The name *C. plena* could possibly be neotypified with a specimen belonging to any of those species; such a typification would not be in conflict with its protologue, and thus would need to be accepted. If the specimen in question would belong to any species other than *C. bruita*, the name *C. plena* would become the correct name for that species.

Nevertheless, adoption of *C. plena* as the correct name for any European species of *Callitriche* would be extremely disruptive to nomenclatural stability, considering the unacceptable degree of arbitrariness that would be involved in any putative typification of this name. Furthermore, the name *C. plena* has not seen any use in the taxonomic literature other than in the work that includes its protologue (i.e., Rafinesque, l.c.). *Callitriche plena* is presented as an “unplaced name” in Plants of the World Online (http://powo.science.kew.org/taxon/urn:lsid:ipni:names:430038-1). Therefore, *C. plena* should be considered a potentially disruptive name. Thus, with the objective of preventing a nomenclatural change that would be evidently disadvantageous to nomenclatural stability, and in accordance with Art. 56 of the *ICN* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018), the name *C. plena* is here proposed for rejection.

Because it will remain impossible to ascertain Rafinesque’s intended identity for this name, we consider it more appropriate to have this name rejected than to propose, arbitrarily, its neotypification by an element identifiable as the earlier *C. bruita*.

Acceptance of this proposal would neutralize the threat posed by *C. plena* to a number of well-established, unequivocal names of European species of *Callitriche*. Rejection of this proposal would mean that *C. plena* could eventually come to replace some well-established, unequivocal name of a European species of *Callitriche*.
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Typus: *P. argentea* L., typ. cons. prop.

As currently delimited, *Potentilla* L. includes 300 to ca. 400 species, being one of the most species-rich genera of *Rosaceae* and the second-biggest in *Potentilleae* Sweet. Since the time of its valid publication by Linnaeus (Sp. Pl.: 495. 1753; Gen. Pl., ed. 5: 219. 1754) and through the whole history of its systematics, there was never a consensus among authors on the delimitation of the genus with respect to the number and status of segregate genera. Molecular phylogenetic studies during the last two decades (Eriksson & al. in Pl. Syst. Evol. 211: 155–179. 1998; in Int. J. Pl. Sci. 164: 197–211. 2003, in Pl. Syst. Evol. 301: 171–184. 2015; Dobeš & Paule in Molec. Phylogen. Evol. 56: 156–175. 2010; Töpel & al. in PLoS Currents 3: RRN1237. 2011; Faghir & al. in Turk. J. Bot. 38: 417–429. 2014; Feng & al. in J. Syst. Evol. 55: 177–191. 2017; Chen & al. in Pl. Syst. Evol. 306: 9. 2020; Persson & al. in B. M. C. Evol. Biol. 20: 38. 2020, in AoB Plants 12: plaa017. 2020) have shed considerable light on the relationships of major lineages within the tribe and within *Potentilla* in its broad circumscription, but the limits of the genus are still a matter of debate. The question is, in particular, which of its main 5–7 clades (disregarding those found outside the subtribe *Potentillinae* J. Presl) are to be recognized as *Potentilla* itself. As was stressed recently (Kechaykin & Shmakov in Turczaninowia 19(4): 114–128. 2016), available molecular and morphological data do not preclude accepting *Tormentilla* L., forming, along with *Duchesnea* Sm., a “Reptans” clade. This clade is less closely related to the biggest clade informally named the “Argentea” clade, in which the bulk (~300 spp.) of *Potentilla* members fall, than is the “Ivesioid” clade containing, in particular, the traditionally recognized North American genera *Horkelia* Cham. & Schltdl. and *Ivesia* Torr. & A. Gray (collectively ca. 50 species). Acceptance of these last two, morphologically well-defined genera makes *Potentilla* paraphyletic since its type, *P. reptans* L., designated by Rydberg (in Britton, N. Amer. Fl. 22: 293. 1908) and affirmed by Green (in Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.: 159. 1929), is a member of the “Reptans” clade, i.e., of *Tormentilla* sensu Kechaykin & Shmakov (l.c.). Noteworthy, the problem of typification of *Potentilla* had been highlighted by Kamelin (in Tzvelev, Fl. Eur. Orient. 10: 395–396. 2001)
before sound molecular phylogenetic data became available. In these circumstances, unless accepting paraphyletic genera within Potentilleae (discussed by Mosyakin & al. in Phytotaxa 474: 261–271. 2020), the best solution seems to be conservation of Potentilla with a new type chosen from among the members of the “Argentea” clade (Potentilla sensu strictissimo), namely, *P. argentea* L. This would facilitate nomenclatural stability since in this case application of the name Potentilla would not depend on whether a narrow or to a varying degree a wide concept of the genus is adopted and whether paraphyletic taxa are accepted or not. Otherwise, under the narrow approach and requiring strict monophyly, the genus is adopted and whether paraphyletic taxa are accepted or not. This would facilitate nomenclatural stability since in this case application of the name Potentilla would not depend on whether a narrow or to a varying degree a wide concept of the genus is adopted and whether paraphyletic taxa are accepted or not. Otherwise, under the narrow approach and requiring strict monophyly, the genus is adopted and whether paraphyletic taxa are accepted or not.
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Typus: *A. glandulosa* Desf.


Typus: *Ailanthus triphysa* (Dennst.) Alston (*Adenanthera triphysa* Dennst.).

Desfontaines took *Ailanthus* from a vernacular name that Rumphius had reported from Ambon (Amboina) or its vicinity in what is now eastern Indonesia (Herb. Amboin. 3: 206. 1743). By publishing the specific name *A. glandulosa* with a feminine epithet, Desfontaines treated *Ailanthus* as feminine, and since then botanists have consistently regarded the name as feminine (Candolle, Prodr. 2: 88–89. 1825 (*Ailanthus*); Bennett in Hooker, Fl. Brit. India 1: 518. 1875 (*Ailanthus*); Trimen, Handb. Fl. Ceylon 1: 230. 1893 (*Ailanthus*); Engler, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 102. 2008; and many others). Moreover, *Ailanthus altissima* (Mill.) Swingle has been cultivated in many parts of the world and has become invasive outside its native range, and there is an extensive literature on its invasiveness and its control that uses the feminine epithet (see CABI, Invasive Species Compendium. 2021 and references therein, https://www.cabi.org/isc/datasheet/3889). In the literature on *Ailanthus* that I have seen, masculine epithets seem only to be errors. For example, Candolle (l.c.) listed four species in the genus, three with feminine epithets and one (*A. malabaricus* DC.) with a masculine epithet; Hewson (l.c.) listed *A. glandulosus* Desf. with a masculine epithet even though every other adjectival epithet he mentioned in the genus was feminine.

Although botanists and other authors have been consistent in regarding *Ailanthus* as feminine, over its history the Code has been unsure whether *Ailanthus* is masculine or feminine. *Ailanthus* has been on lists of conserved generic names since the Vienna Rules (1906), but these lists in the early Codes gave no indication of the species that provided the type or of gender. The Stockholm (1952) and Paris (1956) Codes listed the type of *Ailanthus* as *A. glandulosa*, implying that the generic name was feminine. Without explanation, Rickett & Stafleu (in Taxon 8: 302. 1959) listed the type as “A. glandulosus Desfontaines (*glandulosa*”), implying that the generic name was masculine; the Montreal (1961), Edinburgh (1964), and Seattle (1972) Codes followed Rickett & Stafleu, even...