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**Abstract.** The name *Webbia* has been used to describe three different genera: *Webbia* Spach (Clusiaceae), *Webbia* DC., *nom. illeg.* (Asteraceae: Vernonieae), and *Webbia* Sch. Bip., *nom. illeg.* (Asteraceae: Astereae). The title of the botanical journal *Webbia* does not pertain to any of these generic names but is a mere Latinization of the surname Webb, and was created as a patronym that honors the legacy of Philip Barker Webb (1793–1854). The journal is a tribute to Webb’s botanical contributions, and his importance in the development of the *Herbarium Webbianum*. The journal had an uneasy start, as a book proposal made by the Italian professor (University of Pisa) Ugolino Martelli to the Società Botanica Italiana to honor Webb was rejected in 1905. The names *Conyza obscura* DC. and *Erigeron capensis* Houtt. are lectotypified. The nomenclature of *Conyza pinfolia* Lam. is revisited, and it is considered a legitimate name. A specimen housed in G-DC is designated as the neotype of this Lamarckian name.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Founded in 1905 as a book by Italian professor (University of Pisa) Ugolino Martelli1 (1860–1934, Figure 1A), the journal *Webbia* (Figure 1B)

1 An extensive biographical account of Martelli was written by Negri (1935).
honors Philip Barker Webb (1793–1854, Figure 2A) for his botanical legacy and his contributions in the development of the collections of the Museo di Storia Naturale di Firenze. Indeed, Webb’s herbarium, documents, library, and house in Paris were bequeathed in his will to the Grand Duke of Tuscany Leopold II of Lorraine (1797–1870). The earnings from the sale of the house created an endowment for the curation of Webb’s collections and archives (Parlatore 1856; Stearn 1937).

The plant specimens formed the Herbarium Webbianum (Figure 3), which is currently a central part of the FI herbarium of the Botanical section “F. Parlatore” of the Natural History Museum of the University of Florence. Its entire library and archives are kept in the Biblioteca di Scienze – Botanica, Università degli Studi di Firenze ©. Many of Webb’s documents are posted online as part of the Humboldt Project (https://www.sba.unifi.it/p1790.html), which was sponsored by the Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte (Germany) and the Fundación Canaria Orotava de Historia de la Ciencia (Tenerife, Canary Islands, Spain). Details concerning the content and scope of Webb’s materials held in the Herbarium Webbianum were reviewed by Parlatore (1874), Steinberg (1973, 1977), Moggi (1993), and Nepi (2009).

Extensive accounts of Webb’s life and achievements were published by many authors, including Hooker (1854), Gay (1856), Parlatore (1856, 1992), Martelli (1904), Chiarugi (1956), and Stearn (1973), and it is...
not the main scope of our contribution to provide a full review of his biography. Nevertheless, because of Webb’s connections with Italy, especially with Florence, in the introduction of our paper we provide a historical overview pertinent to Webb’s associations with this country, and especially with Tuscany.

Webb’s contributions to the Macaronesian island flora are also relevant to our study. A few works, published mostly by Canarian Island scholars, provide details of Webb’s significant legacy to Macaronesian botany (Stearn 1937, 1973; García Pérez 1988; Rodríguez Delgado 1998; Relancio and Breen 2006; Suárez Martín 2016, 2018; Rico et al. 2017). Between 1828 and 1830, Webb and the French naturalist Sabin Berthelot (1794–1880) extensively explored this archipelago, visiting all of its islands with the exception of La Gomera and El Hierro. This exploration resulted in the single most important account ever produced on the natural history of the Canaries, the Histoire Naturelle des Îles Canaries, a multivolume work, authored mainly by these two naturalists, that was published between 1835 and 1850. Webb’s work pertinent to the islands was followed by his seminal publication on the flora of Cabo Verde (Webb 1849). The latter was a floristic treatment for which Webb was invited by the then Kew Garden director Sir William J. Hooker (1785–1865). Interestingly, Webb wrote this treatment without ever visiting Cabo Verde (Rico et al. 2017).

