

Comments on proposal to conserve *Sinarundinaria* Nakai

(For IAPT Committee for Spermatophyta, text not submitted for publication)

C.M.A. Stapleton, W.D. Clayton, S. Dransfield, & S.A. Renvoize

Summary

[The proposal \(Li, 1996b\)](#) is concerned principally with the application of the generic names *Sinarundinaria* Nakai and *Yushania* Keng f. to temperate Asian bamboos. By conserving a type specimen for the type species name contrary to existing application of the name, its principal effect would be to bring *Sinarundinaria* out from synonymy in *Fargesia* Franchet, and to reduce *Yushania* to a synonym of *Sinarundinaria*. However, the exact intentions of the proposer are far from clear, and the full consequences of the measure proposed do not appear to have been considered adequately. In fact the proposed action would change the specific name of one of the most widely planted bamboos in temperate horticultural cultivation, and would also actually lead to an additional approximately 51 to 54 new combinations, rather than the reduction claimed. It would also seem to conflict with conventional usage of generic names in many parts of the world, including most of China.

Typification of *Sinarundinaria*

The type species of *Sinarundinaria* Nakai, elected by its author (1935), is *Sinarundinaria nitida*. Nakai (1935) referred to publication of *Arundinaria nitida* by both Mitford (1895) and Stapf (1896).

The validity of the first publication of *A. nitida*, attributed to Mitford in August 1895 might be questionable, but the species he had in mind is not. He later stated that he derived the epithet from the bright colour of the leaves of a bamboo cultivated at Kew (Mitford, 1896b). Moreover this same plant was the basis for the validating description of the name given the previous year by W. J. Bean. This species had been received as seed from China via St Petersburg by James Veitch & Sons Ltd. in April 1889 (Veitch & Sons, 1895). It later became known as the Fountain Bamboo, and is now one of the most widely planted of all horticultural species.

The name of the publishing author is not known as the place of publication was the editorial section of the Gardeners' Chronicle. The writer of the editorial notices was reporting on a lecture given by Mitford at the Royal Horticultural Society, the text of which was to be published the following year in the RHS Journal (Mitford, 1896a) and also in a separate book (Mitford, 1896b). Its validity relies upon reference to an earlier, brief description in March 1894 of plants mis-identified as *A. khasiana* Munro by Bean (1894). This publication is valid as the anonymous writer directly attributed the name to Mitford, making his own name irrelevant.

The type of *A. nitida* Mitford should be selected with reference to material studied by the author of the validating description, not the author of the name. This was Bean, the horticulturalist who grew the Fountain Bamboo at Kew. The description of *Arundinaria khasiana* sensu Bean was based solely upon the living material in his charge. A collection labelled '*A. nitida* Mitford, *A. khasiana* Hort. (Kan-si, St. Petersburg)' from the Fountain Bamboo cultivated at Kew by Bean was deposited in the Arboretum Herbarium in September 1895. This specimen has never been cited or selected as a type, as the validity of Mitford's publication of the name *A. nitida* in Gardeners' Chronicle had previously been considered doubtful (Stapleton 1995). This specimen should really have been selected as type of *A. nitida* Mitford. As a type has already been selected for the name (Stapleton 1995, as lectotype of *A. nitida* Mitford ex Stapf), that selection should stand, but as neotype of *A. nitida* Mitford. The material from Bean's cultivated plant at Kew would also be a neotype, as it was also made after the validating description was published. Which of these two collections typifies the name would seem to make little if

any difference. Both collections are known to have originated from the same seed batch, and are therefore genetically very closely related.

Stapf (1896) published *Arundinaria nitida* Mitford ex Stapf in the Kew Bulletin five months later, giving a diagnosis and full description, both of which were based equally upon two cited collections, neither of which were indicated as holotype. Stapf stated (1896) that his description was drawn up from both cited specimens, rather than the material growing at Kew. One, although labelled 'Potanin, North Szechuan' consisted of vegetative material from the Fountain Bamboo cultivated in St Petersburg from the same batch of seed as the UK material (Batalin 1895):

"..drawn out off [raised from] seeds, which we received [m]any years ago from North Szechuan, collected by Mr Potanin, and of which we have distributed little quantities of seeds in the year 1889. The branch, which I send you, is just cutten off from a pot-grown exemplar."

The other specimen was a fertile collection of a completely different species from a different genus collected by Henry in a different Province of China now known as *Yushania confusa* (McClure) Wang & Ye from Hupeh. Li suggests that the second fertile element should be taken as forming the essential basis of Stapf's description, simply because it was fertile. This argument seems baseless.

