

(1487) Proposal to conserve the name *Bambusa viridistriata* Siebold ex André (Poaceae, Bambusoideae)

Chris M. A. Stapleton¹ & S. A. Renvoize¹

- (0000) *Bambusa viridistriata* Siebold ex André in L'Illustration Horticole 19: 319. 1872. [Poac.] *nom. cons. prop.*
 Type: Royal Gardens, Kew, 21 Sep 1881, *Nicholson 3020* (designated here, K).
Pleioblastus viridistriatus (Siebold ex André) Makino in J. Jap. Bot. 3: 11. 1926.
- (H) *Bambusa viridistriata* Regel in Ind. Sem. Hort. Petrop. 1866: 77. 1867. [Poac.] *nom. rej. prop.*
 Type: None designated.

In his publication of the earlier *Bambusa viridistriata*, Regel (Ind. Sem. Hort. Petrop. 1866: 77. 1867) stated that living material in the Imperial Botanic Gardens, St. Petersburg was “introduced from the gardens of Japan by the renowned Maximowicz”.

Five years later a second *Bambusa viridistriata*, attributed to Siebold and with an expanded description was published from the Linden Garden in Belgium (André in L'Illustration Horticole 19: 319. 1872), including the statement that the species was “introduced from the gardens of Japan first by the renowned Siebold, and then by the renowned Maximowicz”. André started his text with the statement that the species had already been known for some years. He then expanded each of the characters described by Regel (l.c.) in turn, and added generic characters, an illustration and a list of similar variegated bamboos. Nowhere was Regel's earlier publication mentioned, but the wording, the similarities and the connections between the two publications are manifold, not least in the repetition of the epithet. It may be pertinent to note that the horticultural Exposition de St. Petersburg in 1869 had been attended by three Belgians, including one actually from the Linden garden (Anon. in Gartenfl. 16: 12. 1869). This would suggest that these names were not truly independent, and that André was almost certainly fully aware of the earlier publication of the name by Regel. Replying from St. Petersburg (Ender in Gartenfl. 22: 153. 1872), the argument was continued, and it was stated that in fact the Belgian plant in the Linden establishment had actually come from St Petersburg, and it was repeated that, after all, this plant had been introduced only by Maximowicz.

In England the same species of bamboo was named in a truly independent fashion as *Arundinaria auricoma* Mitford in Bamboo Garden: 101. 1896.

No types have ever been cited for any of these names. All were described from living plants. No original material is extant for André's name at GENT (Goetghebeur, pers. comm.), nor apparently for Regel's name at LE.

¹Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AB, UK. E-mail: c.stapleton@rbgkew.org.uk (author for correspondence); s.renvoize@rbgkew.org.uk

The earlier, and rather more obscure name, *B. viridistriata* Regel, was subsequently overlooked. In Japan the more prominently published name *B. viridistriata* Siebold ex André was transferred as *Pleioblastus viridistriatus* (Siebold ex André) Makino in J. Jap. Bot. 3: 11. 1926, and as *Arundinaria viridistriata* (Siebold ex André) Nakai in J. Jap. Bot. 10: 568. 1934. Neither name can be treated as a legitimate nomen novum under Art. 58.3, because in each case *A. auricoma* Mitford is cited as a synonym. The species is now generally placed in *Pleioblastus* although some continue to use *Arundinaria*.

Cultivation of this bamboo spread steadily around the world, and it is now of high economic value in western horticulture as the most widely planted variegated-leaved bamboo. In its country of origin, Japan, it has consistently been known since the 1920s as *Pleioblastus viridistriatus* (Siebold ex André) Makino (Makino & Nemoto, Fl. Jap.: 1381. 1931; Suzuki in Ind. Jap. Bamboo 1978; Emperor Hirohito, Fl. Sedis. Imp. Jap. 1989; Okamura et al. in Ill. Hort. Bamboo Sp. Jap, 1991). This combination is also widely used elsewhere, in the USA (Shor in Bamboo Sp. Source List 18, 1998); Russia (Tsvelev in Poaceae URSS: 88. 1976); Australia (Romanowski in Grasses, Bamboos, & Related Pl. 1993); and parts of Europe (Doesburg & Biemen in Bamboe: 65. 1992; Crouzet in Bamboos: 94. 1996; King & Oudolf in Prachtig Gras: 141. 1996; Ohrnberger in Bamboos of the World: 74. 1999).

In England the correct name, *Arundinaria auricoma* Mitford, has remained in use. Chao (in Bamboos Grown in Britain: 24. 1989) supported this by the brief statement of the situation described above “allowing *A. auricoma* to take priority”. Renvoize, in an “ineffectively published” article (Nom. Forum 25: 180. 1990), explained Chao’s “choice of *A. auricoma* Mitford in preference to the, up until now, commonly used *A. viridistriata*”, as being based on an analysis of the problem by D. Clayton which had concluded that the names in *Arundinaria* and *Pleioblastus* using the epithet *viridistriata* “non Regel” could be based on a legitimate use of the epithet at varietal rank by Makino (Bot. Mag. Tokyo 26: 15. 1912), but that the epithet *auricoma* had priority. In fact, as Makino cites the legitimate *A. fortunei* var. *aurea* Bean in synonymy, there appears to be no legitimate usage of the epithet *viridistriata* “non Regel”, so legitimacy is the issue, not priority. Chao’s (l.c.) use of *A. auricoma* is correct under the apparent requirement of the *Code* to treat *Bambusa viridistriata* Siebold ex André as a name distinct from the earlier *B. viridistriata* Regel, and in *Pleioblastus* the correct name is *P. auricomus* (Mitford) D. McClintock (Bamboo Soc. Newsl. 12: 11. 1991). Unfortunately this nomenclaturally correct action by Chao (l.c.) seems merely to have caused further confusion, as the bamboo is now often called *Pleioblastus viridistriatus*, syn. *A. auricoma*, as though these particular epithets were correct in the different genera. In Japan, U.S.A., Russia, Australia, Germany and Holland, *Pleioblastus viridistriatus* is still used instead, and that name clearly represents overwhelmingly predominant use. The attempt to change the epithet used for this species to the nomenclaturally correct epithet (Chao l.c.; Renvoize l.c.) was not successful. The illegitimate name still remains in predominant use. It now seems best to accept defeat and to apply the strengthened powers for conservation to address the nomenclatural confusion over

the name of this economically important bamboo, and the authors of the previous attempt to change the usage now support this.

Conservation of the name *B. viridistriata* André against *B. viridistriata* Regel is proposed, and a type from contemporary material cultivated at K is designated as type for the conserved name.

The only reason this would not be necessary would be the possibility of the Committee considering *B. viridistriata* André to be the same name as *B. viridistriata* Regel and not to be independent, and hence a superfluous illegitimate homonym, even though André did not refer to Regel's earlier publication. It might be argued that the close parallel between André's description and that of Regel was "some other way" of indicating that a previously published description applied (Art. 32.4). The inclusion of new Article 33.2 in the St. Louis Code allows such treatment of new combinations, and the principle should perhaps be extended to the publication of a new name.