PHILIP BARKER WEBB AND ITALY

At the age of six, Webb, who was born into a wealthy aristocratic family, lost his father, and a large fortune inherited by his mother allowed Webb to receive financial support to travel extensively and to cultivate his passion for classical history, languages, and the natural world. Besides his native tongue English, Webb was fluent in Latin and Greek, as well as in modern Spanish, Italian, and French. Furthermore, he received excellent training in natural history as a student at Christ Church College, Oxford.

In 1815, Webb made his first trip to Italy where he met Alberto Parolini (1788–1867), an Italian humanist and botanist from Bassano del Grappa, Veneto (Figure 4A). This interaction led to a solid friendship that enhanced Webb’s fascination for Italy. Subsequently, both undertook an extensive and long joint trip to the Eastern Mediterranean, centered in Greece and Turkey. The voyage started in Naples on 30th April 1819 and finished in the same city on 21st June 1820. The main focus of this journey was to study the natural history of this region and to visit one of the main cradles of the
Figure 4. Images pertinent to Alberto Parolini and Philip B. Webb. (A) Portrait of A. Parolini from Matteo Favaretti collection. (B) Illustration of Parolinia ornata Webb (Brassicaceae) as published by Webb (1840: Plate 3), this is the type species of the Canary Island endemic genus Parolinia (La Serna Ramos and León Arenciibia 1980: 116), dedicated to Parolini by Webb. (C) Image of P. ornata in habitat. Photo credit: Gerardo García Casanova (C); courtesy of Phaidra, Sistema Bibliotecario di Ateneo, Università degli Studi di Padova (A); and Biblioteca di Scienze – Botanica, Università degli Studi di Firenze© (B).
Western civilizations. Later, Webb (1840) described the Canarian endemic genus *Parolinia* (seven species and occurring in the islands of La Gomera, Gran Canaria, La Palma, and Tenerife (Santos-Guerra 2021), Figures 4B-C) honoring Parolini's botanical contributions, and recognizing the great friendship that they cultivated ("Je dédie ce genre singulier à M. Parolini, éleve et compagnon de Brocchi, qui cultive lui-même les sciences naturelles avec succès. Il possède un des jardins de botanique les plus remarquables de l’Italie, et la collection la plus riche des roches de cette péninsule, qu’il livre généreusement aux études des savans étrangers. C’est avec lui que j’ai parcouru l’Italie méridionale, la Grèce, l’Asie-Mineure, et les îles de Malte et de Sicile, et je suis heureux de lui donner ici cette faible marque de ma haute estime et de ma vieille amitié.”

Between 1820 and 1821, Webb spent some additional time in Italy visiting the island of Ischia (Naples), Rome, Florence, Milan, and Venice, but his most relevant subsequent expedition was the aforementioned one to the Canary Islands (year 1828–1830). Following his stay in the Canaries, he and Berthelot travelled to France, northern Italy, and Switzerland. After this trip, Webb and Berthelot settled in Paris (between 1833 and 1847), mostly preparing their *Histoire Naturelle des Îles Canaries*. During this period, Webb hardly made any additional voyages outside England and France. It was in 1848 that Webb visited Italy again, and between this year and 1850 he devoted a great deal of his time botanizing in this country.

In Rome, Webb met the aristocrat Contessa Elisabetta Fiorini-Mazzanti (1799–1879) who was an authority on cryptogams. In Florence, Webb was impressed with the botanic garden. Founded in 1545 by the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Cosimo dei Medici (1519–1574), it is one of the oldest botanic institutions of the world. This botanic garden accommodated the *Imperiale e Regio Museo di Fisica e Storia Naturale*, where the *Herbarium Centrale Italiano* (known also as *Erbario Centrale Italiano* and currently as Botanical Section “Filippo Parlatore” of the Natural History Museum of the University of Florence) was located. This herbarium, created by the Grand Duke of Tuscany Leopold II of Lorraine (1797–1870) in 1842, had the Sicilian botanist Filippo Parlatore (1816–1877) as its first director (Figure 5). By then, Parlatore was considered the most talented botanist of the country, and he and Webb developed a great rapport; indeed, Webb’s (1854) last publication was prefaced by Parlatore, in which he referred to Webb as “doctissime amico” [“most erudite friend”]. Furthermore, Parlatore wrote the treatments of Apiaceae and Poaceae for the *Histoire Naturelle des Îles Canaries* (Parlatore 1842–1843, 1848).