The name *nitida* has been used for the cultivated Fountain Bamboo around the world. When sterile material of *A. nitida* (along with *A. murielae* Gamble) was received from Kew by Nakai in Japan he erected a new genus *Sinarundinaria* for these two species alone (Nakai, 1935). He stated that the material had been sent from the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, in an exchange of living plants:

"..taken from the type bushes of the bamboos determined by Mitford and Gamble, and which are being cultivated in the Gardens."

Contrary to Li's assertion in his proposal, Nakai's description is based solely upon the Fountain Bamboo. It is purely vegetative, with no mention of floral parts at all. He did not repeat any of Stapf's floral description of the erroneously included Henry collection of *Yushania confusa*. He did cite illustrations in Camus (1913), and along with 6 drawings of vegetative parts, there is one depicting a single spikelet. However, the identity of this spikelet is a mystery. It has 7 fertile florets, while those of the Henry collection have only two or three. It clearly has no connection whatsoever with either of the specimens cited by Stapf. Although we cannot know what was in Nakai's mind at the time, there seems to be absolutely no evidence whatsoever that he had any intention of basing *Sinarundinaria* upon the Henry collection, despite Li's strong and rather surprising assertion to the contrary.

McClure examined the material at Kew in 1936 and realised Stapf's mistake in including two species in the description of *A. nitida*. He published the species *Indocalamus confusus* in 1940, with the Henry collection as holotype. He annotated the other collection of *A. nitida*, the material of the Fountain Bamboo from St Petersburg, as representing the nomenclatural type of *A. nitida* Mitford in Bamboo Garden (Mitford, 1896b), but he did not publish this as a formal lectotypification. It cannot be assumed that *A. nitida* Stapf became typified by the 2nd collection automatically by implication when McClure removed one of the two cited collections of *A. nitida* Stapf as the holotype of a separate, new species. It was formalized later by lectotypification (Stapleton, 1995) in accordance with current usage of the epithet, assuming that *A. nitida* Stapf. was the first valid publication, rather than *A. nitida* Mitford in the Gardeners' Chronicle.

The generic affinity of *Indocalamus confusus* McClure was re-assessed after examination of its rhizomes, and it was transferred to *Yushania* Keng f. (Wang & Ye, 1981). Recently brought into cultivation in the West, it is clearly congeneric with the type species of *Yushania*, *Y. niitakayamensis* (Hayata) Keng f. Therefore, if the Henry collection were conserved as the type of *A. nitida* Mitford as proposed, then because *nitida* is the type of *Sinarundinaria*, the generic names *Yushania* and *Sinarundinaria* would become synonymous. As *Yushania* was only published in 1957, *Sinarundinaria* would have priority over *Yushania*, and *Yushania* would become a synonym of *Sinarundinaria*.

Full implications of the proposed conservation

It is not really clear exactly what the proposer intended from this conservation. Conserving the genus name *Sinarundinaria* seems to serve no purpose if the Henry specimen of *Yushania confusa* cited by Stapf is conserved as the neotype of the species *S. nitida* (Mitford) Nakai. There would be no homonym of *Sinarundinaria* Nakai to be rejected, and no nomenclatural or taxonomic synonym either. *Fargesia* could not be considered a taxonomic synonym of *Sinarundinaria*, as the inflorescences of its type species, *F. spathacea*, and those of the Henry collection of *Yushania confusa* are so different. Therefore, if there were any merit in the proposal, conservation of the species *S. nitida* with a conserved type would have been adequate, without conservation of the genus *Sinarundinaria*.

The justification for this proposal is meant to be the nomenclatural stability of 200 species in the *Thamnocalamus* group. In fact, the real repercussions of this proposed conservation would seem rather different from those suggested by the proposer. They require careful objective consideration in the light of different breadths of species and genus concepts. There would be nomenclatural implications at both specific and generic levels.

At the species level, the Fountain Bamboo, one of the most important of all horticultural bamboos and widely cultivated around the world, could no longer be called *Arundinaria nitida*, *Sinarundinaria nitida*, *Fargesia nitida* or *Thamnocalamus nitidus*. The bamboos currently known as *Yushania confusa*, now cultivated in the West, would be given the name *Sinarundinaria nitida* instead.

