(1142) Proposal to conserve *Scaphyglottis* against *Hexisea (Orchidaceae)*

Robert L. Dressler[1]

(1142) ***Scaphyglottis*** Poepp. & Endl., Nov. Gen. Sp. Pl. 1: 58. 22-28 Mai 1836, *nom. cons. prop.* [*Orch.*].
Type: *S. graminifolia* (Ruiz & Pav.) Poepp. & Endl. (*Fernandezia graminifolia* Ruiz & Pav.).

(=) *Hexisea* Lindl. in J. Bot. (Hooker) 1: 7 Apr 1834, *nom. rej. prop.*
Type: *H. bidentata* Lindl.

Most species of *Scaphyglottis* have superposed shoots developing near the apices of older shoots, thus forming branched, shrub-like plants. This character, together with a prominent column foot and terminal inflorescences, may be taken to delimit a very natural clade, including the genera *Hexisea, Scaphyglottis,* and *Reichenbachanthus* Barb. Rodr.

Both *Scaphyglottis* and *Hexisea* have been in general use for about a century (see, e.g., Ames in Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Bot. Ser. 18: 236, 289. 1937; Ames & Correll in Fieldiana, Bot. 26: 284, 429. 1952-1953; Cogniaux in Urban, Symb. Antill. 6: 460-467. 1910; Schweinfurth in Fieldiana, Bot. 30: 387, 541. 1959-1960; and Williams in Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 33: 139, 386. 1946). The delineation of the genera has varied somewhat. Ames and his coworkers included both *Reichenbachanthus* and *Scaphyglottis amparoana* (Schltr.) Dressler in *Hexisea,* emphasizing the deep, partially closed nectary formed by the column foot and the base of the lip; other species with similar nectaries, such as *S. gigantea* Dressler and *S. triloba* B. R. Adams, would presumably also have been treated as *Hexisea.* Dressler (in Taxon 13: 246. 1964; and in Orquídea 4: 191-200. 1974) limited *Hexisea* to orange- or red-flowered members of the *Scaphyglottis* complex. It now seems clear that both the deep, partially closed nectary and orange-red pigments have evolved independently in different members of the complex (see B. R. Adams, A taxonomic revision of *Scaphyglottis,* unpubl. thesis, Carbondale. 1993; and Dressler, Phylog. Class. Orch. Fam.: 194-195. 1993). Accordingly, B. R. Adams (in Phytologia 64: 257-258. 1988) restricted *Hexisea* to *H. bidentata* and the very similar *H. imbricata.* If restricted to these two species, *Hexisea* is surely monophyletic, yet these, like other red-flowered, would-be *Hexisea* species, are essentially hummingbird-pollinated members of the *Scaphyglottis* clade. In other words, *Scaphyglottis* without *Hexisea* is surely paraphyletic.

In this case, there is some incompatibility between the idea of a hierarchic, phylogenetic classification and nomenclatural stability. *Hexisea,* currently with two to five species, has priority over *Scaphyglottis,* with nearly fifty species. Under the *Code,* if the two genera are united, the generic name must be *Hexisea,* requiring over forty new combinations. For this reason I propose the conservation of *Scaphyglottis* against *Hexisea.* If this is accepted, those who so wish may retain *Hexisea* in any

[1] Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, P. O. Box 117800, Gainesville, FL 32611-7800, U.S.A.

circumscription that excludes *S. graminifolia* (the type of *Scaphyglottis;* see Dressler in Taxon 9: 214. 1960), while those who prefer to unite *Hexisea* and *Scaphyglottis* may do so under *Scaphyglottis* at the cost of only two new combinations and with little disturbance of familiar names.