This visit of Webb to Italy took place at the same time that Florence became the main hub for botanical studies of the country. Here, he found in Parlatore a great colleague, and greatly valued the vision of Leopold II as a statesman in supporting botanical endeavors by creating a major herbarium that was part of a natural history museum specifically located in a botanic garden. There is no doubt that the pro-botanical environment that he encountered then in Florence was relevant for Webb to bequeath his documents, collections, library, and Paris house to Leopold II. Webb being a highly cultured person with a well-rounded education and a passion for history, classical cultures, and art also found in Florence a greatly stimulating place. This ancient Italian city provided him with synergistic inspirations from the fields of both humanities and natural history. It is not surprising, therefore, that he elected to leave many of his belongings to the main city of Tuscany.

Webb made his last trip to Italy, including Florence, between late 1852 and July 1853, this happened one year prior to his death in Paris on 31st August 1854. After this journey to Italy, he returned to Paris and only made occasional visits to England (Relancio and Breen 2006: 68).

---

2 I dedicate this singular genus to M. Parolini, student and mate of Brocchi [it refers to Giovanni Battista Brocchi (1772–1826) who was also born in Bassano del Grappa], who cultivates the natural sciences with success. It has one of the most remarkable botanical gardens in Italy, and the richest collection of rocks from this peninsula, which he generously makes available to the studies of foreign scholars. It was with him that I traveled through southern Italy, Greece, Asia Minor, and the islands of Malta and Sicily, and I am happy to give him here this humble recognition for my high respect and appreciation, and my long-standing friendship.
On 1st December 1855, about a year after the death of Webb, Filippo Parlatore honored the memory of his friend with a lecture delivered at the Imperiale e Regio Museo di Fisica e Storia Naturale of Florence in the presence of countless political, diplomatic, cultural and scientific authorities, including a large audience of influential people from Tuscany (Parlatore 1856, 1992 [posthumous]).

Parlatore’s lecture, published by him on 24th March 1856, accompanied by Webb’s complete bibliography, included a detailed description of Webb’s collections and the herbaria represented therein, and also a detailed synopsis of all the botanical collections of the Herbarium Centrale Italicum, by then regarded among the top ten most important botanical institutions worldwide (Simpson 2010, Funk 2017, Thiers 2022).

As a testimony of Webb’s relationships with important botanists and scientists of the time, Parlatore (1856) also published a selection of correspondence between Webb and natural history scholars such as A. Brogniart, J. Pavón, C. Heineken, A.P. De Candolle, J. D’Urville, M. Lagasca, F.E.L. Fischer, Ch. Guadichaud, F. de Girard, A. de Saint-Hilaire, Ad. de Jussieu, and A. Richard.

WEBBIA: FROM BOOK TO JOURNAL

Prof. Martelli proposed to the Società Botanica Italiana to publish a festschrift under the name of Webbia to celebrate Webb’s 50th memorial anniversary (Martelli 1904, 1905a; Moggi 2006). The original title of the book was a mere commemorative Latin form of the surname Webb to create a patronym (cf., Arnoldia, Englera, Linnaea, Willdenowia, etc. as journal names honoring distinguished botanists). Therefore, it is evident that Webbia, as a journal title, does not refer to any generic name.

The intention was to title the publication as a tribute to Webb and to enshrine him as a distinguished botanist and as one of the most important foreign contributors who helped to advance botany as a discipline in Italy. It was a recognition of Webb’s associations with Italian botanists and to him for bequeathing his collections, library, documents, and house in Paris to the city of Florence.

During that era, it was not an unusual practice to also Latinize names of personalities as patronym to create the titles of new Italian journals (e.g., Delpinoa dedicated to Federico Delpino, Malpighia as tribute Marcello Malpighi or Parlatorea to honor Filippo Parlatore; see list of Italian journal in Lenzi Grillini (1988).