There is a strong possibility that the Fountain Bamboo will eventually be considered conspecific with an earlier species, *Fargesia spathacea* Franchet, although this is by no means proven or accepted, as so little material has been collected. It has been pointed out (Stapleton 1995) that following a broad species concept the flowers of both species are similar enough for them to be considered conspecific, and in that case this proposal would have no effect at the species level. However, if they were considered conspecific it would surely seem that there would be a strong case for conservation of the name *A. nitida* Mitford with a cultivated specimen as type, against the earlier taxonomic synonym *Fargesia spathacea*. It would appear that this may even have been the original intention of the proposer.

However, the vegetative differences are sufficient for them to be considered different species by some authorities, especially in China where species concepts are often rather narrow. In that case a new name would have to be given to this horticulturally important species, were this proposal to be accepted. If the proposal were to be rejected, then the conservation of *nitida* against *spathacea* might be considered instead. However, this could then cause great confusion if they are considered by some to be different species, as under Article 14.6 *spathacea* could be used even after it had been rejected. Clearly further work is required before conservation of *nitida* against *spathacea* is considered.

The wording of this proposal seems very misleading with regard to the effects upon application of the epithet *nitida*. The structure of the final paragraph could lead to the impression that it aims to prevent 'A. *nitida* as currently understood' from being replaced, while it actually would ensure that that is exactly what happens.

At the generic level the real implications, although substantial, seem most likely to be restricted to the genera with open inflorescences, and would not affect genera such as *Thamnocalamus* and *Fargesia* at all, contrary to the claims of the proposer.

The principal effect of this proposed conservation would essentially be the recognition of *Sinarundinaria*, which presently has 59 species, in place of *Yushania*, which presently has 81 species. As *Sinarundinaria* has recently been used as a taxonomic 'dumping ground' to some extent, it contains a very wide range of species (Appendix 1). Only 3 species were originally described in *Sinarundinaria*, and most species already have several combinations in other genera. Of the 59 species with combinations in *Sinarundinaria*, only about 24 would ever be placed in *Yushania*. Of those, 19 species

already have combinations in *Yushania*, so that if the status quo is maintained a maximum of 5 combinations is required, if a broad generic concept is followed. This conflicts somewhat with the ‘some 50 species’ suggested by the proposer.

On the other hand, *Yushania* is a genus in which only 25 of the 81 species were transferred from other genera (Appendix 2). If this proposal were accepted, and *Sinarundinaria* were conserved, then no fewer than 55 of those species presently in *Yushania* would require new combinations, regardless of the breadth of generic concept. It is strange that the proposer does not mention this at all. In a paper from which this proposal is a modified excerpt (Li, 1996a) he lists the genera that he would like to recognize. *Yushania* is not in the list, and it would certainly seem that he has every intention of treating it as a synonym of *Sinarundinaria*, and if this proposal were to be accepted it would seem that no other course of action would be possible.

The proposer mentions the possibility of taking a narrower view of the genera, and recognizing another segregate genus in addition to *Yushania* or *Sinarundinaria*. If such a generic concept is followed, then 4 species of *Sinarundinaria* will require new combinations in the segregate genus, regardless of this proposal. 3 of those 4 species are all already part of the 5 that would require transferral into *Yushania* under the status quo, so that 6 new combinations in *Yushania* and the segregate genus would be required if this proposal were not accepted.

There are presently an unknown number of species in *Fargesia* that clearly cannot stay in that genus. They have open inflorescences rather than the condensed inflorescences of the type species, but many were described from sterile material and have not yet flowered. These species must be transferred, whether they go into *Sinarundinaria* or *Yushania*, or into a segregate of the genus if a narrower generic concept is followed. As most of these species have not yet flowered we do not know which or how many will require transferral. Some of these *Fargesia* species already have combinations in either *Sinarundinaria* or *Yushania*. However there are 13 species in *Fargesia* that also have combinations in *Sinarundinaria*, and by coincidence also 13 species that have combinations in *Yushania*, so the conservation measure proposed is not likely to affect how many name changes are required as such species are moved out of *Fargesia*.

Thus the predictable effects of this proposed conservation can be quantified approximately (ignoring synonymy) in terms of numbers of new combinations required, according to breadth of generic concept followed:

breadth	status quo	after conservation
narrower	6	60
broader	5	56

It can be seen that regardless of the breadth of generic concept, this proposal would actually necessitate an additional approximately 51 to 54 new combinations, rather than a reduction as claimed by the proposer.

Current usage

The dispute in China between those who consider *Sinarundinaria* to be a synonym of *Fargesia*, recognizing *Yushania*, and those who recognize *Sinarundinaria* and treat *Yushania* as a synonym of *Sinarundinaria* is well known. The former camp is headed by Professor P.C. Keng of the Botany Department of Nanjing University. The latter is headed by Professor C.S. Chao of Nanjing Forestry University. There have been several papers recently (in Chinese) in which very uncompromising stands seem to have been taken.

