Revista Brasil. Pl. Med. 17: 274–290. 2015; Oscar & al. in Nutri. Food Sci. Int. J. 9: 1–3. 2019). Fruits of several species were also traditionally used as ink and dye for food and textile (Steward, Handb. S. Amer. Ind. 5: 125. 1949; Steyermark & al. in Fieldiana 28: 841. 1957).

Therefore, to prevent the undesirable loss of the well-established name *Renealmia*, we propose rejection of the long-forgotten *Pacoseroca*.

Author information

LB, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8464-8688
NX, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9852-7393
JL-S, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4490-3490

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Prof. David Mabberley (Sydney, Australia) for his advice, and to Dr. John McNeill and Dr. John H. Wiersema for their constructive feedback and editing of this proposal. Research of the first and second authors is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant no. 32070223) and Natural Science Foundation of Yunnan Province (grant no. 202101AU070081). The research of the last author is supported by the National Parks Board, Singapore.

(2906) Proposal to reject the name *Salsola coquimbana* (*Chenopodiaceae* / *Amaranthaceae*)

Adriel I. Jocou[1] **& Christian A. Zanotti**[2]

1 *Departamento de Biología Aplicada, Facultad de Ciencias Agrarias, Universidad Nacional del Comahue, Ruta Nacional 151 km 12,5, Cinco Saltos, Río Negro, Argentina*
2 *Instituto de Botánica Darwinion (ANCEFN-CONICET), Labardén 200, San Isidro, Buenos Aires, CC 22, B1642HYD, Argentina*
Address for correspondence: *Adriel I. Jocou, adrieljocou@gmail.com*

DOI https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12776

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2906) ***Salsola coquimbana*** Molina, Sag. Stor. Nat. Chili: 161, 350. 12–31 Oct 1782 [Angiosp.: *Chenopod.* / *Amaranth.*], nom. rej. prop.
Typus: non designatus.

Salsola coquimbana Molina (Sag. Stor. Nat. Chili: 161, 350. 1782) was described from the coast of Coquimbo (Chile) by a brief diagnosis ("Salsola (*Coquimbana*) fruticosa, caul. aphyllis, cal. succulentis diaphanis") with observations on the use of the plant by Chilean natives. This name has recently been treated as a heterotypic synonym of *Salicornia neei* Lag. (Mem. Pl. Barrill.: 54. 1817) by Brignone & al. (in Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 106: 307. 2021), despite having priority over it. *Salicornia neei* or more recently *Sarcocornia neei* (Lag.) M.Á. Alonso & M.B. Crespo (in Ann. Bot. Fenn. 45: 250. 2008) has been applied to a perennial shrub of saline soils along the Pacific coast of South America from Peru to Chile, and in the lowlands of Argentina (Alonso & Crespo, l.c.: 251; Brignone & al., l.c.) that currently is used as natural pasture for sheep and cattle, as a fresh vegetable, and as industrial food additives (Arce & al. in Tasks Veg. Sci. 48 [Sabkha Ecosyst. 5]: 275–285. 2016; Riquelme & al. in Ci. Invest. Agrar. 43(2): 283–293. 2016; La Rosa & al. in Acta Bot. Mex. 127: e1695. 2020; Muñoz-Araya & al. in Agron. Colomb. 39: 300–305. 2021; Doncato & Costa in Revista Biotemas 35(1): 1–9. 2022).

The name *Salicornia neei* has been used widely not only in taxonomic studies (Alonso & Crespo, l.c.; Brignone & al., l.c.) and floristic works (Penneckamp, Fl. Vasc. Silv. Archipiél. Juan Fernández: 393. 2018; Brignone in Zuloaga & Belgrano, Fl. Argentina 19(1): 127–205. 2020; Jocou & Gandullo in Revista Mus. Argent. Ci. Nat., N. S. 22: 131–154. 2020; Minué & al. in Caldasia 44: 95–107, suppl. 2022) but also in ecological (Vogt in Bol. Mus. Nac. Hist. Nat. Paraguay 19(2): 41–49. 2015; Alonso & al. in Seed Sci. Technol. 45: 252–258. 2017; Meza & al. in Plants (Switzerland) 7(3): 66. 2018; Diaz & al. in Agriculture (Switzerland) 10(12): 621. 2020; La Rosa & al., l.c.; Rosas & Iannacone in Ci. Suelo 38: 343–354. 2020), phylogenetic (Costa & al. in Rodriguésia 70: e03122017. 2019), microbiological (López Benítez & al. in Rep. Ci. FACEN 12: 21–31. 2021), agricultural and aquacultural (Arce & al., l.c.; Alves & al. in Revista Brasil. Geogr. Fís. 12: 489–509. 2019; Alves & al. in Brazil. J. Developm. 6: 63592–63605. 2020; Schardong & al. in Brazil. Arch. Biol. Technol. 63: e20190118. 2020; Beyer & al. in Aquaculture 543: 736971. 2021; Muñoz-Araya & al., l.c.; Doncato & Costa, l.c. 2022), nutritional and food sciences (Riquelme & al., l.c.; Doncato & Costa in Revista Biotemas 31(4): 57–63. 2018; Faria & al. in Food Res. Int. 137: 109435. 2020; Villarreal & al. in Food Chem. 350: 128659. 2021), and multidisciplinary works (Cárdenas-Pérez & al. in Environm. Exp. Bot. 191: 104606. 2021), among others.

