

(1924) Proposal to conserve the name *Cupressinocladus* against *Libocedrites* (fossil *Coniferophyta*)

Gea Zijlstra¹ & Zlatko Kvaček²

¹ Laboratory of Palaeobotany & Palynology, Budapestlaan 4, 3584 CD Utrecht, The Netherlands

² Charles University, Faculty of Science, Albertov 6, 128 43 Praha 2, Czech Republic

Author for correspondence: Gea Zijlstra, g.zijlstra@uu.nl

(1924) *Cupressinocladus* Seward, Foss. Pl. 4: 303, 307. 1919 (post 18 Jun), nom. cons. prop.

Typus: *C. massiliensis* (Saporta) Seward (*Thujopsis massiliensis* Saporta), typ. cons. prop.

(=) *Libocedrites* Endl., Syn. Conif.: 275. Mai–Jun 1847.

Typus: *L. salicornioides* (Unger) Endlicher (*Thuites salicornioides* Unger ('*Thuytes*'))

In 1919, Seward published *Cupressinocladus* as a genus of fossil conifers. In his diagnosis (p. 304), he proposed this name “for vegetative shoots agreeing in the habit of branching and in the predominance of decussate arrangement of appressed leaves with recent *Cupressineae* (...) When cones are present which throw any light on generic affinity some other term should be adopted.” On pp. 307–311 he included four groups of species, starting with species previously referred to *Libocedrus*. Here *Cupressinocladus salicornioides* is discussed, a species that originally was described by Unger as *Thuites salicornioides*, and later on by various authors was reported from a number of localities in Europe as a species of *Libocedrus* or *Libocedrites*. Seward does not consider affinity with *Libocedrus* to be more likely than with, e.g., *Thuja* or *Thujopsis*, and so Seward argues (p. 308) that “it would be unwise to adopt the designation *Libocedrus* or *Libocedrites*”. Endlicher (Syn. Conif.: 275. Mai–Jun 1847) had created *Libocedrites*, with *Thuites salicornioides* Unger as the only species, which thus provides the type. Seward’s reasoning violates

Art. 51.1 of the ICBN: “A legitimate name must not be rejected merely because it, or its epithet, is inappropriate or disagreeable, or because another is preferable or better known (but see Art. 56.1), or because it has lost its original meaning [...]”. In other words, under Art. 52.1 *Cupressinocladus* is illegitimate: “A name [...] is illegitimate and is to be rejected if it was nomenclaturally superfluous when published, i.e. if the taxon to which it was applied, as circumscribed by its author, definitely included the type [...] of a name which ought to have been adopted [...] under the rules”.

The name *Cupressinocladus* is, however, in general use for a genus including dozens of species, whereas in *Libocedrites* only two combinations have ever been made (Jongm. & Dijkstra, Foss. Cat., II. Pl. 81: 212–214. 1972; 83: 489–490. 1973; Dijkstra & Amerom, ibid. 100: 136–141. 1999; 102: 376–377. 2000). Therefore we propose to conserve *Cupressinocladus* against *Libocedrites*. The conserved type allows the name to apply also to the narrow concept of the genus after the removal of *Cupressinocladus salicornioides* (Unger) Seward ('*salicornoides*') (*Thuites salicornioides* Unger ['*Thuytes*']) to *Tetraclinis* Masters 1892.

The lectotype of *Cupressinocladus massiliensis* as suggested and re-illustrated by Kvaček, Sborn. Nár. Mus. Praze, Řada B, Přír. Vědy 64: 92. pl. 2, f. 4, 5. 2008 (*Thujopsis massiliensis* Saporta, Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot., ser. 5, 3: 72, pl. 1, f. 6 [non pl. 4, f. 2]. 1865) is confirmed and designated here to fulfil Art. 7.11 of the ICBN.

(1925) Proposal to conserve the name *Geinitzia* with a conserved type (fossil *Coniferophyta*)

Gea Zijlstra,¹ Han van Konijnenburg-van Cittert,^{1,2} Lutz Kunzmann,³ Hylke Bosma² & Jiří Kvaček⁴

¹ Laboratory of Palaeobotany & Palynology, Budapestlaan 4, 3584 CD Utrecht, The Netherlands

² Museum of Natural History Naturalis, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

³ Senckenberg Naturhistorische Sammlungen Dresden, Museum für Mineralogie und Geologie, Königsbrücker Landstrasse 159, 01109 Dresden, Germany

⁴ National Museum Prague, Václavské nám. 68, 11579 Prague 1, Czech Republic

Author for correspondence: Gea Zijlstra, g.zijlstra@uu.nl

(1925) *Geinitzia* Endl., Syn. Conif.: 280. Mai–Jun 1847, nom. cons. prop.

Typus: *G. formosa* Heer (in Neue Denkschr. Allg. Schweiz. Ges. Gesamnten Naturwiss. 24: 6. 1871), typ. cons. prop.

In 1847, Endlicher published *Geinitzia* as a genus of fossil conifers with a single species that he called *G. cretacea*. In his diagnosis, a little is said on the leaves, and a simple description of strobili (“strobili (amenta staminigera?)”) is given. His words on the strobili

are curious, since as far as we know, fossil material with cones of this genus was not yet known at that time except for Corda’s doubtful cone on a twig (“zapfentragendes Ästchen”) of *Cryptomeria primaeva* Corda (in Reuss, Verstein. Böhm. Kreideformat. 2: 89, pl. 48, f. 6. 1846). Even more serious, however, is the fact that *Geinitzia* is illegitimate, because Endlicher included *Sedites* Geinitz (Char. Schichten Petref.: 97, pl. 24, f. 5. 1842) with its only species *S. rabenhorstii* from a Cretaceous locality near Dresden (Germany). In addition, he