Demoly (1991) recounted how the incorrect floral component of the description of *A. nitida* by Stapf was repeated in China (Iconographie Cormophytorum Sinicorum, 1976; Chao, Chu, & Hsiung, 1980; 1981), despite McClure's exclusion of the floral material as a separate species (1940). This is the basis for the recognition of *Sinarundinaria* by Chao et al.

However, it should be noted that this approach does **not** interpret *Sinarundinaria nitida* in terms of the species represented by the Henry collection (*Yushania confusa*) alone. The cultivated plants of Fountain Bamboo in the UK were determined and described as *S. nitida* (Stapf) Nakai by Chao (1989), and the type specimen of *S. nitida* (Mitford) Nakai was actually cited (Chao, Chu, & Hsiung, 1981) as "collected from a transplanted bamboo grove in the Royal Botanic Garden, London." Therefore it would seem impossible to argue that those in favour of *Sinarundinaria* were using the name *nitida* in reference to the species represented by the Henry collection rather than the cultivated material of the Fountain Bamboo. Instead, they seemed to continue to envisage *S. nitida* as combining characteristics of the two taxa. The difference in clump habit (the cultivated element forms tight clumps, while the species represented by the Henry element spreads widely) they attributed to differences in climate creating an artificial difference between Western cultivated plants and those growing naturally in China (Chao, Chu, & Hsiung, 1981). The conflicting treatments clashed again recently (Yang & Chao, 1994; Keng & Song, 1994).

It would be difficult for a foreigner to evaluate which camp has the greatest influence within China, especially as most publications are in Chinese, but the Chinese account of the Flora of China (Keng & Wang, 1996) was edited by Professors Keng and Wang in conjunction with no fewer than 28 other bamboo taxonomists, and it recognizes *Yushania*. *Sinarundinaria* is relegated to synonymy within *Fargesia*, where it is even treated as an invalid name on the rather dubious grounds that the description did not include floral parts. The three popular illustrated accounts of Chinese bamboos written in English by a total of 23 Chinese bamboo taxonomists and horticulturalists also all recognize *Yushania* rather than *Sinarundinaria* (Wang & Shen, 1987; Chen & Chia, 1988; Zhu, Ma, & Fu, 1994).

Outside China the impression received has tended to be that within China *Yushania* is recognized much more widely than *Sinarundinaria*. Consequently horticultural usage in the West has almost exclusively followed this, and nursery catalogues around the world now all list species under *Yushania* rather than *Sinarundinaria*.

This was unfortunately complicated for a while by the effect of three publications from Kew, in which *Sinarundinaria* was recognized and *Yushania* synonymized. Clayton & Renvoize followed this procedure in *Genera Graminum* (1986), repeating the recognition of *Sinarundinaria* by McClure (1966), although greatly expanding the breadth of the genus, and unlike McClure, not recognizing *Yushania*. Professor Chao then visited Kew for one year, and was the joint author of two new species and 23 new combinations in *Sinarundinaria* (Chao & Renvoize, 1988; 1989), as well as a guide to cultivated bamboo in the UK in which *Sinarundinaria* was again used.

The treatment of the bamboos in the *Genera Graminum* (Clayton & Renvoize, 1986) was stated as being provisional and somewhat speculative, and therefore employing very broad genera. Both authors are now inclined to recognize a larger number of genera, including *Yushania* rather than *Sinarundinaria*, especially now that the flowers of the cultivated *A. nitida* are known, and have been seen to be so similar to those of the type species of *Fargesia*, and possibly even conspecific.

To some extent counterbalancing the effect of the Kew publications at the time, in an extensive and detailed account of the bamboos of the world (Ohrnberger & Goerrings, 1985 onwards), *Sinarundinaria* was treated as a synonym of *Fargesia* (Ohrnberger, 1988), and *Yushania* was recognized (Ohrnberger, 1989). Meanwhile Soderstrom & Ellis (1988) recognized neither *Yushania* nor *Sinarundinaria*.

In another authoritative account of grass genera, Watson & Dallwitz (1992) portrayed the present situation more evenly, but obviously incompatibly, listing both *Sinarundinaria* and *Yushania*.

Under *Sinarundinaria* they note that it is sometimes considered part of *Fargesia*. Under *Yushania* they indicate that it is sometimes considered part of *Sinarundinaria*.