However, the initial efforts for founding Webbia met with hurdles. Three major obstacles were encountered by Martelli (1904) when he presented his proposal to the Società Botanica Italiana. The first obstacle was by those who felt that such a celebratory initiative should be part of a centennial and not of a fiftieth anniversary event to honor Webb’s legacy with the title of a major publication. Stephen Sommier (1848–1922), President of this botanical society at that time, was one of those opponents. Another objection, laid by Pasquale Baccarini (1858–1919), Director of the Istituto Botanico e dell’Erbario Centrale di Firenze at that time, was that adequate scientific contributions were not available to justify a publication. The third obstacle was that by then not all of Webb’s collections had been transferred from the Imperiale e Regio Museo di Fisica e Storia Naturale to the Istituto Botanico e dell’Erbario Centrale di Firenze; the latter is at Piazza San Marco, and this is the site at which Webb’s collections are currently located. Pasquale Baccarini was also the main proponent of this objection.

Prof. Martelli was obviously frustrated that these objections resulted in the rejection of his proposal, mentioning the same in the foreword to what can be considered as the first issue of Webbia (Martelli 1905b): “My proposal to the Italian Botanical Society, based in Florence, was modest and did not want to offend anyone’s susceptibility. It was a proposal that a priori I hoped to be accepted with complacency even by those who were hostile to it. It failed, due to the veiled submission of the Presidency of the Botanical Society and the hostility of the Director of the Florentine Botanical Institute, who with smooth words opposed the honors.” Undeterred by the lack of support from the Società Botanica Italiana, Martelli eventually published this book himself (Lenzi Grillini 1988: 1078–1079). This work as published in 1905 represents the beginning of a long academic journey eventually establishing Webbia as a botanical journal (for more details on the first 100 years of the journal, see Moggi 2006). It is beyond any doubt that the founding of the journal Webbia was certainly not under quiet and peaceful circumstances, but considering that it is about to reach 120 years of life, it was worth it.

WEBBIA: THE THREE GENERA

The name Webbia was used to describe three different genera honoring Webb’s legacy. The earliest of these genera belongs to the Guttiferae (or Clusiaceae) and was published in June 1836 by the French botanist Édouard Spach (1801–1879), (Spach 1836a: 408, “Nous avons dédié ce genre à M. Ph. Barker-Webb, célèbre botaniste anglais, auter (conjointement avec M. Sabin...
Honoring Philip Barker Webb: the three intriguing stories of Webbia as a genus name

We have dedicated this genus to Mr. Ph. Barker-Webb, famous English botanist, author (jointly with Mr. Sabin Berthelot) of a magnificent work on the natural history of the Canary Islands.


5 Genus dedicated to my most famous friend Philip Barker Webb.
Figure 6. Selection of photos of species that were originally described within *Webbia* Spach, *Webbia*, DC. or *Webbia* Sch.Bip. in habitat. Accepted names are found in nomenclature diagnoses. (A) *Webbia canariensis* (L.) Webb & Berthel. (B) and (C) *Webbia kraussii* Sch.Bip. (D) and (E) *Webbia hirsuta* DC. (F) *Webbia aristata* DC. Photo credits: Arnoldo Santos-Guerra (A); Rich Hoyer (B, C); and John Manning (D–F).
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Besides the three *Webbia* generic names, the New Guinea palm genus *Barkerwebbia* Becc. was also dedicated to Webb in the first issue of the journal *Webbia* (Beccari 1905: 281, “Ho dedicato il nuovo genere Bark-
Figure 8. Distribution map of Webbia DC. (Asteraceae: Vernonieae). Filled dots: Webbia serratuloides DC. Unfilled dots, species of Webbia DC. that are currently placed in Hilliardella H.Rob. Based on Swelankomo et al. (2016) and Several Authors (2022).
Honoring Philip Barker Webb: the three intriguing stories of Webbia as a genus name

Webbia a Filippo Barker Webb nella ricorrenza del 50° anniversario della sua morte). Its nomenclature and systematic placements have been reviewed by Trudgen and Baker (2008) and by Petoe and Barker (2019), and currently Barkerwebbia is included within Heterospathe Schef., a genus with a wider distribution from the Philippines to New Guinea, Moluccas, Micronesia, Vanuatu, and Fiji. A revision of the botanical history of Barkerwebbia, however, is not the scope of this article.

