Gard. 3: ad t. 80. May 1852,
nom. rej. prop.

Type: [icon in] Lindley & Paxton, Paxt. Fl. Gard.: t. 80. May 1852.

Aechmea distichantha Lem. is a superfluous renaming of *Billbergia distichostachya* Lem., and is also predated by *B. polystachya* Lindl. & Paxton. A conservation proposal is needed for nomenclatural stability.

Lemaire (l.c. 1851) announced *Billbergia distichostachya* ('*distichostachia*') as a new taxon that would be described and illustrated later, but in doing so, he briefly described the species and, probably inadvertently, validly published its name. No specimens were cited and none are known to exist. Therefore a neotype is here selected, the same plate as the conserved type of *Aechmea distichantha*, whereby the homotypic status of both is preserved. Next, Lindley & Paxton (l.c. 1852) proposed *B. polystachya* for what is clearly the same species, but that name has since never been used. When Lemaire, in 1853, published the full description and illustration of his new taxon, he changed its name to *A. distichantha* and, at the same time, recognized that it was the same as Lindley & Paxton's *B. polystachya*. Lindley & Paxton had based their description and illustration on a plant that Jonghe had on display at an exposition at the Royal Horticultural Society in London, whereas Lemaire had at his disposal a plate and dried specimen personally supplied to him by Jonghe.

Aechmea distichantha has been consistently used in important catalogues (e.g. Morren, Cat. Bromel.: 3. 1873), and both regional Brazilian Floras (e.g. Mez in Martius, Fl. Bras. 3(3): 342-343. 1892; Smith in Smithsonian Misc. Collect. 126: 213-215. 1955; Reitz, Bromel. Malária: 413-417. 1983; Leme & Marigo, Bromel. Brazil. Wild.: 104-105. 1993) and full monographic treatments of the *Bromeliaceae* (e.g. Beer, Fam. Bromel.: 136. 1856; Baker, Handb. Bromel.: 54. 1889; Mez in Candolle & Candolle, Monogr. Phan. 9: 249-250. 1896; Mez in Engler, Pflanzenr. 100: 149. 1935; and Smith & Downs in Fl. Neotrop. Monogr. 14: 1889-1893. 1979). The other two names have never been adopted in any major treatment and their use now would be disruptive both in botany and horticulture.

Acknowledgements

I thank Gea Zijlstra (Utrecht) and Richard K. Brummitt (Kew) for reviewing the literature and concurring that *Billbergia distichostachya* Lem. is in fact a validly published name,

¹ Department of Plant Biology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-5815, U.S.A.

leading to the current proposal. I also thank James L. Reveal for editing a first version of the proposal.