The latest RHS accounts of the bamboos reduced *Sinarundinaria* to a single species, recognizing *Yushania* for other species (Huxley, Griffith, & Levy, 1992), and then, after *S. nitida* had flowered, listed *Sinarundinaria* as a name no longer in use (Darke & Griffiths, 1994).

In the Indian subcontinent treatments have also varied but *Yushania* is widely recognized. The Himalayan species have been transferred to *Yushania* in an enumeration by the Botanical Survey of India (Majumdar, 1989) in which *Sinarundinaria* was not recognized. The species from Nepal and Bhutan have also been placed in *Yushania* (Stapleton, 1994) without recognizing *Sinarundinaria*. On the other hand *Sinarundinaria* has been used in some other Indian publications (Tewari, 1993; Negi & Naithani, 1994) but in both cases it was applied to a single thorny bamboo that should really be in *Chimonocalamus*, while the species that should have been in either *Yushania* or *Sinarundinaria* were placed in the inappropriate genera *Arundinaria* or *Semiarundinaria*.

The species in South-east Asia are consistently placed in *Yushania* rather than *Sinarundinaria* (Dransfield, 1983; 1992; Dransfield & Widjaja, 1995).

In Taiwan, where the type species of *Yushania* is found on Yu Shan mountain, *Yushania* is always used (Lin, 1974; 1978; National Taiwan University, 1980), rather than *Sinarundinaria*.

The single species found in many African countries has been transferred from *Arundinaria* into both *Yushania* (Lin, 1974) and *Sinarundinaria* (Chao & Renvoize, 1989), but neither name has been applied in any scientific work on the African flora, all of which use *Arundinaria* (Clayton, 1970; Launert, 1971; Hamilton, 1981; Ibrahim & Kabuye, 1987; Champluvier, 1987; Kigomo 1988; Sigu, 1994; Beentje, 1994; Phillips, 1995).

Thus both *Yushania* and *Sinarundinaria* are currently in use. Within China it is difficult for a foreigner to say which is more prevalent, although the impression is that *Yushania* is used more widely than *Sinarundinaria*. Outside China this is now certainly the case. The proposer gives the strong impression that *Sinarundinaria* is currently in use rather than *Yushania*. However, if that were the case it is difficult to see why 55 species of *Yushania* have not already been transferred to *Sinarundinaria*.

Conclusions

It would seem that the conservation measure proposed by Li (1996) would actually lead to a large number of name changes, one being particularly undesirable, rather than preventing them as claimed. It would not lead to nomenclatural stability, and it would seem to conflict with current usage of the names involved in many parts of the world. Present typification of the taxa concerned seems perfectly adequate to stabilize the nomenclature of this group of plants.

It should be noted that although staff of the Grass Section at Kew are thanked in the acknowledgements, none of them were consulted about this proposal before it was submitted for publication.

The present nomenclatural status of the type species of *Sinarundinaria* is given below in accordance with existing typification. It is felt that the objectives of nomenclatural stability and the avoidance of unnecessary name changes are best served by this situation remaining unchanged. The possibility of *Fargesia nitida* being a synonym of the earlier species *Fargesia spathacea* Franchet should be investigated, and conservation of the former should be proposed if it is shown beyond reasonable doubt and widely accepted that the two are conspecific.

Fargesia nitida (Mitford) Keng f. in *Yi* in J. Bamboo Res. 4(2): 30 (1985). Type: 'Potanin, N. Szechuan', [cult. St. Petersburg, 14 Feb. 1895, Batalin s.n.], excluding seed, ex China, N Sichuan/S Gansu, 1886, Potanin/Berezowski (neotype selected in Stapleton 1995, K).

Arundinaria nitida Mitford in Anon. in *Gardeners' Chronicle Series III* 18: 186 (1895), validated by the description of *Arundinaria khasiana* sensu Bean in *Gardeners' Chronicle Series III* 15: 301 (1894) (*non* Munro in *Trans. Linn. Soc. London* 26: 28); *Arundinaria nitida* Mitford ex Stapf in *Bull. Misc. Inform., Kew* 1896: 20; Mitford in *J. Roy. Hort. Soc.* 19: 365 (1896); Mitford in *Bamboo Garden*: 73 (1896); *Sinarundinaria nitida* (Stapf) Nakai, *J. Jap. Bot.* 11: 1 (1935); [*Thamnocalamus nitidus* (Mitford) Demoly, *Bambou* 9: 13 (1991) without reference to basionym.]