---

6 I have dedicated the new genus Barkerwebbia to Philip Barker Webb in the 50th anniversary of his death.

7 Accepted names indicated in bold font.
Hypericum canariense L., Sp. Pl. 2: 784. 1753

Type: Hypericum frutescens, canariensis, multiflorum canariense [Hort. Cliff.: 381, no. 9], lectotype designated by Wijnands (1983: 109), BM000646815 (photo!).


≡ Hypericum floribundum Aiton, Hort. Kew 3: 104. 1789


≡ Webbia canariensis var. floribunda (Aiton) Pit. & Proust, Îles Canaries: 134. 1909


≡ Hypericum canariense var. salicifolium Choisy in DC., Prodr. 1: 544 (Jan. 1824)

Type: Not cited (presumed: in insulis Canariis).

≡ Hypericum canariense var. triphyllum Choisy in DC., Prodr. 1: 544 (Jan. 1824)

Type: Not cited (presumed: in insulis Canariis).


Type: Webbia platysepala Nob. Ténériffe. Webb (holotype P05151177 (photo!).

≡ Hypericum platysepalum (Spach) Steud., Nomencl. Bot. 2nd ed. 1: 789 (Dec. 1840), as ‘platypetalum’.

≡ Hypericum platysepalum (Spach) Walpers Repert. Bot. Syst. 1: 386 (Nov. 1842)


≡ Webbia canariense var. platysepala (Spach) Pit. & Proust, Îles Canaries: 134. 1909, as ‘platypetala’.

≡ Webbia heterophylla Spach, Hist. Nat. Veg. Phan. 5: 409 (June 1836)

Type: not found.

Typification notes

Spach (1836a, b) published two works that included descriptions for his new genus Webbia. The cover of *Histoire Naturelle des Végétaux* (Spach 1836a) clearly shows...
that it was issued in June 1836. The second work (Spach 1836b), was included in the fifth volume of *Annales des Sciences Naturelles*, and according to Stafleu and Cowan (1985: 768) this was also issued in June 1836. The same publication dates for these two publication create confusion regarding the priority between the two publications. We have chosen the publication by Spach (1836a) as having priority. There are two reasons for our assessment. Firstly, the species name “Webbia platypetala” was published in *Historie Naturelle des Végétaux* (Spach 1836a). However, in *Annales des Sciences Naturelles*, the epithet “platypetala” was corrected to “platysepala” by Spach who remarked as follows: “platypetala ex errore typographico” (Spach 1836b). Secondly, Spach (1836b) indicated that *W. heterophylla*, a species that was described by him in the *Historie Naturelle des Végétaux* (Spach 1936a) was included in *W. canariensis*.

Webbia DC.* (Asteraceae: Vernonieae)

*Webbia* DC., Prodr. 5: 72 (Oct. 1836), nom. illeg., non *Webbia* Spach, Hist. Nat. Veg. Phan. 5: 408 (June 1836)


Type: *Hilliardiella pinifolia* H.Rob., nom. invalid. (Conyza pinifolia Lam., *Vernonia pinifolia* (Lam.) Less.).


Type: *Vernonia oligocephala* (DC.) Sch.Bip. in Walpers (*Webbia oligocephala* DC.).

(*) *Crystallopollen* Steetz in Peters, Reise Mossambique 6 (Bot., 2): 363. 1864. (unplaced accepted genus (J.C. Manning pers. comm.; Manning and Govaerts, in prep.).

Type: *Crystallopollen angustifolium* Steetz. Polydora Fenzl, Flora 27: 312. 1844*, nom. nud.* (lectotype designated by Robinson (1999: 230)).


Type: *P. serratuloides* (DC.) H.Rob. (*Webbia serratuloides* DC., “*Polydora stoechadifolia* Fenzl”, invalid.).

*Vernonia smithiana* Less., Linnaea 6: 638. 1831

Type: Democratic Republic of the Congo, Congo – Chrª Smith, C. Smith s.n. (holotype BM013860195 (photo!); Fl. Afr. Trop iii: 276 (isotype, K000272867 (photo!)).