Moquin-Tandon (Chenop. Monogr. Enum.: 149. 1840, in Candolle, Prodr. 13(2): 190. 1849) treated *Salsola coquimbana* as a "Species non satis notæ", and suggested that it could belong to the genus *Suaeda* Forssk. ex J.F. Gmel. (in Onomat. Bot. Compl. 8: 797. 1776). Gay (Fl. Chil. 5: 251. 1849) also doubted if this taxon really belonged to the genus *Salsola* L. (Sp. Pl.: 222. 1753). Philippi

(in Anales Univ. Chile 22: 713. 1863) stated that *Salsola coquimbana* is a doubtful name, since he had not been able to identify the plant. Finally, Reiche (Fl. Chile 6: 176. 1911) proposed to exclude the name *Salsola coquimbana* from the flora of Chile, since it was not known to which plant the description referred. One aspect that adds even more ambiguity is that in his second edition, 38 years later, Molina (Sag. Stor. Nat. Chili, ed. 2: 141, 142. 1810) expanded the description of *Salsola coquimbana* adding "woody branchy stem; tiny, cylindrical, fleshy leaves; flowers axillary and terminal, fasciculate and sessile" and he stated that this species has been found growing together with the European *Salsola kali* L. (l.c.) and with other species of *Salicornia* that he was unable to closely examine. This information suggests that Molina was aware of the two genera and could distinguish between them.

Despite this scarcity of criteria and the resulting ambiguities, it is very probable that the description of *Salsola coquimbana* refers to *Salicornia neei*, because the characteristics of "leafless stem or the tiny cylindrical leaves" and the locality given by Molina in the protologue and the extended description suggest that both names apply to the same taxon (Brignone & al., l.c.), since there is no other *Chenopodiaceae/Amaranthaceae* in Coquimbo that matches this combination of features and inhabits saline environments. In addition, both Molina and Lagasca, in their respective original descriptions, coincide in one of the most common historic uses of these plants, which is the production of soap from their ashes (Velasco Hernandez in Revista Murciana Antropol. 10: 145–158. 2004). However, as is known for Molina's plant descriptions, no original material is available for typification (Thulin & al. in Gayana, Bot. 78: 163. 2021) to allow undoubted confirmation that *Salsola coquimbana* refers to *Salicornia neei*. In this sense, Stafleu & Cowan (in Regnum Veg. 105 (TL-2: 3): 548. 1981) stated that Molina's personal herbarium is "unknown, some material in BOLO", but no Molina materials are kept in BOLO (U. Mossetti, pers. comm.).

To avoid a disadvantageous change of names and future redundant nomenclatural discussions, we here propose the rejection of the name *Salsola coquimbana* in accordance with Art. 56 of the *ICN* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018). Acceptance of this proposal would neutralise the threat posed by *Salsola coquimbana* to the well-established and unequivocal name *Salicornia neei* and its derivatives, and avoid negative nomenclatural changes. Rejection of this proposal would mean that *Salsola coquimbana*, an uncertain and forgotten name, could replace *Salicornia neei*, a widely used name for a South American species.

Author information
AIJ, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8428-8923
CAZ, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4804-7655

Acknowledgements
To C.R. Minué (FaCA-UNCo) and John H. Wiersema (Smithsonian Institution) for their critical review and careful editing of the proposal, which improved the text and contents.

(2907) Proposal to reject the name *Cuscuta aggregata* (*Convolvulaceae*)

I.M. Turner[1,2] & Miguel A. García[3]

1 *Singapore Botanical Liaison Officer, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond TW9 3AB, United Kingdom*
2 *Singapore Botanic Gardens, National Parks Board, 1 Cluny Road, Singapore 259569*
3 *Real Jardín Botánico-CSIC, Plaza de Murillo 2, 28014 Madrid, Spain*
Address for correspondence: *I.M. Turner, i.turner@kew.org*

DOI https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12777

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2907) ***Cuscuta aggregata*** Roxb., Fl. Ind. 1: 467. Jan–Jun 1820, nom. utique rej. prop.
Typus: non designatus.

Roxburgh's posthumous publication (Fl. Ind. 1: 467. 1820) validated the name *Cuscuta aggregata* by including a brief description. The name had been listed earlier (Roxburgh, Hort. Bengal.: 12. 1814) but in the absence of a description or reference to one, it was not validly published there. These two sources provide information on the origin of Roxburgh's plant in India. In 1803, a sample of flax seeds was imported to the Calcutta Botanic Garden of the East India Company from Baghdad. After the seeds were sown, the young plants soon became infected with a "little delicate, leafless, filiform, round, yellow parasite" that went on "to destroy whole beds in a very short space of time". This is what Roxburgh described as *C. aggregata*. We have failed to trace any original herbarium material of *C. aggregata* and the species is not cited in the list of Roxburgh's specimens by Forman (in Kew Bull. 52: 513–534. 1997). There are drawings under Roxburgh's number 1346 (CAL, K) that show a flax plant infected with a flowering plant of dodder with a magnified drawing of a dissected flower and one of an interior view of a detached and opened-out corolla with attached stamens. Circumstantial evidence in terms of the host plant would favour Roxburgh's plant being flax dodder (*C. epilinum* Weihe ex Boenn., Prodr. Fl. Monast. Westphal.: 75. 1824). [Note Manitz (in Feddes Repert. 94: 176. 1983) showed that this was published in the period 14–20 Mai 1824 before Weihe's