Acknowledgements

Dr B. Zimmer and Prof. W. Greuter are thanked for advice on what constitutes an anonymous publication, and assessment of the validity of the publication of the name attributed to Mitford in the *Gardeners' Chronicle*. Dr R.K. Brummitt is thanked for critical reading of the text and many helpful suggestions.

References

- Anon. (1895). Editorial Notices. *Gardeners' Chronicle* 18: 186.
- Batalin, A.F. (1895). Letter to Director, Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, 19th February 1895.
- Bean, W.J. (1894). A classification of hardy bamboos. *Gardeners' Chronicle* 15: 301–302.
- Beentje, H. (1994). *Kenya Trees, Shrubs, & Lianas*. National Museums of Kenya.
- Camus, E.G. (1913). *Les Bambuseés*. Lechevalier, Paris.
- Champluvier, D. et al. (1987). *Flora du Rwanda IV*. Koninklijk Museum voor Midden Afrika.
- Chao, C.S. & Renvoize, S.A. (1988). Two new bamboos from the eastern Himalaya and southern Burma. *Kew Bull.* 43 (3): 409–413.
- Chao, C.S. & Renvoize, S.A. (1989). A revision of the species described under *Arundinaria* (Gramineae) in Southeast Asia and Africa. *Kew Bull.* 44 (2): 349–367.
- Chao, C.S. (1989). *A Guide to Bamboos Grown in Britain*. Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.
- Chao, C.S., Chu, C.D., & Hsiung, W.Y. (1980). A revision of some genera and species of Chinese bamboos. *Acta Phytotax. Sin.* 18: 21–36. (Chinese)
- Chao, C.S., Chu, C.D., & Hsiung, W.Y., (1981). A revision of some genera and species of Chinese bamboos. *Bamboo Research* 1: 1–24. (English)
- Chen, S.L. & Chia, L.-C. (1988). *Chinese Bamboos*. Science Press, Beijing, & Dioscorides Press Inc.
- Clayton, W. D. & Renvoize, S. A. (1986). *Genera Graminum: Grasses of the World*. Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.
- Clayton, W. D. (1970). Gramineae. In: Milne-Redhead, E. & Polhill, R.M. (eds.) *Flora of Tropical East Africa*.
- Darke, R. & Griffith, M. (1994). *The New RHS Dictionary Manual of Grasses*. MacMillan, London.
- Demoly, J.-P. (1991). Eclaircissement du mystère *Arundinaria nitida*. *Bambou* No. 9.

- Dransfield, S. & Widjaja, E.A. (eds.) (1995). Plant Resources of South-east Asia No. 7, Bamboos. Backhuys, Leiden, Holland.
- Dransfield, S. (1983). The genus *Racemobambos* (Gramineae-Bambusoideae). Kew Bull. 37(4): 661–679.
- Dransfield, S. (1992). The Bamboos of Sabah. Sabah Forest Records, No 14. Forestry Department, Sabah.
- Hamilton, A.C. (1981). A Field Guide to Ugandan Forest Trees. Uganda Forest Department.
- Huxley, A., Griffith, M. & Levy, M. (1992). The New Royal Horticultural Society Dictionary of Gardening. MacMillan Press, London & Stockton Press, New York.
- Ibrahim, K.M. & Kabuye, C.H.S. (1987). An Illustrated Manual of Kenya Grasses. FAO.
- Keng, P.C. & Song, G.Q. (1994). Comments on “A revision of the genus *Arundinaria* Michaux in China”. J. Bamboo Res. 13(4): 55–69.
- Keng, P.C., & Wang, Z.P.(1996). *Gramineae*. Flora Reipublicae Popularis Sinicae 9(1). (Chinese)
- Kigomo, B.N. (1988). Distribution, cultivation, and research status of bamboo in eastern Africa. KEFRI Ecological Series Monograph No 1. Kenya Forestry Research Institute.
- Launert, E. (1971). Gramineae. In: Fernandes, A. et al (eds.). *Flora Zambesiaca* 10 (1).
- Li, D.Z. (1996a). The Flora of China Bambusoideae Project: Problems and current understanding of bamboo taxonomy in China. Paper presented at the International Bamboo Symposium, Linnean Society, 25th - 29th March 1996.
- Li, D.Z. (1996b). (1222) Proposal to conserve *Sinarundinaria* Nakai (Gramineae) with a conserved type. Taxon 45(2): 321–322.
- Lin, W.C. (1974). Studies on morphology of bamboo flowers. Bull. Taiwan For. Res. Inst. 248.
- Lin, W.C. (1978). Bambusoideae. Flora of Taiwan 5.
- Majumdar, R. B. (1989). In: Karthikeyan, S. et al., *Flora Indicae, Enumeratio Monocotyledonae*, pp. 274–283. Botanical Survey of India, Howrah, Calcutta.
- Mitford, A.B.F. (1896a). Hardy bamboos. J. Roy. Hort. Soc. 19: 359–374.
- Mitford, A.B.F. (1896b). The Bamboo Garden. MacMillan & Co. London.
- Nakai, T. (1935). *Novitates Bambusacearum In Imperio Japonico Recentissime Detectae* III. J. Jap. Bot. 11(1): 1–9.
- National Taiwan University (1980). Bamboos of the Chitou Forest Recreation Area. College of Agriculture, National Taiwan University, Taipei.
- Negi, S. S. & Naithani, H. B. (1994). Handbook of Indian Bamboos. Oriental Enterprises, Dehra Dun, India.
- Ohrnberger, D. & Goerrings, J. (1983–). The Bamboos of the World - A Preliminary Study of the Names and Distribution of the Herbaceous and Woody Bamboos (Bambusoideae Nees v. Esenb.) - Documented in Lists and Maps. Odenthal, Germany.
- Ohrnberger, D. (1988). The Bamboos of the World - A Preliminary Study. Genus *Fargesia* Edition 1. Langweid am Lech, Germany
- Ohrnberger, D. (1989). The Bamboos of the World - A Preliminary Study. Genus *Yushania* Edition 1. Langweid am Lech, Germany
- Phillips, S. (1995). Poaceae (Gramineae). In: Hedberg, I. & Edwards, S. (eds.) Flora of Ethiopia and Eritrea.