(*) *Webbia smithiana* (Less.) DC., Prodr. 5: 72 (Oct. 1836)


*Erigeron capensis* (as ‘capense’) Houtt., Nat. Hist., Deel [Part] 2, 10: 629 (June 1779)

Type: Illustration in Houtt., Nat. Hist. Deel [Part] 2, 10: t. 69, f. 2 (June 1779), lectotype here designated.

(*) *Cacalia capensis* (Houtt.) Kuntze, Rev. Gen. 3(2): 138 (Sept. 1898)


(*) *Hilliardiella capensis* (Houtt.) H.Rob. in Robinson et al., PhytoKeys 60: 87 (Feb. 2016)

(*) *Conyza canescens* L.f., Suppl.: 367 (Oct. 1782)

Type: South Africa, Cape, Thunberg 334 (holotype LNN 993.7 (photo!); possible isotype: UPS-THUNB (19376 — microfiche!).

(*) *Conyza pinifolia* Lam., Encycl. 2: 86 (Oct. 1786)

Type: C B Sp Musée royal (illeg.) Berlin, Krebs 1830, (G-DC, G00464328 (photo!), neotype here designated); isoneotype: P (P022845 (photo!).

(*) *Vernonia pinifolia* (Lam.) Less., Linnaea 4: 257 (1829), non *V. canescens* Kunth in Humboldt et al., Nov. Gen. Sp. 4 (folio ed.): 27 (Dec. 1818)

(*) *Webbia pinifolia* (Lam.) DC., Prodr. 5: 72 (Oct. 1836)

(*) *Hilliardiella pinifolia* H.Rob. [as “(Less.) H.Rob.”] in

(≡) Vernonia pinifolia var. glabrata Harv. in Harvey & Sonder, Fl. Cap. 3: 51 (Feb.–June 1865)

Type: South Africa, Eastern Cape, Howieson’s Poort, Hutton s.n., holotype (TCD).

Webbia hirsuta DC., Prodr. 5: 73 (Oct. 1836)

Type: “in Africa australi ad Tambukiland et Cafferland (Eckl.! n. 725 et 1318), ad Katriviersberg et Port Natal (Dreg.)”; lectotype designated by Swelankomo et al. (2016): 42. South Africa, KwaZulu-Natal, Howieson’s Poort, Hutton s.n., holotype (TCD).

Webbia nudicaulis DC., Prodr. 5: 73 (Oct. 1836)


Webbia oligocephala DC., Prodr. 5: 73 (Oct. 1836)


(≡) Vernonia kraussii var. oligocephala (DC.) Harvey in Harvey & Sonder, Fl. Cap. 3: 51 (Feb.–June 1865)


(≡) Webbia elaeagnoides DC., Prodr. 5: 73 (Oct. 1836)


Webbia aristata DC., Prodr. 5: 73 (Oct. 1836)

Type: “ad Cap. Bonae Spei ad Katrivier (Dreg. sp. exs.), ad Zw. Key et Basche (between Kei and Bashee rivers), R. IV, 1835 (sic. but evidently March/April 1832 fide Glen & Germishuizen (2010: 155), Drège 5072, (holotype G-DC, G00464303 (photo!)).


(≡) Vernonia nudicaulis (DC.) Kuntze, Revis. Gen. Pl. 2: 970 (Nov. 1891)


Webbia oligocephala DC., Prodr. 5: 73 (Oct. 1836)


(≡) Vernonia kraussii var. oligocephala (DC.) Harvey in Harvey & Sonder, Fl. Cap. 3: 51 (Feb.–June 1865)


(≡) Webbia elaeagnoides DC., Prodr. 5: 73 (Oct. 1836)


Webbia aristata DC., Prodr. 5: 73 (Oct. 1836)


Webbia oligocephala DC., Prodr. 5: 73 (Oct. 1836)


(≡) Vernonia kraussii var. oligocephala (DC.) Harvey in Harvey & Sonder, Fl. Cap. 3: 51 (Feb.–June 1865)


(≡) Webbia elaeagnoides DC., Prodr. 5: 73 (Oct. 1836)
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(*) *Cacalia aristata* (DC.) Kuntze, Rev. Gen.: 138. 1898


