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During the preparation of checklist of Indian flowering plants, the nomenclature in Rosaceae was being perused by one of the authors and was found that Pyrus vestita var. khasiana Hook. f. was transferred to Sorbus cuspidata (Spach) Hedl. by Ghora (2007), although the name S. vestita (basionym Pyrus vestita Wall. ex G. Don) exists. A literature survey was made and found S. vestita (Wall. ex G. Don) S. Schauer has to be accepted and the name S. cuspidata should be considered as its synonym.

In most taxonomical accounts, Loddiges (Cat. Pl. ed. 16: 36. 1836) was attributed with the credit of transferring Pyrus vestita to Sorbus vestita (e.g. Long, 1987; Aldasora et al., 2004; Watson and Manandhar, 2011). Verification of original of the Loddiges’ Catalogue available at Lindley Library, London revealed that Schauer (1848) has to be ascribed because in the Loddiges’ catalogue (ed. 16, 1836), the name Sorbus vestita was mentioned without any author citation or basionym. For further confirmation, other available editions published by Loddiges available at Lindley and Kew Libraries were also searched, but in vain.

It seems Loddiges has been accredited due to Loudon (1854: 912), who cited, ‘Sorbus vestita Lodd. Cat. edit. 1836’ as one of the synonyms under ‘Pyrus vestita Wall.’ The confusion of the validity of the epithet ‘vestita’ crept after publication of The Flora of British India, where J. D. Hooker (1878: 375) did not mention G. Don’s publication, by which for a long period Pyrus vestita Wall. [Cat. no. 679. 1828, nom. nud.] was considered to have been validated by Hook. f. (e.g. Yu et al., 1974; Ohashi, 1979; Press et al., 2000; Lu and Spongberg, 2003). Consequently, the specific epithet of Crataegus cuspidata Spach got priority over Pyrus vestita! Watson & Manandhar (l.c.), however, mentioned C. cuspidata as well as Sorbus cuspidata (Spach) Hedl. are nom. illegit., probably owing to citation of ‘Sorbus vestita Lodd. Cat.’ by Spach while describing Crataegus cuspidata in 1852. Since the name Sorbus vestita in Loddiges’ catalogue is a nomen nudum, Crataegus cuspidata and Sorbus cuspidata (Spach) Hedl. are legitimate names.

McAllister (pers. comm.) opines that throughout the Himalayas there seem to be intergradations between the described species, and regard them all as part of Sorbus vestita, but earliest name for this complex is S. lanata (D. Don) S. Schauer. However, Gabrielian (1978) placed these species in different subsections viz., Lanatae and Grandifoliae (as S. cuspidata). Further, Rushforth (1991, 1992) discussed elaborately the distinguishing characters of the Himalayan species and recognised them as separate entity. Aldasoro et al. (2004) also recognised the Himalayan species, including S. lanata and S. vestita as distinct species.
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The correct citation of *Sorbus vestita* along with its variety is provided below:


**Type**: India, Uttrakhand, Kumaon, Wall. Cat. no. 679 (K!, lectotype; BM!, ERE, G!, L!, LE, W!, isolecotype).


**Type**: India, Meghalaya, Khasia, 5 – 6000 ft., J.D. Hooker & T. Thomson *s.n.* (K – not traceable).

**Note**: Schauer (1848) cited *Pyrus crenata* Royle, which probably an unpublished name. Lindley in Bot. Reg. t. 1655, which is also cited by Schauer, provided the information given by Royle about the distribution, flowering period and other aspects of this species, which confirms it is different from *Pyrus crenata* of D. Don, as opined by J. D. Hooker (1878). D. Don’s species was regarded as synonym of *P. pashia* Buch.-Ham. *ex* D. Don by Ghora and Panigrahi (1995: 400), but Watson (2011) feels, “it is more likely that this name refers to a species of *Photinia*, *Cotoneaster* or *Eriobotrya*”.
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