- Sigu, G.O. (1994). The need for conservation of *Arundinaria alpina* K. Schum in Kenya and its ecological significance. In: Bamboo in Asia and the Pacific. FAO, Bangkok.
- Soderstrom, T. R. & Ellis, R. P. (1988). The position of bamboo genera and allies in a system of grass classification. In: Soderstrom, T. R. et al. (eds.) Grass Systematics and Evolution: pp 225–238. Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Stapf, O. (1896). *Arundinaria nitida* Mitford. In: *Decades Kewenses: plantarum novarum in herbario horti regii conservatorum-Decas XXIII–XXV*. Kew Bull. of Misc. Inform. 1896: 20-21.
- Stapleton, C.M.A. (1994). The bamboos of Nepal and Bhutan Part II: *Arundinaria*, *Thamnocalamus*, *Borinda*, and *Yushania* (Gramineae: Poaceae, Bambusoideae). Edinburgh J. Bot. 51(2): 275-295.
- Stapleton, C.M.A. (1995). Flowering of *Fargesia nitida* in the UK. Bamboo Soc. (GB) Newsletter 22: 17–22.
- Tewari, D.N. (1992). A Monograph on Bamboo, International Book Distributors, Dehra Dun, India.
- Veitch & Sons, (1895). Letter to Director, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Jan 18th 1895.
- Wang, Z.P. & Ye, G.H. (1981). Miscellaneous notes on Chinese Bambusoideae. J. of Nanjing Univ. 1981(1): 91-108.
- Wang, D.J, Shen, S.J. (1987). Bamboos of China. Christopher Helm.
- Watson, L. & Dallwitz, M.J. (1992). The Grass Genera of the World. C.A.B. International, UK.
- Yang, G.Y. & Chao, C.S. (1994). A revision of the genus *Arundinaria* Michaux in China II. J. Bamboo Res. 13(1): 1–23.
- Zhu, S.L., Ma, N.X., & Fu, M.Y. (1994). A compendium of Chinese bamboo. China Forestry Publishing House.

(1222) Proposal to conserve *Sinarundinaria* Nakai (Gramineae) with a conserved type

De-Zhu Li¹

(1222) *Sinarundinaria* Nakai in J. Jap. Bot. 11: 1. Jan. 1935 [*Gram.*], *nom. cons. prop.*

Type: *S. nitida* (Mitford) Nakai (*Arundinaria nitida* Mitford) (*typ. cons. prop.*: China, Hupeh, Fang District, A. Henry 6832, K).