*Webbia serratuloides* DC., Prodr. 5: 73 (Oct. 1836)


**Typification notes**

The works of Hilliard (1977), Jeffrey (1988), Robinson (1999), Swelankomo and Manning (2016), and Van Wyk and Klopper (2021) provided the basis for our nomenclatural study of names associated with *Webbia* DC. We concur with the conclusions of these studies, but we make a few amendments to their typifications. Firstly, we have assigned bar-code numbers to type specimens identified in these previous works. Furthermore, we have identified the holotype of *Vernonia smithiana* as one of the two isotypes listed by Jeffrey (1988, BM013860195). The original description of this species was based on material collected by the Norwegian botanist Christen Smith (1785–1816) during the ill-fated expedition that he and others undertook to the Congo River region in the summer of 1916 (Lessing 1831: 639). The protologue refers to a specimen that was part of the herbarium of the Danish botanist J.W. Hornemann (1770–1841). Hornemann’s herbarium is located in C with additional collections in nine other institutions (Stafleu and Cowan 1979: 333). We could not locate specimens of this species in any of these ten herbaria, and therefore, have accepted BM013860195 as the holotype with an isotype housed in K (K000272867).

The holotype of *Webbia serratuloides* was also located during our study. The identified specimen (G00464329) is housed in De Candolle’s herbarium (G-DC) and matches the morphological features and collection provenance indicated in the protologue (De Candolle 1836: 73). The correct nomenclatural placement of this name is part of an ongoing project (John C. Manning pers. comm) and is not included in this contribution.

Furthermore, in our study of *Erigeron capensis*, we designate the illustration included in the species protologue as the lectotype [Houttuyn 1779: 629, plate 69 (Fig. 2)]. We provide a revised interpretation for the name *Webbia pinifolia* (Lam.) DC., as a superfluous but legitimate name for *Erigeron capensis* Houtt. (1783) on the following grounds. In the protologue of his new species *Conyza pinifolia*, Lamarck (1786), at the end of the second paragraph of this species treatment, included the following two synonyms: “*Eichrysium peregrinum angustifolium … calyce spinoso candido*.” [An Conyza canescens Lin. f. Suppl. 367 [1782]]. Of these, “*Eichrysium peregrinum angustifolium … calyce spinoso candido*” is a polynomial and does not affect the status of the name *Conyza pinifolia*. Regarding the citation of “An Conyza canescens,” it is noted here that in Latin disjunctive clauses, the term ‘an’ is interpreted as denoting uncertainty by itself, without a verb of doubting, and in disjunctive interrogations, ‘an’ is read as “not, whether.” In other words, the doubtfully cited synonym *C. canescens* does not cause superfluity and illegitimacy to the name *C. pinifolia* Lam., and the Lamarck name is legitimate and can serve as a basionym.

Subsequently, Lessing (1829) published *Vernonia pinifolia* and cited *Conyza pinifolia* as the basionym. Furthermore, in contrast to Lamarck’s treatment, Lessing included *C. canescens* as a synonym. It is emphasized here that the new combination *V. pinifolia* was based on the legitimate epithet-bringing synonym *C. pinifolia*. Such new combinations, if they include older legitimate synonyms at the same rank, are nomenclaturally superfluous but not illegitimate (vide Art. 52.4). In this case, because of the existence of *V. canescens* Kunth (1818) for a New World taxon, the name *V. pinifolia* is neither nomenclaturally superfluous nor illegitimate.

For his *Webbia pinifolia*, De Candolle cited *Conyza pinifolia* and *Vernonia pinifolia* as synonyms but implicitly excluded *C. canescens*. However, he included *Erigeron capensis* Houtt. as a synonym. Thus, as illustrated by Art. 52, the new combination *W. pinifolia* (Lam.) DC. was nomenclaturally superfluous for *E. capensis*, but not illegitimate when made.