Two bamboo species are involved, which can hardly be distinguished by their vegetative features, but must be assigned to different genera on account of their floral characters. The first, which is not in cultivation, is a plant from W. Hupeh (Hubei), represented by the fertile specimen *Henry 6832*, presently assigned to *Sinarundinaria*. The second is a plant cultivated in Britain since 1889, commonly called fountain bamboo, originating from seed allegedly collected by Potanin in N. Szechuan (Sichuan) [but perhaps in fact by Berezowski in S. Kansu (Gansu) - see Bretschneider in Kew Bull. Misc. Inform. 1898: 316. 1898) and sent from St Petersburg. This, when first flowering in Europe (in Cornwall in 1993, *Townsend s. n.*, K!), proved to be similar to and perhaps conspecific with *Fargesia* (or *Thamnocalamus*) *spathacea*, which provides the type of *Fargesia* Franchet 1893 (Stapleton in Bamboo Soc. (G.B.) Newslett. 22: 22. 1995).

The name *Arundinaria nitida* was validated in an editorial review of a lecture given by Mitford. There was no description but there is a statement that the name *A. khasiana* had been misapplied to the new species in Bean's account of hardy bamboos. *A. nitida* is therefore validated in August 1895 by the description of *A. khasian* sensu Bean (in Gard. Chron., ser. 3, 15: 301. Mar. 1894; non Munro). No original material is likely to have been preserved, but the species described was obviously the fountain bamboo.

Five months later, Stapf (in Kew Bull. Misc. Inform. 1896: 20. Jan. 1896), to whom the name *Arundinaria nitida* has often been credited, treated Mitford's name as published in August 1895 as a *nomen solum*, provided a detailed description of the species and cited two specimens for it, both preserved: *Potanin s.n.* (K!), sterile but obviously representing the fountain bamboo, and *Henry 6832* (K!). Stapf described characters of the inflorescence and so based his description essentially on the second, fertile element. This was also what Nakai had in mind when describing *Sinarundinaria* and choosing *S. nitida* as the type. Additional evidence may be obtained from his citation of two drawings of *Arundinaria nitida* from Camus (Bambusees. 33. t. 9. & t. 12. 1913). The generic name is now in widespread use in this sense (e.g. McClure in Taxon 6: 209. 1957; Keng, Fl. Illustr. Pl. Prim. Sin. Gram. 21. f.12. 1959; McClure, the Bamboos. 290. 1966; Chao, Chu & Hsiung, in Acta Phytotax. Sin. 18: 20. 1980; Soderstrom & Ellis in Bothalia 14: 65. 1982; Clayton & Renvoize, Gen. Gram. 41. 1986; Hsueh & Li, J. Bamboo Res. 6(2): 21. 1987; Chao, Bamb. Grown Brit. 34. 1989).

McClure had recognised part of the confusion and renamed the taxon described by Stapf as *Indocalamus confusus* McClure (in Lingnan Univ. Sci. Bull. 9: 20. 1940). He accepted *Arundinaria*

¹ University Botanic Garden, Cory Lodge, Bateman Street, Cambridge CB2 1JF, U.K.; Permanent address: Kunming Institute of Botany, Academia Sinica, Kunming, Yunnan 650204, China.

nitida as based on the sterile Potanin collection (presumably still assuming that the two species would turn out to have the same inflorescence type). The latter was formally designated as “lectotype” (in fact, neotype) of *A. nitida* by Stapleton (l.c. 1995).

Unless the above proposal is accepted, there will be no nomenclatural stability in the *Thamnocalamus* group, in which some 200 species may be affected. *Sinarundinaria* will then be considered a synonym of *Fargesia* or, for those adopting a wider taxonomic concept, of *Thamnocalamus* Munro 1868. Some fifty species presently assigned to *Sinarundinaria* will have to be transferred either to *Yushania* Keng f. 1957 or partly, depending on taxonomic concepts, to some recent segregate such as *Burmabambus* Keng f. (in J. Bamboo Res. 1(2): 39. 1982), *Butania* Keng f. (in J. Bamboo Res. 1(2): 41. 1982), *Borinda* Stapleton (in Edinb. J. Bot. 51: 284. 1994) and *Monospatha* W. T. Lin (in J. Bamboo Res. 13(4): 1. 1994). *A. nitida* as currently understood will be replaced by a late name, based on *Indocalamus confusus*, and will, as to its type, become a synonym of *Fargesia spathacea*.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are also due to Julian Campbell (Kentucky, U.S.A.) and Mike Bell (Cornwall, England) for their help during my visit to Cornwall, to the Staff of the Grass Section of the Herbarium of Royal Botanic Garden Kew (K) for their assistance. I am particularly indebted to Prof. W. Greuter who not only clarified the real intent of the original proposal but reframed it in great detail.