Within his new genus *Hilliardiella*, Robinson (1999: 230) proposed a new combination as “*Hilliardiella pinifolia* (Less.) H. Rob.” and cited the basionym as “*Vernonia pinifolia* Less., Linnaea 4:257. 1829.” For new combinations made after 1952, direct references to the basionyms are mandatory (vide Art. 41.5). As mentioned above, *Vernonia pinifolia* itself is a new combination with a direct reference to *Conyza pinifolia*, and Robinson erred...
in his basionym citation. Since Lessing cited *C. pinifolia* as the basionym and since Robinson (1999: 230) did not refer to the basionym directly, his intended new combination was invalid when made (Art. 41.8(a) and Ex. 25 apply). It is mentioned here that as per Art. 41.8(d), on or after 1 January 1953, citation of an indirect reference to the basionym is treated as a correctable error, not affecting the valid publication of new combination when the resulting new combination would otherwise be the validly published name of a new taxon. In other words, had Robinson (1999: 230) provided or referenced a Latin description and holotype citation, the proposed “*Hiliardiella pinifolia* (Less.) H. Rob.” would be corrected to “*Hiliardiella pinifolia* (Lam.) H. Rob.” and treated as a valid new combination. In this case, Robinson did directly refer to the Latin description of *Vernonia pinifolia* but did not cite type or holotype. Therefore, Art. 41.8(d) does not apply, and the published new combination “*Hiliardiella pinifolia* (Less.) H. Rob.” is invalid.

Regarding the type of the Lamarckian name *Conyza pinifolia*, the protologue states “Cette plante croit au Cap de Bonne Espérance, & nous a été communiquée par M. Sonnerat.” Pierre Sonnerat (1748–1814) was a French naturalist who travelled and collected both plant and animal specimens primarily in Mauritius but with brief stopovers in Cape Town in South Africa in 1773 and 1782. Sonnerat did not venture much beyond the immediate vicinity of Cape Town, and as the species does not occur there it is unlikely that he himself collected it. His core herbarium is in P with duplicates in C, G, LE, LINN, STB (Staffeu and Cowan 1985: 745). We have not found any material attributable to *Conyza pinifolia* Lam. in the collections of Sonnerat housed in these herbaria. Therefore, we designated a specimen that was collected at the Cape of Good Hope by the German apothecary and naturalist Georg L. E. Krebs (1792–1844) as the neotype. The selected specimen is housed in G-DC (G00450343 (photo!)), and it is mentioned in his account for *Conyza pinifolia* in G-DC (G00450328, G00450317 (photo!)); isoneotypes, N. 602 in collibus prope Knysna River (TUB004915 (photo!)); isoelectotypes, N. 602 in collibus prope Knysna Gorge, P031296 (photo!); in collibus prope Knysna River, Dr. Krauss, (P031297 (photo!); in collibus prope Knysna River, Krauss, (W0012365 (photo!).

(*) *Conyza obscura* DC., Prodr. 5: 387 (Oct. 1836)

Type: Omtata and Omsamwubo [between Umtata and Umzimvubu] R.III, Drège 3733 (lectotype here designated, G-DC, G00450339 (photo!)); isoelectotypes, Wittebergen [Witteberg], Drège 3733 G-DC, G00450317 (photo!); Wittebergen [Witteberg] R VIII, Drège 3733 G-DC, G00450343 (photo!),


(*) *Conyza obscura* var. calvescens DC., Prodr. 5: 387 (Oct. 1836)

Type: Langkloof, Drège 5717 G-DC (holotype G00450209 (photo!).

*Typification notes* 

*Webbia kraussii* was known to Harvey (1865: 114) only from the description, and he treated it as a ‘doubtful genus–probably a species of *Conyza’*. It was subsequently placed in synonymy under *Conyza obscura* by Hilliard (1977) in her regional monograph of the family for Natal (South Africa). Hilliard’s citation of the TUB specimen as the “holotype” of the name can be construed as an act of effective lectotypification as it was inadvertently done in 1977, and at that time, it was not necessary to include a typification statement “here designated” or its equivalent, a phrase required for lecto-, neo-, and epitypifications done on or after 1 January 2001 (Shenzhen Code Art. 7.11; Turland et al. 2018).

Regarding the type of *Conyza obscura*, Hilliard (1977) listed five specimens as ‘Types’, and thus did not typify
the name. We found Drège 3733 at G-DC [G00450339] as the best material agreeing with the description and choose it as the lectotype.
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